DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 458 072 RC 023 209

TITLE	Test Scores and the Rural School and Community Trust.
INSTITUTION	Rural School and Community Trust, Washington, DC.; Harvard Univ., Cambridge, MA. Graduate School of Education.
PUB DATE	2000-12-00
NOTE	34p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Rural School and Community Trust, 1825 K Street NW, Suite 703, Washington, DC 20006 ($5). Tel: 202-955-7177.
PUB TYPE	Numerical/Quantitative Data (110) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Achievement; Achievement Gains; Achievement Tests; College Entrance Examinations; Educational Assessment; Elementary Secondary Education; *Rural Schools; Scores; *Small Schools; *Standardized Tests; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS	Stanford Achievement Tests

ABSTRACT

A number of studies suggests that the small size of many rural schools gives their students, especially the poorest, a leg up on academic achievement. This notion is supported by the standardized test results presented in this report, from a sample of the primarily small schools participating in the Rural School and Community Trust, a national federation of schools and communities "getting better together." Overall, the evidence shows students in Rural Trust schools making steady gains in performance on national standardized tests and statewide assessments at all grade levels and in all subjects, and the scores of Rural Trust students comparing favorably with state averages. Data tables present: (1) results from the Ninth Edition of the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT-9) for California schools in the Rural Trust in 1998-2000 and for Alabama and South Dakota schools in 1996-2000; (2) statewide achievement test results for schools in Colorado, Maine, Minnesota, Oregon, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, and Wisconsin; and (3) results from college entrance exams (SAT and ACT) in Rural Trust schools in 12 states. Brief descriptions of the national standardized tests, statewide assessments, and college entrance examinations are given, as well as examples of schools that showed remarkable gains on particular tests. (SV)

TEST SCORES AND THE RURAL SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY TRUST

A Report from the Rural School and Community Trust
December 2000

THE RURAL SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY TRUST

The Rural School and Community Trust (Rural Trust) is a nonprofit educational organization dedicated to enlarging student learning and improving community life by strengthening relationships between rural schools and communities and engaging students in community-based public work.

Through advocacy, research and outreach, the Rural Trust strives to create a more favorable environment for rural schooling, for student work with public audience and use and for more active community participation in schooling.

Founded as the Annenberg Rural Challenge in 1995, the Rural Trust today works with more than 700 rural elementary and secondary schools in 35 states.

TEST SCORES AND THE RURAL SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY TRUST

A Report from the Rural School and Community Trust
December 2000

Table of Contents

Preface..... 1

Introduction..... 2

Results on the Ninth Edition of the Stanford Achievement Test..... 5

Results on State Assessments..... 12

Results on College Entrance Exams..... 24

Preface

In the fall of 1999, the Rural Challenge Research and Evaluation Program at the Harvard Graduate School of Education prepared a report on standardized test results in a number of schools participating in the Rural Challenge (now known as the Rural School and Community Trust). The schools featured in the report included some of the longest-standing members of this national confederation of schools and communities "getting better together." They also were schools with several consecutive years of stable test results.

This publication provides an update, where possible, of recent test data for these same schools. It also includes college entrance exam scores (on the SAT and ACT tests) to give an additional frame for looking at the test performance of students in schools receiving Rural Trust funds.

These test scores are not intended as an indicator of the quality or impact of the Rural Trust in these schools. While it would be nice to be able to make these connections, the circumstances and data simply do not allow for such inferences. Instead, we offer these data as one commonly accepted indicator of how students in schools associated with the Rural Trust measure up on standardized tests of academic performance. Like a blood pressure reading, standardized test results give us some information about the status of the students, but they fall short of a complete diagnosis.

Harvard University graduate student Michelle Westholm worked assiduously guided by Rural Trust staff member Carla Fontaine, to retrieve the data reported here. Lisa Rowley, along with students June Shin and Xing Tan lent a helping hand.

Barbara Cervone
Harvard Graduate School of Education
Rural School and Community Trust Documentation and Assessment Program
November 2000

TEST SCORES AND THE RURAL SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY TRUST

Like schools in urban and suburban communities, rural schools nationwide face heightened concerns about the performance of their students on standardized tests and state assessments. Historically, rural students have fared reasonably well on standardized tests, especially in the more homogeneous communities of the Northeast, Midwest, Plains and Northwest states. Scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress, for example, are consistently higher than the national average in rural communities in these regions. In other parts of the country, rural students generally do as well or better than their urban counterparts, even when accounting for the hugely influential factors of race and socioeconomic status (SES). A number of studies—including one just concluded by the Rural Trust Policy Program—suggests that the small size of many rural schools gives their students, especially the poorest, a leg up on academic achievement.

The test results reported here, from a sample of Rural Trust schools, affirm these patterns. Overall, the evidence suggests:

- Students in schools participating in the Rural Trust are making steady gains in performance on national standardized tests and state assessments. This trend holds true at all grade levels and in all subjects.

- The scores of Rural Trust students compare favorably with state averages on the same tests. In the majority of cases, they are near or above the state average.

In some cases, Rural Trust schools report remarkable gains and impressive comparisons with statewide averages. Here are some examples.

At St. Paul High School in Virginia (part of the Rural Trust's Appalachian Rural Education Network) the percentage of students passing Virginia's "Standards of Learning" has risen dramatically from 1998 to 2000. For instance:

- The percent passing in Algebra 1 rose from 69 to 93 percent, with comparable state averages of 40 and 65.
- In Earth Science, the passing percentage increased from 53 to 81, compared to state figures of 58 and 70.
- In Chemistry, passing scores went from 80 to 94 percent, compared to 54 and 64 percent statewide.
- The percentage of students passing U. S. History increased from 15 to 55 percent compared to 30 and 39 statewide.

At the Cabot School in Vermont (one of four schools in the Vermont Rural Partnership) students have made gains from 1998 to 1999 on the New Standards Reference Exams in virtually every category in which they were tested. (There are 21 categories in all, covering grades 4, 8, and 10). Highlights include:

- The percent of 4th graders scoring at the top performance levels (standard or standard with honors) in math rose from 41 to 69 percent.
- In 8th grade math, top level performance scores increased from 41 to 67 percent.
- In 10th grade math, the percent scoring at top performance levels rose from 46 to 63.
- In 4th grade reading, the percent meeting or exceeding standards increased from 68 to 88 percent.
- 10th grade reading percentages at standard or above rose from 38 to 71.

Students in Schleicher County, Texas have now made impressive gains on the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills for five years running. Their scores exceed the state average, by as much as 17 percentage points, in every grade and subject measured. Their lowest passing rate—in 6th grade math—is 91 percent; 100 percent of Schleicher County students passed the TAAS in four of the 12 categories: 7th grade reading; 5th, 6th, and 7th grade math.

Students in schools belonging to Minnesota's Center for School Change have made substantial strides on the Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment Test. This is especially evident at the "superior" level, which indicates performance "well beyond what is expected at the grade level." From 1998 to 2000, for example, the percentage of 3rd graders scoring "superior" rose in four of the five schools sampled, with the average increase in "superior" reading scores going from 3 percent to 13 percent. In math, the percentage of students rating "superior" rose, on average, from 5 to 13 percent.

As in urban and suburban schools, however, the "achievement gap" in test results between economically richer and poorer (communities, schools, and students) remains painfully evident in the Rural Trust schools surveyed. Within individual Rural Trust school/community networks, significant disparities in median family income are often—and predictably—reflected in test scores. While schools in a particular network may each show an overall rise in student scores during the past few years, those schools with a higher SES student body almost always start and track higher, often posting comparatively greater gains than their lower SES counterparts.

In a national program like the Rural Trust, a quick scan of test scores also underscores the disparities in income and results not just among and between communities, but also across states and regions of the country. On the ACT, the preferred test for college-bound seniors in many Southern, Midwest, and Plains states, the differences in state averages can be significant. In Mississippi, for example, the average composite score on the ACT in 2000 was 18.7; in Wisconsin the same average was 22.2. Students in West Tallahatchie, Mississippi (at a school that participates in the Southern Initiative of the

Algebra Project, a Rural Trust partner) achieved a composite score of 17.0 in 2000, up impressively from the 15.7 they scored in 1998, though still below the state average. Students at Flambeau High School in Wisconsin, part of New Paradigm Partners, posted a composite score of 21.8 in 2000—lower than their 22.5 average in 1998 and slightly shy of the state average, but far higher than West Tallahatchie.

The test scores presented in the following tables come with several, necessary caveats, it should be noted.

First, they represent only a small sample of the many schools (roughly 700) that have some degree of affiliation with the Rural Trust. The schools featured are not technically a random sample. Rather, several factors guided their selection: geographical diversity, length of involvement with the Rural Trust (as noted earlier, most are long-standing partners), and availability of several years' worth of stable test data. The last deserves a bit more explanation.

In the currently volatile world of standardized testing and local/state assessments, change rules the day. The particular test chosen for statewide administration can change. The grade levels tested also fluctuate. Occasionally, norms on state-designed assessments are re-calibrated to better reflect student performance. Representing some 30 plus states, Rural Trust sites are not exempt from this testing flux. As we returned to the schools sampled in last year's report to update their information, we found instances of all these types of change—making comparisons with this year's results impossible for some schools.

A second caveat is that the Rural Trust is mostly comprised of small schools, with correspondingly small numbers of students tested. Researchers, however, like big "N's": the greater the number of students (or in the larger world, subjects) tested, the more reliable the results. When the number of students taking the test is small—in some Rural Trust schools *very* small—year-to-year fluctuations are to be expected and may have little to do with the quality of instruction. One year's crop of 25 "bright" fifth graders may give way to a "less ambitious" group of 19 the following year.

Third, because of the number of variables involved, making direct causal connections between a given educational program and a certain student outcome is exceedingly difficult. In the case of this report, for instance, the grade levels and subject areas tested do not routinely line up with the age levels and areas that may have received the greatest attention through the Rural Trust. And not all the students tested in a particular grade or subject may have participated in a Rural Trust project. A goal of the Rural Trust in the years ahead is to reach more grades, subject areas, and students, but this deepening and spreading is still in its early stages.

Occasionally, signs of a possible cause and effect relationship do emerge. St Paul High School in Virginia, for example, has concentrated much of its Rural Trust work in the sciences; student test scores in these subjects over the past three years have risen markedly. This seems like good news. But as a rule, we must eschew drawing

conclusions that the data is simply not equipped to support. The fundamental purpose of this report, again, is to take the pulse of selected Rural Trust schools on an array of standard measures of student academic performance, suggesting trends in relation to improving scores and allowing comparisons with state norms.

Finally, the students, parents, teachers, and community leaders participating in the Rural Trust would argue strongly that the goals of their efforts are multi-dimensional—spanning school and the outside world close at hand and spanning subjects and grades. The skills Rural Trust projects seek to help students master are not just academic, but include teamwork, initiative, problem solving, communications, and citizenship. Those active in the Rural Trust would remind us that while paper and pencil tests certainly play a central role in assessment, they are inadequate tools for capturing the impact of project-based and community learning by students.

Results on the Ninth Edition of the Stanford Achievement Test

The standardized test increasingly favored by school districts and states nationwide is the Ninth Edition of the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT-9). Its popularity stems, at least in good part, from the fact that it is designed to test mastery of challenging content aligned with the Federal Government's voluntary national standards. Also, it does so in a format that includes not only multiple-choice questions, but also open-ended ones. Many educators believe that test-preparation activities for open-ended questions—particularly ones focused on challenging content—can provide learning benefits for students that go beyond test-taking skills.

The SAT-9 reports student test results according to performance levels ("advanced," "proficient," "basic," and "below basic"). It reports them in terms of national norms as well (that is, how the students scored in comparison to a national sample of students who took the test earlier). In the tables that follow, we provide the percentage of students testing at or above these national norms (that is, at the 50 percent level or higher). In addition, we report how these percentages compare with the state average.

In Tables 1 through 6 are SAT-9 scores for students in three California projects (North Coast Rural Challenge Network, Mariposa, and the Yuba Watershed Alliance), PACERS schools in Alabama, and the Program for Rural School and Community Renewal in South Dakota.

TABLE 1

North Coast Rural Challenge Network (California)
Percent of Students Scoring At or Above 50% National Percentile Rank, Grades 2-11, 1998-2000

	Mendocino			Laytonville			Anderson Valley			Point Arena			State (2000)
	98	99	00	98	99	00	98	99	00	98	99	00	
Grade 2													
Reading	64	80	73	28	34	21	47	38	47	38	28	--	49
Math	60	80	92	23	26	30	60	71	43	41	39	--	57
Language	55	71	77	32	31	17	43	45	40	21	21	--	52
Spelling	55	70	77	23	29	17	37	34	27	36	24	--	50
Grade 3													
Reading	69	78	86	36	26	42	30	31	39	35	29	--	44
Math	71	67	89	38	41	30	52	60	65	30	32	--	56
Language	67	75	86	32	29	35	32	41	30	28	39	--	48
Spelling	57	53	79	31	46	31	26	22	15	33	35	--	46
Grade 4													
Reading	65	71	85	44	40	33	43	33	43	39	36	--	45
Math	41	49	85	31	32	39	54	35	58	21	31	--	51
Language	56	68	80	43	35	47	41	31	46	35	35	--	51
Spelling	52	56	74	31	34	33	35	17	26	32	35	--	43
Grade 5													
Reading	68	74	87	50	43	54	60	52	31	40	50	--	44
Math	48	54	72	37	31	47	67	62	44	29	44	--	50
Language	64	70	72	47	34	42	59	51	45	33	46	--	50
Spelling	51	56	66	36	33	31	36	46	20	33	42	--	45
Grade 6													
Reading	72	72	81	42	55	55	39	64	55	51	39	--	46
Math	54	67	66	39	49	53	53	71	67	40	48	--	55
Language	70	70	75	50	53	52	44	61	61	47	46	--	52
Spelling	64	69	58	41	58	41	25	39	47	41	33	--	44
Grade 7													
Reading	71	70	88	41	47	58	52	39	71	34	58	--	46
Math	59	51	63	37	41	54	51	57	71	26	56	--	48
Language	72	75	84	43	54	65	58	57	73	31	67	--	54
Spelling	62	61	74	42	50	53	39	30	44	25	43	--	47
Grade 8													
Reading	74	78	91	61	44	60	54	57	51	51	41	--	49
Math	51	58	58	41	36	50	53	61	60	36	38	--	48
Language	71	73	82	65	52	53	58	57	66	47	41	--	51
Spelling	52	62	58	46	32	39	39	42	28	35	30	--	37

	Mendocino (cont.)			Laytonville (cont.)			Anderson Valley (cont.)			Point Arena (cont.)			State (2000) (cont.)
	98	99	00	98	99	00	98	99	00	98	99	00	
					Grade 9								
Reading	--	64	71	38	53	24	27	62	35	33	32	28	35
Math	--	65	80	42	53	52	42	76	65	44	45	49	51
Language	--	69	85	33	65	42	46	69	68	43	41	33	52
Science	--	67	74	39	47	42	41	65	38	40	40	34	41
Social Sci.	--	64	70	36	55	46	36	69	46	44	37	44	46
					Grade 10								
Reading	--	67	71	42	42	42	35	31	44	45	35	32	34
Math	--	64	71	40	39	32	51	55	69	51	41	45	46
Language	--	67	73	38	25	54	45	42	60	48	36	42	40
Science	--	71	88	50	46	48	60	39	73	67	45	46	46
Social Sci.	--	72	67	55	41	46	55	40	57	59	46	39	37
					Grade 11								
Reading	--	63	84	34	44	40	46	49	36	28	32	45	36
Math	--	56	73	33	41	50	63	64	49	44	53	38	47
Language	--	65	86	39	46	36	57	49	31	34	41	54	48
Science	--	64	88	41	55	38	54	56	49	57	54	47	43
Social Sci.	--	77	98	51	55	38	61	67	46	51	63	59	57
N (2000)=	*36-78*			*22-46*			*19-56*			*33-45*			

TABLE 2

Mariposa Rural Challenge Schools
(California)
Percent Scoring at or Above 50% National Percentile Rank, Grades 2-11, 1998 – 2000

Grade	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
					1998					
Reading	46	53	55	53	51	56	59	47	49	47
Math	52	47	49	43	56	45	50	53	54	50
					1999					
Reading	54	56	62	55	61	58	57	52	49	53
Math	57	54	58	50	58	54	52	54	56	57
					2000					
Reading	42	69	63	52	54	76	74	49	42	47
Math	51	70	47	57	62	74	78	65	64	64
N (2000) =	*35*	*61*	*47*	*42*	*52*	*133*	*149*	*154*	*173*	*139*
					State (2000)					
Reading	49	44	45	44	46	46	49	35	34	36
Math	57	56	51	50	55	48	48	51	46	47

TABLE 3

Yuba Watershed Alliance
(California)
Percent Scoring At or Above 50% National Percentile Rank, Grades 2 - 8, 1998 – 2000

	Sierra-Plumas			Twin Ridges			State (2000)
	1998	1999	2000	1998	1999	2000	
			Grade 2				
Reading	65	71	76	31	56	--	49
Math	67	52	65	22	26	25	57
Language	64	58	71	31	50	58	52
Spelling	69	65	59	11	20	31	50
			Grade 3				
Reading	53	65	67	43	62	57	44
Math	66	61	63	19	62	64	56
Language	57	58	70	0	62	33	48
Spelling	53	71	80	6	46	47	46
			Grade 4				
Reading	69	58	62	55	47	--	45
Math	60	56	51	56	44	--	51
Language	69	59	59	63	50	--	51
Spelling	58	48	41	19	22	--	43
			Grade 5				
Reading	69	60	47	56	73	61	44
Math	60	62	67	20	68	65	50
Language	69	64	63	20	45	45	50
Spelling	58	51	54	45	45	40	45
			Grade 6				
Reading	50	75	55	57	57	44	46
Math	49	78	67	35	71	44	55
Language	49	78	63	45	57	24	52
Spelling	36	60	50	26	50	12	44
			Grade 7				
Reading	57	58	76	68	50	42	46
Math	61	68	80	68	63	31	48
Language	59	65	80	59	58	33	54
Spelling	52	51	65	50	37	58	47
			Grade 8				
Reading	75	59	69	57	70	56	49
Math	74	59	59	52	89	39	48
Language	61	59	57	67	74	33	51
Spelling	41	39	45	29	25	22	37
N=	*34-54*	*31-57*	*30-55*	*14-27*	*13-22*	*6-20*	

TABLE 4
Program for the Academic and Cultural Enhancement of Rural Schools (PACERS)
(Alabama)

Selected Elementary School Sites
Percent Scoring At or Above 50% National Percentile Ranks, Grades 3 – 6, 1996 - 2000

(Scores are a Composite of Reading, Mathematics, Language, Science, and Social Science)

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2000
			Akron			
Grade 3	--	43	58	39	49	**55**
Grade 4	30	48	64	62	47	**59**
Grade 5	28	32	32	47	50	**57**
Grade 6	38	55	52	54	71	**61**
Avg, Grs. 3-6 *N('99)=29-36*	33	44	52	51	54	**58**
			Oakman			
Grade 3	--	73	72	56	63	**55**
Grade 4	68	71	68	76	62	**59**
Grade 5	55	76	68	75	80	**57**
Grade 6	71	66	75	68	78	**61**
Avg, Grs. 3-6 *N('99)=52-70*	64	72	71	71	71	**58**
			Harlan			
Grade 3	--	53	47	58	53	**55**
Grade 4	61	54	50	67	61	**59**
Grade 5	55	53	53	70	70	**57**
Avg, Grs. 3-5 *N('99)=40-56*	58	54	50	65	61	**57**
			Coffeeville			
Grade 3	--	36	38	61	30	**55**
Grade 4	25	51	41	35	54	**59**
Grade 5	46	40	37	52	52	**57**
Grade 6	39	76	63	47	43	**61**
Avg, Grs 3-6 *N ('99)=20-29*	34	49	44	49	45	**58**

TABLE 5
Program for the Academic and Cultural Enhancement of Rural Schools (PACERS)
(Alabama)

Selected Secondary School Sites
Percent Scoring At or Above 50% National Percentile Ranks, Grades 7 – 11, 1996 - 2000

(Scores are a Composite of Reading, Mathematics, Language, Science, and Social Science)

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	State (2000)
		Cedar Bluff				
Grade 7	44	63	40	48	59	**57**
Grade 8	53	54	53	50	45	**57**
Grade 9	53	54	46	47	42	**53**
Grade 10	50	49	46	45	48	**50**
Grade 11	53	53	48	53	42	**53**
Avg, Grades 7-11	51	55	49	49	47	**54**
N('99)=29-58						
		Florala				
Grade 9	39	61	58	44	49	**53**
Grade 10	41	47	48	52	44	**50**
Grade 11	31	50	45	52	58	**53**
Avg, Grades 9-11	39	54	51	49	50	**52**
N('99)=40-42						
		Mellow Valley				
Grade 7	60	65	79	63	65	**57**
Grade 8	60	72	68	70	60	**57**
Grade 9	63	58	60	52	67	**53**
Grade 10	40	48	41	49	45	**50**
Grade 11	55	56	52	38	56	**53**
Avg, Grades 7-11	60	66	64	55	59	**54**
N('99)=31-44						
		Monroe				
Grade 7	43	33	29	40	35	**57**
Grade 8	21	40	34	58	52	**57**
Grade 9	22	23	32	34	60	**53**
Grade 10	15	22	15	38	34	**50**
Grade 11	15	18	21	22	52	**53**
Avg, Grades 7-11	23	27	26	38	47	**54**
N('99)=9-14						
		Red Level				
Grade 7	54	56	49	47	49	**57**
Grade 8	59	63	57	50	44	**57**
Grade 9	52	58	49	51	41	**53**
Grade 10	45	47	54	48	48	**50**
Grade 11	44	54	47	52	50	**53**
Avg, Grades 7-11	50	58	51	50	46	**54**
N('99)=59-67						

TABLE 6

Program for Rural School and Community Renewal
(South Dakota)
Percent Scoring At or Above 50% Percentile National Rank, 1996 – 2000

(Scores are a Composite of Reading, Mathematics, Environment and Language Arts)

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	State (2000)
			Belle Fourche			
Grade 2	--	--	--	61	71	60
Grade 4	58	62	67	64	66	62
Grade 8	55	53	66	63	65	67
Grade 11	49	41	59	58	58	62
N('99)=297-411						
			Clear Lake			
Grade 2	--	--	--	72	60	60
Grade 4	55	58	58	55	62	62
Grade 8	65	68	63	60	59	67
Grade 11	68	61	63	59	57	62
N('99)=152-180						
			Willow Lake			
Grade 2	--	--	--	69	65	60
Grade 4	52	52	59	54	65	62
Grade 8	58	73	64	62	66	67
Grade 11	67	75	74	55	59	62
N('99)=52-60						
			Howard			
Grade 2	--	--	--	79	79	60
Grade 4	56	56	71	74	63	62
Grade 8	58	70	70	67	61	67
Grade 11	67	72	56	58	68	62
N('99)=136-141						
			Wessington Springs			
Grade 2	--	--	--	65	78	60
Grade 4	58	48	55	61	72	62
Grade 8	64	76	75	65	70	67
Grade 11	58	51	50	50	62	62
N('99)=82-111						
			Rutland			
Grade 2	--	--	--	48	55	60
Grade 4	62	55	54	64	76	62
Grade 8	85	63	58	46	67	67
Grade 11	73	66	71	71	54	62
N('99)=36-42						
			Elm Valley			
Grade 2	--	--	--	49	51	60
Grade 4	71	69	79	62	78	62
Grade 8	67	65	76	80	79	67
Grade 11	74	72	73	67	69	62
N('99)=48-80						

Results on State Assessments

A substantial number of Rural Trust projects are located in states that use a state-developed test for measuring student progress. These state assessments typically form the cornerstone of a multi-tiered accountability system.

Tables 7 through 17 present student results on a number of these state tests. They include the Yampa Valley Initiative (Colorado), the Southern Maine Partnership and Lubec (Maine), the Center for School Change (Minnesota), the Tillamook County Education Consortium (Oregon), the Appalachian Rural Education Network (Virginia), Edcouch-Elsa and Schleicher County (Texas), and New Paradigm Partners (Wisconsin).

Below are descriptions of the state assessments and accountability systems reflected in these tables.

Colorado

In 1997, Colorado began giving statewide assessments in several subject areas, based on the state's model content standards. As a result of recent legislation, the Colorado Student Assessment Program (CSAP) now includes assessments in reading and writing in grades 3 through 10, assessments in mathematics in grades 5 through 10, and a science assessment in grade 8. Assessment frameworks list the knowledge and skills that are assessed by CSAP at each grade level.

Maine

Maine's *Learning Results*, enacted in 1996, are intended to represent high standards for all students; all Maine schools are required to implement *Learning Results* by the 2002-2003 school year. Two years ago the Maine Education Assessment (MEA) was redesigned, after a trial run, to better measure student progress against the *Learning Results*. The MEA tests are taken by all 4th, 8th, and 11th grade students. Students are tested in an array of subject areas: Reading, Writing, Mathematics, Science & Technology, Social Studies, Visual & Performing Arts, and Health.

The MEA reports student and school results in performance levels and as scale scores on a performance scale from 501 to 580: 561 – 580 (Exceeds Standards); 541 – 560 (Meets Standards); 521 – 540 (Partially Meets Standards); 501 – 520 (Does Not Meet Standards). "Because implementation of major education reform is still in the early stages, and because the standards are very rigorous for all students," notes Maine's State Commissioner of Education in a recent news release, "the 'Partially Meets the Standards' category should still be viewed positively at this point."

Minnesota

Minnesota's statewide testing program includes different components for elementary and secondary school students. The Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments (MCA's) test third- and fifth-grade students in mathematics and reading, using both multiple choice and short answer questions. Fifth graders are also tested in writing.

For secondary school students, Minnesota's Graduation Standards are comprised of two elements: the High Standards and the Basic Standards. High Standards define what students should know, understand, and be able to do to demonstrate a high level of achievement. The Basic Standards are a "safety net" to make sure that no student graduates without learning the basic skills needed to live and work in today's society. Students must pass Basic Standard tests in reading, mathematics, and writing to be eligible for a Minnesota public high school diploma.

Oregon

The Oregon Statewide Assessment is a criterion-referenced assessment based on the Oregon Content Standards. All students in grades 3, 5, 8, and 10 are assessed in reading/literature, writing, and mathematics. Results indicate whether an individual student has "Not Yet Met," "Met," or "Exceeded" the performance levels established by the State Board of Education.

In 1996, the Board adopted new, higher standards, including a Certificate of Initial Mastery for tenth graders. Students who do not earn a certificate can still receive a diploma if they've accumulated enough course credits, but the special recognition of accomplishment is expected to be valued by employers and college admissions officers.

Texas

The Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) is a statewide test in reading and mathematics given to all students in grades 3-8 and grade 10. In addition, TAAS tests writing in grades 4, 8, and 10, as well as science and social studies in grade 8. Spanish-version TAAS tests are administered at grades 3 through 6. Satisfactory performance on the TAAS exit level tests (grade 10) is a prerequisite to a high school diploma.

Vermont

In effect since June 1997, Vermont's bold school finance and accountability law, Act 60, is perhaps best known for establishing a hugely controversial state-wide property tax to equalize funding among school districts. The law, however, also contains a large accountability provision, requiring statewide assessments for mathematics and English/language arts in grades 4, 8, and 10. An early reading assessment is required in second grade, a state science assessment in grades 6 and 11.

Called the New Standards Reference Exams, the mathematics and English/language arts assessments are aligned with Vermont's Framework of Standards and Learning Opportunities. For math, they test concepts, skills and problem solving; in English/language arts, they test basic understanding and analysis/interpretation for reading and effectiveness and conventions for writing. Schools report on the percentages of students that meet or exceed the two highest levels of performance ("Achieved the Standard" and "Achieved the Standard with Honors").

Virginia
Adopted in June of 1995, Virginia's Standards of Learning (SOL) outline expectations for students in the four core areas of English, mathematics, science, and history. Computer Technology standards are also included. School children in grades 3, 5, and 8 take SOL tests each spring, while students in certain high school courses are tested as well. Schools must provide remediation for students who do not pass any of the SOL tests in grades 3, 5, and 8.

In the future, the SOL tests will have "high stakes" attached for both students and schools. Beginning with the Class of 2004, the SOL tests will be used for high school graduation. In 2007, schools will be accredited on the basis of how students perform on the SOL tests; to receive state accreditation, 70 percent of a school's students will be required to pass the tests in English, math, science, and history (50 percent for third-grade science and history).

Wisconsin
Wisconsin's Student Assessment System includes three sets of statewide tests: the Wisconsin Reading Comprehension Test (grade 3); the Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examinations (WKCE); and the High School Graduation Test.

Given annually to students in grades 4, 8, and 10, the WKCE are achievement tests that measure performance in reading, enhanced language (includes language arts and writing), mathematics, science, and social studies. Each subject area test is comprised of approximately 75 percent multiple-choice items and 25 percent short-answer questions; students also submit a writing sample. Student results are measured as "minimal," "basic," "proficient," and "advanced." Starting in school year 2002-03, students will be required to score at "basic" or above in order to be promoted

TABLE 7

Yampa Valley Educational Initiative

Colorado Student Assessment Program
Percentage of Students in the Unsatisfactory, Partially Proficient, Proficient, and Advanced Categories, 1998-2000

	1998				1999				2000			
	U	**PP**	**P**	**A**	**U**	**PP**	**P**	**A**	**U**	**PP**	**P**	**A**
East Grand												
		(N=81-100)				*(N=83-101)*				*(N=87-105)*		
3rd grade Reading	9	16	71.6	4	6	6	71	12	2	18	70	8
4th grade Reading	2	26	65	5	5	22	71	2	5	15	69	10
4th grade Writing	4	47	38	9	5	38	50	3	6	45	46	8
7th grade Reading	--	--	--	--	7	28	64	1	6	27	64	4
7th grade Writing	--	--	--	--	1	48	48	0	3	36	59	1
Hayden												
		(N=22-40				*(N=31-46)*				*(N=38-44)*		
3rd grade Reading	5	23	68	5	10	19	69	2	12	17	67	5
4th grade Reading	5	23	68	5	7	24	65	4	11	30	50	7
4th grade Writing	14	64	23	0	15	54	24	2	23	39	32	2
7th grade Reading	--	--	--	--	0	16	84	0	0	24	71	0
7th grade Writing	--	--	--	--	0	45	55	0	0	50	45	0
Moffat County												
		(N=182-212)				*(N=197-208)*				*(N=189-202)*		
3rd grade Reading	10	22	62	3	8	22	59	9	3	19	72	6
4th grade Reading	8	32	56	5	7	28	60	3	6	27	56	8
4th grade Writing	17	46	27	9	17	57	23	0	11	50	33	2
7th grade Reading	--	--	--	--	16	34	48	1	12	34	49	2
7th grade Writing	--	--	--	--	3	67	28	0	4	59	31	0
Steamboat Springs												
		(N=142-149)				*(N=143-183)*				*(N=143-183)*		
3rd grade Reading	6	13	68	11	4	15	62	17	0	13	76	10
4th grade Reading	1	15	68	14	4	13	70	12	4	10	66	19
4th grade Writing	7	45	43	4	8	38	48	4	7	36	44	11
7th grade Reading	--	--	--	--	3	17	73	6	4	19	71	5
7th grade Writing	--	--	--	--	0	33	64	0	0	37	62	0
South Routt												
		(N=31)				*(N=36-38)*				*(N=36-41)*		
3rd grade Reading	10	23	51	10	16	14	59	5	3	17	64	14
4th grade Reading	0	32	68	0	0	22	61	11	13	34	47	5
4th grade Writing	13	45	35	6	0	56	42	0	18	50	26	5
7th grade Reading	--	--	--	--	3	34	63	0	12	29	56	0
7th grade Writing	--	--	--	--	0	47	42	0	0	49	44	0

State (2000)				
	U	**PP**	**P**	**A**
3rd grade Reading	9	20	63	7
4th grade Reading	8	27	53	9
4th grade Writing	15	44	33	3
7th grade Reading	12	26	55	4
7th grade Writing	2	51	41	1

TABLE 8

Maine Rural Trust Projects

4th Grade Maine Education Assessment
Selected Secondary Schools, 1999-2000

	Reading		Writing		Math		Science		Soc. Sci.		Health	
	99	00	99	00	99	00	99	00	99	00	99	00
Baileyville *(N=17)*	536	534	528	527	527	530	522	522	534	529	540	535
Bowdoinham *(N=38)*	539	545	529	531	532	537	527	530	536	532	539	543
East Machias *(N=31)*	535	535	529	527	528	525	526	523	532	534	539	538
Eastport *(N=16)*	532	539	522	533	526	532	522	525	527	537	537	537
Fryeburg *(N=37)*	539	543	528	530	528	530	521	525	531	537	537	539
Kingfield *(N=21)*	545	544	531	533	532	538	529	529	540	542	541	541
Lubec *(N=19)*	533	532	524	525	522	521	522	519	529	528	535	529
Mexico *(N=55)*	533	535	523	529	528	528	520	523	528	530	537	536
Topsham *(N=131)*	540	542	532	534	532	537	526	530	535	539	539	541
State (2000)	539	539	530	532	531	530	526	526	535	535	539	539

- Machias & Topsham scores are averages of several schools: Machias (Bay Ridge Elem., Fort O'Brien School, Elm Street School, & Whiting Village Elem.) & Topsham (Williams-Cone & Woodside Elem.)

Note: The scoring range on the Maine Education Assessment is 501 – 580.

TABLE 9

Maine Rural Trust Projects

11th Grade Maine Education Assessment
Selected Secondary Schools, 1999-2000

	Reading		Writing		Math		Science		Soc. Sci.		Health	
	99	00	99	00	99	00	99	00	99	00	99	00
Machias Memorial	538	538	529	534	521	523	524	527	522	529	535	536
Calais	541	539	533	533	527	526	526	526	530	526	539	537
Gorham	546	544	539	537	532	532	528	531	536	532	541	540
Bonny Eagle	541	539	535	533	527	527	525	526	531	528	537	536
Mt. Blue	542	541	537	534	529	527	528	529	532	529	541	539
Oxford Hills	541	541	534	537	528	527	526	525	528	526	538	538
Lubec	539	537	533	533	524	520	529	527	527	525	539	538
Mt. Valley	539	542	534	536	528	526	526	527	527	523	538	537
Messalonskee	540	542	531	538	527	525	527	528	527	529	538	540
Skowhegan	538	538	532	531	525	525	524	526	527	527	536	537
Noble	539	539	533	534	525	524	525	525	529	524	538	537
Mt. Ararat	543	542	536	539	530	529	527	529	532	530	540	539
State (2000)	541	541	535	531	532	528	527	528	531	530	537	539

TABLE 10

Center for School Change (Minnesota)

Grade 5 Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment Test
Percentage of Students Scoring at Levels 2, 3 and 4, 1998 - 2000
(Partial to Proficient, Above Grade Level, and Superior, respectively)

	Level 2 (partial to proficient)			Level 3 (above grade level)			Level 4 (superior)		
	1998	1999	2000	1998	1999	2000	1998	1999	2000
Warren – Alverado – Oslo									
Reading	39	38	38	41	26	34	0	6	19
Math	54	52	40	21	18	40	0	9	11
Writing	57	34	40	37	39	45	0	5	9
Houston									
Reading	31	43	33	43	31	42	9	6	19
Math	66	49	39	20	31	49	0	6	0
Writing	50	57	48	44	12	46	0	0	0
Cambridge – Isanti									
Reading	39	44	38	29	23	37	9	4	8
Math	50	54	39	25	22	36	5	2	9
Writing	52	39	65	40	19	25	2	1	1
Huron Lake – Okebana									
Reading	27	52	40	41	27	43	5	0	10
Math	55	46	43	41	43	37	4	0	10
Writing	59	31	37	36	31	46	5	0	0
Fertile – Beltrami									
Reading	34	44	43	34	23	28	12	10	16
Math	50	41	58	34	24	23	2	3	6
Writing	46	49	36	41	16	45	0	7	2
State (2000)									
Reading			34			36			16
Math			41			33			12
Writing			50			38			4

TABLE 11

Center for School Change (Minnesota)

Grade 3 Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment Test
Percentage of Students Scoring at Levels 2, 3 and 4, 1998 - 2000
(Partial to Proficient, Above Grade Level, and Superior, respectively)

	Level II (partial to proficient)			Level III (above grade level)			Level IV (superior)		
	1998	1999	2000	1998	1999	2000	1998	1999	2000
Cambridge – Isanti									
Reading	49	47	43	22	30	33	4	3	9
Math	53	47	45	25	38	33	2	5	12
Heron Lake – Okebana									
Reading	58	55	57	29	24	14	0	0	0
Math	35	55	65	45	38	25	4	7	0
Fertile - Baltrami									
Reading	39	40	39	29	37	25	0	0	3
Math	55	61	58	11	30	22	2	0	6
Goodhue									
Reading	35	34	33	44	50	40	6	8	18
Math	56	30	51	22	40	37	3	25	10
Perham									
Reading	43	37	34	40	38	37	3	17	23
Math	38	34	21	42	41	52	12	23	22
State (2000)									
Reading			38			33			11
Math			43			37			10

TABLE 12

Tillamook County Education Consortium (Oregon)
Grades 3, 5, 8, 10, Oregon Statewide Assessment
Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding Standard, 1998 - 2000

Reading and Literature	1999		2000		State (2000)	
	Tillamook					
	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
Grade 3	41	28	37	45	30	52
Grade 5	50	15	43	18	50	23
Grade 8	24	17	29	31	27	36
Grade 10	34	17	37	11	34	17
	Neah-Kah-Nie					
Grade 3	31	41	40	42	30	52
Grade 5	48	13	54	26	50	23
Grade 8	16	31	30	26	27	36
Grade 10	30	37	33	5	34	17

Mathematics	1999		2000		State (2000)	
	Tillamook					
	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
Grade 3	44	14	47	23	43	32
Grade 5	41	10	42	12	51	19
Grade 8	25	22	35	20	26	30
Grade 10	28	8	28	5	25	15
	Neah-Kah-Nie					
Grade 3	34	27	49	19	43	32
Grade 5	52	5	54	10	51	19
Grade 8	30	43	25	28	26	30
Grade 10	23	18	21	8	25	15

Writing	1999		2000		State (2000)	
	Tillamook					
	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
Grade 3			83	3	77	9
Grade 5	51	1	56	2	64	2
Grade 8	75	4	69	1	64	2
Grade 10	67	2	75	1	73	3
	Neah-Kah-Nie					
Grade 3	--	--	72	11	77	9
Grade 5	72	3	68	4	64	2
Grade 8	44	0	54	0	64	2
Grade 10	75	2	82	0	73	3

TABLE 13
Llano Grande Center for Research and Development, Edcouch-Elsa, Texas

Grades 4, 8 & 10, Texas Assessment of Academic Skills
Percentage of Students Passing, 1995 – 1998 & 2000

	1995	1996	1997	1998	2000	State (2000)
Reading						
Grade 4 *(N=306)*	83	85	82	95	88	90
Grade 5 *(N=309)*	88	87	77	91	80	87
Grade 6 *(N=309)*	87	88	68	95	72	86
Grade 7 *(N=320)*	79	84	86	90	72	83
Grade 8 *(N=300)*	76	78	77	94	83	89
Grade 10 *(N=241)*	76	76	94	98	89	90
Mathematics						
Grade 4	76	84	80	94	87	87
Grade 5	81	87	72	94	89	92
Grade 6	73	87	67	98	82	88
Grade 7	69	87	75	92	85	87
Grade 8	52	68	73	95	87	90
Grade 10	70	74	48	90	85	86

TABLE 14
Schleicher County, Texas

Grades 4, 8 & 10, Texas Assessment of Academic Skills
Percentage of Students Passing, 1995 – 1998 & 2000

	1995	1996	1997	1998	2000	State (2000)
Reading						
Grade 4 *(N=45)*	84	85	92	95	95	90
Grade 5 *(N=46)*	80	87	89	100	98	87
Grade 6 *(N=46)*	76	79	90	91	91	86
Grade 7 *(N=46)*	70	70	98	89	100	83
Grade 8 *(N=55)*	73	70	98	100	92	89
Grade 10 *(N=50)*	60	67	83	97	94	90
Mathematics						
Grade 4	76	84	100	94	93	87
Grade 5	67	85	100	94	100	92
Grade 6	65	82	100	98	100	88
Grade 7	48	57	98	92	100	87
Grade 8	53	67	96	95	98	90
Grade 10	42	51	80	90	96	86

TABLE 15

Vermont Rural Partnership

New Standards Reference Exam
Percent of Students Scoring at the Top Performance Levels
(Standard or Standard with Honors), 1998 - 2000

	1998				1999				2000				State (2000)
	Cabot	Holland	Peacham	Walden	Cabot	Holland	Peacham	Walden	Cabot	Holland	Peacham	Walden	
Grade 4													
Math: Concepts	32	18	50	22	69	8	76	30	21	40	36	23	38
Math: Skills	62	45	70	33	88	31	82	60	93	80	81	69	69
Math: Problem Solving	29	27	20	22	51	16	47	20	50	30	54	15	35
Reading: Basic Skills	79	50	90	--	94	62	88	90	100	80	89	85	83
Reading: Analysis & Interpretation	57	40	80	--	81	31	71	80	79	40	89	77	64
Writing: Effectiveness	35	--	80	--	56	31	65	70	93	80	78	54	58
Writing: Conventions	51	30	50	--	50	31	59	50	64	30	67	62	49
Grade 8													
Math: Concepts	37	--	--	20	61	--	--	26	37	--	--	9	32
Math: Skills	57	--	--	50	77	--	--	58	69	--	--	54	66
Math: Problem Solving	29	--	--	10	62	--	--	48	51	--	--	45	43
Reading: Basic Skills	61	--	--	100	62	--	--	53	71	--	--	82	57
Reading: Analysis & Interpretation	40	--	--	50	31	--	--	37	29	--	--	55	29
Writing: Effectiveness	86	--	--	100	69	--	--	43	94	--	--	73	58
Writing: Conventions	82	--	--	100	69	--	--	58	82	--	--	36	56
Grade 10													
Math: Concepts	33	--	--	--	56	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	36
Math: Skills	78	--	--	--	78	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	56
Math: Problem Solving	26	--	--	--	55	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	29
Reading: Basic Skills	45	--	--	--	69	--	--	--	43	--	--	--	45
Reading: Analysis & Interpretation	32	--	--	--	75	--	--	--	48	--	--	--	42
Writing: Effectiveness	46	--	--	--	69	--	--	--	22	--	--	--	38
Writing: Conventions	75	--	--	--	88	--	--	--	87	--	--	--	75

- Missing data indicate that the population was too small or the school didn't have the grade levels (beyond grade six for Peacham and Holland and beyond grade eight for Welden).

TABLE 16

Appalachian Rural Education Network (St. Paul High School, Virginia)

1998 – 2000, Virginia Standards of Learning
Percentage of Students Passing

	St. Paul High School			State		
	1998	1999	2000	1998	1999	2000
English Literature	76	72	75	72	75	78
English Writing	85	83	86	71	81	85
Algebra 1	69	87	93	40	56	65
Algebra 2	50	79	N/A	31	51	58
Earth Science	53	88	81	58	65	70
Biology	84	88	91	73	81	79
Chemistry	80	100	94	54	64	64
World History	80	81	86	62	68	75
U.S. History	15	42	55	30	32	39

TABLE 17

New Paradigm Partners (Wisconsin)
Grades 4 & 10, Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examination
Percentage of Students who Scored at or Above the Proficient Level, 1998-2000

		Reading				Enhanced Language			
	N (2000)	1998	1999	2000	State (2000)	1998	1999	2000	State (2000)
Grade 4									
Weyerhauser	20	61	52	47	77	63	52	49	87
Hayward	149	66	73	67		65	68	67	
Chetek	87	68	60	60		65	53	57	
Birchwood	25	71	81	66		62	69	59	
Ladysmith	85	73	67	64		63	61	65	
Grade 10									
Weyerhauser	18	70	64	67	69	65	66	74	63
Hayward	166	64	75	65		60	74	67	
Chetek	81	81	71	70		75	63	69	
Birchwood	28	59	69	72		58	80	75	
Ladysmith	103	76	66	72		72	71	75	

		Mathematics				Science				Social Science			
	N (2000)	1998	1999	2000	State (2000)	1998	1999	2000	State (2000)	1998	1999	2000	State (2000)
Grade 4													
Weyerhauser	20	63	66	63	75	59	66	63	87	49	64	60	86
Hayward	149	63	68	71		56	69	74		55	64	70	
Chetek	87	60	59	69		60	66	70		62	57	65	
Birchwood	25	79	88	71		79	79	72		72	70	70	
Ladysmith	85	70	67	70		63	69	74		58	65	70	
Grade 10													
Weyerhauser	18	73	59	83	39	74	63	75	52	72	57	74	75
Hayward	166	56	65	60		52	65	64		65	68	70	
Chetek	81	81	69	71		67	62	67		72	64	73	
Birchwood	28	64	63	68		47	66	76		56	70	82	
Ladysmith	103	79	70	77		70	66	74		70	69	77	

Results on College Entrance Exams

Nationally, more college-bound high school seniors take the Scholastic Aptitude Tests (SAT's) than the ACT's: in 2000, 62 percent of high school graduates tested took the SAT's and 38 percent the ACT's. However, high schools involved with the Rural Trust tend to be disproportionately located in those states that favor the ACT's (the South, Midwest, and Plain States). In the Northeast, the number of students taking the ACT's ranges from a high of 14 percent (in New York in 2000) to as low as 4 percent (in Connecticut, Rhode Island, and New Jersey); the vast majority of students take the SAT's.

For those not familiar with the ACT's, a few words of information. The ACT (now called the ACT Assessment) covers four skill areas: English, mathematics, reading, and science reasoning. The scale scores range from 1 (low) to 36 (high) for each of the four tests. A composite score is also provided using the same range. The Composite is the average of the four tests scores, rounded to the nearest whole number.

To answer the question of what a score really means, ACT has created "Standards for Transition." "Standards for Transition are sets of statements that represent widely held learning goals or expectations of what you have learned through high school that is important for success in college," the instructions to test-takers explain. "The Standards show how skills can progress, becoming increasingly sophisticated from score range to score range." There are five score ranges: 16 – 19, 20 – 23, 24 – 27, 28 – 32, 33 – 36. "If you obtain a score between 1 and 15," students are advised, "you are most likely beginning to develop the knowledge and skills described in the 16 – 19 score range for that particular ACT test."

The score range for the math and verbal portions of the SAT I is 200 to 800, with 800 being the best score. If you don't answer any verbal questions, you automatically get a 200. The same is true for the math questions.

Below is a breakdown of 2000 ACT scores by ethnic/racial minority:

2000 ACT Subject & Composite Scores* by Ethnic/Racial Minority

	No. Tested	English	Math	Reading	Sci. Reason	Composite
Am. Indian	10,976	(18.0)	18.5	**19.4**	**19.4**	**19.0**
Asian	35,474	20.5	**23.2**	**21.3**	**21.5**	21.7
Black	110,617	16.4	(16.8)	(17.0)	17.3	(17.0)
Hispanic	57,815	17.9	(18.9)	19.1	19.1	18.9
Multiracial	14,441	20.7	20.5	21.9	**21.1**	21.2
Other	16,116	**18.5**	20.3	**19.2**	**19.7**	19.5

* Scores higher than in 1999 indicated by bold type, lower scores by ( ).

ACT SCORES

ACT Composite Scores: Alabama

1998	1999	2000
State (AL)		
20.2	20.2	20.2
Akron		
16.8	16.9	18.9
Cedar Bluff		
19.5	19.5	18.8
Collinsville		
19.0	19.7	16.1
Florala		
19.2	18.5	20.1
Frisco City		
18.4	16.4	16.6
Gaylesville		
19.0	19.7	20.8
Mellow Valley		
19.3	19.8	18.4
Monroe, AL		
14.0	15.0	N/A
Oakman		
17.7	18.6	19.7
Pleasant Home		
22.7	20.8	24.3
Red Level		
19.9	20.1	21.5

ACT Composite Scores: Colorado

1998	1999
State (CO)	
21.6	21.5
Hayden	
19.5	20.6
Steamboat Springs	
22.9 *(N=52)*	23.6 *(N=64)*

ACT Composite Scores: League of Professional Schools (Georgia)

1998	1999
State (GA)	
20.0	20.0
Brooks County, GA	
16 *(N=9)*	18 *(N=11)*
McIntosh County	
15 *(N=10)*	16 *(N=9)*
Oglethorpe County	
23 *(N=16)*	23 *(N=15)*

ACT Composite Scores: Mississippi

1998	1999	2000
State (MI)		
18.7	18.7	18.7
Greenville		
17.5 *(N=88)*	18.2 *(N=86)*	17.0 *(N=103)*
Hollandale		
15.0 *(N=38)*	15.3 *(N=24)*	15.4 *(N=23)*
Indianola		
16.3 *(N=117)*	15.7 *(N=111)*	15.9 *(N=114)*
Shaw		
15.7 *(N= 32)*	15.6 *(N=46)*	16.1 *(N=25)*
West Tallahatchie		
15.7 *(N= 41)*	15.7 *(N=29)*	17.0 *(N=37)*

ACT Composite Scores: Program for Rural School and Community Renewal (South Dakota)

1998	1999	2000
State (SD)		
21	21	21
Belle Forche		
20	20	21
Clear Lake		
22	21	22
Willow Lake		
23	21	24
Howard		
21	23	21
Wessington Springs		
21	21	20
Rutland		
22	22	21
Elm Valley		
23	22	22

ACT Composite Scores: Tennessee

1998	1999	2000
State (TN)		
19.8	19.9	20.0
Wartburg		
19.6 *(N=66)*	19.3 *(N=47)*	20.2 *(N=54)*

ACT Composite Scores: Texas

1998	1999	2000
State (TX)		
20.3	20.3	20.3
Schliecher County		
20.4 *(N=45)*	20.4 *(N=47)*	19.8 *(N=23)*

ACT Composite Scores: Wisconsin

1998	1999	2000
State (WI)		
22.3	22.3	22.2
Flambeau School District		
22.5	21.5	21.8

SAT I VERBAL AND MATH SCORES

SAT Verbal and Math Scores: California

1998		1999		2000	
State (CA)					
Verbal	Math	Verbal	Math	Verbal	Math
497	516	497	514	497	518
Mendocino Unified					
Verbal	Math	Verbal	Math	Verbal	Math
525	514	531	518	539	566

SAT Verbal and Math Scores: Colorado

1998		1999		2000	
State (CO)					
Verbal	Math	Verbal	Math	Verbal	Math
--	--	536	540	505	514
Steamboat Springs					
Verbal	Math	Verbal	Math	Verbal	Math
--	--	515	523	529	531
		N=81		*N=73*	

SAT Verbal and Math Scores: Maine

1998		1999		2000	
State (MA)					
Verbal	Math	Verbal	Math	Verbal	Math
504	501	507	503	504	500
Lubec					
Verbal	Math	Verbal	Math	Verbal	Math
557	512	477	411	418	408
N=10		*N=9*		*N=8*	

SAT Verbal and Math Scores: Vermont

1998		1999		2000	
State (VT)					
Verbal	Math	Verbal	Math	Verbal	Math
508	504	514	506	513	508
Cabot					
Verbal	Math	Verbal	Math	Verbal	Math
571	486	539	510	517	453
N=16		*N=17*		*N=12*	

SAT Verbal and Math Scores: Virginia

1998		1999		2000	
State (VA)					
Verbal	Math	Verbal	Math	Verbal	Math
507	499	508	499	509	500
Saint Paul					
Verbal	Math	Verbal	Math	Verbal	Math
505	497	493	490	486	470
N=37		*N=45*		*N=37*	

Rural School and Community Trust
1825 K Street, NW
Suite 703
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 955-7177
www.ruraledu.org

NOTICE

REPRODUCTION BASIS

This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket) form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").