

**California State Board of Education  
Agenda Summary  
September 2 & 3, 2015**

The following table is a summary of assessment and accountability items on the SBE Agenda. Use the following link to access the full SBE Agenda for more information regarding specific or additional items: <http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr15/agenda201509.asp>

Item #	Subject	Action
<a href="#">Item 01</a>	<b>Subject:</b> CAASPP Update	<p><b>INFORMATIONAL ITEM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keric Ashley was elected to State Smarter Balanced Executive Committee</li> <li>• CASSPP cut points are consistent across SBAC states. Names for the four achievement levels are unique to each state</li> <li>• REMINDER: One year of data = baseline; 2015 scores do not show “growth” or decline because they are baseline data             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is this score consistent thinking with other information?</li> <li>Error band is a frame of reference</li> <li>SBAC is considering rephrasing the “At or Near” category which was intended to describe a broader reference than ‘the field’ appears to be currently interpreting the category</li> <li>Hope that teachers will use Claim and Scale Scores to check if the results are consistent with other information.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Individual Student Report (ISR) shipments will continue through September 2015</li> <li>• Parent Guides are posted             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ca/index.asp?tabsection=3#ssr">http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ca/index.asp?tabsection=3#ssr</a>.</li> <li><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ca/caasppsreports.asp">http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ca/caasppsreports.asp</a>.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Teacher Guide is coming soon</li> <li>• New website to display CAASPP results             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="http://caaspp.cde.ca.gov/">http://caaspp.cde.ca.gov/</a></li> </ul> </li> <li>• CAASPP Institutes are coming to a location near you</li> <li>• Jerry Winkler was selected as <i>Director</i>, Educational Data Management Division and is in charge of CALPADS. He comes from the Utah State Dept of Education</li> </ul>

**California State Board of Education  
Agenda Summary  
September 2 & 3, 2015**

Item #	Subject	Action
<a href="#">Item 01</a>	<b>Subject:</b> CAASPP Update <i>(continued)</i>	<p><b><i>SBE members comments:</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would like to see LTEL and Foster included as a drop-down options on the CAASPP webpage. The student groups should match the group names cited in the LCAP</li> <li>• Want a report on the predictability between Interim results and Summative results. (Tony Alpert indicated the lack of standardization in the delivery of the Interims makes specific correlation reports difficult)</li> <li>• The “Data Points” on the Score Summary needs to be explained differently to schools and to parents because they are using the data for different purposes</li> <li>• CA is choosing “College &amp; Career Ready” instead of “Proficiency”, another reason scores cannot be compared – even though other states are continuing to use the term “Proficiency”</li> </ul> <p><b><u>BIIG</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broadband Infrastructure Improvement Grant (BIIG) received additional funding for 2015-16. Priority 1 = Connectivity &lt;20Kbps per student; Priority 2 = Connectivity &lt;100Kbps per student’ Priority 3 = If funds available to schools ranked by lowest connection capacity</li> <li>• BIIG also received funding to provide technical assistance/professional development for district IT staff <a href="http://www.k12hsn.org/grants/biig2/">http://www.k12hsn.org/grants/biig2/</a></li> </ul> <p><b><u>CA Alternative Assessment</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CDE continues communication with Nat’l Center and State Collaborative (NCSC) in order to use the NCSC test item bank for CalAlt in 2016</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS)</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NGSS Items are in the developmental stage for grade 5 and high school by the Science Assessment Item Collaborative (SAIC). Prototypes of the items are expected are expected fall 2015</li> </ul> <p><b><u>CAHSEE</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CAHSEE recommendations will be a part of the March 2016 meeting</li> <li>• “There are a number of other high school exit alternatives the CDE is investigating</li> </ul>

**California State Board of Education  
Agenda Summary  
September 2 & 3, 2015**

Item #	Subject	Action
<a href="#"><u>Item 02</u></a>	<b>Subject:</b> Supt. Recommendations on ESEA Required CA NGSS	<b>WITHDRAWN</b>
<a href="#"><u>Item 03</u></a>	<b>Subject:</b> CAASPP Independent Evaluation Study Plan	<p><b>APPROVED</b> <i>(With option to revise scope of work to include augmenting review items as determined as implementation continues)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Human Resource Research Organization (HumRRO) is the contractor</li> <li>• Interim Annual Reports and a 3-year Final Evaluation</li> <li>• Provide information on access and use of Designated Supports</li> <li>• Efficacy of human scorers/quality control</li> <li>• Ease of Interpretation of Summative &amp; Interim assessment results by administrators, teachers, students and parents/guardians</li> <li>• Implementation of Smarter Balanced assessments and identification of ‘best practices’</li> <li>• Quality of new assessment items aligned to NGSS</li> <li>• Establish a Collaborative Research Networks with LEAS</li> <li>• Not overlap with studies conducted as a part of ETS’ CAASPP contract</li> </ul>
<a href="#"><u>Item 07</u></a>	<b>Subject:</b> ESEA Accountability Update – Attendance Rate for Elementary & Middle Grades	<p><b>APPROVED</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Set attendance rate for 2015 AYP calculations at 90% for the second indicator for elementary and middle schools</li> <li>• 98% of reporting LEAs meet the suggested target of 90%</li> <li>• CDE has received 97% of LEA attendance data</li> <li>• USDE has regulations in process to add attendance to their collection requirements</li> <li>• CALPADS has “attendance” on their list of things to do for 2015-16</li> </ul>
<a href="#"><u>Item 14</u></a>	<b>Subject:</b> New State Accountability System, LCAP Rubrics and LCAP Electronic Template	<p><b>INFORMATIONAL ITEM</b> <u>New Accountability System</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LCFF is the basis for the emerging CA Accountability System</li> <li>• Need to determine how “accountability” applies to the various elements of the 8 state priorities</li> <li>• The components of the API (test scores, grad rates) are called out in other state priorities, so the API as a single numerical index is no longer needed</li> <li>• November 2015 item with more specific recommendations</li> </ul>

**California State Board of Education  
Agenda Summary  
September 2 & 3, 2015**

Item #	Subject	Action
<a href="#">Item 14</a>	<b>Subject:</b> New State Accountability System, LCAP Rubrics and LCAP Electronic Template <i>(continued)</i>	<p><u>New Accountability System</u> <i>(continued)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Waiting for ESEA reauthorization prior to making final decisions regarding SARC and other required Plans</li> <li>• CDE and Workgroups will work on a “Dashboard” to determine and display the accountability results (indicators) in terms of progress over time</li> <li>• Kirst sees a more “robust” set of indicators for LEAs and schools to use to make decisions and a more specific set of indicators to be used for state-level accountability</li> <li>• CCEE statute refers to meeting multiple indicators over a period of time – as opposed to the API model of one indicator met/not met on an annual basis</li> </ul> <p><u>CORE</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School Quality Improvement Indicators</li> <li>• Guiding Principles – Using data as a flashlight and not a hammer</li> <li>• n group = 20 students - makes more students “visible”</li> <li>• Indicators must be Measureable, Actionable, Meaningful</li> <li>• 90% attendance rate in NOT averaged</li> <li>• Use Indicators to identify which students are in need (Students in the “Red zone” in all five areas) and refer these students to specific Provider with the understanding that the students MUST move out of the red zone. For Y2, Provider will receive 50% \$ up front and will only receive remaining funds based on student movement out of the zone</li> <li>• Working with Great Schools to create a dashboard for parents</li> <li>• Reclassification Rate calculation – annual denominator is calculated as a cohort</li> <li>• “Report Card” shows one year, two year and progress data points with an overall score for each indicator on a range of 1 -10. The Report Card evolved with input from CORE districts and outside measurement experts providing simulations of the various indicator options</li> <li>• CORE is currently providing a student growth model that compares an individual student with identified “peer” group. Defining the peer group is under discussion</li> <li>• Things we measure/report should compel us to make changes</li> </ul>

**California State Board of Education  
Agenda Summary  
September 2 & 3, 2015**

Item #	Subject	Action
<a href="#">Item 14</a>	<b>Subject:</b> New State Accountability System, LCAP Rubrics and LCAP Electronic Template <i>(continued)</i>	<p><u>CCSESA (CA County Supts Educational Services Association)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CCSESA has 11 service areas to support the 58 COE supts</li> <li>• BASC (<i>Business &amp; Administration Steering Committee</i>)- financial officers for 58 LEAs</li> <li>• CISC (<i>Curriculum &amp; Instruction Steering Committee</i>) – instructional leaders from the 58 LEAs</li> <li>• Established an LCAP coordinator committee to include BASC, CISC and Student Services</li> <li>• 640 of 945 school district LCAPs were approved by August 28, 2015</li> <li>• Work to ensure LCAP does not become another compliance document</li> <li>• CCSESA recommends the template remains the same for 2015-16 so a new template of expectations need not be learned</li> <li>• CalEdPartners grant will be used to develop trainings to be delivered across the state, including a “best practices” compendium to ensure consistent, quality training across the state</li> <li>• CCSESA recommends a close coordination between CDE, SBE and WestEd with CCSESA and COEs in order to develop a 3-year training/support plan so COEs and LEAs are not scrambling ‘after-the-fact’ to address the requirements</li> <li>• Need to focus on Capacity and Coherence, separate but related elements of making progress on the Goals in the an LEAs LCAP</li> <li>• Member Burr introduces the idea of having fewer priorities in order to clarify the focus – rather than add priorities to address the foundational processes to improve an LEAs capacity to make changes</li> </ul> <p><u>WestEd – Evaluation Rubric</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LCFF legislation requires an evaluation rubric that identifies strengths, weaknesses and areas that require improvement</li> </ul> <p>The rubric will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encompass all 8 state priorities</li> <li>• Include disaggregated data</li> <li>• Offer clear descriptors of the practice/expectation</li> <li>• Support analysis and feedback to facilitate deeper reflection to support actions</li> <li>• Priorities, Indicators (expectations, i.e., All Students Graduate from HS), Metrics (measurement, i.e., how will the indicator be measured)</li> </ul> <p>Ran correlation rates between graduation rates and other measures, including attendance, a-g rate, CTE pathway, etc.</p>

**California State Board of Education  
Agenda Summary  
September 2 & 3, 2015**

Item #	Subject	Action
<a href="#"><u>Item 14</u></a>	<b>Subject:</b> New State Accountability System, LCAP Rubrics and LCAP Electronic Template <i>(continued)</i>	<p><u>WestEd – Evaluation Rubric</u> <i>(continued)</i></p> <p>Found no significant correlations between graduation and the various potential College and Career Readiness (CCR) indicators, therefore graduation rate should remain a separate measurement from other potential CCR measurements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy statement + Research leads to the identification of Key Indicator &amp; potential Associated/Related Indicators               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Key Indicator – All Students Graduate</li> <li>Associated “early indicators” (correlated relationships) include drop-out rates, suspension, expulsion, chronic absenteeism, parent engagement, and local measures such as: GPA, 6<sup>th</sup> grade persistence rates, etc.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Associated “Practice Guides” be developed for each Key Indicator LEAs can use to see the research, understand the correlated relationships and provide examples of “best practice” for moving forward</li> <li>• Considering the development of a local indicator identification tool</li> <li>• Propose showing 3 years of data - Current Year, 3-year average, and comparison data with State and/or County and/or LEA – at both LEA and school level</li> <li>• Lessons from Alberta: 1. People need to understand how to use data; 2. People need to own the data</li> <li>• Growth and measurement against a standard should both be displayed</li> <li>• Planning to test potential indicators with a group of approximately 12 pilot districts/COEs</li> <li>• Member Rucker requests pilot indicators be reviewed with other stakeholder groups in addition to the LEAs/COEs</li> </ul> <p><u>LCAP Electronic Template</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6 COEs and 13 LEAs are field testing the system</li> <li>• Anticipating “full-release” February 2016</li> </ul> <p><u>Outreach &amp; Communication</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met with multiple stakeholder groups to gather suggestions on what should be a part of the parent engagement element</li> </ul>