

REFERENCES

- American Council on Education. 1995. *Guidelines for Computerized-Adaptive Test Development and Use in Education*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- American Educational Research Association (AERA), American Psychological Association (APA), and National Council on Measurement in Education (NCME). 1999. *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing*. Washington, DC: AERA, APA, and NCME.
- Associated Press April 17, 2006. With help of states, U.S. government, schools duck potential penalties. <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/12357165/from/RSS/> (accessed September 22, 2008).
- Association of Test Publishers (2000). *Guidelines for Computer-Based Testing*. Washington, D.C.: Association of Test Publishers.
- Chudowsky, N., and V. Chudowsky. 2008. Many states have chosen a back-loaded approach to No Child Left Behind goal of all students scoring proficient. Washington, DC: Center on Education Policy. http://www.cep-dc.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=document_ext.showDocumentByID&nodeID=1&DocumentID=238 (accessed September 19, 2008).
- Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). 2008. Profiles of state accountability systems, California state profile 2006–2007. <http://accountability.ccsso.org/index.asp> (accessed August 1, 2008).
- Cronin, J., M. Dahlin, D. Adkins, and G.G. Kingsbury. 2007a. *The Proficiency Illusion*. Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Institute.
- Cronin, J., G.G. Kingsbury, M. Dahlin, D. Adkins, and B. Bowe. 2007b. Alternate methodologies for estimating state standards on a widely used computer-adaptive test. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Erpenbach, W.J., and E. Forte. 2005. *Statewide Educational Accountability under the No Child Left Behind Act—A Report on 2005 Amendments to State Plans*. Washington, DC: CCSSO.
- Fulton, M. 2006. *State Note. Minimum Subgroup Size for Adequate Yearly Progress: State Trends and Highlights*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States. <http://www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/71/71/7171.pdf> (accessed September 22, 2008).
- Kane, T. J., and D.O. Staiger. 2002. Volatility in school test scores: Implications for test based accountability systems. Pages 235–238 in *Brookings Papers on Education Policy*, edited by D. Ravitch. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Kim, J., and G. Sunderman. 2004. *Large Mandates and Limited Resources: State Response to the “No Child Left Behind Act” and Implications for Accountability*. Cambridge: The Civil Rights Project at Harvard University.
- Kingsbury, G.G., A. Olson, J. Cronin, C. Hauser, and R. Houser. 2003. *The State of State Standards*. Lake Oswego, OR: Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA).

- Linn, R., and C. Haug 2002. *Stability of School Building Accountability Scores and Gains*. Los Angeles: National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing.
- McGlaughlin, D. H. 1998a. *Study of the Linkages of 1996 NAEP and State Mathematics Assessments in Four States*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics (NCES).
- McGlaughlin, D. H. 1998b. Linking state assessments of NAEP: A study of the 1996 mathematics assessment. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.
- McGlaughlin, D. H., and V. Bandeira de Mello. 2002. Comparison of state elementary school mathematics achievement standards using NAEP 2000. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- . 2003. Comparing state reading and math performance standards using NAEP. Paper presented at the National Conference on Large-Scale Assessment, San Antonio, TX.
- McLaughlin, D.H., V. Bandeira de Mello, C. Blankenship, K. Chaney, P. Esra, H. Hikawa, D. Rojas, P. William, and M. Wolman. 2008. *Comparison between NAEP and State Mathematics Assessment Results: 2003*. NCES 2008-475. Washington, DC: NCES, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.
- NCES. 2007. *Mapping 2005 State Proficiency Standards onto the NAEP Scales*. NCES 2007-482. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- National Education Association. 2006. NCLB testing results offer “complex, muddled” picture. <http://www.nea.org/esea/ayptrends1104.html> (accessed October 6, 2008).
- Novak, J., and B. Fuller. 2003. Penalizing diverse schools? Similar test scores, but different students bring federal sanctions. Policy Brief. Berkeley: Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE).
- NWEA. 2005. *Rit Scale Norms*. Lake Oswego, OR: NWEA.
- Peterson, P., and F. Hess. 2008. Few states set world class standards. *Education Next* 8:3. <http://www.hoover.org/publications/ednext/18845034.html> (accessed September 19, 2008).
- Porter, A., R. Linn, R., & C.S. Trimble. 2005., C.S. (2005). The effects of state decisions about NCLB adequate yearly progress targets. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice* 24(4): 32–39.
- Qian, J., and H. Braun. 2005. *Mapping State Performance Standards on the NAEP Scale*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Rogosa, D.R. 2003. The NCLB "99% confidence" scam: Utah-style calculations. <http://www-stat.stanford.edu/~rag/nclb/utahNCLB.pdf> (accessed October 3, 2008).

———. 2005. Statistical misunderstandings of the properties of school scores and school accountability. Pages 147 – 174 in *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, edited by J. L. Herman and E. H. Haertel. Chicago, IL: National Society for the Study of Education.

San Francisco Chronicle, September 5, 2008. State falling way behind No Child Left Behind.
<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2008/09/05/MNEJ12O85V.DTL&hw=Adequate+Yearly+Progress&csn=001&sc=1000>
(accessed October 6, 2008).

Simpson, M.A., B. Gong, and S. Marion. 2005. *Effect of Minimum Cell Sizes and Confidence Intervals for Special Education Subgroups on School-Level AYP Determinations*. Dover, NH: National Center for Improvement of Educational Assessment.

Spellings, Margaret (2007, January). *Building on Results: A Blueprint for Strengthening the No Child Left Behind Act*. Washington, DC.: U.S. Department of Education.

Sunderman, G.L. 2006. *The Unraveling of No Child Left Behind: How Negotiated Changes Transform the Law*. Cambridge: The Civil Rights Project at Harvard University.

U.S. Department of Education. 2006. *National Assessment of Title I Interim Report: Executive Summary*. Washington, DC: Institute of Education Sciences.

———. 2008. *Approved State Accountability Plans. California State Plan*.
<http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/stateplans03/index.html> (accessed August 1, 2008).