



THE CENTER ON  
STANDARDS &  
ASSESSMENT  
IMPLEMENTATION  
WestEd  CRESST

# CSAI Report

## Nevada State and District Assessment Survey – Report Summary

---

July 2016



The work reported herein was supported by grant number #S283B050022A between the U.S. Department of Education and WestEd with a subcontract to the National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST). The findings and opinions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of CRESST, WestEd, or the U.S. Department of Education.



WestEd is a nonpartisan, nonprofit research, development, and service agency that works with education and other communities throughout the United States and abroad to promote excellence, achieve equity, and improve learning for children, youth, and adults. WestEd has more than a dozen offices nationwide, from Massachusetts, Vermont and Georgia, to Illinois, Arizona and California, with headquarters in San Francisco. For more information about WestEd, visit [WestEd.org](http://WestEd.org); call 415.565.3000 or, toll-free, (877) 4-WestEd; or write: WestEd / 730 Harrison Street / San Francisco, CA 94107-1242.

This year, from April through June, The Nevada Department of Education (NDE), under the guidance of The Center on Standards and Assessment Implementation, conducted an audit of the Nevada State Assessment System and district-level assessments. The audit and the information collected is intended to provide information to NDE about current assessments being used within the state and help to determine future direction in regards to statewide assessment. This assessment audit had three phases: a local education agency assessment inventory, an online survey for district assessment directors and charter school representatives, and focus groups in three Nevada regions.

This Summary presents the results of the online survey, which asked Nevada’s District Test Directors (DTDs) to provide feedback on the possible benefits and burdens of state and district assessments. This Summary contains overviews of survey responses to questions about the value and benefits of district and state assessments, as well as the level of concerns with each of those assessments. For more detailed data on survey responses, please refer to the accompanying complete report.

## Responses to District Assessments

Each DTD was asked to provide feedback on every required assessment administered within his or her particular district. For each assessment, respondents were asked to rate each of their district-administered assessments on three aspects: the value in informing student progress, the value to school or district improvement, and finally, the benefit and value versus the time and cost to administer. Respondents were asked to rate the three attributes on a four-point Likert scale, with 1 indicating low value or low benefit and 4 indicating high value or high benefit.

Results for district assessments that are used by five or more districts are presented in the tables below in descending order by number of districts providing feedback for a particular assessment. Mean values are rounded to the nearest tenth.

**Table 1: Commonly Used District Assessments – Value in Informing Student Progress**

<i>Assessment Name</i>	<i>Number of Districts Providing Feedback</i>	<i>Mean Score (Scale 1–4)</i>
Measures of Academic Progress – Reading	15	3.6
Measures of Academic Progress – Mathematics	14	3.6
Advanced Placement Testing	11	2.7
STAR Reading	6	3
Developmental Reading Assessment, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Edition	5	4
End of Level Mathematics	5	2.4

**Table 2: Commonly Used District Assessments – Value to School or District Improvement**

<b>Assessment Name</b>	<b>Number of Districts Providing Feedback</b>	<b>Mean Score (Scale 1–4)</b>
Measures of Academic Progress - Reading	15	3.4
Measures of Academic Progress – Mathematics	14	3.5
Advanced Placement Testing	11	2.4
STAR Reading	6	3
AAPPL for Bilingual	5	2.8
Developmental Reading Assessment, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Edition	5	3.8
End of Level Mathematics	5	2.4

**Table 3: Commonly Used District Assessments – Benefit Received vs. Time and Cost to Administer**

<b>Assessment Name</b>	<b>Number of Districts Providing Feedback</b>	<b>Mean Score (Scale 1–4)</b>
Measures of Academic Progress - Reading	15	3.4
Measures of Academic Progress – Mathematics	14	3.5
Advanced Placement Testing	11	2.4
STAR Reading	6	3
AAPPL for Bilingual	5	2.8
Developmental Reading Assessment, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Edition	5	3.8
End of Level Mathematics	5	2.4

## Open-Ended Responses Regarding District-Required Assessments<sup>1</sup>

### Concerns

- Too much time spent on testing at the expense of instructional time.
- Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) are time consuming.
- Difficulty of translating MAP scores into instructional change.
- Ensuring that formative assessment results are not used in a punitive manner for program evaluation and performance determination.
- District assessments not providing high-quality information for tracking student progress.

### Suggestions

- Increase and expand district options for formative and interim assessments.
- Provide information on alignment between i-Ready and Smarter Balanced assessments.
- Have all district assessments come from the same provider (e.g., ACT).

---

<sup>1</sup> Nineteen districts provided responses to these open-ended questions.

## Responses to State Assessments

For each state-mandated assessment, respondents were asked to determine the value of each assessment on a variety of features and to rate any concerns on aspects of each assessment. For the value measures, responses were based on a four-point Likert scale, with 1 indicating low value and 4 indicating high value. For measures of concern, responses were based on a four-point Likert scale, with 1 indicating little concern and 4 indicating great concern. In addition, respondents were asked to rate each of the assessments regarding the value and benefit received versus the burden, i.e., time and cost to administer.

Results for each of the state assessments (arranged in descending rank order based on benefit received vs. burden) are displayed below, with mean values rounded to the nearest tenth. The features measuring value and concern have been aggregated into a single mean for each. For disaggregated results, please refer to the accompanying report.

**Table 4: State-Mandated Assessments – Benefit vs. Burden, Value, and Concern**

<i>Assessment Name</i>	<i>Mean of Benefit Provided vs. Burden (time and cost) Questions<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>Mean for “Value” Features<sup>3</sup></i>	<i>Mean for Concern Aspects<sup>4</sup></i>
English Language Proficiency Assessment	2.9	3	2.1
ACT	2.8	2.6	2
CTE Assessments	2.8	3	2
Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment	2.2	2.3	2.7
High School Proficiency Examination	2.1	2.5	2.1
Science Grades 5 & 8 Assessments	1.9	2	2.4
Nevada Alternate Assessment	1.8	2.1	2.6
Science Grade 10 Assessment	1.8	2	2.4
End-of-Course Exams	1.7	1.9	2.8

<sup>2</sup> Responses were given on a four-point Likert scale, with 1 indicating low /benefit vs. burden to administer and 4 indicating high benefit vs. burden to administer.

<sup>3</sup> Responses were given on a four-point Likert scale, with 1 indicating low value and 4 indicating high value.

<sup>4</sup> Responses were given on a four-point Likert scale, with 1 indicating low concern and 4 indicating great concern.

## Open-Ended Responses Regarding State-Mandated Assessments

### Concerns

- Issues with receiving data from the EOC Exams, the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment, and the state science assessments; either data was received late, or never sent at all (*seven districts*).
- Amount of state testing time taking staff time and detracting from instructional time (*five districts*).
- Test design/structure of state assessments - concern about flaws in the design of the EOC exams (*two districts*) and the NAA not having value to respondents (*two districts*).
- EOC Science assessments are only for participation and have no benefit to students, parents, or schools (*two districts*).
- Year-round schools may be impacted by the amount of time spent on state assessments in a way that other schools are not, due to “unfair and inequitable administration of assessments” (*one district*).

### Suggestions

- Provide timely results from state assessments that can be used in making instructional and programmatic decisions, rather than late summer when the data cannot be used for instructional adjustments (*two districts*).
- Expand formative, interim assessment options provided by the state (*one district*).
- Add the WorkKeys assessments as an option for students who do not plan to attend college (*one district*).