

**New York State Examination Program  
Department Review of January 2010  
Regents Examination in Physical Setting/Physics**

**Technical Report**

**September 2011**



**Office of Assessment Policy, Development and Administration  
New York State Education Department**

## **I. Introduction**

This report summarizes the results of the Department Review of the Regents Examination in Physical Setting/Physics (Physics Exam) administered in January 2010. Department Review is an internal audit process conducted by the New York State Education Department (Department) to ensure test score reliability of the Regents Examinations. Each year, the Department conducts audits of the local scoring of a selected Regents Exams. For the January 2010 administration, the Physics Exam was chosen for Department Review. A sample of 299 Physics Exam papers from 42 high schools across New York State was rescored by an independent panel of eight scorers convened by the Department. The 2010 Department Review included the rescoring of all 29 constructed-response (CR) items on the exam and review of the computation of the total test scores, as well as subscores for each part of the exam.

The purpose of Department Review is to provide important evidence for test reliability and inter-rater reliability of the Regents Exams. The audit process allows the Department to evaluate the extent to which committees of teachers are properly applying the scoring rubrics and scoring guides when scoring the CR items. Department Review also acts as a deterrent to inappropriate local scoring procedures, ensuring that schools score tests properly and in accordance with the directions and procedures specified by the Department. This process also provides feedback to schools, which can lead them to improve their scoring procedures and enhance compliance with the scoring rubrics if deficiencies are noted. The process of Department Review is an essential element for maintaining overall test reliability.

The 2010 Department Review is particularly important due to the nature of the January administration of the exam. Starting in 2010, the January examination was administered using a restricted form. Since raters of the January exam did not have access to the test booklets, it was critical that the Department evaluate the extent to which the raters in each school adhered to the Scoring Key and Rating Guide for this administration and to the *Information Booklet for Scoring Regents Examinations in the Sciences*.

## **II. Sample Section and Responses**

A total of 42 schools submitted test papers to the Department for this review. For each school that submitted more than 10 papers, a sample of 10 papers was randomly selected for rescoring. For schools that submitted 10 or fewer papers, all of the answer papers submitted were rescored. This process yielded a total of 299 test papers for the Department Review. This number represented approximately 26 percent of the answer papers written by students across the state for this administration of this examination.

It is essential that the audit sample represent the test population. Table 1 shows the distribution of the audit sample by Need/Resource Category. The results indicate that the distribution of the sample test takers approximates the January Physics Exam population. For example, approximately 41 percent of the January Physics exam takers were from New York City, compared to 36 percent of the audited test papers.

**Table 1. Distribution of January 2010 Physics Exam Department Review Sample Papers**

Need/Resource Category	Population*		Department Review Sample	
	N	%	n	%
New York City	482	41.1%	107	35.8%
Big 4 Cities	105	9.0%	34	11.4%
High Need Urban/Suburban	25	2.1%	2	0.7%
High Need Rural	176	15.0%	65	21.7%
Average Need	353	30.1%	79	26.4%
Low Need	31	2.6%	12	4.0%
Total:	1,172	100.0%	299	100.0%

\*based on January 2009 operational test data

### III. Rescoring Procedures:

**Mechanical Review:** The purpose of the mechanical review was to determine whether local scorers tabulated student scores accurately and recorded the correct total score and sub-total score for each of the four parts of the examination (i.e. Part A and Part B1 containing multiple choice (MC) items and Part B2 and Part C containing CR items). To conduct the mechanical review of each answer sheet, specially trained Department clerks counted the number of correct responses to MC items and summed the scores for CR items to generate subscores for the four parts of the exam and the total raw score. The mechanical review total raw scores were then converted to scale scores using the raw score-to-scale score conversion chart for the January 2010 administration. The process yielded two sets of summary scores, the school scores and the Department mechanical review scores for each part of the exam, total test raw score, and scale score, for analysis.

**Rescoring CR Items:** Eight experienced high school physics teachers were employed by the Department in April 2010 as raters for the Department Review. Their task was to rescore a sample of student papers for the January exam. The scoring session was led by a specially selected Department Education Specialist with many years of experience in both the teaching of physics and the development of the Physics Exams and scoring materials. He trained the Department raters in the procedures for rating. The raters were divided into two teams of four raters each. Each team was led by a team leader. Each rater was assigned to rescore a fixed number of CR questions (items) and no one rater rated more than approximately one quarter of the CR questions on any given student paper.

To ensure rating consistency, each rater was responsible for scoring the same questions (items) in the student papers throughout the scoring session (see Organization Chart in Appendix A). For example, Rater 1 scored Items 52 to 56 and Rater 2 scored Items 57 to 65. The team leader periodically checked the scored student papers for accuracy and consistency of the team members' work. Once a student's paper was rescored by one team, the team leader compared the credit(s) allowed by the Department raters to the credit(s) allowed by the school for each item. If the former agreed with the latter, the team leader recorded the "Final Department credit(s)" for the item and no further rescoring was done for that item. If there were

disagreements between the credit(s) allowed by Department raters and those allowed by local scorers, the team leader would pass this student paper to the other team for a second round of rescoring. The team leader of the second team compared the credit(s) allowed by the Department Rater 2 to both the credit(s) allowed by Department Rater 1 and the credit(s) allowed by the school. If two of the three parties agreed on the rating for the item, the team leader recorded the credit(s) agreed on by two of the three parties as the "Final SED credit(s)" for each item and no further rescoring was done for that item. If no agreement was reached by two of the three parties, the team leader did a final rescore of the item and recorded the credit(s) as the "Final SED credit(s)." The "Final SED credit(s)" and other data for all items on the test were then compiled for analysis.

#### **IV. Data Analysis**

Three sets of scores were compared to assess the scoring reliability: local scores, mechanical review scores, and Department Review rescoring. The inter-rater reliability of the 2010 January Physics Exam was examined at multiple levels. First, at the item level, the inter-rater agreement between the school score and Department Review score for each CR item was examined. Second, at the total score level, the school and Department Review total test scores and sub-scores for all four parts of the exam were compared to determine the overall inter-rater reliability. Finally, the total raw and scale scores from the school rating and the mechanical review were compared for consistency.

No single method is adequate in determining inter-rater reliability; therefore, multiple statistical methods were employed to assess the degree of agreement between local school rating and Department Review rating.

1. **Item raw score agreement** as a measure of consensus between school scores and Department Review scores was examined. In this method, the percentages were calculated for exact agreement, adjacent agreement, and of nonadjacent agreement.
2. **Intra-class correlation** was calculated as a measure of the inter-rater reliability estimate by comparing the variability of different ratings of the same subject to the total variation across all ratings and all subjects.
3. **Item mean and standard deviation** between the school scores and Department Review rescoring were calculated and compared as measures of average agreement/difference and variability between the two groups of scorers on any given item.
4. **Total test mean difference and correlation** between school and audit scores were computed for each of the four parts of the exam, all MC items, all CR items, and total scores.
5. **Internal consistency reliability** (Cronbach's Alpha) was calculated as a measure of the reliability of the CR portion of the exam.

#### IV. Results:

##### 1. Item Raw Score Agreement

Item raw score agreement measures the absolute agreement/differences deviations between local scores and audit scores. As shown in Table 2, the exact raw score agreement between school scores and Department Review scores for the 29 CR items ranged from 76% to 100%, with a mean exact agreement rate of 94%. Twenty five of the 29 CR items had exact agreement rates of 90% or higher. The four items that exhibited relatively lower exact agreement rates (76% to 88%) were Items 53, 69, 71, and 74. The results suggest a high degree of inter-rater agreement between the local scoring and audit rescoreing.

**Table 2: Item Raw Score Agreement between School Score and Dept. Review Score**

Item #	Max Points	N Count	Raw Score Agreement			Intra-class Correlation
			Exact	Adjacent*	Non Adjacent**	
51	1	299	92.6%	7.4%	0.0%	0.921
52	1	299	99.7%	0.3%	0.0%	0.995
53	2	299	84.6%	15.0%	0.3%	0.917
54	2	299	93.0%	7.0%	0.0%	0.977
55	1	299	99.3%	0.6%	0.0%	0.993
56	2	299	90.3%	9.4%	0.3%	0.962
57	1	299	99.3%	0.7%	0.0%	0.989
58	1	299	99.7%	0.3%	0.0%	0.996
59	1	299	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.000
60	1	299	96.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.956
61	1	299	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.000
62	1	299	99.3%	0.6%	0.0%	0.986
63	1	299	93.0%	7.0%	0.0%	0.922
64	1	299	99.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.982
65	1	299	94.0%	6.0%	0.0%	0.918
66	1	299	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.000
67	1	299	95.3%	4.7%	0.0%	0.953
68	1	299	97.3%	2.7%	0.0%	0.960
69	1	299	87.6%	12.3%	0.0%	0.743
70	1	299	97.3%	2.7%	0.0%	0.923
71	2	299	76.3%	23.5%	0.3%	0.897
72	1	299	98.3%	1.7%	0.0%	0.983
73	1	299	89.6%	10.0%	0.3%	0.871
74	2	299	79.6%	20.0%	0.3%	0.932
75	2	299	92.6%	7.3%	0.0%	0.977
76	1	299	97.3%	2.6%	0.0%	0.970
77	1	299	93.0%	7.0%	0.0%	0.920
78	1	299	97.0%	3.0%	0.0%	0.968
79	1	299	97.3%	2.7%	0.0%	0.964

\*Adjacent agreement: School score and audit score differ by +/-1 raw score credit.

\*\*Non Adjacent agreement: School score and audit score differ by +/-2 raw score credits.

## **2. Intra-class correlation**

As shown in Table 2, the intra-class correlation coefficients for all CR items were high, ranging from 0.74 to 1.00. More specifically, all but two of the 29 CR items had intra-class correlations above .90. The two items that showed relatively lower intra-class correlations were Items 69 and 73. The results again suggest high degree of consistency between the local scoring and Department Review rescoring.

The distribution of raw score agreement/differences is further detailed in Table 3. The positive raw score differences (+1 and +2) indicate that local scores were higher than the audit scores by one or two raw score credits, while the negative score discrepancies (-1 and -2) indicate that school scores were lower than the audit scores by one or two score credits. Again, the results suggest high degree of agreement of 90% or higher for most CR items. However, it should be noted that, on eight of the 29 CR items (Items 53, 63, 67, 69, 71, 73, 74, and 77), the distribution of score difference indicated that the local scoring tended to award higher scores than the Department Review rescoring.

**Table 3: Percentage of Raw Score Difference Between School and Department Review Scoring (School Score Minus Audit Score)**

Item #	Max Credits	N Count	School Score Lower		Exact Score	School Score Higher	
			(-2)	(-1)	0	(+1)	(+2)
51	1	299		4.7%	92.6%	2.7%	
52	1	299		0.3%	99.7%	0.0%	
53	2	299	0.3%	2.0%	84.6%	13.0%	
54	2	299		2.3%	93.0%	4.7%	
55	1	299		0.3%	99.3%	0.3%	
56	2	299	0.3%	3.0%	90.3%	6.4%	
57	1	299		0.7%	99.3%	0.0%	
58	1	299			99.7%	0.3%	
59	1	299			100.0%	0.0%	
60	1	299		0.3%	96.0%	3.7%	
61	1	299			100.0%	0.0%	
62	1	299		0.3%	99.3%	0.3%	
63	1	299		0.3%	93.0%	6.7%	
64	1	299		1.0%	99.0%	0.0%	
65	1	299		1.7%	94.0%	4.3%	
66	1	299			100.0%	0.0%	
67	1	299			95.3%	4.7%	
68	1	299		2.7%	97.3%	0.0%	
69	1	299		0.3%	87.6%	12.0%	
70	1	299		0.7%	97.3%	2.0%	
71	2	299		7.4%	76.3%	16.1%	0.3%
72	1	299		0.7%	98.3%	1.0%	
73	1	299			89.6%	10.0%	0.3%
74	2	299		1.3%	79.6%	18.7%	0.3%
75	2	299		4.0%	92.6%	3.3%	
76	1	299		1.3%	97.3%	1.3%	
77	1	299			93.0%	7.0%	
78	1	299		0.3%	97.0%	2.7%	
79	1	299		0.7%	97.3%	2.0%	

### **3. Mean Score and Standard Deviation**

Table 4 presents the item raw score mean and standard deviation for all CR items from both local scoring and Department Review rescoring. The mean score difference was also computed and tested for statistical difference using a pair-t test. The mean score comparison indicated that the school mean scores on 21 out of 29 CR items were exactly the same or comparable for school scores and Department Review scores. On eight items, the school mean scores were slightly, but statistically significantly, higher than the Department Review mean scores. The standard deviations of the school and Department Review score were generally similar. The mean local score was .74 as compared to the mean Department Review score of .71.

**Table 4: Item Mean Raw Score and Standard Deviation**

Item #	Max Credits	N Count	Raw Score Mean			Standard Deviation	
			School	Department Review	Mean Diff	School	Department Review
51	1	299	0.49	0.51	-0.02	0.50	0.50
52	1	299	0.19	0.19	0.00	0.39	0.40
53	2	299	1.58	1.47	0.11*	0.70	0.72
54	2	299	1.28	1.26	0.02	0.88	0.87
55	1	299	0.45	0.45	0.00	0.50	0.50
56	2	299	1.31	1.28	0.03	0.87	0.85
57	1	299	0.81	0.82	-0.01	0.39	0.39
58	1	299	0.73	0.72	0.01	0.45	0.45
59	1	299	0.68	0.68	0.00	0.47	0.47
60	1	299	0.66	0.63	0.03	0.47	0.48
61	1	299	0.92	0.92	0.00	0.28	0.28
62	1	299	0.15	0.15	0.00	0.35	0.35
63	1	299	0.39	0.32	0.07*	0.49	0.47
64	1	299	0.83	0.84	-0.01	0.38	0.37
65	1	299	0.28	0.25	0.03	0.45	0.44
66	1	299	0.86	0.86	0.00	0.34	0.34
67	1	299	0.55	0.51	0.04*	0.50	0.50
68	1	299	0.77	0.80	-0.03	0.42	0.40
69	1	299	0.89	0.78	0.11*	0.31	0.42
70	1	299	0.90	0.89	0.01	0.30	0.31
71	2	299	1.01	0.92	0.09*	0.81	0.79
72	1	299	0.52	0.52	0.00	0.51	0.50
73	1	299	0.39	0.28	0.11*	0.50	0.45
74	2	299	1.36	1.18	0.18*	0.86	0.83
75	2	299	1.14	1.15	-0.01	0.91	0.89
76	1	299	0.65	0.65	0.00	0.48	0.48
77	1	299	0.37	0.30	0.07*	0.48	0.46
78	1	299	0.61	0.59	0.02	0.49	0.49
79	1	299	0.75	0.74	0.01	0.43	0.44

\*Mean difference is statistically significant,  $p < .001$ .

#### **4. Total Test Mean Scores and Correlation**

Inter-rater reliability was also examined at the total test level and the subtest level. Mean score and standard deviation were computed for the total raw score, raw score for each part of the exam, and scale score. Mean score differences and correlation between school scores and Department Review scores were computed.

As shown in Table 5, no significant mean score differences were found between school and Department Review mean scores for Part A and Part B1 that contain MC items. Small but statistically significant mean score differences were found between school and Department Review mean scores for Part B2 and Part C that contain CR items, as well as the total test mean score, with school mean scores being slightly higher than the audit mean scores. However, it should be noted that the overall impact of the CR mean score differences on the overall raw score and scale score was less than one credit out of a total of 85 raw score credits and 100 scale score points.

Despite the mean difference found in the CR section of the test, the school scores correlated highly with the audit scores for each part of the examination, as well as with the total score, with correlation coefficients ranging from .972 to .999. The high correlations indicate a very high degree of consistency between school and Department Review scoring results.

**Table 5: Physics Exam: January 2010 Administration  
Inter-Rater Agreement**

Item #	Max Points	N Count	Raw Score Mean			Raw Score SD		Corr. Between School and Dept Review Scores
			School	Dept Review	Diff.	School	Dept Review	
Part A (MC)	35	299	22.39	22.40	-0.01	7.48	7.43	.999**
Part B1 (MC)	15	299	8.58	8.56	0.02	3.74	3.73	.997**
Part B2 (CR)	15	299	9.24	9.08	0.16*	3.98	4.00	.984**
Part C (CR)	20	299	12.30	11.56	0.74*	5.16	5.06	.972**
Total Raw Score	85	299	52.48	51.61	0.87*	18.87	18.78	.996**
Scale Score	100	299	68.45	67.57	0.88*	19.67	19.61	.996**

\* difference is statistically significant,  $p < .000$

\*\*correlation coefficient is statistically significant,  $p < .000$

#### **5. Internal Consistency**

Internal consistency is another measure of test reliability. Cronbach's Alpha was computed to measure the internal consistency of CR items in Part B2 and Part C of the examination respectively as well as all CR items for both the school score and Department Review score. The high Cronbach's Alpha coefficients suggest that the CR scores from both the school scoring and audit scoring were highly consistent and reliable. The Chronbach's Alpha reliability coefficients for CR items in Part B2 and Part C were over .80 for both the school scores and Department Review rescores. The reliability for all CR items was .92 for both the school scores and

Department Review rescores. The results suggest that the CR scores from both school and Department Review scoring were highly consistent.

**Table 6: Internal Consistency of CR Items**

	Max Credits	N Count	(Cronbach's Alpha)	
			School Score	Department Review Score
Part B2 (CR)	15	299	0.838	0.842
Part C (CR)	20	299	0.868	0.863
All CR Items	35	299	0.922	0.921

### Mechanical Review Results

The mechanical review was conducted to check whether school scorers added up the total score for each section of the test as well as the total test correctly. The raw score and scale score for the total test, and raw score for each of the four parts of the exam from the school scorers and Department mechanical reviewer were compared. As shown in Table 7, there was a high degree of exact agreement between the school scores and mechanic review scores for each section, ranging from 95% to 97%. At the total score level, 87% of the local scores and mechanical review scores were exactly the same, 96% of the scores were within +/- 1 raw score point, and 98% of the scores were within +/-2 score credits.

**Table 7: Percentage of Score Difference Between School and Mechanical Review Scores (School score minus mechanical review score)**

	Max Credits	N Count	School Score Lower			Exact 0	School Score Higher		
			(-3)	(-2)	(-1)		(+1)	(+2)	(+3)
<b>Part A Raw Score</b>	35	299	0.3	0.7	1.3	95.3	2.0	0.3	
<b>Part B1 Raw Score</b>	15	299			1.3	96.0	2.0	0.3	0.3
<b>Part B2 Raw Score</b>	15	299		0.3	0.7	97.0	1.7	0.3	
<b>Part C Raw Score</b>	20	299			0.7	96.7	2.3	0.3	
<b>Total Raw Score</b>	85	299	0.6	0.7	3.3	86.6	6.4	2.3	
<b>Total Scale Score</b>	100	299	1.4	0.3	3.0	87.0	5.0	3.0	0.3

### Additional Analysis

Item analysis was performed on the 29 CR items for the local scores and Department Review scores. The results are presented in Appendix B and Appendix C. School level audit reports were generated and provided to the participating schools (See report template in Appendix D.)

## **V. Summary**

A total of 299 test papers from the January 2010 administration of the Physics Exam from 42 schools were rescored by the Department Review raters during April 2010. The audit sample was representative of the student population who took the January exam. Multiple methods were used to assess the reliability of the test and the inter-rater reliability of the CR items, including item raw score agreement, item mean score and standard deviation, intra-class correlation, total test mean score and correlation, and internal consistency of the CR portion of the exam.

A summary of the item level analysis indicates a high level of agreement between the local scores and Department Review scores for the 27 CR items, with a mean exact agreement rate of 94%. The intra-class correlation between the local score and the Department Review score was over 90% for all but two items. The school and Department Review item mean scores were exactly the same or comparable for a large majority of the items. The results suggest a high degree of inter-rater reliability and scoring consistency for the CR portion of the January exam.

At the total score level, the mechanical review of total test score and subscores for the four parts of the exam showed a high level of local scoring accuracy. The local scores for the total test and the four parts of the exam correlated highly with the Department Review scores, with correlation coefficients ranging from .972 to .999. The total test mean difference between local score and Department Review score was less than one raw score credit. The internal consistency analysis of the CR portion of the exam indicated a high degree of consistency for both the local scores and Department Review scores with the Chronbach's Alpha of .921.

In conclusion, the local scores of the CR items were very consistent with the Department Review scores. The total test score for the CR portion of the January exam was highly reliable for both the school scores and Department Review scores.

# Appendix A

## 2010 Department Review - Physics Exam Organization Chart for Rescoring of CR Items

Item #	Max. credit	School												
		1	2	3	...	...	...	...	...	...	n-2	n-1	n	
		Team 1 Round 1 = Team 1 Round 2 = Team 2							Team 2 Round 1 = Team 2 Round 2 = Team 1					
51	1													
52	1													
53	2													
54	2													
55	1													
56	2													
57	1													
58	1													
59	1													
60	1													
61	1													
62	1													
63	1													
64	1													
65	1													
66	1													
67	1													
68	1													
69	1													
70	1													
71	2													
72	1													
73	1													
74	2													
75	2													
76	1													
77	1													
78	1													
79	1													

## Appendix B

**Item Statistics Based on School Scores**

Item #	Max Credits	Score Credit (%)			Item Mean	Item-Total Correlation
		0	1	2		
51	1	51.2	48.8		0.49	0.57
52	1	80.9	19.1		0.19	0.34
53	2	12.4	17.4	70.2	1.58	0.62
54	2	28.4	14.7	56.9	1.28	0.72
55	1	54.8	45.2		0.45	0.42
56	2	26.8	15.4	57.9	1.31	0.70
57	1	18.7	81.3		0.81	0.52
58	1	27.4	72.6		0.73	0.59
59	1	32.1	67.9		0.68	0.61
60	1	34.1	65.9		0.66	0.54
61	1	8.4	91.6		0.92	0.39
62	1	85.3	14.7		0.15	0.35
63	1	61.2	38.8		0.39	0.56
64	1	17.1	82.9		0.83	0.51
65	1	71.9	28.1		0.28	0.36
66	1	13.7	86.3		0.86	0.48
67	1	44.8	55.2		0.55	0.41
68	1	23.1	76.9		0.77	0.55
69	1	10.7	89.3		0.89	0.20
70	1	9.7	90.3		0.90	0.46
71	2	32.1	34.4	33.4	1.01	0.59
72	1	48.2	51.5	0.3	0.52	0.51
73	1	61.2	38.5	0.3	0.39	0.53
74	2	25.4	13.4	61.2	1.36	0.73
75	2	35.5	14.7	49.8	1.14	0.70
76	1	35.5	64.5		0.65	0.54
77	1	63.2	36.8		0.37	0.48
78	1	39.1	60.9		0.61	0.61
79	1	25.1	74.9		0.75	0.49
<b>Mean</b>					<b>0.74</b>	<b>0.52</b>

## Appendix C

**Item Statistics Based on Department Review Scores**

Item #	Max Credits	Score Credit (%)			Item Mean	Item-Total Correlation
		0	1	2		
51	1	49.2	50.8		0.51	0.61
52	1	80.6	19.4		0.19	0.36
53	2	13.0	26.4	60.5	1.47	0.64
54	2	27.8	18.4	53.8	1.26	0.74
55	1	54.8	45.2		0.45	0.45
56	2	25.4	20.7	53.8	1.28	0.70
57	1	18.1	81.9		0.82	0.50
58	1	27.8	72.2		0.72	0.57
59	1	32.1	67.9		0.68	0.61
60	1	37.5	62.5		0.63	0.53
61	1	8.4	91.6		0.92	0.39
62	1	85.3	14.7		0.15	0.35
63	1	67.6	32.4		0.32	0.51
64	1	16.1	83.9		0.84	0.49
65	1	74.6	25.4		0.25	0.38
66	1	13.7	86.3		0.86	0.47
67	1	49.5	50.5		0.51	0.41
68	1	20.4	79.6		0.80	0.53
69	1	22.4	77.6		0.78	0.16
70	1	11.0	89.0		0.89	0.46
71	2	35.5	37.1	27.4	0.92	0.61
72	1	48.2	51.8		0.52	0.54
73	1	71.6	28.4		0.28	0.51
74	2	27.4	27.4	45.2	1.18	0.72
75	2	33.1	18.7	48.2	1.15	0.71
76	1	35.5	64.5		0.65	0.54
77	1	70.2	29.8		0.30	0.44
78	1	41.5	58.5		0.59	0.58
79	1	26.4	73.6		0.74	0.47
<b>Mean</b>					<b>0.71</b>	<b>0.52</b>

**Appendix D**

**The University of the State of New York  
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT  
Albany, New York 12234**

**Sample School Report**

**Department Review Report for the January 2010 Regents Examinations**

**Examination Title: Physical Setting/Physics**

**School:**

	Part A	Part B-1	Part B-2	Part C	Total Raw Score	Scale Score
Item Type	Multiple Choice	Multiple Choice	Constructed Response	Constructed Response		
# of Items						
Max. Credits						
# of Papers Reviewed						
# of Papers with School Score 4 or More Credits Higher Than SED Score						
# of Papers with School Score 3 Credits Higher Than SED Score						
# of Papers with School Score 2 Credits Higher Than SED Score						
# of Papers with School Score 1 Credit Higher Than SED Score						
# of Papers with Exact Agreement Between School and SED Scores						
# of Papers with School Score 1 Credit Lower Than SED Score						
# of Papers with School Score 2 Credits Lower Than SED Score						
# of Papers with School Score 3 Credits Lower Than SED Score						
# of Papers with School Score 4 or More Credits Lower Than SED Score						