

## **Decision Considerations**

### **Article 2**

**Editors, Education Week on the Web** (2003), *Legal Twists, Digital Turns, 2003 Editorial Projects in Education*, Vol. 22, number 35, page 11-14,16. Available online at <http://counts.edweek.org/sreports/tc03/article.Cfm?slug=35impact.h22>

This article provides an overview of the status of online testing in Virginia, West Virginia, Texas, Indiana, Oregon, Georgia and South Dakota. Overall, it was expressed that technology could change the face of testing itself, and have an impact on states using test results for instructional and accountability purposes. Cost was an issue for each state because of the funding that is actually being attached to the “No Child Left Behind” Act (NCLB). Because of the money needed to implement online testing, Bennett from the Educational Testing Service (ETS) states that lack of funds could slow down technology-based testing at least on the accountability end. However, Vantage Learning CEO Scott Elliott estimated that the cost could be reduced from \$8 to \$10 per student paper-and-pencil test to \$5 to \$6 per student with computer testing. Swartz (ETS) stated that computer-administered and computer-scored versions of a test for Indiana cost about a quarter of what the paper-and-pencil version. In addition, the results were received in a matter of days, rather than months. Of major concern is the upfront monies needed to build an assessment and to implement online testing is a major roadblock given available state funds. Another roadblock that states have encountered under federal law is that of adaptive testing. A student’s performance is to be compared to the expectations of the student’s grade level. So, states that had implemented online testing have adjusted their testing program to give districts the option to test online and also offering a fixed-form of the test correlated to the standards. Others argue that adaptive testing could meet NCLB but it would take more extended communication from testing experts.

In summary, technology is viewed as a positive direction for testing, but the issue of funding is yet to be solved.