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Context

• All 50 states and DC adopted college and career-ready (CCR) standards in math and ELA/literacy between 2007 and 2015.
• The Longitudinal Outcomes Study is intended to assess the effects of states’ adoption of CCR standards and aligned assessments on key student outcomes, both for all students and for important student subgroups such as ELLs and SWDs.
Questions Driving This Study

• Does the adoption of CCR standards and aligned assessment result in increases in students’ college and career readiness?
• How does the effect of adopting CCR standards and aligned assessments vary by student subgroup (including ELLs and SWDs), subject, and grade?
• Is the effect of adopting CCR standards and aligned assessments on student learning moderated by the specificity, consistency, authority, power, and stability of state implementation?
Data & Measures

- **State-Level student outcome data from NCES**
  - State-level NAEP scores in math and reading for grades 4 and 8
  - High school graduation
  - College enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures of math achievement</th>
<th>Measures of reading achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math composite score</td>
<td>Reading composite score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Subscale 1: algebra</em></td>
<td><em>Subscale 1: gaining information</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Subscale 2: data analysis</em></td>
<td><em>Subscale 2: literary experience</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Subscale 3: geometry</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Subscale 4: measurement</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Subscale 5: number properties</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

» 9 ~ 11 waves of data available from 1990 through 2015
Comparative Interrupted Time Series (CITS) Analyses

- **Approach**: Effects of the adoption of CCR standards were assessed by comparing the change in the student outcome trend from before to after CCR adoption between “treatment” states and “comparison” states
  - Treatment states: states with lower prior proficiency standards
  - Comparison states: states with higher prior proficiency standards
  - Rigor/stringency of different states’ prior proficiency standards was measured on a common metric -- the NAEP scale equivalent score.

- **Assumption**: the new CCR standards represent a stronger form of “treatment” for states with lower prior proficiency standards in place than for states with higher standards prior to CCR

- **Statistical model**: state-year-level regression controlling for state and year fixed effects and time-varying covariates
Figure 1. Observed NAEP grade 4 math scores of all students for states with lower prior proficiency standards and their predicted scores in the absence of CCR standards.

1-year effect = 0.22 points (0.01 SD), p = 0.821
3-year effect = 0.81 points (0.03 SD), p = 0.549
5-year effect = 1.01 points (0.03 SD), p = 0.494
Effects on Achievement in Grade 8 Math

Figure 2. Observed NAEP grade 8 math scores of all students for states with lower prior proficiency standards and their predicted scores in the absence of CCR standards

1-year effect = -0.23 points (-0.01 SD), p = 0.850; 3-year effect = -0.14 points (-0.004 SD), p = 0.929; 5-year effect = 0.31 points (0.01 SD), p = 0.840
Effects on Achievement in Grade 4 Reading

Figure 3. Observed NAEP grade 4 reading scores of all students for states with lower prior proficiency standards and their predicted scores in the absence of CCR standards

1-year effect = 2.42 points (0.07 SD), p = 0.011*; 3-year effect = 2.76 points (0.07 SD), p = 0.011*;
5-year effect = 2.12 points (0.06 SD), p = 0.136
Effects on Achievement in Grade 8 Reading

Figure 4. Observed NAEP grade 8 reading scores of all students for states with lower prior proficiency standards and their predicted scores in the absence of CCR standards

1-year effect = 0.33 points (0.01 SD), p = 0.644; 3-year effect = 0.36 points (0.01 SD), p = 0.675; 5-year effect = -0.18 points (-0.005 SD), p = 0.830
Potential Reasons for Limited Evidence for Significant Effects

• CCR standards may be no more effective at improving student achievement than prior standards.
• CCR standards may not have been well implemented.
  • Challenges in implementing CCR standards
  • Extended timeline of implementation
• Study limitations may have led to conservative estimates of the effects of CCR standards.
  • Lack of a true “no-treatment” comparison group given the timing of CCR adoption across states
  • Definition of treatment and comparison states based on the rigor of states’ prior proficiency standards as a proxy for the rigor of their prior content standards
  • Less-than-perfect alignment between NAEP and CCR standards