Final Report of the Certificate of Mastery Study Committee

Presented to the
State Board of Education

by

Gary Gainer, Chair
COM Study Committee
(On behalf of the COM Study Committee)

May 21, 2003

May 21, 2003

Bobbie May, President
State Board of Education
P.O. Box 47206
Olympia, Washington 98504-7206

RE: Final Report of the Certificate of Mastery Study Committee

Dear Bobbie:

On behalf of the Certificate of Mastery Study Committee (COMSC), I am pleased to present this Final Report to the State Board of Education.

I commend, applaud, and thank the members of the committee who have hung in there nearly three years; confronted with a challenging topic, a lot of dialogue, and many presentations from assessment experts. The journey had its inherent joys and frustrations, to be expected given the complexity of the public policy issue (s). It has not been an easy road to travel. The public service performed by the committee members has been outstanding. I cannot thank them enough for their time, commitment, patience, and humor.

The ongoing education reform challenge before the State Board of Education, the Legislature, the education community—including students, and the citizens and businesses of Washington is complex in its simplicity. While it is clear the state has realized much progress since the 1993 passage of HB 1209 (The Improvement of Education Act) -- system changes have been made and continue to be made resulting in improved student achievement -- the voyage is by no means finished.

The committee's work is complete, but the work is not yet done. The baton is now passed to the Board. Your task is no less easy because of the committee's journey, but it may be more focused due to that journey. I entrust this final report to you with the confidence that the Board will be duly thoughtful in moving forward on the path of enhancing the learning and performance experiences of all Washington students. In moving onward, I encourage the Board to maintain contact with the COM Study Committee members and take advantage of their collective perspectives, experiences, and expertise.

I thank you for the opportunity and privilege of chairing the Certificate of Mastery Study Committee.

In gratitude,

Gary Gainer, Chair
COM Study Committee

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Letter of Transmittal	
Table of Contents	i
Background	1-5
Committee Positions	6-16
Goal 1A	6-7
Goal 1B	8-10
Goal 2A	11
Goal 2B	12-14
Goal 3	15-16

Appendices	17-37
A	17
B	18
C	19
D	20
E	21-24
F	25-37

BACKGROUND

In 1993, the Legislature passed the Improvement of Student Achievement Act (E2SHB 1209). The law states, in part:

> *"After a determination is made by the state board of education that the high school assessment system has been implemented and that it is sufficiently reliable and valid, successful completion of the high school assessment shall lead to a certificate of mastery. The certificate of mastery shall be obtained by most students at about the age of sixteen, and is evidence that the student has successfully mastered the essential academic learning requirements during his or her educational career. The certificate of mastery shall be required for graduation but shall not be the only requirement for graduation."*
>
> **RCW 28A.655.060(3)(c)**

The former Commission on Student Learning submitted to the legislative education committees in 1997, a report titled, Recommendations on the Washington Certificate of Mastery. The report was developed by the Commission's Certificate of Mastery Ad Hoc Committee. The committee recommended formal implementation of the Certificate of Mastery (COM) beginning with the graduating Class of 2006. (Copies available upon request to the State Board of Education office.)

Legislation was introduced in 1999, to establish in law that the Certificate of Mastery be formally required for graduation beginning with the senior Class of 2008. The bill did not pass. As a result of dialogue with key legislators, the State Board indicated that it could and would use its rule-making authority to set a target effective date for the Certificate of Mastery.

In January 2000, the State Board of Education adopted a rule establishing 2008 as the target first graduating class that will have to possess the COM in order to receive a diploma and graduate. (See **Appendix A.** WAC 180-51-063.) At the same time, the Board adopted another rule creating the Certificate of Mastery Study Committee (COMSC). (See **Appendix B.** WAC 180-51-064.) (See **Appendix C** for ending membership list. See **Appendix D** for committee membership history.)

In adopting WAC 180-51-064, the State Board of Education committed to providing annually to the legislative education committees an annual January status report on the work of the COM Study Committee. Copies of the reports are on the State Board's website (www.sbe.wa.gov).

<><><>

Included in the 2003 annual report to the Legislature are the following definitions for "Validity" and "Reliability":

> **Validity** is the extent to which an assessment/test measures what it is supposed to measure, as well as the extent to which inferences and actions based on the assessment/test scores are appropriate and accurate. [NOTE: Validity has different connotations for different types of assessments/ tests. Different kinds of validity evidence are appropriate for each. Example: Content validity is a question of the match and balance between the test items (i.e., the questions) and the course content (i.e., the EALRs being assessed.)]
>
> **Reliability** is the degree to which the results of an assessment are dependable (i.e., relatively free from random errors of measurement) and consistently measure particular student knowledge and/or skills. Reliability defines the extent to which standard errors of measurement are absent from a measurement instrument. Reliability is usually expressed in the form of a reliability coefficient (or as the standard error of measurement derived from it). The higher the reliability coefficient the better, because this means there are smaller random errors in the scores. A test (or a set of test scores) with a reliability of 1.00 would have a standard error of zero and thus be perfectly reliable. No test is perfectly reliable. The judgment about reliability is whether the scores are sufficiently reliable given the context (e.g., if retake opportunities are available). An unreliable assessment cannot be valid. An invalid assessment can be reliable; however, it provides no useful information.

The COM Study Committee was fortunate to obtain the research support of Catherine Hardison, a law student at Seattle University. Ms. Hardison research and developed a report on high stakes testing issues and the experience of selected states.

The State Board and COMSC were further supported by the 1991 Legislature and inclusion of $100,000 in the state operating budget to support the work of the committee. As a result, in October 2001, the State Board entered into a contract with Educational Service District No. 101 (Spokane). In turn, ESD 101 hired Mr. Geoff Praeger (at the time a recently retired, 30-years school district level assessment director) to develop, administer, and analyze the results of an Opportunity To Learn survey. The purpose of the survey was to generate a snapshot data and evidence relating to the readiness of the K-12 system to provide all students the opportunities

they need to learn the Essential Academic Learning Requirements(EALRs) before taking the high school WASLs to meet the Certificate of Mastery state graduation requirement. Mr. Praeger involved the COM Study Committee and the State Board of Education in the survey development process.

In addition to the research support by Ms. Hardison and Mr. Praeger, the committee benefited from a number of presentations during its nearly three years duration, including presentations and/or discussions with:

- Dr. Rosemary Fitton, OSPI, reviewed the basics of validity and reliability issues.
- Dr. Catherine Taylor, University of Washington, appeared before the committee three times, presenting on: setting cut-scores and performance standards; and the technical validity and reliability of the high school WASLs.
- Greg Hall, Assistant Superintendent for Assessment, OSPI, shared the history of education reform and high stakes testing in Alberta, Canada; and also shared the preliminary results from the WASL retakes pilot project in the North Thurston School District.
- Dr. Thomas Haladyna, Professor of Educational Psychology, Arizona State University-West, made a presentation on accountability, uses of high-stakes test scores, legal defensibility and validity, and opportunity-to-learn.
- Dr. Patricia Almond, Oregon Department of Education, who spoke to the committee about Oregon's approach to alternative assessments.
- Superintendent of Public Instruction Dr. Terry Bergeson provided the committee a brief history on different ways to look at performance.
- Mr. Robert Butts, Policy and Partnerships, OSPI, led a discussion on using incentives to promote the high school WASL until it becomes a formal graduation requirement.
- Dr. William Mehrens and Dr. Joseph Ryan, members of the national Technical Advisory Committee to the State Superintendent, dialogued with the committee on assessment issues.
- Conference call with Kathy Christie, Vice President for Information Management and ECS Clearinghouse, on high stakes graduation testing in other states.
- Steve Mullin, Vice President, Washington Roundtable, and COMSC member, shared information about incentives used in Oregon relating to that state's Certificate of Initial Mastery (CIM) and Certificate of Advanced Mastery (CAM).
- Dialogue with UCLA Professor Emeritus Dr. W. James Popham on assessment issues. (8/15/02)
- Nancy Skerritt, Director of Curriculum and Instruction, Tahoma School District, shared a district perspective on assessment validity. (11/19/02)

- Dr. Joe Willhoft, Director of Assessment, Tacoma School District, shared a district perspective on assessment reliability. (11/19/02)
- Dr. John Brickell, Research Specialist, Washington Education Association, twice shared a summary of research and evidence relating to assessment validity and reliability.

The summary of lessons learned from all this activity is perhaps best captured in the 2003 progress report to the Legislature:

> *"What has the Certificate of Mastery Study Committee learned? Among the learnings are that at the state level there are concerns and questions about the number of EALRs and scoring of the WASL assessment. Likewise, there are differences in the understanding, awareness, and readiness of our state's schools to support the Certificate of Mastery as a graduation requirement. While the State Superintendent's office has experts working on the EALRs and WASL assessment issues, the COM Study Committee has assigned a significant portion of its work to the development and distribution of a credible survey instrument to elicit information from 16 different subgroups of the education system about implementation of state reforms in our schools. It is intended that the survey be repeated over time. While students will be held accountable for demonstrating their learning, we do not want our students to bear the burden of accountability for the system.*

GOAL 1A

Make a recommendation to the State Board of Education about the validity of the secondary Washington Assessments of Student Learning (WASLs).

POSITION 1

Barb Clausen, Lynn Fielding, Phyllis Bunker Frank, Gary Gainer, Greg Hall, Gary Kipp, Bob McMullen, Carol Mohler, Bill Moore, Steve Mullin, Wes Pruitt, Marv Sather, Gay Selby, Chris Thompson, Jennifer Vranek

Based on evidence of alignment between the Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALRs) and assessment provided by the test's publisher, researchers from the University of Washington, and independent research studies conducted on the mathematics assessments for grades 4, 7 and 10, this body of evidence indicates a very strong alignment between the EALRs and the WASL.

We believe that the WASL, for the purpose of graduation, is sufficiently valid in reading, math, and writing. We expect that validity will improve as monitoring occurs and continuing refinements are made; such as:

- Ongoing adherence to the American Educational Research Association (AERA) high-stakes testing guidelines for implementation (curriculum alignment of WASL/EALRs)
- Lengthening the listening WASL
- Identifying the grade level content expectations that will be eligible to be assessed on the WASL.

POSITION 2

Nick Brossoit, Christie Perkins, Laura Jo Severson, Dennis Wallace, Andy Wheeler, Ron Woldeit

The test may be valid for some students. We are concerned that it is not valid for all students. We recommend that additional work be done in all aspects of validity.

POSITION 3

Nick Brossoit, Christie Perkins, Patty Raichle, Laura Jo Severson, Andy Wheeler, Ron Woldeit

While certain inferences from a test may be validly drawn for some groups of students but not for others, any test that is being used for high stakes decisions for all students must be proven to make valid inferences for all students.

There are different kinds of validity, and adequacy must be demonstrated separately for each kind. Testing experts agree that tests must be valid for each purpose for which they are used. If a test is being used to determine mastery of math, can we validly assume that a student who passes the test knows math, knows the kinds of math expected to be mastered, and has mastered that math at the expected level of performance? If the test is being used to determine whether a student should graduate from high school, can we validly assume that a student who passes the test knows the right information at the right level of performance for success after high school?

Content validity research conducted by OSPI has determined that the 10th grade WASL generally matches the 10th grade EALRs. However, this determination is challenged by outside research. The Fall 2002 report from the Stanford Research Institute raises questions about the match of the Math test items to the 10th grade math EALRs, test coverage of all 10th grade Math EALRs, and appropriate levels of difficulty. These issues point out serious concerns about the content validity of the 10th grade Math WASL. Corrections and follow-up research need to occur before the State Board can determine the content validity of the Math WASL. Obviously, similar research needs to be conducted on the other three WASL-tested areas.

Additional questions are raised by the fact that no one has conducted research into the content-related evidence of the valid use of the 10th grade WASLs for the purpose of high school diploma decisions. In the absence of such research, we are unable to determine that these tests correctly contribute to a defensible decision to award a high school diploma. Furthermore, no research has been conducted into the predictive validity of the 10th grade WASL, according to OSPI's national technical advisory committee, and OSPI cannot back up any claims that WASL scores predict anything. We also are concerned about the lack of research into consequent validity—are the uses and interpretations of the scores contributing to enhanced student achievement and, at the same time, not producing unintended negative outcomes.

Lacking this information, we cannot recommend to the State Board of Education at this time that the 10th grade WASL is valid for the purpose of conferring or denying a high school diploma.

GOAL 1B

Make a recommendation to the State Board of Education about the reliability of the secondary Washington Assessments of Student Learning (WASLs).

POSITION 1

Barb Clausen, Lynn Fielding, Phyllis Bunker Frank, Gary Gainer, Greg Hall, Gary Kipp, Bob McMullen, Carol Mohler, Steve Mullin, Wes Pruitt, Marv Sather, Gay Selby, Chris Thompson, Jennifer Vranek

Based upon the reliability coefficient as published in the technical report produced by University of Washington contract and published by the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI), we believe that the WASL is sufficiently reliable as an assessment tool in reading, math, and writing. However, to increase the reliability of the graduation decision, the following steps need to be taken:

- Retakes for all four areas (reading, mathematics, writing, listening)
- Writing double-scored
- Reconsideration of cut-scores for decision-making in 10th grade as a graduation requirement in reading, math, listening, and writing.

POSITION 2

Nick Brossoit, Christie Perkins, Laura Jo Severson, Dennis Wallace, Andy Wheeler, Ron Woldeit

The test may be a reliable measurement for some students. We are concerned that it is not reliable for all students. We recommend additional work be done in this area.

POSITION 3

Nick Brossoit, Christie Perkins, Patty Raichle, Laura Jo Severson, Dennis Wallace, Andy Wheeler, Ron Woldeit

While a test may give reliable scores for a unique group of students, it must be proven to give reliable scores for all students if it is going to be used to make high stakes decisions about all students.

Reliability can vary from .0 (meaning that the results are entirely based upon chance) to 1.0 (meaning the score is not based on chance at all). Tests that are used for different purposes need to meet differing standards of reliability. If a test is used to make group decisions (a school is performing well over-all), then a lower reliability is sufficient.

This is because the accumulation of many scores averages out chance as a factor for the final determination of the group's level of accomplishment. However, if a test is used to make a high stakes decision for an individual, testing experts agree the standard for reliability must be much higher. Generally, a reliability of .50 to .60 is acceptable to evaluate the level of group accomplishment. To evaluate the level of individual accomplishment, the reliability should be at least .94.

The Certificate of Mastery Committee now has technical data for the tenth grade WASL from the 1999, 2000, and 2001 administrations. We do not yet have data from the 2002 administration. The trend data shows that the reliability of the different sections of the test vary from each other as well as from year to year. None of the tests reaches the .94 level of reliability.

Based on the information we have for 2001, the 10th grade Listening test (.77 reliability) and Writing test (. 81 reliability) are clearly not meeting the necessary standard of reliability for individual decisions.

The 2001 Math test is very close to the necessary level of reliability at .92, although the reliability dropped in 2000 and continues to be lower than in 1999. The reliability for the 2001 Reading test is marginal at .90 and is lower than in 1999.

In the absence of further data, we can conclude that the scoring of only the 10th grade Math and Reading WASLs approximates the necessary standard of reliability for individual high-stakes decisions. Neither of the others meets the standard. OSPI is planning some adjustments to its testing processes (double scoring for Writing; lengthening the test for Listening), but we have no data yet to show us that these "fixes" have increased the reliability of these tests to acceptable levels.

In the absence of sufficient data, we can only conclude that additional information is necessary to determine the reliability of all but the 10th grade Math WASL.

In conclusion for both 1A and 1B, there is conflicting expert opinion as to the extent to which the 10th grade WASL is sufficiently valid and reliable for purposes of awarding the COM and the high school diploma. Clearly, the WASL is reliable as a systems indicator for curriculum and program assessment. However, it does not yet meet the

technical standards necessary to be used as the tool to make high stakes decisions for individual students. Furthermore, the most vital issue to be resolved is the 10th grade WASL's validity for the purpose of making graduation decisions. The technical level of reliability is meaningless unless we know that the test is reliably assessing what is essential for all high school graduates to know.

Therefore, more work needs to be done in the next year to resolve these issues before the State Board can make a recommendation with any confidence as to the appropriate use of this test for student graduation decisions.

GOAL 2A

Make recommendations to the State Board of Education regarding
a legal analysis of the readiness of the system to support
the secondary WASLs as a graduation requirement.

POSITION 1

Barb Clausen, Lynn Fielding, Phyllis Bunker Frank, Gary Gainer, Greg Hall,
Gary Kipp, Bob McMullen, Carol Mohler, Bill Moore, Steve Mullin, Wes Pruitt,
Marv Sather, Gay Selby, Chris Thompson, Jennifer Vranek

Based on a variety of federal and state legal precedents from cases in states as diverse as California, Florida, Indiana, Louisiana, Massachusetts, and Texas, we believe that the WASL as a graduation requirement will withstand legal challenges, provided the following conditions are met:

- Adequate notice of requirement is given (met)
- Multiple retakes are provided (not met)
- Academic help is available
- Insure alignment between taught and tested curriculum
- Demonstrate that tests are necessary to education reform (met)

POSITION 2

Nick Brossoit, Christie Perkins, Patty Raichle,
Laura Jo Severson, Dennis Wallace, Andy Wheeler, Ron Woldeit

Currently, the system is not ready from a legal perspective. However, if the right conditions are met it could be legally ready. See the legal defense list provided by the OSPI COM Advisory Committee, and seek additional legal experts from independent and diverse viewpoints. Consider list/issues from the Position 1 group.

GOAL 2B

Make recommendations to the State Board of Education regarding a fairness analysis of the readiness of the system to support the secondary WASLs as a graduation requirement.

POSITION 1

Barb Clausen, Lynn Fielding, Phyllis Bunker Frank, Gary Gainer, Greg Hall, Gary Kipp, Bob McMullen, Carol Mohler, Bill Moore, Steve Mullin, Wes Pruitt, Gay Selby, Chris Thompson, Jennifer Vranek

Because fairness resides in the consistent and objective manner in which the requirement would be applied to all students, we believe that the system will be sufficiently fair. The system promises to become more fair by addressing the following issues:

Statewide Assessment System:

- Alternate measures of assessment with the same standards
- Clear and uniform test administration guidelines
- Retake opportunities
- Articulated cut-scores
- Limited right of appeals for diligent students

Fairness will be maximized by addressing Opportunity To Learn (OTL)* issues such as:

- Teacher readiness and effectiveness
- Early childhood development of numeracy and literacy skills
- Timely supplemental learning opportunities
- Aligned instructional materials
- Instructional leadership
- Notice on student progress on the standards

*Recommended to help ALL students meet standards, but not essential for the WASL as a graduation requirement.

POSITION 2

Nick Brossoit, Phyllis Bunker Frank, Christie Perkins, Marv Sather,
Laura Jo Severson, Dennis Wallace, Andy Wheeler, Ron Woldeit

Currently, the system is not fair for all students. The following need to be addressed:

- Teacher readiness, support, and training
- Revisit and refine the EALRs
- Equity and adequacy of resource issues. (Disaggregated groups should all show improvement.)
- Enhance effectiveness of educational leadership
- Recognition and alternatives for diverse learning needs/styles
- Appeals process
- Diagnostics and remediation for both individuals and the system

POSITION 3

Nick Brossoit, Phyllis Bunker Frank, Christie Perkins,
Patty Raichle, Marv Sather, Laura Jo Severson,
Dennis Wallace, Andy Wheeler, Ron Woldeit

Currently the system is not fair for all students. It is critical that all of the following conditions be addressed successfully prior to the implementation of the COM as a graduation requirement. We recommend that the Certificate of Mastery not become a diploma requirement until all of these conditions are in place.

1. Research-based blended compensatory scoring model (similar to the SAT)
2. Multiple re-takes
3. Alternative methods of assessing what students know and can do
4. Assessment accommodations/modifications based upon IEP needs
5. EALR-focused support continuing beyond one year for English Language Learners (and other special needs populations)
6. Systems readiness (and capacity) that provides equal opportunity to learn for all students. This requires:

a. Funding alignment with performance-based learning needs
b. Ongoing professional development for teachers, administrators, paraeducators, and school directors
c. Curriculum, instruction, assessment, and instructional materials alignment
d. Performance-based authority and management alignment for performance-based learning organization (policy and contract matters, communication processes, etc)
e. Reducing barriers to learning,such as poor health, alcoholism, homelessness, etc., through interagency collaborations
f. A safe, learning environment that provides knowing, advocating, and modeling for students

8. Revisit, reduce and prioritize the EALRS to identify the ones that should be tested at the state level
9. Review cut scores and reset as necessary, according to recommendations from the SRI Report
11. Ensure equity and adequacy of resources so that all disaggregated groups show improvements
12. Enhance effectiveness of educational leadership
13. Provide diagnostics and remediation for both individual students and the system
14. Provide clear test administration guidelines
15. Design an appeals process and explore the concept of differentiated test administration dates based on student readiness
16. Provide appropriate notice to students and parents of student progress

GOAL 3

Make recommendations to the State Board of Education regarding what to do for students who do not and cannot pass the secondary WASLs.

SUPPORTED BY:

Nick Brossoit, Barbara Clausen, Lynn Fielding, Phyllis Bunker Frank, Gary Gainer, Greg Hall, Gary Kipp, Bob McMullen, Carol Mohler, Bill Moore, Steve Mullin, Christie Perkins, Wes Pruitt, Patty Raichle, Marv Sather, Gay Selby, Laura Jo Severson, Chris Thompson, Dennis Wallace, Andy Wheeler, Ron Woldeit, Jennifer Vranek

A. Establish a formal group at OSPI and/or SBE, representative of state stakeholders, that is ongoing and reports regularly to the SBE, OSPI, and other relevant stakeholder groups. The group should focus its work around three questions:

1. What are the reasons some students do not meet standard as measured by the WASLs?

2. What student groups need to be specifically addressed and how? (e.g., disabilities, ELL, immigrants, and students struggling to meet standards)

3. What can/should the state do for non-test passers? (e.g., alternate credentials; programs, including career and technical education)

The work needed to answer these questions might be done through:

- Current or new committees created to support the formal group, and which committees are representative of stakeholders

- Empirical studies

- Other

B. Particular attention must be paid to the development of an alternate measure for students to demonstrate the WASL standards.

C. The SBE should investigate ways of recognizing the educational accomplishments of students who do not meet the 10th grade WASL requirements.

- Particularly, attention must be paid to the development of an alternate measure for students to demonstrate the standards (WASL).

- We recommend that the SBE investigate multiple methods of recognizing achievement (educational accomplishments) for students who do meet the 10th grade WASL requirements.

APPENDIX A

WAC 180-51-063 Certificate of mastery -- High school graduation requirement -- Effective date. (1) Pursuant to RCW 28A.655.060 (3)(c):

(a) The certificate of mastery shall be a graduation requirement, but not the only requirement for graduation from high school; and

(b) The state board of education is responsible for determining when the secondary Washington assessment of student learning has been implemented and is sufficiently valid and reliable.

(2)(a) The state board of education establishes the 2007-08 school year as the first year in which graduating high school students shall be required to have attained the state certificate of mastery in order to graduate, in addition to other state and local graduation requirements.

(b) The state board of education fully recognizes that a higher standard of validity and reliability must be applied when the result of the assessment affects the ability of an individual student to receive a high school diploma. Therefore, the state board of education will continue to monitor the high school level Washington assessment of student learning. If the board finds that the assessment is lacking in this higher level of validity or reliability, or both, by the beginning of the 2004-05 school year, the state board may change the effective date of the certificate of mastery, for state graduation purposes, to a later school year.

(c) Beginning the 2007-08 school year, the certificate of mastery shall consist of the subject areas under the student learning goals for which a Washington assessment of student learning secondary assessment has been implemented and declared valid and reliable for graduation purposes. It is expected that the initial certificate of mastery will be comprised of reading, writing, communications, and mathematics.

(d) Beginning the 2009-10 school year, the certificate of mastery shall include science if a Washington assessment of student learning secondary assessment has been implemented and declared valid and reliable for this subject area.

(e) As determined by the state board of education, in consultation with the legislature and the academic achievement and accountability commission, successful completion of the Washington assessment of student learning secondary assessment in social studies may be required to achieve the certificate of mastery or may lead to an endorsement on the high school transcript.

(f) As determined by the state board of education, in consultation with the legislature and the academic achievement and accountability commission, successful completion of the Washington assessment of student learning secondary assessment in arts and health and fitness may lead to an endorsement on the high school transcript.

(g) Effective with students who begin the ninth grade in 2003 (the graduating class of 2007), students who take the secondary Washington assessment of student learning and earn the certificate of mastery and/or meet the standard, attainment of the state certificate of mastery and/or meeting the standard shall be noted on the student's transcript pursuant to WAC 180-57-070.

(3) Notwithstanding WAC 180-18-055 and 180-51-107, subsection (2) of this section shall not be waived.

(4) The certificate of mastery shall not be a graduation requirement for students who receive home-based instruction under RCW 28A.200.101(3) nor for students attending private schools under RCW 28A.195.010(6).

APPENDIX B

WAC 180-51-064 Certificate of mastery -- Validity and reliability study. (1) The state board of education recognizes that a state investment in activities to verify the validity and reliability of the secondary Washington assessment of student learning for graduation purposes is critical. Therefore, the state board will work with the legislature to establish funding support for validity and reliability substantiation activities.

(2) The state board recognizes that there remain unanswered questions about the certificate of mastery. In order to facilitate the necessary dialogue to address the questions and issues, the board will establish a certificate of mastery validity and reliability advisory committee. At a minimum, the advisory committee shall include representatives from the academic achievement and accountability commission, the office of superintendent of public instruction, the public, the business community, and education stakeholder groups.

(3) The advisory committee shall examine and make recommendations to the state board of education on validity and reliability issues and conduct a review and analysis of the requirement that students obtain a certificate as a condition for high school graduation.

(4) The advisory committee shall submit to the state board a final report and recommendations not later than the board's meeting in May 2003.

(5) By the second Monday of January 2001, and no later than the second Monday of each year thereafter, the state board of education will provide to the house of representatives and senate committees on education, a progress report on the deliberations of the certificate of mastery validity and reliability advisory committee. The state board will submit any proposed policy change based on recommendations of the advisory committee to the house of representatives and senate education committees for review and comment before the change is implemented by the state board under its rule-making authority.

APPENDIX C

SBE CERTIFICATE OF MASTERY STUDY COMMITTEE	
NAME	NAME
Brossoit, Nick; Superintendent Tumwater School District	**Mullin, Steve;** Vice President Washington Roundtable
Clausen, Barbara; Retired Washington Assoc. of School Administrators	**Perkins, Christie;** Public Policy Chair Wa State Special Education Coalition
Densley, Terry; School Director Wilbur School District	**Pruitt, Wes;** Policy and Research Team Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board
Evans, Buck; Member State Board of Education	**Raichle, Patricia;** Director Learning & Education Policy Center, WEA
Fielding, Lynn; School Director Kennewick School District	**Sather, Marv;** Teacher Riverside School District
Frank, Phyllis Bunker; Member State Board of Education	**Selby, Dr. Gay;** Vice Chair Higher Education Coordinating Board
Gainer, Gary; Chair, COM Study Committee (retired SBE member)	**Severson, Laura Jo;** President Washington School Counselor Assoc.; Counselor, SeaTac Occupational Skills Center
Hall, Greg; Assistant Superintendent Assessment & Research, OSPI	**Thompson, Chris;** Executive Director A+ Commission
Hurtado, Denny; Indian Education, OSPI; Tribal Chair, Skokomish Tribe	**Vranek, Jennifer;** Executive Director Partnership for Learning
Kipp, Gary; Assistant Superintendent Secondary Education, Evergreen School District	**Wallace, Dennis;** President Washington-Association for Career and Technical Education; Vocational Director, Yelm High School
McMullen, Robert; Director High School Programs, AWSP	**Wheeler, Andy;** Region 1 Rep. Washington Alternative Learning Assoc.
Mohler, Carol; Citizen	**Woldeit, Ron;** Citizen (former SBE member)
Moore, Bill; Research Manager Student Outcomes, SBCTC	

APPENDIX D

SBE CERTIFICATE OF MASTERY STUDY COMMITTEE

COMSC	2000							2001												2002												2003				
MEMBER	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	1	2	3	4	5
Androsko																																				
Brossoit																																				
Carpenter																																				
Clausen																																				
Cyr																																				
Densley																																				
Fielding																																				
Evans																																				
Frank																																				
Frazer																																				
Gainer																																				
Hall																																				
Hanson																																				
Hernandez																																				
Hurtado																																				
Kipp																																				
Koenninger																																				
Mayo																																				
McMullen																																				
Mohler																																				
Moore																																				
Mullin																																				
Nafziger																																				
Patrick																																				
Perkins																																				
Pruitt																																				
Raichle																																				
Sather																																				
Selby																																				
Severson																																				
Shannon																																				
Thompson																																				
Vranek																																				
Wallace																																				
Wheeler																																				
Woldeit																																				

APPENDIX E

POSITION STATEMENT CONCERNING HIGH-STAKES TESTING IN PREK-12 EDUCATION

Adopted July 2000

The American Educational Research Association (AERA) is the nation's largest professional organization devoted to the scientific study of education. The AERA seeks to promote educational policies and practices that credible scientific research has shown to be beneficial, and to discourage those found to have negative effects. From time to time, the AERA issues statements setting forth its research-based position on educational issues of public concern. One such current issue is the increasing use of high-stakes tests as instruments of educational policy.

This position statement on high-stakes testing is based on the 1999 *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing*. The *Standards* represent a professional consensus concerning sound and appropriate test use in education and psychology. They are sponsored and endorsed by the AERA together with the American Psychological Association (APA) and the National Council on Measurement in Education (NCME). This statement is intended as a guide and a caution to policy makers, testing professionals, and test users involved in high-stakes testing programs. However, the *Standards* remain the most comprehensive and authoritative statement by the AERA concerning appropriate test use and interpretation.

Many states and school districts mandate testing programs to gather data about student achievement over time and to hold schools and students accountable. Certain uses of achievement test results are termed "high stakes" if they carry serious consequences for students or for educators. Schools may be judged according to the school-wide average scores of their students. High school-wide scores may bring public praise or financial rewards; low scores may bring public embarrassment or heavy sanctions. For individual students, high scores may bring a special diploma attesting to exceptional academic accomplishment; low scores may result in students being held back in grade or denied a high school diploma.

These various high-stakes testing applications are enacted by policy makers with the intention of improving education. For example, it is hoped that setting high standards of achievement will inspire greater effort on the part of students, teachers, and educational administrators. Reporting of test results may also be beneficial in directing public attention to gross achievement disparities among schools or among student groups. However, if high-stakes testing programs are implemented in circumstances where educational resources are inadequate or where tests lack sufficient reliability and validity for their intended purposes, there is potential for serious harm.

Policy makers and the public may be misled by spurious test score increases unrelated to any fundamental educational improvement; students may be placed at increased risk of educational failure and dropping out; teachers may be blamed or punished for inequitable resources over which they have no control; and curriculum and instruction may be severely distorted if high test scores per se, rather than learning, become the overriding goal of classroom instruction.

This statement sets forth a set of conditions essential to sound implementation of high-stakes educational testing programs. It is the position of the AERA that every high-stakes achievement testing program in education should meet all of the following conditions:

Protection Against High-Stakes Decisions Based on a Single Test

Decisions that affect individual students' life chances or educational opportunities should not be made on the basis of test scores alone. Other relevant information should be taken into account to enhance the overall validity of such decisions. As a minimum assurance of fairness, when tests are used as part of making high-stakes decisions for individual students such as promotion to the next grade or high school graduation, students must be afforded multiple opportunities to pass the test. More importantly, when there is credible evidence that a test score may not adequately reflect a student's true proficiency, alternative acceptable means should be provided by which to demonstrate attainment of the tested standards.

Adequate Resources and Opportunity to Learn

When content standards and associated tests are introduced as a reform to change and thereby improve current practice, opportunities to access appropriate materials and retraining consistent with the intended changes should be provided before schools, teachers, or students are sanctioned for failing to meet the new standards. In particular, when testing is used for individual student accountability or certification, students must have had a meaningful opportunity to learn the tested content and cognitive processes. Thus, it must be shown that the tested content has been incorporated into the curriculum, materials, and instruction students are provided before high-stakes consequences are imposed for failing examination.

Validation for Each Separate Intended Use

Tests valid for one use may be invalid for another. Each separate use of a high-stakes test, for individual certification, for school evaluation, for curricular improvement, for increasing student motivation, or for other uses requires a separate evaluation of the strengths and limitations of both the testing program and the test itself.

Full Disclosure of Likely Negative Consequences of High-Stakes Testing Programs

Where credible scientific evidence suggests that a given type of testing program is likely to have negative side effects, test developers and users should make a serious effort to explain these possible effects to policy makers.

Alignment Between the Test and the Curriculum

Both the content of the test and the cognitive processes engaged in taking the test should adequately represent the curriculum. High-stakes tests should not be limited to that portion of the relevant curriculum that is easiest to measure. When testing is for school accountability or to influence the curriculum, the test should be aligned with the curriculum as set forth in standards documents representing intended goals of instruction. Because high-stakes testing inevitably creates incentives for inappropriate methods of test preparation, multiple test forms should be used or new test forms should be introduced on a regular basis, to avoid a narrowing of the curriculum toward just the content sampled on a particular form.

Validity of Passing Scores and Achievement Levels

When testing programs use specific scores to determine "passing" or to define reporting categories like "proficient," the validity of these specific scores must be established in addition to demonstrating the representativeness of the test content. To begin with, the purpose and meaning of passing scores or achievement levels must be clearly stated. There is often confusion, for example, among minimum competency levels (traditionally required for grade-to-grade promotion), grade level (traditionally defined as a range of scores around the national average on standardized tests), and "world-class" standards (set at the top of the distribution, anywhere from the 70th to the 99th percentile). Once the purpose is clearly established, sound and appropriate procedures must be followed in setting passing scores or proficiency levels. Finally, validity evidence must be gathered and reported, consistent with the stated purpose.

Opportunities for Meaningful Remediation for Examinees Who Fail High-Stakes Tests

Examinees who fail a high-stakes test should be provided meaningful opportunities for remediation. Remediation should focus on the knowledge and skills the test is intended to address, not just the test performance itself. There should be sufficient time before retaking the test to assure that students have time to remedy any weaknesses discovered.

Appropriate Attention to Language Differences Among Examinees

If a student lacks mastery of the language in which a test is given, then that test becomes, in part, a test of language proficiency. Unless a primary purpose of a test is to evaluate language proficiency, it should not be used with students who cannot understand the instructions or the language of the test itself. If English language learners are tested in English, their performance should be interpreted in the light of their language proficiency. Special accommodations for English language learners may be necessary to obtain valid scores.

Appropriate Attention to Students with Disabilities

In testing individuals with disabilities, steps should be taken to ensure that the test score inferences accurately reflect the intended construct rather than any disabilities and their associated characteristics extraneous to the intent of the measurement.

Careful Adherence to Explicit Rules for Determining Which Students Are to be Tested

When schools, districts, or other administrative units are compared to one another or when changes in scores are tracked over time, there must be explicit policies specifying which students are to be tested and under what circumstances students may be exempted from testing. Such policies must be uniformly enforced to assure the validity of score comparisons. In addition, reporting of test score results should accurately portray the percentage of students exempted.

Sufficient Reliability for Each Intended Use

Reliability refers to the accuracy or precision of test scores. It must be shown that scores reported for individuals or for schools are sufficiently accurate to support each intended interpretation. Accuracy should be examined for the scores actually used. For example, information about the reliability of raw scores may not adequately describe the accuracy of percentiles; information about the reliability of school means may be insufficient if scores for subgroups are also used in reaching decisions about schools.

Ongoing Evaluation of Intended and Unintended Effects of High-Stakes Testing

With any high-stakes testing program, ongoing evaluation of both intended and unintended consequences is essential. In most cases, the governmental body that mandates the test should also provide resources for a continuing program of research and for dissemination of research findings concerning both the positive and the negative effects of the testing program.

Bibliography List for COM Study Committee			
No.	**Date/Source**	**Pages**	**Title/Author(s)**
1	1992	39	A Review of the Legal Pitfalls Minimum Competency Testing Must Circumvent, Robert E. "Skip" Patterson, Senior Counsel, Assistant Attorney General
2	1993	24	Testing Condition Accommodations for Disabled Students, S.E. (Susan) Phillips
3	1993	30	Legal Issues in Performance Assessment, S.E. (Susan) Phillips
4	1993	46	The *Golden Rule* Remedy for Disparate Impact of Standardized Testing: Progress or Regress?, S.E. (Susan) Phillips
5	October 1994 Educational Leadership	8	GRADING: The Issue Is Not How but Why, Alfie Kohn
6	March 3, 1995 Education Policy Analysis Archives	13	Educational Assessment Reassessed: The Usefulness of Standardized and Alternative Measures of Student Achievement as Indicators for the Assessment of Educational Outcomes, William L. Sanders, Sandra P. Horn
7	1999 National Academy Press	9	HIGH STAKES Testing for Tracking, Promotion, and Graduation, Jay P. Heubert and Robert M. Hauser, Editors, Committee on Appropriate Test Use, Board on Testing and Assessment, Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education, National Research Council
8	September 1999 Educational Leadership	6	Why Students Lose When "Tougher Standards" Win: A Conversation with Alfie Kohn, John O'Neil and Carol Tell

Bibliography List for COM Study Committee			
No.	**Date/Source**	**Pages**	**Title/Author(s)**
9	September 29, 1999 The Boston Globe	3	Tougher Tests = Lower Standards, Alfie Kohn
10	October 29, 1999 State Board of Education	47	Joe Ryan Transcription
11	November 14, 1999 The Boston Globe	4	Turning the tables: What if students and parents designed a test for the Board of Education?, Tim Wise
12	December 1999 Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)	4	Traditional and Modern Concepts of Validity, ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation
13	December 9, 1999 The New York Times	3	Tests That Cheat Students, Alfie Kohn
14	Winter 1999 Teachers College Record	35	Assessment Policy and Political Spectacle (assessment policy in Arizona), Mary Lee Smith, Walter Heinecke, Audrey J. Noble
15	2000? ?	3	The Case Against "Tougher Standards", Alfie Kohn
16	2000? ?	6	Practical Strategies to Save Our Schools, Alfie Kohn
17	2000? Eye on Education	3	About MCAS: Cons – A "set up to tell you you're stupid', Anne Wheelock
18	2000? American Youth Policy Form and National Conference of State Legislatures	35	THINKING ABOUT TESTS AND TESTING: A Short Primer in "Assessment Literacy", Gerald W. Bracey
19	2000 Wrightslaw	31	Understanding Tests and Measurements for the Parent and Advocate, Peter W.D. Wright and Pamela Darr Wright

Bibliography List for COM Study Committee			
No.	**Date/Source**	**Pages**	**Title/Author(s)**
20	2000 Commonwealth Accountability Testing System	99	Kentucky Alternate Portfolio Assessment: TEACHER'S GUIDE, Kentucky Department of Education
21	March 20, 2000 The Boston Globe	4	Poor Teaching for Poor Students: More Reasons to Boycott the MCAS Tests, Alfie Kohn
22	Spring 2000 The State Education Standard	5	The Purposes and Elements of Effective Assessment Systems, Carla Claycomb, David Kysilko
23	Spring 2000 The State Education Standard	5	The Too Often Neglected Aspects of State Assessment, Suellen Reed, Indiana State Superintendent
24	Spring 2000 The State Education Standard	4	Stakes, Mistakes, and Statewide Testing, Stuart Kahl
25	Spring 2000 The State Education Standard	5	After Great Expectations, Hard Times, Bruce M. Penniman
26	Spring 2000 The State Education Standard	4	A Reflection on What People Want out of Testing, Katherine Fraser
27	Spring 2000 The State Education Standard	5	State Exams Flunk Test of Quality, Monty Neill
28	Spring 2000 The State Education Standard	2	Watchdog Agency Needed for Standardized Test Makers, Larry Cuban
29	Spring 2000 The State Education Standard	2	State Assessments: The Pandora's Box of Politics, Opportunities, and Litigation, Keith C. McDowell
30	June 2000 Kappan	6	Performance Assessment and the New Standards Project: A Story of Serendipitous Success, Elizabeth Spalding
31	June 2000 Kappan	8	Inquiry-Minded Schools: Opening Doors for Accountability, Sharon F. Rallis, Margaret M. MacMullen

Bibliography List for COM Study Committee			
No.	**Date/Source**	**Pages**	**Title/Author(s)**
32	June 2000 OSPI	17	Guidelines for Participation and Testing Accommodations for Special Populations on the Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL), Dr. Terry Bergeson, Superintendent of Public Instruction
33	June 11, 2000 Greensboro News & Record	2	The Insanity of Testing Mania, Irv Besecker
34	July 2000 American Educational Research Association	5	AERA Position Statement Concerning High-Stakes Testing in PreK-12 Education
35	July 3, 2000 Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO)	104	High School Exit Examination (HSEE): Year 1 Evaluation Report, HumRRO
36	August 3, 2000 Education Week	2	ASSESSMENT
37	August 7, 2000 Education Week	2	ACCOUNTABILITY
38	August 24, 2000 U.S. Department of Education	14	Questions and Answers about Provisions in the Individual with Disabilities Education Act Amendments of 1997 Related to Students with Disabilities and State and District-wide Assessments, Judith E. Heumann, Kenneth R. Warlick
39	August 25, 2000 Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO)	87	High School Exit Examination (HSEE): Supplemental Year 1 Evaluation Report, HumRRO
40	Autumn 2000 The State Education Standard	5	Successful Student Accountability: Mixing Sticks & Carrots in a Comprehensive Approach to Reform, James, F. Causby, Superintendent, Johnson County Schools, North Carolina

Bibliography List for COM Study Committee			
No.	**Date/Source**	**Pages**	**Title/Author(s)**
41	Autumn 2000 The State Education Standard	2	Steering through the Legal Shoals: Social Promotion, Standards-Based Testing, and Educational Malpractice, Christopher R. Yukins
42	Fall 2000 Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL)	11	Insights From Employers and Employment Recruiters: What Kinds of Oral Communication Skills and Behaviors are Employers Looking for When They Interview Job Applicants?, COMMUNICATIONS MATTERS, NWREL
43	Fall 2000 AERA	6	On High Stakes Testing, Beverly M. Gordon
44	September 27, 2000 Education Week	7	Standardized Testing and Its Victims, Alfie Kohn
45	November 2000 AERA	6	Responses to AERA's Position Statement Concerning High-Stakes Testing, Robert M. Hauser, Wayne Martin, Monty Neill, Andrew Porter, Audrey l. Qualls
46	November 2, 2000	15	Student Self-Portraits as Test-Takers: Variations, Contextual Differences, and Assumptions Motivation (about MCAS in Mass.) Anne Wheelock, Damian J. Bebell, Walt Haney
47	November 15, 2000	5	The Development an Impact of High Stakes Testing – Part 1 – Recent Developments, Gary Natriello
48	November 19, 2000 Seattle Post-Intelligencer	3	WASL fails students, teachers, parents, Doug Selwyn
49	November 26, 2000 The News Tribune	2	New on report cards: 'Employability', Aaron Corvin
50	November 28, 2000 Bellingham Public Schools	4	Birchwood Learning Contract, Birchwood Elementary School, Bellingham, Washington
51	November 29, 2000 Education Week	3	Arizona Poised To Revisit Graduation Exam, Darcia Harris Bowman

Bibliography List for COM Study Committee			
No.	**Date/Source**	**Pages**	**Title/Author(s)**
52	November 29, 2000 Seattle Union Record	3	Throw out standardized test, Seattle teachers union says, Rebekah Denn
53	December 2000 The School Administrator	4	***My Stakes Well Done*** Daniel A. Domenech
54	December 2000 The School Administrator	6	***Testing in Texas*** Joseph F. Johnson, Jr., Uri Treisman and Ed Fuller
55	December 2000 U.S.D.E., Office of Civil Rights	104	The Use of Tests When Making High-Stakes Decisions for Students: A Resource Guide for Educators and Policy-Makers
56	December 4, 2000 The Seattle Times	2	Don't abandon tests in Seattle schools, Editorial
57	December 7, 2000 Teachers College Record	10	Falling Short of the Standards – Part 1: High Stakes Testing in American Education – The English Language Arts Test – The Reading Test, Clifford Hill
58	December 7, 2000 Teachers College Record	4	Falling Short of the Standards – Part 2: High Stakes Testing in American Education – The English Language Arts Test – The Reading Test, Clifford Hill
59	December 7, 2000 Teachers College Record	2	Falling Short of the Standards – Part 3: High Stakes Testing in American Education – The Effects of Testing, Clifford Hill
60	December 7, 2000 Teachers College Record	8	Falling Short of the Standards – Part 4: High Stakes Testing in American Education – The Progress Profile, Clifford Hill
61	December 15, 2000 California Department of Education	65	High School Exit Examination (HSEE), California

Bibliography List for COM Study Committee			
No.	**Date/Source**	**Pages**	**Title/Author(s)**
62	December 17, 2000 Los Angeles Times	3	Exit-Exam Retreats Reflect Fears That Students Lack Skills, Martha Groves
63	Winter 2000-2001 American Federation of Teachers (FT)	5	Burned at the High Stakes: A Somewhat Pseudo Self-Test About Testing, W. James Popham
64	2001? Learning First Alliance	11	Standards and Accountability: A Call by the Learning First Alliance for Mid-Course Corrections
65	2001? University of Kentucky	32	Teacher Created Processes for Embedding Statewide Alternate Assessment Requirements into Ongoing Classroom Instruction, Ann Denham, Jean Clayton, and Harold Kleinert, Kentucky Alternate Portfolio Study, Interdisciplinary Human Development Institute, University of Kentucky
66	2001? University of Kentucky	21	Research on the Impact of Alternate Assessments: Practical Implications for Teachers, Harold Kleinert, Jacqui Kearns, Kim Costello, Karen Nowak-Drabik, Michelle Garrett, Leah Horvath, Stephanie Kampfer, and Matt Turner, University of Kentucky
67	2001?	28	Chapter 20: Legal Issues Affecting Special Populations in Large-Scale Testing Programs, S.E. (Susan) Phillips
68	January 2001 U.S. Department of Education	3	Clarification of the Role of the IEP Team in Selecting Individual Accommodations, Modifications in Administration, and Alternate Assessments for State and District-wide Assessments of Student Achievement, Michael Cohen, Judith E. Heumann

Bibliography List for COM Study Committee			
No.	**Date/Source**	**Pages**	**Title/Author(s)**
69	January 2001 U.S. Department of Education	5	Guidance on Including Students with Disabilities in Assessment Programs, Judith E. Heumann, Kenneth R. Warlick
70	January 2001 Principal Leadership	6	Requirements for Accountability, Stephanie Wood-Garnett, Cynthia L. Warger
71	January 2001 PHI DELTA KAPPAN	17	FIGHTING THE TESTS: A Practical Guide to Rescuing Our Schools, Alfie Kohn
72	January 2001 Mathematics Teacher	15	Standards for School Mathematics: Objectivity in Mathematics Assessment, Lew Romagnano
73	January 2001 Teachers College Record	43	Effects of Computer Versus Paper Administration of a State-Mandated Writing Assessment, Michael Russell, Tom Plati
74	January 8, 2001 The Seattle Times	4	A frenzy of testing isn't helping education, Howard Gardner
75	January 9, 2001 The Washington Post	3	Education's Different Drummer, Jay Mathews
76	January 10, 2001 Education Week	3	Test Debate: What Counts As Multiple?, Lynn Olson
77	January 19, 2001 Education Week	5	Seeking Stability For Standards-Based Education, [Quality Counts 2001]
78	January 19, 2001 Education Week	15	Finding the Right Mix, Lynn Olson [Quality Counts 2001]
79	January 19, 2001 Education Week	6	Pressure Without Support, Ulrich Boser [Quality Counts 2001]
80	January 19, 2001 Education Week	25	The State of the States, Greg F. Orlofsky, Lynn Olson [Quality Counts 2001]
81	January 21, 2001 The News Tribune	1	In the real world, WASL isn't working, Robert P. Ward (Letter to the Editor)
82	January 26, 2001 The Arizona Republic	2	AIMS goes too far, educators say, Kelly Pearce, Beverly Medlyn

Bibliography List for COM Study Committee			
No.	**Date/Source**	**Pages**	**Title/Author(s)**
83	January 29, 2001 Everett Herald	1	Stress without learning, Jean M. Hanson (Letter to the Editor)
84	January 29, 2001 Federal Way Mirror	2	Graduation elusive for some seniors, Liz Aberg
85	January 30, 2001 The Washington Post	3	State Tests Are Becoming a Graduation Hurdle, Jay Mathews
86	January 30, 2001 KOMO TV 4	2	WASL Graduation Requirement Debated, Keith Eldridge
87	January 31, 2001 The Daily World (Aberdeen)	2	State poll shows support for WASL, Ryan Teague Beckwith
88	February 3, 2001 The Spokesman-Review	1	Bergeson should get with it, Gayle A. Corativo (Letter to the Editor)
89	February 3, 2001 The Spokesman-Review	1	WASL not ready for prime time, Juanita Doyon (Letter to the Editor)
90	February 5, 2001 The News Tribune	1	WASL and Goals 2000 are social engineering, Cynthia Carr Woods (Letter to the Editor)
91	February 5, 2001 Miami Herald	3	On course to higher test scores: Prof's methods receiving credit, John Barry
92	February 6, 2001 The Seattle Times	3	Pace remains for student test scores, Linda Shaw
93	February 7, 2001 The Washington Post	3	Bills Advance To Ease Grip of SOL Tests, Christina A. Samuels
94	February 8, 2001 The New York Times	3	Disabled Win Halt to Notations of Special Arrangements on Tests, Tamar Lewin
95	February 13, 2001 Education Week	4	Oregon Special-Needs Students To Get Testing Assistance, Lisa Fine
96	February 14, 2001 New York Times	3	Lessons: A School District Refuses to Worship Scores Alone, Richard Rothstein

Bibliography List for COM Study Committee			
No.	**Date/Source**	**Pages**	**Title/Author(s)**
97	February 15, 2001 The News Tribune	2	Teachers grade the WASL test: There's educational value in strategies for taking test, Toni McCord Sadlowski
98	February 15, 2001 The News Tribune	2	Teachers grade the WASL test: Basic accountability must rest with those who take test, Richard Dary
99	February 15, 2001 PBS Online NewsHour	7	School Testing (Four experts discuss President Bush's proposal for required testing in schools) [Host: Margaret Warner; Guests: Bill Evers, Alfie Kohn, Lisa Graham Keegan, Monty Neill]
100	February 15, 2001 The Boston Globe	3	When good students fail MCAS, Scott S. Greenberger
101	February 18, 2001 Los Angeles Times	4	Two Decades of School Reforms Take Us Back to the 1950s, Larry Cuban
102	February 19, 2001 Chicago Tribune	5	Test-prep pressure hits grade schools, Karen Brandon
103	February 19, 2001 Union Tribune (San Diego)	3	A good teacher is not a thing to buy, Logan Jenkins
104	February 20, 2001 Denver Post	2	Test effort is a dumb solution, Diane Carman
105	February 20, 2001 SF Gate News	3	Senate approves bill delaying graduation exam for one year, Jennifer Kerr
106	February 21, 2001 The Boston Globe	2	Poll finds strong opposition to MCAS approach, Scott S. Greenberger
107	February 27, 2001 Dallas Morning News	5	Along with her fourth-graders, rookie teacher feels pressure of TAAS, Colleen McCain Nelson

Bibliography List for COM Study Committee			
No.	**Date/Source**	**Pages**	**Title/Author(s)**
108	March 2001 Catalyst (Voices of Chicago School Reform)	5	Research points to solutions, Elizabeth Duffrin
109	March 2001 Educational Leadership	7	Teaching to the Test?, James Popham
110	March 2001 Educational Leadership	9	Closing the Achievement Gap, Kati Haycock
111	March 5, 2001 Dallas Morning News	3	States stumped by exit exams, Charles Ornstein
112	March 6, 2001 E-mail to Larry Davis	3	Just Say No To Texas-Style School Reform In Washington State, David Marshak
113	March 6, 2001 Contra Costa Times	2	Republicans block bill that would make exam a trial run, Andrew LaMar
114	March 7, 2001 Education Week	4	Solution or Fad?, Peter D. Rosenstein
115	March 7, 2001 Education Week	3	South Dakota Aims To Put Online Assessment to the Test, Michelle Galley
116	March 7, 2001 Los Angeles Times	1	Senate Rejects Bid to Make Exit Test a Practice Exam, Times Staff
117	March 11, 2001 Los Angeles Times	4	Ready or Not, Exit Exam Is the Real Thing, Katie Cooper
118	March 13, 2001 California Department of Education	2	High School Exit Exam Debuts in California, Delaine Eastin and Reed Hastings
119	March 13, 2 001 The New York Times	2	What Tests Can't Fix, Paul Wellstone, Jonathan Kozol
120	March 14, 2001 Education Week	3	The 'Receptivity Factor', Davy McClay

Bibliography List for COM Study Committee			
No.	**Date/Source**	**Pages**	**Title/Author(s)**
121	March 14, 2001 The News Tribune	2	Failing schools split Senate, Joseph Turner
122	March 14, 2001 The Seattle Times	2	Sponsors drop their own school plan, David Ammons
123	March 14, 2001 Spokesman-Review	2	Bill removes the 'secrecy' from WASL, Virginia de Leon
124	November 2000 POLICY ISSUES, Issue 6 North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL)	12	Using Student Assessment Data: What Can We Learn From Schools?, Allison Cromey, NCREL
125	March 18, 2001 The Spokesman-Review	3	Overall, the WASL is nitty-gritty evaluation, Andy James
126	1999 Corwin Press, Inc.	70	PORTFOLIO PLUS: A Critical Guide to Alternative Assessment, Linda Mabry
127	March 2000 Kappan	10	A Seat at the Table: Teachers Reclaiming Assessment Through Rethinking Accountability, Chris Gallagher
128	2000 Heinemann	100	The Case Against Standardized Testing: Raising the Scores, Ruining the Schools, Alfie Kohn
129	January 2001 Kappan	9	The Authentic Standards Movement and Its Evil Twin, Scott Thompson
130	January 8, 2001 State Board of Education	14	First Annual Report on the Status of the Certificate of Mastery Study Committee (to the House and Senate Education Committees), Gary Gainer, President, State Board of Education
131	January 24, 2001 Education Week	7	States Adjust High-Stakes Testing Plans, Lynn Olson
132	January 2001 Principal Magazine	19-21	Balancing the Calendar for Year-Round Learning, Marilyn Stevall

Bibliography List for COM Study Committee			
No.	**Date/Source**	**Pages**	**Title/Author(s)**
133	March 2002 Phi Delta Kappan	487- 498	What Students Do in the Summer, Gerald Bracey
134	May 2002 Phi Delta Kappan	12-13	Summer Loss: The Phenomenon No One Wants to Deal With, Gerald Bracey