## Assessment and Accountability Network Meeting

**April 14, 2011**  
**9:00-11:00am**  
**Oak Grove Room**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
<th>PERSON</th>
<th>TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warm-up and Update</td>
<td>• Predict and learn how career options for students have changed over time</td>
<td>Bill Conrad</td>
<td>9:00-9:15am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARC and SBAC Presentation</td>
<td>• Update on the assessment work of PARC and SBAC.</td>
<td>Bill Conrad</td>
<td>9:15-9:30am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Compare sample performance assessments from each assessment type.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARC Discussion</td>
<td>• Discuss implications of these new assessments for our school districts</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>9:30-9:50am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discuss the role of SCCOE in supporting the new assessment paradigm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics Diagnostic Testing Program (MDTP) Presentation</td>
<td>• Update on the MDTP assessment as a diagnostic and evaluation instrument as it pertains to college and career readiness</td>
<td>Julie Cates</td>
<td>9:50-10:35am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics Diagnostic Testing Program Discussion</td>
<td>• Discussion of MDTP’s use in our districts</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>10:35-11:00am</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Next year’s meetings:**  
- Aug 19, 2011  
- Oct 20, 2011  
- Jan 26, 2012  
- Mar 22, 2012  
- May 24, 2012
## ANSWER SHEET

### What Were the 5 Worst Jobs in 2011?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 Best Jobs</th>
<th>5 Worst Jobs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Accountant</td>
<td>1. Mathematician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mathematician</td>
<td>2. Roofer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Actuary</td>
<td>3. Roustabout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ironworker</td>
<td>5. Taxi Driver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumberjack</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Steven Strieber at CareerCast.com
### What Were the 5 Worst Jobs in 2011?

**5 Best Jobs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 Best Jobs</th>
<th>SCORE (Based on Work Environment, Stress Level, Physical Demands, Hiring Outlook, and Income)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Accountant</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mathematician</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Actuary</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Statistician</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Computer Systems Analyst</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5 Worst Jobs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 Worst Jobs</th>
<th>SCORE (Based on Work Environment, Stress Level, Physical Demands, Hiring Outlook, and Income)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Roustabout</td>
<td>892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ironworker</td>
<td>887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lumberjack</td>
<td>868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Roofer</td>
<td>863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Taxi Driver</td>
<td>821</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What do the best jobs have in common? Each requires a high level of education.

Source: Steven Strieber at CareerCast.com
The Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC)

*Presentation to California State Board of Education*  
*March 9, 2011*

**Mitchell Chester,** Massachusetts Commissioner of Education & Chair of PARCC Governing Board  
**Matt Gandal,** Executive Vice President, Achieve
At a once in a lifetime moment in education reform

Nearly every state in the nation is working to improve academic standards and assessments

PARCC’s overarching goal: to ensure students graduate with the knowledge and skills most demanded by college and careers
The Common Core State Standards Initiative

- Beginning in the spring of 2009, Governors and state commissioners of education from 48 states, 2 territories and the District of Columbia committed to developing a common core of state K-12 English-language arts (ELA) and mathematics standards.

- The **Common Core State Standards Initiative (CCSSI)** is a state-led effort coordinated by the National Governors Association (NGA) and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). [www.corestandards.org](http://www.corestandards.org)
44 States + DC Have Adopted the Common Core State Standards

* Maine and Washington have adopted the CCSS provisionally
** Minnesota adopted the CCSS in ELA only
While standards are a critical first step, they alone will not bring about the instructional changes necessary to improve student achievement and attainment.

Creating common assessments grounded in common standards is a logical next step to ensure:

- All students have access to the new standards
- States get an accurate view of how their students are performing and how they stack up against one another

Assessments aligned to the Common Core will help ensure the new standards truly reach every classroom.
Race to the Top Assessment Program Competition

- $350 million of Race to the Top Fund set aside for awards to consortia of states to design and develop common K-12 assessment systems aligned to common, college- and career-ready standards
- The competition asked consortia to design assessment systems that meet the dual needs of *instructional improvement* and *accountability*
- In September 2010, the U.S. Department of Education awarded grants to:
  - Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC)
  - Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC)
- The winning consortia have four years to develop assessments systems, and states participating in either consortium will administer new assessments statewide by 2014-2015
• PARCC is an alliance of 25 states working together to develop a common set of K-12 assessments in English and math anchored in what it takes to be ready for college and careers

• PARCC is state-led and a subset of PARCC states make up its Governing Board

• State-based collaboration is the hallmark of PARCC, and collectively these states educate more than 31 million students — nearly 63% of K-12 students attending American public schools
PARCC Governance

Governing Board States

- Governing States serve on the PARCC Governing Board, lead the consortium, and are responsible for shaping the vision of PARCC’s next generation assessments.
- While all PARCC states have input, Governing states have decision making authority.
- Governing states commit to using the assessments in 2014-2015.
- Governing States receive $90,000 per year to support staff time devoted to the effort.
- Governing States receive funds to engage postsecondary leaders and faculty in high school assessment development.

States:
- Arizona
- Arkansas
- District of Columbia
- Florida (*Fiscal Agent*)
- Georgia
- Illinois
- Indiana
- Louisiana
- Maryland
- Massachusetts (*Board Chair*)
- New York
- Rhode Island
- Tennessee
PARCC Participating States

12 Participating States

- Participating States provide staff to serve on PARCC’s design committees, working groups, and other task forces established by the Governing Board to conduct the work necessary to design and develop PARCC’s proposed assessment system.
- By 2014–15, any state that remains in PARCC must commit to statewide implementation and administration of the Partnership’s assessment system.
- Any PARCC Participating State prepared to make the commitments and take on the responsibilities of a Governing State can become one.

- Alabama
- California
- Colorado
- Delaware
- Kentucky
- Mississippi
- New Jersey
- North Dakota
- Ohio
- Oklahoma
- Pennsylvania
- South Carolina
PARCC selected Achieve as its Project Management Partner to play a key role in coordinating the work of the Partnership based on Achieve’s deep experience:

- Developing educational standards, including the Common Core State Standards;
- Leading multi-state assessment development efforts anchored in college- and career-ready goals; and
- Convening a cross-section of state leaders around common issues and challenges through the American Diploma Project

Achieve is a bipartisan, non-profit organization that helps states raise academic standards, improve assessments, and strengthen accountability to prepare all young people for postsecondary education, work, and citizenship

Achieve’s Board consists of Democratic governors, Republican governors and business leaders
PARCC’s Goals

1. Build a pathway to college and career readiness for all students
2. Create high quality assessments that measure more sophisticated, authentic student performances
3. Support educators in the classroom
4. Keep students on the path to success
Goal #1: Build a Pathway to College and Career Readiness for All Students

- The PARCC assessment system will be aligned to the college- and career-ready, Common Core State Standards
- In high school, PARCC assessments will be modeled after the CA EAP; results will indicate whether students are ready for entry-level, non-remedial courses at higher education institutions in all 25 PARCC states
- Students who score proficient on the assessments from kindergarten through high school will know they are on track for the next steps in their education, creating a more meaningful target
- Over 200 higher education institutions and systems in PARCC states, including CSU & CA Community College System, have committed to help develop the high school assessments, set the college-ready performance levels and honor the results
Goal #1: Build a Pathway to College and Career Readiness for All Students

K-2 formative assessment being developed, aligned to the PARCC system

Real-time student achievement data showing students, parents and educators whether ALL students are on-track to college and career readiness

College readiness score to identify who is ready for college-level coursework

Targeted interventions & supports:
• 12th-grade bridge courses
• PD for educators

SUCCESS IN FIRST-YEAR, CREDIT-BEARING, POSTSECONDARY COURSEWORK

ONGOING STUDENT SUPPORTS/INTERVENTIONS
Higher Education: Key PARCC Partner

- **200 postsecondary systems and institutions across all 25 PARCC states**
  - Representing nearly 1,000 campuses – committed as partners.

- **Role of Higher Education:**
  - Partner with K-12 to develop college-ready high school assessments in English and mathematics acceptable to all PARCC colleges and universities
  - Guide long-term strategy to engage **all** colleges and universities in PARCC states
  - Lay groundwork for implementation of college-ready high school assessments as valid placement instruments for credit-bearing courses

- **PARCC college-ready assessments will help students** –
  - To enter colleges better prepared
  - To persist in and complete degree and certificate programs
The PARCC assessment system will:

- Better reflect the sophisticated knowledge and skills found in the English and math Common Core State Standards
- Include a mix of item types (e.g., short answer, richer multiple choice, longer open response, performance-based)
- Make significant use of technology
- Include testing at key points throughout the year to give teachers, parents and students better information about whether students are on track or need additional support in particular areas
Goal #2: Create High Quality Assessments

Benefits:

• Through-course assessments provide teachers information on their students performance at key points during the year, allowing them to adjust instruction and target interventions

• Results will be returned immediately so they are more useful to schools

• Assessments will measure more sophisticated, authentic performances
Goal #3: Support Educators in the Classroom

**INSTRUCTIONAL TOOLS TO SUPPORT IMPLEMENTATION**
- Model instructional units
- Content frameworks
- Prototypes of through-course assessments

**PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT MODULES**
- *Common Assessment 101-103*: PD focused on the implementation the new assessments
- *Common Assessment 201-204*: PD focused on how to interpret and use the assessment results

**REAL-TIME STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA**
- Aligned performance-based assessments given throughout year
- Data reports will be available, designed with teacher use in mind

**EDUCATOR-LED TRAINING TO SUPPORT “PEER-TO-PEER” TRAINING**
- Training for cadres of K-12 educators around the common core state standards and PARCC assessments
Goal #4: Keep students on the path to success

- From *kindergarten through high school*, the assessment system is being designed to support the growth of all students: to challenge them, help identify when they’re not meeting the standards, and provide targeted instruction & supports to help them succeed:
  - Real-time **diagnostic information** at multiple points during the school year to help target instruction to individual students
  - Consistent signals across students’ K-12 experience about whether they are **on track to be college and career ready**; “proficient” means prepared
  - **Curricular tools** to support high quality instruction
  - **College-readiness interventions** in high school to help all students succeed
To support state efforts to implement and transition to the Common Core State Standards and new assessments successfully by the 2014-15 school year, PARCC will facilitate:

- Consortium-wide strategic planning institutes to bring teams of education leaders together to map out and monitor implementation strategies

- Collaborative efforts to develop the highest priority curricular and instructional tools

- Multi-state support to build leadership cadres of educators who are deeply engaged in the use of those tools, the CCSS and the PARCC assessments
PARCC Timeline

- **Oct. 2010**: Launch and design phase begins
- **Sept. 2011**: Development phase begins
- **Sept. 2012**: First year field testing and related research and data collection begins
- **Sept. 2013**: Second year field testing begins and related research and data collection continues
- **Sept. 2014**: Full administration of PARCC assessments begins
- **Summer 2015**: Set achievement levels, including college-ready performance levels
The PARCC TAC advises state leaders of the PARCC consortium on the development of a next generation assessment system that is valid, reliable, fair, and moves the 25 state consortium towards its shared goal of college and career readiness for all students by the end of high school.

Each member of the fifteen-person TAC was selected for their large-scale assessment expertise, their specific areas of technical expertise, and their stated commitment to the vision of PARCC. They are some of the most influential, respected leaders in the field.
PARCC Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

- Henry Braun, Boston College
- Bob Brennan, University of Iowa
- Derek Briggs, University of Colorado at Boulder
- Wayne Camara, College Board
- Linda Cook, Retired, ETS
- Ronald Hambleton, University of Massachusetts, Amherst
- Gerunda Hughes, Howard University
- Huynh Huynh, University of South Carolina
- Michael Kolen, University of Iowa
- Suzanne Lane, University of Pittsburgh
- Richard Luecht, University of North Carolina at Greensboro
- Jim Pellegrino, University of Illinois at Chicago
- Barbara Plake, University of Nebraska- Lincoln
- Rachel Quenemoen, National Center on Educational Outcomes
- Laurie Wise, (Human Resources Research Organization, HumRRO
The PARCC TAC held its first meeting on January 31 and February 1, 2011 in Washington, D.C. to begin discussing key design and technical considerations of the PARCC assessment system. Specific topics of discussion included:

- assessment design, scoring and reporting
- future research and development
- validity evidence
- convening of technical working groups in key areas such as accommodations, innovative item types, and automated scoring.

The TAC is now advising the state leaders of the PARCC consortium on key design and development issues and a robust research strategy, and are tapping their peers to help PARCC identify the most innovative approaches to fairly and reliably assessing all students, including ELL students.
PARCC Technical Working Groups

- PARCC Technical Working Groups (TWGs) will go deeper into high priority issues—develop the research strategy, work with and advise the TAC and advise states on a variety of design and technical issues.

- High Priority PARCC Technical Working Groups include:
  - Research Strategy
  - Accessibility, Accommodations and Fairness
  - Technology
  - Innovative Item Design
  - Automated or Artificial Intelligence Scoring

- The PARCC TAC will work with states to identify areas and topics that are in need of additional TWG expertise over the course of the project.
To help ensure the validity and success of the assessment system, PARCC designed a robust research and evaluation plan that starts with the collection of cutting-edge knowledge and research to inform the earliest stages of assessment development and carries through to evaluation of the assessment system.

The RSG is a high-level, multi-disciplinary advisory group of experts in the fields of higher education, teaching and learning, assessment, evaluation, school organization, and the economics of education.

The RSG will provide strategic policy advice about the Partnership’s broad research agenda to inform ongoing improvements in assessment design and development, as well as evaluation and implementation.
Accessibility, Accommodations and Fairness TWG

• PARCC will provide fair and accessible assessments because all students deserve the opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge.

• This working group will have a range of expertise in access and accommodations for ELL and SWD students and will include leaders in the field.

• *Types of Accessibility, Accommodations and Fairness working group members:*
  – ELL accommodations experts
  – SWD accommodations experts
Technology Implementation TWG

- PARCC is developing a computer-based assessment system that will require many states to accelerate efforts to expand technology infrastructure in their schools. However, with well-designed technology supports, PARCC-wide administration of computer-based assessments can be achieved in a cost-effective and reliable manner.

- This group will advise PARCC on helping states build and deploy the required network infrastructure, including the assessment platform. Members have deep experience implementing technology in schools, and include state and district technology officers. Members will have expertise in:
  - Information Systems
  - Applications Systems
  - Network Systems
  - State and/or District Technology and experience deploying large-scale technology systems and/or system architecture knowledge
  - Assessment
  - Test security and related test delivery concerns
Innovative Item TWG

• PARCC intends to push the field of assessment technology and maximize the use of innovative computer-scored item formats in its assessment.

• This group will advise on new and innovative item types and will represent experts with experience in designing, writing, and researching innovative item types, as well as experts in large-scale assessment and validity.

• Types of Innovative Item working group members:
  – Experts with experience using technology to design innovative and interactive items (including those outside of the education field)
  – Assistive Technology Experts
  – Experts in user interface design
  – Assessment Experts
Automated Scoring TWG

- The PARCC design relies on automated scoring to ensure fast turn around or results. This working group will advise on issues related to the automated scoring of student writing. Members will represent experts who have experience with the automated scoring of writing and other extended student responses, and content experts.

- *Types of Innovative Item working group members:*
  - Automated scoring experts (including, but not limited to, automated scoring of student writing)
  - Content experts
An Overview of the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium for the California State Board of Education

Joe Willhoft, Executive Director

March 9, 2011
California Department of Education, Room 1101
Sacramento, California
The Purpose of the Consortium

• To develop a system of comprehensive and innovative assessments for grades 3-8 and high school in English language arts and mathematics aligned to the Common Core State Standards, so that...

• ...students leave high school prepared for postsecondary success in college or a career through increased student learning and improved teaching.

• The assessments shall be operational across Consortium states in the 2014-15 school year
Who Are We?
## Consortium Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Co-Chairs</strong></td>
<td>Tony Alpert (OR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Judy Park (UT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Executive Director</strong></td>
<td>Joe Willhoft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Executive Committee</strong></td>
<td>Dan Hupp (ME); Joseph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martineau (MI); Carissa Miller (ID); Lynette Russell (WI); Mike Middleton (WA); Charlie Lenth (SHEEO); tbd (2-year colleges)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Management Partner</strong></td>
<td>WestEd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy Coordinator</strong></td>
<td>Sue Gendron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior Research Advisor</strong></td>
<td>Linda Darling-Hammond</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Keeping States Connected with the Work

- Regular meetings with chief state school officers
- Twice-monthly Governing States conference calls
- Monthly Advisory States calls
- Monthly assessment Webinars open to all
- Twice-per-year face-to-face All States meetings
- Three-per-year “Implementing Common Core Systems” workshops, twice-a-month follow-up
- Weekly newsletter to all participants
- Regular Work Group meetings and activities
- Live streaming of all Technical Advisory meetings
- Advisory groups for ELL and higher education
What Guides Our Work?
Federal Grant Requirements – The "Givens"

- $178M project
  - $159M Main Grant, $16M Supplemental (Additional $2M Private)
- Valid, fair, reliable system aligned to Common Core State Standards
- Use of multiple measures
- Student acquisition of and progress toward “college and career readiness”
- Assess all students, except those with “significant cognitive disabilities”

Source: Federal Register / Vol. 75, No. 68 / Friday, April 9, 2010 pp. 18171-85
Federal Grant Requirements – The "Givens"

- Instructionally useful information for teachers
- Comparable scores across member states
- Information useful to institutions of higher education
- Data that “can be used for”:
  - School and district accountability
  - Teacher and principal evaluation
  - Identify teacher and principal professional development needs
- Online assessments, with timely results
- Development only; tests ready in 2014-15

Source: Federal Register / Vol. 75, No. 68 / Friday, April 9, 2010  pp. 18171-85
Seven SMARTER Balanced Design Principles

- An integrated system
  - Summative/Interim/Formative
- Design with evidence of student performance
  - “Evidence-based design”
- Teacher involvement
  - Prototype design; item/task writing; scoring of complex items/tasks
- State-led with transparent governance
  - Engagement in policy and implementation decisions
Seven SMARTER Balanced Design Principles

- Continuously improve teaching and learning
  - Regular feedback of progress; professional development supports
- Useful information on multiple measures
  - Progression-based scores; extended response items and performance tasks
- Adhere to established professional standards
  - AERA/NCME Standards for Testing
  - ATP Best Practices
  - JCSEE Standards (Utility, Reliability, Propriety, Feasibility)
Technical Advisory Committee

Jamal Abedi  
*UC Davis/CRESST*

Randy Bennett  
*ETS*

Derek Briggs  
*University of Colorado*

Greg Cizek  
*University of North Carolina*

David Conley  
*University of Oregon*

Linda Darling-Hammond  
*Stanford University*

Brian Gong  
*The Center for Assessment*

Ed Haertel  
*Stanford University*

Joan Herman  
*UCLA/CRESST*

Jim Pellegrino  
*University of Illinois, Chicago*

W. James Popham  
*UCLA, Emeritus*

Joe Ryan  
*Arizona State University*

Martha Thurlow  
*University of Minnesota/NCEO*
What Is Our Design?
How do we get from here...

Common Core State Standards specify K-12 expectations for college and career readiness

...to here?

All students leave high school college and career ready

...and what can an assessment system do to help?
Assessment System Components

- Common Core State Standards specify K-12 expectations for college and career readiness
- Adaptive summative assessments benchmarked to college & career readiness
- All students leave high school college and career ready
Summative assessments using online computer adaptive technologies

- The accountability component
- Adaptive testing...
  - A way to select items for students
  - Highly individualized
  - Accurate measurement across the performance scale
  - Very efficient – less testing time needed
- Reports current achievement and growth across time
- Multiple item types
- Two performance tasks per year per content area
- Students may take twice a year; results in two weeks
All students leave high school college and career ready

Adaptive summative assessments benchmarked to college & career readiness

Adaptive interim assessments that are flexible and open providing actionable feedback

Common Core State Standards specify K-12 expectations for college and career readiness
Optional interim assessments using online adaptive technology

- Non-secure and fully accessible
- Timing and content are customizable
- On same scale as the summative assessments
- Includes performance tasks
- Clear examples of the expected performance
- Helps identify specific needs
- Teachers included in item and task design and scoring
All students leave high school college and career ready

Adaptive interim assessments that are flexible and open providing actionable feedback

Adaptive summative assessments benchmarked to college & career readiness

Teachers can access formative tools and practices to improve instruction

Common Core State Standards specify K-12 expectations for college and career readiness
Optional Web-based formative resources

• **Online resources for...**
  - Aligning instruction to CCSS
  - Classroom evidence of student learning
  - Formative assessment guides

• **Training in item and task development, creating scoring guides/rubrics**

• **Best-practice support through online learning modules**

• **Comprehensive information portal...**
  - Access to information about student progress
  - Student performance history
Common Core State Standards specify K-12 expectations for college and career readiness.

Adaptive summative assessments benchmarked to college & career readiness.

All students leave high school college and career ready.

Adaptive interim assessments that are flexible and open providing actionable feedback.

Teachers can access formative tools and practices to improve instruction.

Assessment System Components
Fifteen students watched a movie and rated the movie on a scale of 1 (very bad movie) to 20 (very good movie). Their ratings are shown in the table.

a. Using the data in the table, complete the box-and-whisker plot by adding the upper quartile, the lower quartile, and the median. A box will be formed with the three points indicated. You will be able to adjust the box once created if needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Movie Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andy</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bee</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamal</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasper</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenn</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofie</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Click on the line to add the upper quartile, lower quartile, and median.
b. The teacher gave the movie a rating of 8. The teacher’s rating was added to the ratings of the 15 students. Explain how the addition of the teacher’s rating will affect the:

- minimum
- maximum
- upper quartile
- lower quartile
- median
Gas Bills, Heating Degree Days, and Energy Efficiency

Here is a typical story about an Ohio family concerned with saving money and energy by better insulating their house.

Kevin and Shana Johnson’s mother was surprised by some very high gas heating bills during the winter months of 2007. To improve the energy efficiency of her house, Ms. Johnson found a contractor who installed new insulation and sealed some of her windows. He charged her $600 for this work and told her he was pretty sure that her gas bills would go down by “at least 10 percent each year.” Since she had spent nearly $1,500 to keep her house warm the previous winter, she expected her investment would conserve enough energy to save at least $150 each winter (10% of $1,500) on her gas bills.

Ms. Johnson’s gas bill in January 2007 was $240. When she got the bill for January 2008, she was stunned that the new bill was $235. If the new insulation was going to save only $5 each month, it was going to take a very long time to earn back the $600 she had spent. So she called the insulation contractor to see if he had an explanation for what might have gone wrong. The contractor pointed out that the month of January had been very cold this year and that the rates had gone up from last year. He said her bill was probably at least 10% less than it would have been without the new insulation and window sealing.

Ms. Johnson compared her January bill from 2008 to her January bill from 2007. She found out that she had used 200 units of heat in January of 2007 and was charged $1.20 per unit (total = $240). In 2008, she had used 188 units of heat but was charged $1.25 per unit (total = $235) because gas prices were higher in 2008. She found out the average temperature in Ohio in January 2007 had been 32.9 degrees, and in January of 2008, the average temperature was more than 4 degrees colder, 28.7 degrees. Ms. Johnson realized she was doing well to have used less energy (188 units versus 200 units), especially in a month when it had been colder than the previous year.

Since she used gas for heating only, Ms. Johnson wanted a better estimate of the savings due to the additional insulation and window sealing. She asked Kevin and Shana to look into whether the “heating degree days” listed on the bill might provide some insight.
a. Assess the cost-effectiveness of Ms. Johnson’s new insulation and window sealing. You will need to research on “heating degree days” on the internet. In your response, you must do the following:

- Explain Ms. Johnson’s savings after the insulation and sealing.
- Identify circumstances under which Ms. Johnson’s January 2008 gas bill would have been at least 10% less than her January 2007 bill.
- Decide if the insulation and sealing work on Ms. Johnson’s house was cost-effective and provide evidence for this decision.
b. Create a short pamphlet for gas company customers to guide them in making decisions about increasing the energy efficiency of their homes. The pamphlet must do the following:

- List the quantities that customers need to consider in assessing the cost-effectiveness of energy efficiency measures.
- Generalize the method of comparison used for Ms. Johnson’s gas bills with a set of formulas, and provide an explanation of the formulas.
- Explain to gas customers how to weigh the cost of energy efficiency measures with savings on their gas bills.

When you have completed your pamphlet, upload it using the button below.
Key Features
Responsible Flexibility

- Formative Processes and Tools
- Interim Assessments
- Summative Achievement
- Summative Growth

Flexibility Balance Standardization
• **Computerized testing**
  - Paper/pencil option locally available during a 3-year transition
  - Spring 2011: State-by-state survey of technology/infrastructure gaps

• **End-of-course tests**
  - Test-builder tool available to use interim item pool for EOCs

• **Common, interoperable open-source software**
  - Accommodate State-level assessment options

• **Adoption of best practices procedures/protocols**
  - Common protocols for item development: accessibility, language/cultural sensitivity, construct irrelevant variance
  - Common accommodation and translation protocols
Features: Benefits of a Multi-State Consortium

- **Better service** for students with disabilities and EL students through common, agreed-upon protocols for item/test development and accommodations
- **Consistent identification of needs** for stable and mobile students
- **Less cost and more capabilities** through scope of work sharing and collaboration
- **More control** through shared, interoperable open-source software platforms: Item authoring system, item banking, and adaptive testing platform no longer exclusive property of vendors
Features: Tailored, Online Reporting

- Supports **access to information about student progress** toward college and career readiness
- Includes **evidence of student work** in addition to scores
- Allows for exchange of **student performance history** across districts and states
- Uses a Consortium-supported platform, while individual **states retain jurisdiction** over access, appearance, and branding of online reports
- Tied to **digital clearinghouse of formative materials**
- **Graphical display of learning progression** status (interim assessment).
Getting the Work Done
Timeline

2010-2011 School Year
- Common Core Translation and Item Specifications Completed

2011-2012 School Year
- Common Core State Standards Adopted by All States

2012-2013 School Year
- Pilot Testing of Summative and Interim Assessments Conducted

2013-2014 School Year
- Preliminary Achievement Standards (Summative) Proposed and Other Policy Definitions Adopted

2014-2015 School Year
- Operational Summative Assessment Administered

Field Testing of Summative Assessment Administered
- Final Achievement Standards (Summative) Verified and Adopted

Formative Processes, Tools, and Practices Development Begins
- Item Writing and Review Activities Completed (Summative and Interim)

Master Plan Developed and Work Groups Launched
Consortium has established 10 work groups

Work group engagement of a total of 90 state-level staff...

- 2 co-chairs per work group from governing states
- 6 members from governing or advisory states
- 1 liaison from the Executive Committee
- Each work group staffed by a WestEd partner

Work group responsibilities:

- Define scope and time line for work in its area
- Identify resource needs (incl. contracted services)
- Select and monitor service providers
Work Groups

1. Transition to Common Core State Standards
2. Technology Approach
3. Item Development
4. Performance Task Development
5. Assessment Design
6. Test Administration
7. Reporting
8. Accessibility and Accommodations
9. Formative Processes and Tools/Professional Development
10. Research and Evaluation
To find out more...

...the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium can be found online at

www.k12.wa.us/SMARTER

Thank You
Introduction: The purpose of this activity is to review sample assessment items that were developed or identified by the two major assessment consortia and to discuss these items from using the following key questions:

- How does this assessment item compare to items that you currently use for your Benchmark assessment?
- Does this assessment item assess an idea or skill that would align with college and/or career readiness?
- Does your curriculum align with the common core standard and assessment item?
- Does your instructional practice align with the common core standard and assessment item?
- Does the common core aligned assessment item imply any changes to Curriculum and Instruction within your district?

Each sample item will include background information and alignment to common core standards.
PARCC Sample Item 1

**Background Information:**
Source: PARCC Assessment Consortia Application: Appendix (A) (3) – A, Example Item Types: English Language Arts/Literacy and Mathematics

**Alignment to Common Core Standards:**
CCSS 11-12.RI.8
Delineate and evaluate the reasoning in seminal U.S. texts, including the application of constitutional principles and use of legal reasoning (e.g., in U.S. Supreme Court majority opinions and dissents) and the premises, purposes, and arguments in works of public advocacy (e.g., The Federalist, presidential addresses).

**Sample Extended Constructed Response Item:**
Delineate and evaluate the argument that Thomas Paine makes in Common Sense. Assess the reasoning present in his analysis, including the premises and purposes of his essay.

How does this assessment item compare to items that you currently use for your Benchmark assessment?

Does this assessment item assess an idea or skill that would align with college and/or career readiness?

Does your curriculum align with the common core standard and assessment item?

Does your instructional practice align with the common core standard and assessment item?

Does the common core aligned assessment item imply any changes to Curriculum and Instruction within your district?
PARCC and SBAC Sample Assessment Review
Assessment and Accountability Network Meeting
Thursday, April 14, 2011

PARCC Sample Item 2

Background Information:
Source: PARCC Assessment Consortia Application: Appendix (A) (3) – A, Example Item Types: English Language Arts/Literacy and Mathematics

Alignment to Common Core Standards:
CCSS 9-10.RI.3 and 9-10.R1.9

Analyze how the author unfolds an analysis or series of ideas or events, including the order in which the points are made, how they are introduced and developed, and the connections that are drawn between them.

Analyze seminal U.S. documents of historical and literary significance (e.g., Washington’s Farewell Address, the Gettysburg Address, Roosevelt’s Four Freedoms speech, King’s “Letter from Birmingham Jail”), including how they address related themes and concepts.

Sample Extended Constructed Response Item:
Analyze how Abraham Lincoln in his "Second Inaugural Address" examines the ideas that led to the Civil War, paying particular attention to the order in which the points are made (1), how Lincoln introduces (2) and develops (3) his points, and the connections that are drawn among them (4).

Key Questions
How does this assessment item compare to items that you currently use for your Benchmark assessment?

Does this assessment item assess an idea or skill that would align with college and/or career readiness?

Does your curriculum align with the common core standard and assessment item?

Does your instructional practice align with the common core standard and assessment item?

Does the common core aligned assessment item imply any changes to Curriculum and Instruction within your district?
PARCC and SBAC Sample Assessment Review
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PARCC Sample Item 3

Background Information:
This is an extended ELA-3 Through-Course: Extended Writing/Research Prompt

Alignment to Common Core Standards:
CCSS 9-10.RI.3 and 9-10.R1.9

Analyze how the author unfolds an analysis or series of ideas or events, including the order in which the points are made, how they are introduced and developed, and the connections that are drawn between them.

Analyze seminal U.S. documents of historical and literary significance (e.g., Washington’s Farewell Address, the Gettysburg Address, Roosevelt’s Four Freedoms speech, King’s “Letter from Birmingham Jail”), including how they address related themes and concepts.

Sample Extended Writing/Research Prompt Response Item:
...students will be asked to select and read a variety of materials and compose a written essay based on the relevant information over several sessions. These extended performance tasks will be controlled research projects that take advantage of advances in testing technologies to provide students with the materials they need, including multi-media materials.

For example, the task might be built to include a searchable environment (i.e., an online "library") in which students locate, evaluate, and select from a set of pre-defined sources, which are of various complexity and relevance to the task (including some that might be irrelevant).

Key Questions
How does this assessment item compare to items that you currently use for your Benchmark assessment?

Does this assessment item assess an idea or skill that would align with college and/or career readiness?

Does your curriculum align with the common core standard and assessment item?

Does your instructional practice align with the common core standard and assessment item?

Does the common core aligned assessment item imply any changes to Curriculum and Instruction within your district?
PARCC and SBAC Sample Assessment Review
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PARCC Sample Item 4

Background Information:
Science/Technical Texts

Alignment to Common Core Standards:
CCS 11-12.RST.8
Evaluate the hypotheses, data, analysis, and conclusions in a science or technical text, verifying the data when possible and corroborating or challenging conclusions with other sources of information.

Sample Science/Technical Text Item:
Compare what the latest science tells us about Genetically Modified food against the arguments offered for and against Genetically Modified food. Evaluate the hypotheses, data, analysis, and conclusions of each side, including determining the extent to which each side in the debate over Genetically Modified food relies on the available science, argues from an economic perspective or appeals to political and emotional concerns. Verify the data from each author and corroborate or challenge the conclusions with other sources of information.

Key Questions
How does this assessment item compare to items that you currently use for your Benchmark assessment?

Does this assessment item assess an idea or skill that would align with college and/or career readiness?

Does your curriculum align with the common core standard and assessment item?

Does your instructional practice align with the common core standard and assessment item?

Does the common core aligned assessment item imply any changes to Curriculum and Instruction within your district?
PARCC and SBAC Sample Assessment Review
Assessment and Accountability Network Meeting
Thursday, April 14, 2011

PARCC Sample Item 5

Background Information:
End of the Year Assessment
The end-of-year component will build on high-quality, authentic texts at the appropriate level of complexity; meaningful distractors for any selected response developed by content experts; and computer-enhanced items such as ones enabling students to view or listen to digital media. The assessment will draw on higher-order skills such as critical thinking and analysis; measure comprehension, language use and vocabulary; be designed to tap deeper into student depth of knowledge; and use digital technologies to assess hard-to-measure skills (for example, by asking students to listen to a poem or a scene from a play).

Examples of Selected Response Items from NYS Regents Exam & MCAS:

Alignment to Common Core Standards:
CCS 11-12.RST.8
Evaluate the hypotheses, data, analysis, and conclusions in a science or technical text, verifying the data when possible and corroborating or challenging conclusions with other sources of information.

Sample End of Year Assessment Item:
Examples of Selected Response Items from NYS Regents Exam & MCAS
Text
When teacher Jeremy Gypton was reviewing the Civil War material for his American history class at Empire High School in Vail, Arizona, he found something he'd never read before, even though he has a degree in history: the complete Constitution of the Confederate States of America.

A traditional textbook might have made a passing reference to the document. But there are no textbooks at Empire .... When Empire High School opened in July of last year [2005], students weren't issued backpack-breaking stacks of textbooks. They were handed an Apple iBook with a wireless Internet connection, because the school eschews textbooks in favor of laptops and electronic content. In science class, they don't just discuss cell division. They go online and watch it in real time. In Michael Frank's first-year biology class, students access their lab instructions, then organize data and graph the results of their work. Later, they will correlate the data from the experiment in a PowerPoint presentation. In Melinda Jensen's honors math class, students went online to learn about game theory when two game-theory researchers won the Nobel Prize in economics. "It was a great class discussion. You can't do that in a regular classroom," Jensen notes. "It would have been something you had to plan ahead of time." Plenty of schools have instituted pilot programs using laptops to supplement their traditional curriculum. But Empire is one of very few in the country - perhaps the only school- that has eliminated textbooks almost entirely in grades nine through 12.

"The key to making this work is not having the textbooks," says Calvin Baker, superintendent of the Vail Unified School District. "You walk in any of the classrooms in this school and it's a different feel, different from a textbook school, different from a school where kids just happen to have laptops so they're doing their homework on laptops, but sometimes they use them and sometimes they don't." "Laptops are part of the fabric of everything that goes on at Empire. That's the way it should be," he adds. "We all use laptops to gather information, store information, and distribute information. That's the way the world turns now."
Percentage of children in nursery school and students in grades K-12 using the Internet for specific activities, by sex and grade level: 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internet activity</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Grade level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completing school assignments</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email or instant messaging</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing games</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News/weather/sports</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch/listen to TV, movies, or radio</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make purchases</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone calls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking a course online</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find government information</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find health information</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find a job</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online banking</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading stocks</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Not available. Data were not collected.
# Rounds to zero

Questions about noted activities were asked only about persons age 15 and older. Estimates for these activities are for students in grades 9 through 12 who are age 15 or older.

Multiple-choice Questions

7. As used in line 9, the word “eschews” most nearly means
   (1) reduces
   (2) arranges
   (3) censors
   (4) rejects

8. Empire is different from other high schools in the county because Empire
   (1) has eliminated almost all textbooks
   (2) uses only classroom discussion
   (3) follows a traditional curriculum
   (4) has expanded testing

9. Some early problems with Empire’s laptop program were a result of
   (1) inadvertent training errors
   (2) inadequate technical support
   (3) inappropriate computer use
   (4) insufficient budget allocations
10. According to Matt Donaldson (lines 41 through 44), effective use of computers in the classroom is directly related to a teacher's
   (1) knowledge of technology
   (2) skill in supervising students
   (3) ability to evaluate students
   (4) willingness to experiment

11. According to the text, what did Empire hope to achieve with its policy regarding textbooks and laptops?
   (1) increase textbook use
   (2) improvement of test scores
   (3) uniformity of teaching standards
   (4) changes in instructional techniques

12. When Empire started its laptop program, the computer skills of many students were limited to
   (1) creating documents
   (2) playing games
   (3) watching videos
   (4) shopping online

13. A conclusion that could be drawn from Maine’s “laptop initiative” is that teachers
   (1) found the software troublesome
   (2) preferred using textbooks
   (3) achieved their teaching goals
   (4) paid for computer distribution

14. According to the table, what is one Internet activity that is lower for males than females?
   (1) using email
   (2) reading news
   (3) researching products
   (4) making purchases

15. The table indicates that children in grades 1 through 5 spend most of their Internet time
   (1) doing homework
   (2) playing games
   (3) watching the news
   (4) listening to music

16. According to the table, the greatest percentage of students who use the Internet for schoolwork are those in
   (1) kindergarten
   (2) grades 1-5
   (3) grades 6-8
   (4) grades 9-12

CCSS Match: 9-10.RI.2, 9-10.RI.4, and 9-10.RI.6
Source: The University of the State of New York Regents High School Examination Comprehensive Examination in English (Session One)
Key Questions
How does this assessment item compare to items that you currently use for your Benchmark assessment?

Does this assessment item assess an idea or skill that would align with college and/or career readiness?

Does your curriculum align with the common core standard and assessment item?

Does your instructional practice align with the common core standard and assessment item?

Does the common core aligned assessment item imply any changes to Curriculum and Instruction within your district?
PARCC and SBAC Sample Assessment Review
Assessment and Accountability Network Meeting
Thursday, April 14, 2011

PARCC Sample Item 6

Background Information:
End of the Year Assessment
The end-of-year component will build on high-quality, authentic texts at the appropriate level of complexity; meaningful distractors for any selected response developed by content experts; and computer-enhanced items such as ones enabling students to view or listen to digital media. The assessment will draw on higher-order skills such as critical thinking and analysis; measure comprehension, language use and vocabulary; be designed to tap deeper into student depth of knowledge; and use digital technologies to assess hard-to-measure skills (for example, by asking students to listen to a poem or a scene from a play).

Examples of Selected Response Items from NYS Regents Exam & MCAS:

Alignment to Common Core Standards:
CCS Grade 3 RI - 9
Compare and contrast the most important points and key details presented in two texts on the same topic.

Sample End of Year Assessment Item:
Source: “Sample Innovative Items/or Assessing Skills in Math and English Language Arts 'from Sireci Psychometric Services (May 28, 2010)

Drag-and-Drop Example 2

The two passages below give different opinions about making gambling legal. Read each passage and think about the similarities and differences between the two opinions. Using your mouse, click on one sentence from each paragraph that illustrates how the two opinions differ, and drag each sentence into the “Difference” box. Then, click and drag one sentence from each paragraph that shows how the two opinions are similar, and place them in the “Similar” box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passage 1</th>
<th>Passage 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The easiest way for states to raise money during these difficult times is to legalize gambling. Casinos and slot machines are fast and low-resource means for generating state tax revenue. The tax money brought in by these games of chance can be used to fix roads, fund local education, and feed the poor. Clearly, gambling should be legalized to help our struggling communities during these difficult economic times.</td>
<td>If we want to ruin on communities, clearly, we should legalize gambling. Sure, gambling raises money for states. However, studies have shown that gambling leads to increased alcoholism and prostitution within and around the communities in which casinos and slot machines are set up. Moreover, gambling has ruined the lives of many “gamers” who just would not quit. Gambling addicts have lost their family fortunes by spending everything in pursuit of the “next sure win”. I can think of no reason that justifies the legalization of gambling.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key Questions

**How does this assessment item compare to items that you currently use for your Benchmark assessment?**

Does this assessment item assess an idea or skill that would align with college and/or career readiness?

Does your curriculum align with the common core standard and assessment item?

Does your instructional practice align with the common core standard and assessment item?

Does the common core aligned assessment item imply any changes to Curriculum and Instruction within your district?
PARCC and SBAC Sample Assessment Review
Assessment and Accountability Network Meeting
Thursday, April 14, 2011

PARCC Sample Item 7

Background Information:
ELA-5 Through-course: Speaking and Listening

For this component, students will be expected to present their analysis and findings from the research conducted for the through-course ELA-3, include multimedia elements as appropriate, and engage discussion with or answer questions from their classmates and/or teacher. The speaking and listening component will be required but will not be included as part of the student’s summative score. The Partnership will develop common rubrics to capture the full range of student performance for teachers to use to evaluate students’ speaking skills. Example #1 below is adapted from the guidelines for the New York City Senior Circle Panel presentations. As is the case with all of the items provided in this Appendix, the Partnership will continue to explore innovations in how to best measure speaking and listening and implement this component.

Alignment to Common Core Standards:
Initiate and participate effectively in a range of collaborative discussions (one-on-one, in groups, and teacher-led) with diverse partners on grades 9–10 topics, texts, and issues, building on others’ ideas and expressing their own clearly and persuasively.

Propel conversations by posing and responding to questions that relate the current discussion to broader themes or larger ideas; actively incorporate others into the discussion; and clarify, verify, or challenge ideas and conclusions.

Present information, findings, and supporting evidence clearly, concisely, and logically such that listeners can follow the line of reasoning and the organization, development, substance, and style are appropriate to purpose, audience, and task.

Adapt speech to a variety of contexts and tasks, demonstrating command of formal English when indicated or appropriate. (See grades 9–10 Language standards 1 and 3 on pages 54 for specific expectations.)

Sample End of Year Assessment Item:
Performance Task Example Topic #1, Sample Task A

Presentation: The student will present his/her research and findings on the topic examined in ELA-3 (e.g., Genetically Modified food from Example Topic #1 above), use evidence to support his/her claim(s), and utilize digital media as appropriate. For example, the student might provide a summary of his/her findings; explain why he/she is either for or against the researched topic, citing evidence from specific articles and research material; and present a visual graphic of data or a compelling video that supports his/her argument.

Clarifying Questions and Collaborative Discussions: The audience (the teacher and classroom) may ask the student to clarify any points that may have been vague or confusing during the presentation or ask the student questions to test the depth of the student’s mastery of relevant skills and content. For
example, the student might be asked about the opposing side of the argument or to clarify a piece of data from the presentation.

_Rubric:_ Although the Partnership will create rubrics during the development process, during the presentation, students should communicate a clear understanding of his or her ideas and argument, present information logically and concisely, and demonstrate command of formal English. In addition, the student should answer questions accurately, thoughtfully, and effectively while engaging in thoughtful discourse about their presentation topic with his or her peers.

_CCS Match:_ 9-10.SL.1C, 9-10.SL.4, and 9-10.SL.6
_Source: New York City Department of Education, Guidelines for Senior Circle Panel Presentations_
PARCC and SBAC Sample Assessment Review
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PARCC Sample Item 8

Background Information:
Math-1 and Math-2: Focused Assessments of Essential Topics
The first two through-course components will emphasize standards or clusters of standards from the CCSS that are considered mathematical building blocks for instruction over the school year. Each component will likely be a blend of brief constructed response and extended constructed response items. The example items below highlight the content knowledge and performances expected of students; they should not be considered definitive representations of the cluster/essential topic for any particular through-course component, as these will be identified through the standards unpacking process referenced in (A)(4). The Partnership will explore how technology can enhance these traditional item types.

Alignment to Common Core Standards:
(+) Multiply matrices by scalars to produce new matrices, e.g., as when all of the payoffs in a game are doubled.

(+) Add, subtract, and multiply matrices of appropriate dimensions.

Sample End of Year Assessment Item:

1. [Maximum mark: 10]
   Let $S_n$ be the sum of the first $n$ terms of the arithmetic series $2 + 4 + 6 + \ldots$
   (a) Find
      (i) $S_n$;
      (ii) $S_{10}$.
   (b) (i) Find $M^2$.
   (ii) Show that $M^n = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 6 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$
   It may now be assumed that $M^n = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2n \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, for $n \geq 4$. The sum $T_n$ is defined by
   $$T_n = M^1 + M^2 + M^3 + \ldots + M^n.$$
   (c) (i) Write down $M^4$.
   (ii) Find $T_5$.
   (d) Using your results from part (a)(ii), find $T_{10}$.

CCSS Match: N.VM.7 (b & c) AND N.VM.8 © (no CCSS math for “a” or “d”)
**Key Questions**
How does this assessment item compare to items that you currently use for your Benchmark assessment?

Does this assessment item assess an idea or skill that would align with college and/or career readiness?

Does your curriculum align with the common core standard and assessment item?

Does your instructional practice align with the common core standard and assessment item?

Does the common core aligned assessment item imply any changes to Curriculum and Instruction within your district?
PARCC and SBAC Sample Assessment Review
Assessment and Accountability Network Meeting
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PARCC Sample Item 9

Background Information:
Math-1 and Math-2: Focused Assessments of Essential Topics
The first two through-course components will emphasize standards or clusters of standards from the CCSS that are considered mathematical building blocks for instruction over the school year. Each component will likely be a blend of brief constructed response and extended constructed response items. The example items below highlight the content knowledge and performances expected of students; they should not be considered definitive representations of the cluster/essential topic for any particular through-course component, as these will be identified through the standards unpacking process referenced in (A)(4). The Partnership will explore how technology can enhance these traditional item types.

Common Core Standard Alignment:
Solve problems involving scale drawings of geometric figures, including computing actual lengths and areas from a scale drawing and reproducing a scale drawing at a different scale.

Draw (freehand, with ruler and protractor, and with technology) geometric shapes with given conditions. Focus on constructing triangles from three measures of angles or sides, noticing when the conditions determine a unique triangle, more than one triangle, or no triangle.

Reason abstractly and quantitatively.

Construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others.
Sample Through Course Assessment Item:

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) needs to assign radio frequencies to seven new radio stations located on the grid in the accompanying figure. Such assignments are based on several considerations including the possibility of creating interference by assigning the same frequency to stations that are too close together. In this simplified situation it is assumed that broadcasts from two stations located within 200 miles of each other will create interference if they broadcast on the same frequency, whereas stations more than 200 miles apart can use the same frequency to broadcast without causing interference with each other. The FCC wants to determine the smallest number of frequencies that can be assigned to the six stations without creating interference.

- Student 1 began thinking about the problem by drawing a circle of radius 200 miles centered on each radio station.
- Student 2 began thinking about the problem by drawing line segments to connect pairs of radio stations whenever the two radio stations are within 200 miles of one another.
- Student 3 began thinking about the problem by drawing line segments to connect pairs of radio stations whenever the two radio stations are more than 200 miles from one another.

Which approach seems most promising to you? Use this approach to determine the smallest number of frequencies that can be assigned to the six stations without creating interference. Justify your final answer.


Source: This item was contributed by Jason Zimba, Professor of Physics and Mathematics, Bennington College; Council of Chief State School Officers, and the National Governors Association – original source unknown.
**Key Questions**
How does this assessment item compare to items that you currently use for your Benchmark assessment?

Does this assessment item assess an idea or skill that would align with college and/or career readiness?

Does your curriculum align with the common core standard and assessment item?

Does your instructional practice align with the common core standard and assessment item?

Does the common core aligned assessment item imply any changes to Curriculum and Instruction within your district?
Background Information:
Math-3: Extended Assessment
This through-course component will meet the demands of the CCSS by using performance tasks that require depth of understanding and the ability to apply mathematics to real world problems. These problems may not be explicitly stated as math problems but rather as problems to which students will need to apply their conceptual understanding of key mathematical concepts in order to solve. The examples below demonstrate the beginnings of the Partnership's thinking on the kinds of contextual problems students will encounter and the mathematical thinking required as part of this component. However, the Partnership expects that the performance tasks developed during this initiative will require far more investigation, evaluation, and synthesis that is shown be the examples below. For this reason, each example includes some insight into how the items might be enhanced to better illustrate the kinds of thinking and performances that students would be asked to demonstrate. In addition, the Partnership will explore how technology can enhance student engagement within each performance tasks.

Examples of Performance Tasks
Example #1
The mathematical concepts in Example #1 are indicative of the mathematics that might be required in a performance task; however, to further enhance this item, the Partnership might require students to take measurements of actual staircases, wheelchair ramps, etc.; record and analyze their results; and make recommendations for building code guidelines. The item would still introduce the algebraic components of the below items and might include a graphing component as well.

Common Core Standard Alignment:
Apply and extend previous understandings of arithmetic to algebraic expressions.
  Write an inequality of the form $x > c$ or $x < c$ to represent a constraint or condition in a real-world or mathematical problem. Recognize that inequalities of the form $x > c$ or $x < c$ have infinitely many solutions; represent solutions of such inequalities on number line diagrams.

Use variables to represent quantities in a real-world or mathematical problem, and construct simple equations and inequalities to solve problems by reasoning about the quantities.

Construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others.

Model with mathematics.
Sample Extended Response Assessment Item:

All states have building codes. Many such codes can be interpreted as mathematical inequalities, since they establish limits on what can be done. Most states have codes related to staircase construction (see the photo).

The most basic dimensions of a set of stairs are riser height and tread depth. A riser is the vertical front of a stair. The surface that you step on is called a tread. (See the diagram.)

(a) The Massachusetts State Building Code includes this statement:
   Maximum riser height shall be seven inches (178 mm) and minimum riser height shall be four inches (102 mm).
   This statement contains two requirements for riser height. Write these requirements in two ways: as a pair of simple inequalities, and also as a compound inequality.

(b) Here is another statement from the Massachusetts State Building Code:
   Minimum tread depth shall be 11 inches (279 mm), measured horizontally between the vertical planes of the foremost projection of adjacent treads at a right angle to the tread’s leading edge.

CCSS Match: 6.EE.8 (a & b), 7.EE.4c, A-REI.10 A-REI.12 (d), and Mathematical Practice 3 & 4 (e)

Source: This item was contributed by Jason Zimba, Professor of Physics and Mathematics, Bennington College; Council of Chief State School Officers, and the National Governors Association – original source unknown.
**Key Questions**
How does this assessment item compare to items that you currently use for your Benchmark assessment?

Does this assessment item assess an idea or skill that would align with college and/or career readiness?

Does your curriculum align with the common core standard and assessment item?

Does your instructional practice align with the common core standard and assessment item?

Does the common core aligned assessment item imply any changes to Curriculum and Instruction within your district?
Background Information:
This component will leverage technology to administer innovative, computer-enhanced items that measure the extent to which students have mastered important knowledge and skills. The items for this component will include next-generation selected-response items that not only signal whether students provided an incorrect answer (i.e., by identifying common mathematical errors that suggest common math misunderstandings).

The examples below are divided into two sections. Section A includes examples from the New York State Regents Exam that demonstrate a range of existing selected response item types in mathematics. The examples in Section B demonstrate current features of innovative computer-based items that could be used to enhance the selected response items in Section A. The Partnership includes the computer-based features to illustrate how technology offers the opportunity for rich item development aligned with the vision for the PARCC assessment system; current item design is generally not sophisticated enough to capture the full range of innovative items that the Partnership envisions.

Common Core Standard Alignment:
Approximate the probability of a chance event by collecting data on the chance process that produces it and observing its long-run relative frequency, and predict the approximate relative frequency given the probability. For example, when rolling a number cube 600 times, predict that a 3 or 6.

Sample End of the Year Example:

CCSS Match: 7.SP.6
Source: The University of the State of New York – Regents High School Examination Integrated Algebra (June 2009)
Key Questions
How does this assessment item compare to items that you currently use for your Benchmark assessment?

Does this assessment item assess an idea or skill that would align with college and/or career readiness?

Does your curriculum align with the common core standard and assessment item?

Does your instructional practice align with the common core standard and assessment item?

Does the common core aligned assessment item imply any changes to Curriculum and Instruction within your district?
Background Information:
This component will leverage technology to administer innovative, computer-enhanced items that measure the extent to which students have mastered important knowledge and skills. The items for this component will include next-generation selected-response items that not only signal whether students provided a correct answer but also help analyze why some students might have provided an incorrect answer (i.e., by identifying common mathematical errors that suggest common math misunderstandings.)

The examples below are divided into two sections. **Section A** includes examples from the New York State Regents Exam that demonstrate a range of existing selected response item types in mathematics. The examples in **Section B** demonstrate current features of innovative computer-based items that could be used to enhance the selected response items in Section A. The Partnership includes the computer-based features to illustrate how technology offers the opportunity for rich item development aligned with the vision for the PARCC assessment system; current item design is generally not sophisticated enough to capture the full range of innovative items that the Partnership envisions.

Alignment to Common Core Standards
Recognize a line of symmetry for a two-dimensional figure as a line across the figure such that the figure can be folded along the line into matching parts. Identify line-symmetric figures and draw lines of symmetry.

Sample Innovative Assessment Item:

![Image of a regular trapezoid with labeled points A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H.](image)

**CCSS Match: 4.G.3**
Source: “Sample Innovative Items for Assessing Skills in Math and English Language Arts” from Sireci Psychometric Services (May 28, 2010)
Key Questions
How does this assessment item compare to items that you currently use for your Benchmark assessment?

Does this assessment item assess an idea or skill that would align with college and/or career readiness?

Does your curriculum align with the common core standard and assessment item?

Does your instructional practice align with the common core standard and assessment item?

Does the common core aligned assessment item imply any changes to Curriculum and Instruction within your district?
Summary of Similarities and Differences between the PARCC and SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortia

Excerpt from “An Opportunity We Cannot Miss,” a paper by Stan Heffner delivered in Atlanta, Georgia on February 10, 2011.

To provide a means of measuring student achievement of the Common Core standards, the U.S. Department of Education set aside $350 million in federal Race to the Top funds to award funding for common assessments to state consortia through a Comprehensive Assessment System Notice of Intent to Award (NIA). The NIA provided the blueprint for consortia applications. Prominent among these were:

- Innovation, flexibility and consistency with a theory of action;
- A means of measuring all of the Common Core standards, including performance tasks, selected responses, brief or extended constructed response(s) and the distribution of item types within the assessment(s); and
- Use of the assessment results for various purposes, including school accountability (according to ESEA), educator effectiveness evaluation, and instructional decision-making.

Two such consortia -- the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC), with 25 member states, and the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC), with 31 member states -- were funded. Consistent with the NIA, both PARCC and SBAC focused their application primarily on the creation of a common summative assessment. However, both also envisioned a system of distributive assessments (or “through course” assessments) that would culminate in a composite score. This would replace the current single summative assessment commonly found in current state testing systems with a "sum of assessments."

SBAC’s plan consists of an end-of-year computer-adaptive test that is preceded by a performance assessment administered during the last 12-weeks of the school year. Member states could also make use of optional performance tasks and interim assessments from item banks that would be developed. PARCC’s plan consists of a comprehensive, computer-based summative assessment that would be preceded by performance assessments at three intervals (with an optional fourth performance assessment of speaking and listening skills in English language arts in the spring). Both consortia’s plans would promptly report the students’ scores for each assessment completed and add the values of all assessments to yield a final, composite score for each student. Additionally, both consortia will make formative assessment items, curriculum frameworks, and other instructional resources available to schools through a digital portal.

The Department of Education requires that both consortia have assessment systems developed within four years of the award announcements. As a result, the assessments will be operational by the 2014-2015 school year.
Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC)

SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC)
### SBAC Performance Tasks

- Measure depth of understanding, research skills, and complex analysis
- Given last 12 weeks of year
- Scored within 2 weeks
- Tasks for grades 3-8:
  - 1 ELA, 1 math each year
- Tasks for grades 9-11:
  - Accumulate up to 6 ELA & 6 math over three years

### PARCC Through-Course Assessments

- 1-3 tasks that assess a few “keystone” standards/topics
- Computer-delivered with results within 2 weeks
- Given at three points during the school year, near the end of quarters

### SBAC End of Year Adaptive Assessment

- Includes 40-65 questions per content area
- A computer adaptive assessment given during final weeks of the school year
- Multiple item types, scored by computer
- Re-take option, as locally determined
- Demonstrates achievement and growth overtime on a College and Career ready trajectory

### PARCC End of Year Comprehensive Assessment

- 40-65 questions
- Computer-based, with mixed item types; computer scored
- Scores from focused assessments and end-of-year test will be combined for annual accountability score.

Source: The Center for K-12 Assessment & Performance Management at ETS
### Highlight of Expectations for Governing and Participating/Advisory States for Partnership for the Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers vs. SMARTER Balanced

**Expectations for Governing States**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership for the Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC)</th>
<th>SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accountability</strong></td>
<td>Accountability systems were not defined as part of the expectation for governing states. Under Consortium Vision and Principles, it is noted that a sophisticated design will yield scores to support evaluations of student growth, as well as school, teacher, and principal effectiveness in an efficient manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Computer-based assessment.</strong> While the move to computer-based assessments will be challenging for some states, districts and schools, PARCC will offer technology audits and transition plans for its member states to ease the transition.</td>
<td><strong>Computer-adaptive assessment.</strong> Although all assessments are to eventually be delivered via computer, <em>paper-and-pencil option</em> will be available for 3 years to support states that do not yet have sufficient technology infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Field Testing</strong> will begin in 2013. <strong>New Summative Assessments:</strong> Fully implement statewide the Consortium's summative assessment in grades 3-8 and high school for both mathematics and English language arts no later than the 2014–2015 school year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Field Testing will begin in 2012. <strong>New Summative Assessments:</strong> Must be committed to statewide implementation and administration of the assessment system developed by the Consortium no later than the 2014–15 school year.</td>
<td>• Field Testing will begin in 2012. <strong>New Summative Assessments:</strong> Must be committed to statewide implementation and administration of the assessment system developed by the Consortium no later than the 2014–15 school year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Role</strong></td>
<td>Must provide staff to the Consortium to support the activities of the Consortium as follows: 1. Coordinate the state's overall participation in all aspects of the project, including: • Ongoing communication within the state education agency, with local school systems, teachers and school leaders, and higher education leaders. • Communication to keep the State Board of Education, Governors Office and appropriate legislative leaders and committees informed of the consortium's activities and progress on a regular basis;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Has an active role in policy decision-making for the Consortium, • Provides a representative to serve on the Steering Committee, • Provides a representative(s) to serve on one or more Work Groups, • Approves the Steering Committee Members and the Executive Committee Members, • Participates in the final decision-making of the following: o Changes in Governance and other official documents, Specific Design elements, and o Other issues that may arise.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Highlight of Expectations for Governing and Participating/Advisory States for Partnership for the Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers vs. SMARTER Balanced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Role (cont'd)</th>
<th>Partnership for the Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC)</th>
<th>SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                     | • Participation by local schools and education agencies in pilot tests and field test of system components; and  
                      • Identification of barriers to implementation.  
                      2. Participate in the management of the assessment development process on behalf of the Consortium:  
                      3. Represent the chief state school officer when necessary in Governing Board meetings and calls;  
                      4. Participate on Design Committees that will:  
                      • Develop the overall assessment design for the Consortium:  
                      • Develop content and test specifications;  
                      • Develop and review Requests for Proposals;  
                      • Manage contracts for assessment system development;  
                      • Recommend common achievement levels: and  
                      • Recommend common assessment policies. | (See above) |
| Exit from Consortium | Membership Opt-Out Process  
                      At any time, a State may withdraw from the Consortium by providing written notice to the chair of the Governing Board, signed by the individuals holding the same positions that signed the MOU, at least ten (10) days prior to the effective date of the withdrawal including an explanation of reasons for the withdrawal. | Any State may leave the Consortium without cause, but must comply with the following exit process:  
                      • A State requesting an exit from the Consortium must submit in writing their request and reasons for the exit request,  
                      • The written explanation must include the statutory or policy reasons for the exit,  
                      • The written request must be submitted to the Project Management Partner with the same signatures as required for the MOU,  
                      • The Executive Committee will act upon the request within a week of the request, and  
                      • Upon approval of the request, the Project Management Partner will then submit a change of membership to the USED for approval. |
## Highlight of Expectations for Governing and Participating/Advisory States for Partnership for the Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers vs. SM eller Balanced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectations for Participating/Advisory States</th>
<th>Partnership for the Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC)</th>
<th>SM eller Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commitment</strong></td>
<td>May be a member of more than one consortium that applies for or receives grant funds from the ED for the Race to the Top Fund Assessment Program for the Comprehensive Assessment Systems grant category.</td>
<td>Has not fully committed to any Consortium but supports the work of this Consortium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pilot and Field Testing</strong></td>
<td>Must participate in pilot and field testing of the assessment systems and tools developed by the Consortium, in accordance with the Consortium’s work plan.</td>
<td>Participation in pilot and field testing of the assessment systems is not outlined as a specific responsibility of advisory states.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Role</strong></td>
<td>• Shall review and provide feedback to the Design Committees and to the Governing Board regarding the design plans, strategies, and policies of the Consortium as they are being developed; • Commits to support and assist with the Consortium’s execution of the program described in the PARCC application; and • Is encouraged to provide staff to participate on the Design Committees, Advisory Committees, Working Groups, or other similar groups established by the Governing Board;</td>
<td>• Participates in all Consortium activities but does not have a vote unless the Steering Committee deems it beneficial to gather input on decisions or chooses to have the Total Membership vote on an issue; • May contribute to policy, logistical, and implementation discussions that are necessary to fully operationalize the SM eller Balanced Assessment System; and • Is encouraged to participate in the Work Groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changing Roles in the Consortium</strong></td>
<td>• Recommitment to the Consortium (section): In the event that the governor or chief state school officer is replaced in a Consortium state, the successor in that office shall affirm in writing to the Governing Board Chair the State’s continued commitment to participation in the Consortium and to tile binding commitments made by that official’s predecessor within five (5) months of taking office. • A State that wishes to join the Consortium after submission of the grant application may apply for membership in the Consortium at any time, provided that the State meets the prevailing eligibility requirements associated with its desired membership classification in the Consortium. The state’s Governor, Chief State School Officer, and President of the State</td>
<td>A State desiring to change from an Advisory State to a Governing State or from a Governing State to an Advisory State may do so under the following conditions: • A State requesting a role change in the Consortium must submit in writing their request and reasons for the request, • The written request must be submitted to the Project Management Partner with the same signatures as required for the MOU, and • The Executive Committee will act upon the request within a week of the request and submit to the USED for approval.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Highlight of Expectations for Governing and Participating/Advisory States for Partnership for the Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers vs. SMARTER Balanced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectations for Participating/Advisory States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partnership for the Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing Roles in the Consortium (Cont'd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Board or Education (if applicable) must sign a MOU with all of the commitments contained in the MOU, and the appropriate state higher education leaders must sign a letter making the same commitments as those made by higher education leaders in the states that have signed this MOU. A State that joins the Consortium after the grant application is submitted to the Department of Education is not authorized to reopen settled issues, nor may it participate in the review of proposals for Requests for Proposals that have already been issued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(See above)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This meeting summary is intended for use by Regional Assessment Network (RAN) members to disseminate information within their region in order to strengthen communications and build a greater understanding of and support for state assessment and accountability.

MEETING SUMMARY

Assessment and Accountability Division Update
(Rachel Perry)

At its March 2011 meeting, the State Board of Education (SBE) adopted performance standards (levels) for the California Modified Assessment for English-language arts (CMA for ELA) in grade nine, Algebra I, and Life Science in grade ten. In November 2009, the SBE adopted performance standards for the CMA for ELA in grades six through eight, mathematics in grades six and seven, and science in grade eight.

Division activities

The California Department of Education (CDE) released the revised preview data for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and Program Improvement (PI) to local educational agencies (LEAs) on March 11, 2011, which did not include results of appeals that have been filed. Caps for California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA) and CMA have been applied, which may change data for some schools and LEAs if they exceeded the cap with the CMA data included. The cap is on the percent of scores that count as proficient or above; therefore, some scores will be reassigned to a lower performance band if the cap for the proficient level is exceeded. The public release of AYP and PI on March 21, 2011 included results of the appeals in the data. LEAs can apply to the Special Education Division of the CDE for an exception for the one percent cap on the CAPA. For more information about the cap for CAPA or CMA, contact Meredith Cathcart at 916-327-3702 or at mcathcart@cde.ca.gov.

The SBE approved the commencement of the rulemaking process to amend the California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Section 1039.1(c) to include middle school dropouts in the Academic Performance Index (API). The most significant change is the terminology, which would eliminate the term “summer dropout” and use the term “transitional dropout.” In addition, dropouts were originally assigned for accountability purposes to the last school and LEA of attendance, and that would be changed to the last LEA of attendance only. There would be no consequence to the last school of attendance with the proposed new regulations. A public hearing concerning this Title 5 amendment is scheduled for July 6, 2010, at 9 a.m. at 1430 N. Street, Room 1801, and written comments must be received by the Regulations Coordinator by fax at 916-319-0155 or by e-mail at regcomments@cde.ca.gov by 5 p.m. on that date. The plan is to include the
dropout rate data on the 2010–11 API reports for information purposes only, and then the dropout data is to become part of the calculations for the 2011–12 reporting cycle.

The API report has been revised to have the data for all subgroups follow the school-wide data on the same page. The revised API report looks more like the AYP report, and the intent of this change is to provide greater transparency.

There is no funding for the Alternate Schools Accountability Model (ASAM) in the governor’s budget, and work by CDE staff on ASAM has been discontinued. Although there currently is no ASAM program for participating schools, schools still can apply for the ASAM designation. ASAM schools will receive an API report, beginning with the 2010 Base, but they will not receive state rankings. The window for submitting attendance data will open in fall 2011 and ASAM schools will have the option of submitting data during that window.

At its March meeting, the SBE approved the assignment of Corrective Action #6 of California Education Code (EC) Section 52055.57(c) to fully implement a new curriculum for all Cohort 4 PI LEAs. The technical assistance aspect of this proposed action was moved for further discussion to the SBE meeting in May 2011. The SBE did not approve the methodology for ranking Cohort 1 PI LEAs, which are due for a 36-month Board review, and requested that the CDE develop additional reviewing options for the SBE to consider. The CDE will work on this assignment and report back to the SBE at its May 2011 meeting.

**Legislation (Cathy McBride)**

Cathy McBride provided an update on current legislation (see attached summary).

Assembly Bill 250 (Brownley), called the Common Core Roll-out bill, is now in the Assembly Education Committee. This bill would delete the schedule for submitting instructional materials for foreign languages and health and the exception to the requirement for the evaluation of instruction to be approved when curriculum frameworks are approved or at least 30 months before the date the materials are due for adoption. It would require that materials for mathematics be submitted for adoption in 2014 and for English-language arts in 2016. This bill, sponsored by State Superintendent of Public Instruction (SSPI) Tom Torlakson, also would extend the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program for an additional year.

Senate Bill 280 (Wyland), which is now in the Senate Education Committee, would require the governing board of an LEA to conduct a public hearing to discuss, analyze, and compare results of the API, STAR test results, and school rankings. This bill also would require that the public hearing would include an examination of STAR results by school, grade, and subgroup, as specified.

Two bills, Senate Bill 753 (Padilla) and Senate Bill 754 (Padilla), which are now in the Senate Education Committee, relate to the administration window, administration requirements and procedures for the California English Language Development Test (CELDT). Senate Bill 753 would require the annual assessment to be conducted during a three-month test period commencing with the day upon which 65 percent of the instructional year is completed. Senate Bill 754 would prohibit a pupil from being required to retake those portions of the CELDT that measure English language skills for which the student has previously tested as proficient.
The legislature is now at the beginning of a two-year session, and a number of bills related to standards, assessment, and accountability have been introduced. Legislative information pertaining to education in California (e.g., EC, regulations, waivers) is available on the CDE Government Affairs Web page at [http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/lr/](http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/lr/).

**CAHSEE (Diane Hernandez)**

**Assembly Bill (AB) 2040**

At its March 2011 meeting, the SBE approved the immediate commencement of a pilot study for alternative means to the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE) for eligible students with disabilities (SWDs). The pilot study will include an analysis of the following tiers:

- **Tier I** – Eligible SWDs achieving a scale score of 300 on the California Standards Test (CST) for English-language arts in grade ten and a scale score of 269 on the CST for Algebra I. The SBE also asked that a scale score range of 269-300 for the CST Algebra I be examined.
- **Tier II** – Eligible SWDs who do not meet the Tier I requirement would advance to an evaluation of evidence (work samples).

The SBE also approved incorporating the CMA for ELA in grade ten and the CMA for Algebra I into the study once scale scores are determined. The SBE also approved the appropriate use of the remaining funds (approximately $863,000) for the pilot study allocated by Assembly Bill (AB) 2040.

**PFT (Linda Hooper)**

The California Physical Fitness Test (PFT) has a new user-friendly Web site with an updated Home page that includes the PFT Coordinator Designation Form. The new Web site, available at [http://www.pftdata.org/](http://www.pftdata.org/) (Outside Source), also features an updated Resources page (public) and an updated District Portal (secure, requires login). The PFT Resources Web page includes the PFT Coordinator Manual, Reference Guide, Student file layout, Excel template, *FITNESSGRAM®* data file conversion instructions, and the PFT Training Web site link. There are now two ways to submit PFT data: Web data-upload and Web data-entry. When designated PFT coordinators upload data, they automatically receive an e-mail receipt that provides detailed information on the number of student records accepted, the number of student records with errors, and the number of duplicate student records removed. Coordinators also are able to correct errors in student-level data online, and will receive automated e-mail reminders every two weeks until errors are corrected. LEAs that have not yet submitted a PFT Designation Form to the San Joaquin County Office of Education must do so to receive a password enabling access to the secure District Portal.

To address inconsistencies across ages for the Body Mass Index (BMI), the Cooper Institute has instituted new *FITNESSGRAM®* standards that are aligned with the Center for Disease Control (CDC) BMI standards. The BMI and percent body fat standards also have been adjusted to be more comparable. LEAs should note that this change will probably result in fewer students scoring in the Healthy Fitness Zone. More information about the change in the BMI and body fat standards is available at *FITNESSGRAM®* Healthy Fitness Zone® Standards.
Frequently Asked Questions Web page at http://www.fitnessgram.net/newstandards (Outside Source). One of the purposes of the FITNESSGRAM® is to identify students who are at risk of metabolic syndrome. The risk factors for metabolic syndrome are high fasting glucose, high waist circumference, high triglycerides, low high-density lipoprotein (HDL), and high blood pressure.

STAR Program (John Boivin)

Standard Setting Panels

Recruitment is in progress for standard setting panels for 2011–12 for the CMA and the Standards-based Test in Spanish (STS). The standard setting workshop for the CMA for ELA in grades ten and eleven and for the CMA for Geometry is scheduled for August 17 through 19, 2011. The workshop for the STS for ELA in grades eight, nine, ten, and eleven and for Algebra and Geometry will be in November 2011. Teachers participating on the STS panel need to be bilingual with experience and expertise in administering the STS. All expenses are paid for teachers that participate on standard setting panels, including LEA reimbursement for substitutes. For more information or to apply to participate on one of the panels, visit http://www.startest.org/cma or http://www.startest.org/sts (Outside Sources).

Field-Testing for Writing Tests

Field-testing for possible new items/prompts for the CMA for Writing and the CST for Writing is scheduled for September 12 through 14, 2011. LEAs are needed for volunteer participation. Students in grades five and eight are needed for field-testing because they just completed grades four and seven. Only CMA students, who have individualize education plans (IEPs) and have scored below basic or far below basic on previous CSTs, are eligible for CMA field-testing.

Assessment Review Panels

Assessment Review Panels (ARPs) meet once per year to review new STAR test items. Teachers are being recruited to participate on these APRs for each grade level and content area. The ARPs involve a longer selection process for panel members than for standard setting panels, and actual participation would be for spring 2012. Most expenses are covered for ARP participation (e.g., mileage reimbursement, meals provided at the meeting, and LEA reimbursement for substitutes). For more information or to apply, visit http://arp.startest.org/app (Outside Source).

Read Aloud Procedures

As STAR testing approaches, it is important for LEAs and schools to review the Read Aloud procedures, which include allowable variations, accommodations, and modifications for test administrations. Resources that summarize current regulations regarding these procedures for the CSTs can be found at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sa/documents/matrix2010.doc and http://www.startest.org/pdfs/STAR.coord_man.2011.pdf (Outside Source). The same information for the CMA can be found under “Allowable Testing Variations and Accommodations for the 2010 California Modified Assessment” at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sr/cmastar.asp.
CST:
Tests read aloud to student or used audio CD presentation (Coordinator Manual, Matrix page 85)

Accommodation for CST Math, Science, History–Social Science (Coordinator Manual, Matrix page 85)
Eligible students shall be permitted to take the examination/test with accommodations if specified in the eligible student’s IEP or Section 504 plan for use on the examination, standardized testing, or for use during classroom instruction and assessment. (Coordinator Manual, Matrix footer Accommodation (2))

Modification for CST ELA (Coordinator Manual, Matrix page 85)
For the STAR Program and CELDT, eligible students shall be permitted to take the tests with modifications if specified in the eligible student’s IEP or Section 504 plan. Eligible students shall be permitted to take the CAHSEE with modifications if specified in the eligible student’s IEP or Section 504 plan for use on the examination, standardized testing, or for use during classroom instruction and assessment. (Coordinator Manual, Matrix footer Modification (3))

CST DFA (CST Multiple Choice Directions For Administration (DFA), page 13)
Test questions and passages may only be read to students in cases in which the student has an IEP or a Section 504 plan that specifies these modifications.

Resources:
Testing Variations, Accommodations, and Modifications

District and Test Site Coordinator Manual
Appendix E: Allowable Test Variations, Accommodations, and Modifications

CMA:
Answer options read aloud to student and Test questions read aloud to student or used audio CD presentation (Coordinator Manual, Appendix M, page 143)

Accommodation for ALL CMA Assessments
Eligible students shall be permitted to take the examination/test with accommodations if specified in the eligible student’s IEP or Section 504 plan for use on the examination, standardized testing, or for use during classroom instruction and assessment. (Coordinator Manual, Matrix page 85)

A3 Accommodations and Modifications
Complete this field only for students who used accommodations or modifications. In part “a,” mark the circle to indicate that the student has an IEP and/or Section 504 plan. In part “b,” mark the circle(s) to indicate all accommodations and/or modifications the student used as specified in his/her IEP and/or Section 504 plan. The following information is found on the inside back cover of each DFA:
The student heard the test examiner read questions and/or passages or any text in the Writing Prompt and Response Booklet aloud. (Coordinator Manual, Demographic Codes on STAR Test Booklets and Answer Documents, page 117)

CMA DFA:
Passages in the California English–Language Arts Modified Assessment may not be read under any circumstances. (CMA Multiple Choice DFAs, page 14)

Questions & Answers Regarding the CMA

**Question:** Are the references to a “passage” and a “prompt” the same on the CMA?

**Answer:** Students might have a reading passage to respond to in their writing assessment or as a part of the multiple-choice test. The response to the reading passage tests reading comprehension. The prompt instructs students in what they have to do.

**Question:** If a student takes the "modified" CST writing test, will the writing score be included in his/her overall CST ELA scaled score or the overall ELA scaled score only includes the multiple choice items?

**Answer:** Modifications result in changes. Scores for students tested with modifications are assigned 200 (far below basic) in the API calculations. These changes are made to accountability reporting only and do not affect the individual student's score report. The student receives an individual score report with his or her actual score.

**Question:** Is it an allowable accommodation to read the prompt aloud on the CMA writing test? And if it is read, how does that affect participation for accountability?

**Answer:** Yes, a student with disabilities who has an IEP that states that the student requires read aloud is an accommodation. This has no impact on accountability reporting.

**Resources:**
Allowable Testing Variations and Accommodations for the 2010 California Modified Assessment
http://www.startest.org/pdfs/CMA.acc_table.2010.doc (Outside Source)

District and Test Site Coordinator Manual
Appendix M: Allowable Testing Variations and Accommodations for the 2011 California Modified Assessment

**API Information Guide:**
**Variations, Accommodations, and Modifications**
Test administration variations and accommodations do not result in changes to API calculations. Modifications, however, do result in changes. Scores for students tested with modifications are assigned 200 (far below basic) in the API calculations. These changes are made to accountability reporting only and do not affect the individual student's score report. The student receives an individual score report with his or her actual score.

**STAR Program Modifications Codes**
(W) Student used an unlisted modification
(Z) Student heard test examiner read test questions or text in Writing Prompt aloud (This is applied for CST test takers only)


**AYP Information Guide:**

**Variations, Accommodations, and Modifications**

Test administration variations and accommodations do not result in changes to AYP calculations. Modifications, however, do result in changes. Changes due to modifications are made to accountability reporting only and do not affect the individual student's score report. The student receives an individual score report with his or her actual score.


____

**Data Management (Keric Ashley)**

**CALPADS**

An interagency workgroup met on March 2, 2011, as required by Governor Brown, to review the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) in terms of funding for the coming budget year and at the future for the CALPADS system. The workgroup included a diverse group of members from the Assembly, Senate, Department of Finance, Legislative Analyst Office, California School Information Services (CSIS), CDE, SBE, and a LEA representative. The workgroup did not recommend the project be stopped and there was a consensus that the system and the data being managed are needed. It is anticipated that there will be funding for CALPADS in the budget. Future workgroup meetings are to focus on the direction of the CALPADS systems, but a meeting date has not yet been scheduled.

**Data Deadlines**

The deadline for the Fall 1 Data was February 16, 2011. For LEAs that submitted data by that deadline, the following dates pertaining to graduation and dropout data apply:

- March 16, 2011 – Private Preview of Counts
- April 6, 2011 – Private Preview of Rates

For all LEAs, the following dates apply:

- April 22, 2011 – Amendment Window Closes
- May 19, 2011 – Second Private Preview of Rates
- May 23, 2011 – Public Release of Rates

LEAs that do not certify their Fall 1 Data by April 22, 2011 will have no official enrollment for 2010–11 and no graduate or dropout rates for 2009–10. Official enrollment data is used for calculating funding for some categorical programs and graduation rates are used for making AYP determinations.
CDE will be calculating graduation data in two ways: through the old procedure for purposes of measuring against growth targets and the new procedure for reporting a four-year cohort rate to the US Department of Education.

The 2010–11 Fall 2 data submission also has a deadline of April 22, 2011, and the amendment window closes May 25, 2011. In development are the spring language census to be released in late March or early April with an amendment window through May 2011; end-of-year data collection (course completion with grades/credits, program participation data, and suspension data) in June 2011; and loading historical assessment data in July 2011.

Common Core (Tom Adams)

CDE staff presented an update on the implementation of California’s Common Core System to assembly members and staff in a special assembly hearing on March 9, 2011. The working group that is implementing the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in California is comprised of CDE staff, a member of the SBE, Senate and Assembly staff, and Commission of Teacher Credentialing staff. The implementation plan includes the following steps:

- Adoption and implementation of CCSS
- Development of frameworks
- Adoption of instructional materials
- Development and implementation of professional development strategies
- Development and implementation of assessment tools
- Development and implementation of accountability systems
- Alignment with post-secondary education

Implementation Timelines

Two timelines have been developed for materials’ implementation. Timeline #1 assumes the passing of legislation to lift the materials adoption suspension under EC Section 602007 and the funding of the Curriculum Commission for 2011 and subsequent years. This timeline calls for SBE action on the frameworks for mathematics in May 2013 and for ELA in May 2014, materials submissions in March 2014 for mathematics and in March 2016 for ELA, the implementation of Common Core assessments in 2014–15 for both mathematics and ELA, and SBE approval of instructional materials for mathematics in November 2014 and for ELA in November 2016. If legislation to lift the materials adoption suspension is not passed but the commission is funded, Timeline #2 calls for completing Common Core assessments for mathematics and ELA in 2014–15, SBE action on the frameworks for mathematics in May 2015 and for ELA in May 2017, and SBE approval of materials for mathematics in November 2017 and for ELA in November 2019. Currently, there is no legislatively authorized initiative for professional development based on the CCSS.

Classroom Assistance

The Standards, Curriculum Frameworks, and Instructional Resources Division of the CDE extended its newly developed assistance document to help prepare teachers for transitioning to CCSS through grade five. This document, now called “A Look at...Kindergarten through Grade Five in California Public Schools,” is available on the CDE Grade Level Curriculum Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/grlevelcurriculum.asp. This document provides a compilation of subject-matter curriculum, including information about the CCSS, organized by individual grade.
Assessment Consortia Update (Kristen Brown)

Kristen Brown provided an update on the Assessment Consortia (see attached summary).

Currently, there are two federally funded core assessment consortia, Partnership for the Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) and SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC). California is a participating member of PARCC. The CDE has until May 2011 to let PARCC know if the state will continue in this capacity. At the request of the SBE, consortia staff presented an overview of their consortia at the March 2011 SBE meeting which helped to highlight similarities and differences between the two groups. California can choose inclusion as a participating state in both consortia but only can be a governing state with decision-making authority in one of them. Governing states make a commitment to implement the new common assessments in 2014–15 while participating states can decide at a later date.

CELDT and Title III Accountability (Lily Roberts)

English Language Development Assessment Grant

The U.S. Department of Education (ED) plans to release a Request for Proposal (RFP) for consortia to develop enhanced assessments for English language proficiency. There is up to $11 million being allocated for this project, which would fund two consortia. The consortia would be required to develop common definitions for English learner and English language proficiency and a common reclassification (exit) criterion from participating states, in addition to uniformity in assessment administration between the states. The required timeframe for implementation of the assessment is 2014–15.

Scoring Training of Trainers

The first Scoring Training of Trainers (STOT) Workshop is scheduled for April 7, 2011, in Sacramento. There will be a total of fifteen STOT Workshops in 2011. Thirteen workshops will take place from April 7 through May 11, 2011, and the final two will take place in August 2011. Registration for the STOT Workshops is still open, but some sites are filled. To register for a workshop, district coordinators can log on to the secure CELDT District Portal available at http://www.celdt.org (Outside Source). For more information, contact the CELDT Customer Service Center at 866-850-1039.

CELDT Coordinator Designation

The deadline to submit a Superintendent's Designation of CELDT District Coordinator 2011–12 Edition form to designate the 2011–12 CELDT District Coordinator is March 25, 2011. For those LEAs that have not yet designated a coordinator, the form can be found at http://www.celdt.org/documents/2011-12/CELDT_Superintendents_Designation_Form_2011-12.pdf (Outside Source). Passwords will be reset and provided to the newly designated coordinator on July 1, 2011.
May SBE Meeting Items
CELDT items for the May SBE meeting will include the 2010–11 preliminary annual assessment (AA) results, and proposed CELDT regulations. The 2010–11 English-only Study with final English-only Study counts will be provided as an April Information Memorandum. The key purposes of the proposed amendments to the CELDT regulations are to add new or refine current definitions, add a reference to clarify the appropriate use of American Sign Language in primary language determinations, clarify duties and responsibilities of CELDT district and site coordinators, clarify applicable CELDT dates and testing windows, and clarify language regarding alternate assessment provisions for students with IEPs or Section 504 Plans.

Title III Accountability
Updated 2009–10 Title III accountability results showed that the state met Annual Measurable Achievement Objective (AMAO) I and II but not AMAO III targets, with only 15 percent of the LEAs (96) meeting all the targets for AMAO 3. The Title III 2010–11 Information Guide is scheduled for posting in July 2011. More information about CELDT and Title III Accountability is available through the CELDT and Title III Accountability Office by calling 916-319-0784, or by e-mail at celdt@cde.ca.gov and amao@cde.ca.gov.

California High School Proficiency Exam
The next two administrations of the California High School Proficiency Exam (CHSPE) are scheduled for March 19, 2011, and June 18, 2011. There is a new CHSPE Coordinator Designation Form, and assistance is available through the CHSPE Help Line at 866-342-4773.

Consequential Validity Study (Jim Grissom and Kristen Brown)
The CDE, with the generous help of RAN members, has begun Phase I of a Consequential Validity Study that will run over the next two years. The first set of focus group interviews of elementary school teachers is scheduled to take place in five regions across the state, from March 15 through 30, 2011. This study focuses on identifying the intended and unintended consequences of testing in California. The Consequential Validity Study is divided into two phases. Phase I includes a series of focus groups with elementary teachers (spring 2011), middle and high school teachers (anticipated in fall 2011), and school administrators (anticipated in spring 2012). For Phase II, a survey, based on information gathered from the focus groups, will be developed, implemented, and analyzed (February 2012 through July 2013).

Next RAN Meeting
May 13, 2011 (Citizen Hotel)
# RAN meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Introduced</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Leg Rep</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Existing law requires each school district that has one or more pupils who are English learners to assess the English language development of each of those pupils upon initial enrollment in order to determine the level of proficiency of those pupils, and thereafter to assess each of those pupils annually until the pupil is redesignated as English proficient. This bill would establish a 13-member English Language Development Standards Advisory Committee for the purpose of ensuring high-quality instruction for English language learners as the state implements the academic content standards in English language arts. The bill would specify the appointing authorities and qualifications of the members of the advisory committee. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

Existing law imposes various requirements on a test sponsor or test agency, as defined, with respect to the administration of standardized tests for purposes of postsecondary education. This bill would require a test sponsor to accept a university transcript and university identification issued within the last 5 years as a valid form of identification for purposes of admitting a test subject to take a standardized test administered by the sponsor. A violation of this requirement would subject a test sponsor to the above civil penalty. This bill contains other existing laws.

Existing law requires the State Board of Education to adopt basic instructional materials for use in kindergarten and grades 1 to 8, inclusive, for governing boards and authorizes the board to establish criteria for that purpose. Existing law sets forth a schedule for the submission of instructional materials to the state board for adoption. Notwithstanding this schedule, existing law prohibits the state board from adopting instructional materials or following the procedures related to that adoption until the 2013-14 school year. This bill would delete the schedule for submission of instructional materials for foreign languages and health and the exception to the requirement that criteria for the evaluation of instruction be approved when curriculum frameworks are approved or at least 30 months before the date that the materials are to be approved for adoption. The bill would require that materials for mathematics be submitted for adoption in 2014, and for English language arts in 2016. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

Existing law, the Public Schools Accountability Act of 1999, provides a state assessment program for schools, an intervention program for low-performing schools, and a reward system for high-achieving schools, as specified. This bill would require California's assessments to be valid, reliable, and comparable assessments for pupils who are limited-English-proficient and for pupils with developmental
disabilities. The bill would require any primary language assessment developed by the department and administered to limited-English-proficient pupils, as identified pursuant to existing law, to be included in the state’s assessment system or in any successor system and in any measure or index developed or used for the state’s federal and state accountability system and any successor system. The bill would require the results of the primary language assessment to be used in any measure or results reported for the state’s assessment system or in any successor system. The bill would also require the results to be used in any measure, index, or results reported for the state’s federal and state accountability system or any successor system. The bill would also require any successor system to the state’s assessment system adopted on or after the effective date of this act to include modifications and accommodations, as specified. The bill would require any advisory committee, work group, task force, and technical assistance group that provides recommendations to the Superintendent and the state board on state and federal assessment and accountability systems to determine specified things. The bill would require the testing contractor chosen for the purpose of developing the primary language assessments to report to the state board in writing as to how certain requirements regarding validity, reliability, and comparability were met. This bill contains other related provisions.

Introduced: 2/18/2011 30646
Status: 2/20/2011 - From printer. May be heard in committee March 22.
Location: 2/18/2011 - A. PRINT

Leg Rep: Cathy McBride
Topic: Assessments

Existing law requires the Superintendent of Public Instruction to review tests that assess the English language development of pupils whose primary language is a language other than English. Existing law requires the tests or series of tests to meet specified requirements, including, but not limited to, a requirement that the tests or series of tests be aligned with the standards for English language development adopted by the State Board of Education pursuant to specified law. This bill would require that the tests or series of tests be aligned with the standards for English language development adopted by the state board pursuant to specified law, and revised thereafter.

Introduced: 2/14/2011 30646
Location: 2/24/2011 - S. ED.

Leg Rep: Cathy McBride
Topic: Assessments

Existing law requires each school district, charter school, and county office of education to administer to each of its pupils in grades 2 to 11, inclusive, designated achievement tests. Existing law establishes the Public Schools Accountability Act of 1999 and requires the Superintendent of Public Instruction to develop an Academic Performance Index (API), which consists in part of the results of the tests administered pursuant to the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program, to measure the performance of schools and to rank schools based on the value of the API. Existing law requires schools to report their ranking, including a description of the components of the API, in their annual school-accountability report card. Existing law requires the governing board of each school district to discuss the results of the annual ranking at the next regularly scheduled meeting following the annual publication of the API and school rankings by the Superintendent of Public Instruction and encourages that meeting to include a discussion that examines STAR test results by school, grade, and subgroup, as specified. This bill would require the governing board of a school district to conduct a public hearing to discuss, analyze, and compare the results of the API, STAR test scores, and school rankings and would instead require that public hearing to include a discussion that examines STAR test results by school, grade, and subgroup, as specified. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

Introduced: 2/17/2011 30646
Status: 3/3/2011 - Referred to Com. on RLS.
Location: 3/3/2011 - S. RLS.

Leg Rep: Cathy McBride
Topic: Assessments

Existing law contains legislative findings and declarations stating that advanced placement courses, among other things, help to improve the overall curriculum at schools where they are provided and provide a cost-effective means for high school pupils to obtain college-level coursework experience. Existing law states the intent of the Legislature to provide financial assistance to economically disadvantaged pupils for the payment of advanced placement examination fees. This bill would make technical, nonsubstantive changes in the provision described above.

Introduced: 2/18/2011 30646

Leg Rep: Cathy McBride

http://ct3k1.capitoltrack.com/PrintReport.aspx
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject: Assessments</strong></td>
<td><strong>Location: 3/3/2011 - S. ED.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Topic: Pupil assessment.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing law, the Leroy Greene California Assessment of Academic Achievement Act, requires each school district, charter school, and county office of education to administer to each of its pupils in grades 2 to 11, inclusive, certain achievement tests. This bill, commencing July 1, 2012, would exclude pupils in grade 2 from the standards-based achievement test requirement and make conforming changes.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced: 2/18/2011</td>
<td>Leg Rep: Cathy McBride</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SB 753**

**Padilla D**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject: Assessments</strong></td>
<td><strong>Location: 3/3/2011 - S. ED.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Topic: Pupil assessment.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing law requires each school district that has one or more pupils who are English learners to assess the English language development of each of those pupils upon initial enrollment in order to determine the level of proficiency of those pupils and thereafter to assess each of those pupils annually until the pupil is redesignated as English proficient. The assessment primarily consists of the administration of the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) that assesses pupils in grades 2 to 12, inclusive, in English listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills, and pupils in kindergarten and grade 1 in English listening and speaking. This bill would require the annual assessment to be conducted during a 3-month test period commencing with the day upon which 55% of the instructional year is completed. The bill would require the State Department of Education to provide the score a pupil achieves on the CELDT to the parent or guardian of the pupil in English and, if available, in the language reported on the home language survey. The bill would require that the score be provided in a format that utilizes terminology that is easy to understand and includes an explanation of the purpose of the test, the pupil’s score, and the intended use of that score by the school district.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced: 2/18/2011</td>
<td>Leg Rep: Cathy McBride</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SB 754**

**Padilla D**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject: Assessments</strong></td>
<td><strong>Location: 3/3/2011 - S. ED.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Topic: California English Language Development Test.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing law requires each school district that has one or more pupils who are English learners to assess the English language development of each of those pupils upon initial enrollment in order to determine the level of proficiency of those pupils and thereafter to assess each of those pupils annually until the pupil is redesignated as English proficient. The assessment primarily consists of the administration of the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) that assesses pupils in grades 2 to 12, inclusive, in English listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills, and pupils in kindergarten and grade 1 in English listening and speaking. This bill would prohibit a pupil from being required to retake those portions of the CELDT that measure English language skills for which he or she has previously tested as proficient. This prohibition would not become effective until the current CELDT publisher's contract expires. The bill would also state legislative findings and declarations regarding English learners and the CELDT.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced: 2/18/2011</td>
<td>Leg Rep: Cathy McBride</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Measures:** 10

**Total Tracking Forms:** 10
Developmental Assets

The Building Blocks To Student Academic Success

Friday, May 20, 8:00 a.m.–3:30 p.m.
Santa Clara County Office of Education
1290 Ridder Park Drive, San Jose, CA

- Understand the link between health and academic achievement
- Identify methods to strengthen school connectedness via developmental assets
- Develop an action plan and strategies to build developmental assets on site

This training provides schools with strategies to enhance school culture and academic success. Author and national speaker Clay Roberts will share interventions that have proven to be effective in schools across the state. Project Cornerstone will highlight local programs, initiatives and data to assist schools in creating a healthy school environment.

**Recommended Audience:** Superintendents, school board members, coordinated school health teams, school nurses, counselors, psychologists, district administrators, teachers, and after-school program staff.

**Register FREE at** [http://santaclara.k12oms.org](http://santaclara.k12oms.org) **by May 13**
For questions or additional information, contact Armida Alvarez at (408) 453-6529 or email armida_alvarez@sccoe.org

Clay Roberts, MS is a senior trainer with Vision Training Associates and the founder of Roberts & Associates, a national educational consulting firm that has advised the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, the U.S. Department of Justice, and the American Medical Association. He is co-author of Great Places to Learn.