

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 420 724

TM 028 446

AUTHOR Carriedo, Ruben
TITLE Commentary on National Test.
PUB DATE 1997-09-00
NOTE 10p.; Paper presented at the Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing Assessment Conference (Los Angeles, CA, September 1997).
PUB TYPE Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Criteria; *Educational Assessment; Educational Planning; Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Minority Groups; *National Competency Tests; Public Schools; *Student Evaluation; Test Construction; *Test Use; *Testing Problems; Testing Programs; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS *San Diego Unified School District CA

ABSTRACT

The administrator in charge of assessment for the San Diego (California) schools discusses the district's decision about whether or not to endorse a national test. The San Diego schools serve 135,000 urban students in 165 schools, 31% of whom are Latino, 22% Asian Indochinese, 18% African American, and 29% White. Before San Diego would want to participate in a national test, the district's administrators would have to be convinced that the test would meet several criteria. First, they would need a clear understanding of the purpose of the national test, and it could not be simply another test to add to the existing program. The national test would have to be part of a cogent assessment plan that uses multiple assessments to measure student achievement. It would need to be standards-based, relying on a national consensus on what students should know and be able to do, and it would need to be linked to essential parts of the educational system. To be accepted, a national test would need to be "doable," so that the practical problems of testing are addressed. A final criterion is that the national test must recognize state and local content. San Diego is open to the national test proposal, but needs more information about its purpose. The stakeholders of the San Diego community hold district administrators to these criteria, and a national test must adhere to them also. (SLD)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS
Planning, Assessment, Accountability, and Development Division

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ruben Carriedo

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

CRESST Assessment Conference
University of California, Los Angeles
September 4, 1997

COMMENTARY ON NATIONAL TEST

Presentation by Ruben Carriedo
Assistant Superintendent

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

Minor changes have been made to
improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this
document do not necessarily represent
official OERI position or policy.

I am the person in charge of assessment in San Diego, a large urban district serving 135,000 students in 165 schools -- 31 percent Latino, 29 percent White, 22 percent Asian Indochinese, 18 percent African American. More than 20 percent of our students come to school with a language other than English as their first language. My comments today reflect the response from an urban district to the national test proposal.

San Diego has not signed on for the national test. We are in the process of making a decision. My comments will address the criteria we are using to make the decision.

If Mike Smith approached me and made an offer for my district to participate voluntarily in a national test, the offer would have to be described in a way that convinced me it was a deal I couldn't refuse. The deal in my thinking, and that of my Board of Education and district, would have to meet four criteria. The criteria are related to purpose, standards based system, connectedness, and doability. Let me say what I mean by each of them.

Criterion 1: Purpose

I would need to have a clear understanding of the purpose of a national test. Last year our district coordinated and/or administered more than 137,000 tests to more than 120,000 students (Grades 2-12) in 160 schools. The tests included **Abbreviated**

ED 420 724

TM028446

Standard Achievement test (ASAT), a norm reference test in mathematics and language arts (Grades 2-10); Aprenda in Spanish for the same grades; PSAT, SAT, Advanced Placement tests; Golden State Examination in eight subjects (Grades 8-12); Physical Education (Grades 5, 7 and 9); The New Standards Reference Exam (Grades 4, 8, and 10); CEEB Achievement Tests; and NAEP (National Assessment of Educational Progress). These tests are in addition to teacher-developed tests. In some ways, **the last thing I need in my life is another test.** Our testing window dominates a good portion of our spring months each school year. The window is full, it's tight, and about to shatter. The national test would have to make my life better for it to get serious consideration.

And to make my life better, its purpose would need to fulfill at least some existing mandates and requirements, board expectations, and replace some of the existing tests. **IT CANNOT BE ANOTHER TEST TO ADD TO THE EXISTING TESTING PROGRAM.**

We, as a district, are investing heavily in other forms of assessment in addition to norm referenced, multiple choice tests (even if the new NRTs are described as standards based). We are strongly committed to standards-based portfolios and exhibitions as forms of assessment that should be used to document what students know and are able to do. This summer we scored 4,000 literacy portfolios in 3 clusters (high school, feeder middle, and elementary schools) and all middle level schools. Next summer we expect to score more than 25,000 portfolios at Grades 3,4, and 8 in all district schools. Right now we are fighting hard to keep this kind of thoughtful and performance-based assessment in our district assessment program. The national test and these new assessments are competing for nonexistent space/time in our fragile testing window.

So, to be more specific, I am reluctant to consider giving up the Abbreviated Stanford Achievement Test (our current NRT) or TerraNova (which we plan to administer next year) to be replaced or complemented by the national test unless I know that the national test can fulfill some Title I requirements, and have a chance of fulfilling some statewide testing requirements.

I would also need to have a clear understanding how the test results will be used--that the results can be articulated in relation to local and state standards. That is, what data will be reported to schools, districts, states, and the media; and what kind of comparisons will be made. I would also want to know what stakes, if any, the national test results would need to be attached to.

And while I do not expect the national test to fulfill all the multiple purposes embodied in existing tests, I DO EXPECT THE NATIONAL TEST TO BE PART OF A COGENT ASSESSMENT PLAN IN WHICH MULTIPLE ASSESSMENTS ARE UTILIZED TO MEASURE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT. It cannot be a one-day happening without connectedness to the current system.

Criterion 2: Standards-Based System

From my perspective, and certainly from the perspective of the district, there is great interest in any initiative or opportunity that will support us to become more of a standards-based system. Thus, we cannot disregard an offer to participate voluntarily in a test that is proposed to measure student progress toward standards, and for this reason we are giving the proposal serious consideration.

High standards to improve student achievement has become a mantra for districts and states. The single most important issue in our school community is improving student achievement, and improving it for all students. There is a great urgency to improve the performance of all but especially students of color who are performing at low levels. We have the closest alignment with the national test proposal on the issue of purpose - the improvement of student achievement so that they can reach high standards.

However, three cautions need to be articulated in this area. The first I will refer to as “Whose Standards?” and the recognition that:

Whose standards

- There are many sets of standards at the national, state, district and even school levels. Some are officially adopted, some are being developed, some address content, some address performance, and some address content and performance with examples of student work.
- Many of these sets of standards are different from each other; some focus on basic skills, some on higher order thinking and problem solving, some both; some are broad, general statements, some are very specific objectives and checklist-like.
- In short, there is more consensus on the need for high standards than consensus on the actual content and format of these standards.

The caution here for the national test proposal is embodied in a central question: **on which standards will the test be based?** We have to really question the notion that we have achieved national consensus on what students should know and be able to do. Our experience in California is that the consensus is still emerging.

A second caution is about the need to create a standards-based system with all the necessary components. In San Diego a standards-based system has several components beginning with:

- Content and performance standards in the academic subject areas that focus on student work.
- Standards-based curriculum and instruction.
- Standards-based professional development.
- Standards-based assessment.
- Standards-based accountability system that links all the components.

A national test, if it proposes to wear the label of standards-based assessment, must make the connections to these other essential parts of the system. **IT CANNOT BE A ONE-TIME EVENT.**

A third caution is that there are many assessments that already exist that describe themselves as standards friendly. Ask any of the developers, vendors, or program managers of these various assessments and tests about whether or not their instrument is based on high academic standards and can report results in terms of which students and schools have met standards in the various academic areas. They will all say yes. Among these tests, there are the New Standards Reference Exam, commercially developed tests like TerraNova, NAEP, and state assessments where they exist (places like Vermont, KY, Maryland). The point of caution is this: First why another test, second who gets to decide whether or not a test is truly standards based, third which one of the several is the best, and, finally does it really matter if it is one or several?

Criterion 3: Doability

At some point we have to get to the nuts and bolts of successfully introducing and administering a new test in our district--no matter how good the instrument and how worthy its purposes, we've got to get to routine things like:

- Ordering the materials.
- Training teachers and administrators about the new instrument, its purpose; in our district we take a new test very seriously. It took us nearly two years to select a new NRT this year. We involved teachers, curriculum specialists, administrators, parents, and the general public. We formed task forces to address issues like alignment to our curriculum, text books, and local, state, and federal mandates. We also have important

- discussions about second language and special education--how they are accommodated within the new assessment. On the issue of second language (LEP), let me say a few words. In California and San Diego we really believe all means all. We also believe that you have to address special populations, especially language, from the very beginning--when building something as important as a test that is supposed to assess everyone.
- Communicating to parents and the community about the new instrument, how it relates to current system of grades, report cards, graduation requirements, and any stakes attached to it.
- Scheduling the test in the master calendar.
- Receiving, storing, and disseminating the materials.
- Scoring and reporting results of the assessment.

All of these details require lead time, and the planning has to occur in a timely manner in a district as large as ours. As I noted previously, it has taken two years of planning to change from ASAT to TerraNova, for example. Local districts will need to plan for the national test if it is to have any chance of being administered successfully. Test calendars in most large school districts are planned at least a year in advance.

Criterion 4: Connectedness

The final criterion recognizes the local and state context. School districts, typically have local needs articulated by their boards which may include test requirements (in our case, integration--with test score comparisons between racially isolated and nonracially isolated schools). In addition, there are state mandates and related testing requirements. In California there is an absence of clear direction on how statewide assessment will be addressed- only that it is going to happen, at some time in the future with some type of instrument that, to date, is undetermined, and the test will be aligned to emerging but not adopted state standards. School districts are supposed to plan for all eventualities. And we are. A new test on the block cannot survive unless it addresses these district level and state context issues.

Our participation in the national test would have to, at the minimum, not conflict with and be coordinated with local and state needs. Right now there are so many unknowns that it is difficult to make the decision. We see this discussion today and a similar one several months ago in Washington as very positive outreach by proponents of the national test proposal to talk with districts and schools to resolve issues.

In summary, San Diego is open to the national test proposal, but we need more information about its purpose. We need to know whether or not it is a one-time event or whether it is part of a total standards-based system. We need to have these questions answered and begin the planning. And, finally, we need to know that participation in the national test will be consistent with and connected to local and state policy and context. These four criteria

are really the standards that I am held to by stakeholders in my school community, and they should be the same standards that a national test proposal should be held to.

RC:vjh

National Test.9-4-97



U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



T1M028446

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: COMMENTARY ON NATIONAL TEST	
Author(s): Ruben Carriedo	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: September 4, 1997

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

_____ Sample _____

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

_____ Sample _____

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

_____ Sample _____

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 1



Level 2A



Level 2B



Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: <i>Ruben Carriedo</i>	Printed Name/Position/Title: Ruben Carriedo, Assistant Supt.		
Organization/Address: San Diego City Schools 4100 Normal St., San Diego, CA 92103	Telephone: (619) 293-8047	FAX: (619) 295-5739	Date: April 7, 1998
	E-Mail Address: rcarried@mail.		

sandi.net

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse: THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION 1129 SHRIVER LAB, CAMPUS DRIVE COLLEGE PARK, MD 20742-5701 Attn: Acquisitions
--

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1100 West Street, 2nd Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080

Toll Free: 800-799-3742

FAX: 301-953-0263

e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov

WWW: <http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com>