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SUBJECT: 2015-16 Santa Clara County California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) Results

The 2015-16 school year marked the second year of California's new statewide student assessment system - California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) which replaced the previous Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) system. The CAASPP system consists of:

- Smarter Balanced assessments, which incorporate:
- Summative Assessments in grades 3 through 8 and 11 for English language arts/literacy (ELA) and mathematics,
- Interim Assessments for all grades in ELA and mathematics, and
- the Digital Library, which is a repository of tools and practices designed to help teachers utilize formative assessment processes for improved teaching and learning in all grades.
- California Alternative Assessments (CAA) in ELA and mathematics for students with significant cognitive abilities in grades 3 through 8 and 11.
- Science assessments in grades 5, 8, and 10 (California Standards Test [CST], California Modified Assessment [CMA], and California Alternate Performance Assessment [CAPA]).
- Standards-based Tests in Spanish (STS) for reading/language arts in grades 2 through 11 (optional).

The spring of 2016 marked the second year of operational testing of the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments. The Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments are the focal point of this analysis.

The new Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments are very different from the old STAR tests in several ways:

- They are aligned with California's updated content standards for ELA and mathematics.
- They reflect the critical thinking and problem solving skills that students will need to be ready for college and the 21st century job market.
- They are taken on a computer and are adaptive, which means that during the test, the questions become more or less difficult on the basis of how the student performs.
- They provide many more supports for students who need them, including students learning English and students with disabilities.
- The Smarter Balanced assessment system includes a variety of item types, including:
- Selected-response items, which prompt students to choose one or more answers.
- Technology-enhanced items, which might prompt students to edit text or draw an object.
- Constructed-response items, which prompt students to write a short written or numerical response.
- Performance tasks, in which students engage in a complex set of tasks to demonstrate their understanding. Students may be asked to conduct research and then write an argumentative essay, using sources as evidence. Or they may be asked to solve a complex problem in mathematics. Performance tasks integrate knowledge and skills across many areas and standards.

For each grade level and subject area, students receive a scale score from approximately 2000 to 3000 . The overall score falls into one of four achievement levels:

- Standard Exceeded: The student has exceeded the achievement standard and demonstrates advanced progress toward mastery of the knowledge and skills needed for likely success in future coursework.
- Standard Met: The student has met the achievement standard and demonstrates progress toward mastery of the knowledge and skills needed for likely success in future coursework.
- Standard Nearly Met: The student has nearly met the achievement standard and may require further development to demonstrate the knowledge and skills needed for likely success in future coursework.
- Standard Not Met: The student has not met the achievement standard and needs substantial improvement to demonstrate the knowledge and skills needed for likely success in future coursework.

The test reports also show how students performed in key content claims, also called areas, in ELA and mathematics.

- ELA Claims: Reading, Writing, Listening, and Research/Inquiry
- Mathematics Claims: Problem Solving \& Modeling/Data Analysis, Concepts \& Procedures, and Communicating Reasoning

Jon R. Gundry, County Superintendent of Schools
August 24, 2016
Page 3

For each claim, a student's performance is represented as "Above Standard," "Near Standard," or "Below Standard." There are only three content claim levels reported, rather than four, because they are based on fewer test items and therefore less precise than the overall scores.

Unlike the CSTs, the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments are based on a vertically calibrated growth model that allows the California Department of Education (CDE) to produce growth comparisons that can track students' progress through the grade levels. This being the second operational year of the tests means that it is the first year that growth comparisons are available.

The results of the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments should under no circumstance be compared to the CST results of the outmoded STAR system. The new assessments are far too different from the old assessments (e.g., the standards being measured, the adaptive nature of the new assessments, the types of test items in the assessments, the types of critical thinking that students are asked to demonstrate, the growth model of the new assessments) to make any valid comparisons.

The following is a summary of the CAASPP summative assessment results for Santa Clara County and California.

## Key Findings

For the ELA assessments:

- $62 \%$ of Santa Clara County students reached the Standard Met or Standard Exceeded achievement levels ( $29 \%$ reached Standard Met and $33 \%$ reached Standard Exceeded) compared to $49 \%$ students statewide ( $29 \%$ reached Standard Met and 20\% reached Standard Exceeded). See Figure 1
For the mathematics assessments:
- $55 \%$ of Santa Clara County students reached the Standard Met or Standard Exceeded achievement levels ( $21 \%$ reached Standard Met and $34 \%$ reached Standard Exceeded) compared to $37 \%$ students statewide ( $20 \%$ reached Standard Met and 17\% reached Standard Exceeded). See Figure 2.

With the exception of the Filipino subgroup, and the Hispanic/Latino subgroup on the ELA assessment, Santa Clara County subgroups met or exceeded standard at higher rates than their statewide counterparts on both the ELA and mathematics assessments. See Figure 3 and Figure 4.

Within Santa Clara County there is a substantial achievement gap between Hispanic/Latino students and white and Asian students:

- For ELA, there is a 47 percentage point difference between the percent of Hispanic/Latino and Asian students that met or exceeded standard (37\% vs. 84\%, respectively). See Figure 3, Figure 5, Figure 7, Table 3 and Figure 9.
- The gap is even larger in math, where there is a 57 percentage point difference ( $26 \% \mathrm{vs}$. 83\%, respectively). See Figure 4, Figure 6, Figure 8, Table 4 and Figure 10.

Within Santa Clara County there is a substantial achievement gap between Economically Disadvantaged ${ }^{1}$ and Not Economically Disadvantaged students:

- For ELA, there is a 40 percentage point difference between the percent of Economically Disadvantaged and Not Economically Disadvantaged students that met or exceeded standard ( $38 \%$ vs. $78 \%$, respectively). See Figure 3, Figure 5, Figure 7 and Table 3.
- The gap is even larger in math, where there is a 44 percentage point difference ( $29 \% \mathrm{vs}$. $73 \%$, respectively). See Figure 4, Figure 6, Figure 8 and Table 4.

All Santa Clara County subgroups increased their percentages of students meeting or exceeding standards on both assessments by at least one percentage point:

[^0]- For ELA, while the overall population grew from $58 \%$ to $62 \%$ meeting or exceeding standard, Filipino grew from $60 \%$ to $67 \%$, Hispanic/Latino grew from $33 \%$ to $37 \%$, and Economically Disadvantaged grew from $33 \%$ to $38 \%$. See Figure 5.
- For mathematics, while the overall population grew from $52 \%$ to $55 \%$ meeting or exceeding standard, Filipino grew from $48 \%$ to $53 \%$, Hispanic/Latino grew from $23 \%$ to 26\%, and Not Economically Disadvantaged grew from 68\% to 73\%. See Figure 6.

Within Santa Clara County, for the ELA and mathematics assessments:

- Hispanic/Latino students had the highest rates of Standard Not Met among the racial/ethnic subgroups ( $35 \%$ on ELA and $43 \%$ on mathematics). Almost three quarters of Hispanic/Latino students did not meet standard on the math assessments. See Figure 7, Table 3, Figure 8 and Table 4.
- A significant majority of Economically Disadvantaged students did not meet standard ( $62 \%$ on ELA and $71 \%$ on mathematics). See Figure 7, Table 3, Figure 8 and Table 4.

Santa Clara County students met or exceeded standard at higher rates than their statewide counterparts at all grade levels on the ELA and mathematics assessments. Within Santa Clara County:

- On the ELA assessments, the rates of Santa Clara County students meeting or exceeding standard ranged from 57\% (grade 3) to 68\% (grade 11). See Figure 11 and Figure 13.
- On the mathematics assessments, the low and high performing grades for Santa Clara County students were the reverse of ELA ( $49 \%$ of grade 11 reached Standard Met or Standard Exceeded and 63\% of grade 3). See Figure 12 and Figure 14.
- Comparing like grade levels from last year to this year, three grades had 5 percentage point gains of students meeting or exceeding standard on the ELA assessment: Grade 6 went from $57 \%$ to $62 \%$; Grade 7 went from $58 \%$ to $63 \%$; and Grade 8 went from $59 \%$ to $64 \%$. See Figure 13.
- Comparing the students meeting or exceeding standard by like grade levels from last year to this year on the mathematics assessment: Grade 3 went from $57 \%$ to $63 \%$; Grade 6 went from $50 \%$ to $54 \%$; and Grade 8 went from $51 \%$ to $55 \%$. See Figure 14 .

The Smarter Balanced summative assessments are based on a vertically calibrated growth model, so with the exceptions of grades 3 and 11, it is possible to view growth in performance over time and grade levels. Within Santa Clara County:

- On the ELA assessment, the largest grade level gains in terms of students meeting or exceeding standard over the prior year's grade level occurred at Grade 5 ( $63 \%$ vs. $56 \%$ the previous year in Grade 4), Grade 8 ( $64 \%$ vs. $58 \%$ the previous year in Grade 7), and Grade 4 ( $58 \%$ vs. $53 \%$ the previous year in Grade 3). Hispanic/Latino and Economically Disadvantaged Grade 5 students had gains of 12 percentage points ( $40 \%$ vs $28 \%$ the previous year in Grade 4). See Figure 15 and Table 7.
- On the mathematics assessment, the largest grade level gains in terms of students meeting or exceeding standard over the prior grade year's grade level occurred at Grade 7 ( $56 \%$ vs. $50 \%$ the previous year in Grade 6) and Grade 6 ( $54 \%$ vs. $50 \%$ the previous year in Grade 5). Filipino Grade 7 and Grade 6 students had gains of 10 and 8 percentage points respectively. See Figure 16 and Table 8.

Within Santa Clara County:

- For the ELA assessments, Grade 3 had the highest rate of students not meeting standard (44\%). See Figure 17 and Table 9.
- For the mathematics assessments, grade 11 had the highest rate of students not meeting standard (52\%). See Figure 18 and Table 10.
- The mean scale scores rose by 4 to 12 points per grade on the ELA assessments and by 4 to 13 points on the mathematics assessments. The Grade 6 ELA mean scale score was 12 points higher than Grade 6 last year and the Grade 8 Mathematics mean scale score was 13 points higher than Grade 8 last year. With the exception of Grade 11 mathematics, the mean scale scores for both subjects are in the lower range of the scale scores for Standard Met. The Grade 11 mathematics mean scale score is in the upper range of the scale scores for Standard Nearly Met. See Figure 19 and Figure 20.

For the ELA claims (areas):

- Santa Clara County students performed best on the Listening claim (13\% below standard), followed by Research/Inquiry (15\% below standard), Writing (20\% below standard) and Reading ( $24 \%$ below standard). See Table 11 and Table 15.
- The percentage of students scoring above standard on the Research/Inquiry claim rose from $35 \%$ to $40 \%$ and the percentage of students scoring above standard on the Writing claim rose from $36 \%$ to $40 \%$. See Table 11, Table 12, Table 15 and Table 16.

For the mathematics claims (areas):

- Santa Clara County students performed best on the Communicating Reasoning claim (20\% below standard), followed by Problem Solving/Modeling and Data Analysis (24\% below standard) and Concepts and Procedures ( $30 \%$ below standard). See Table 13 and Table 17.
- The percentage of students scoring above standard on the Concepts and Procedures claim rose from $38 \%$ to $42 \%$. See Table 13, Table 14, Table 17 and Table 18.

Of Santa Clara County students, Hispanic/Latino students made up the largest racial/ethnic subgroup portion of the students tested (38\%), followed by Asian students (29\%) and white students (21\%). See Table 19.
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Please note: Because of space constraints, abbreviations were sometimes necessary in the graphs and tables. The following is a list of the terms that the CDE uses followed by the abbreviations:

- Black or African American: African American, African Amer., Af. Am.
- Hispanic or Latino: Hispanic/Latino, Hispanic, Hispan.
- Economically Disadvantaged*: Econ. Dis., ED
- Not Economically Disadvantaged: Not Econ. Dis., Not ED
- English Learner: EL
- Students with Disability: Students w/ Disab., SWD
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Figure 1: 2016 CAASPP English Language Arts/Literacy Overall Results, Achievement Level Distributions, Santa Clara County vs. California


Figure 2: 2016 CAASPP Mathematics Overall Results, Achievement Level Distributions, Santa Clara County vs. California
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Figure 3: 2016 CAASPP English Language Arts/Literacy Overall Results, Percent of Subgroups Meeting or Exceeding Standard, Santa Clara County vs. California


Table 1: 2016 CAASPP English Language Arts/Literacy, Santa Clara County Students with Scores by Subgroup

| Subgroup | Students <br> with Scores |
| :--- | :---: |
| All Students | 142,401 |
| African American | 2,855 |
| Asian | 41,602 |
| Filipino | 6,238 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 54,685 |
| White | 29,307 |
| Not Economically Disadvantaged | 85,278 |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 57,123 |
| English Learner | 27,263 |
| Students with Disability | 13,496 |
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Figure 4: 2016 CAASPP Mathematics Overall Results, Percent of Subgroups Meeting or Exceeding Standard, Santa Clara County vs. California


Table 2: 2016 CAASPP Mathematics, Santa Clara County Students with Scores by Subgroup

| Subgroup | Students <br> with Scores |
| :--- | :---: |
| All | 143,202 |
| African American | 2,847 |
| Asian | 41,994 |
| Filipino | 6,279 |
| Hispanic | 54,795 |
| White | 29,435 |
| Not Economically Disadvantaged | 85,796 |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 57,406 |
| English Learner | 27,869 |
| Students with Disability | 13,408 |
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Figure 5: Percent of Santa Clara County Students Meeting or Exceeding Standard in English Language Arts/Literacy by Subgroup, by Year
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Figure 6: Percent of Santa Clara County Students Meeting or Exceeding Standard in Mathematics by Subgroup, by Year
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Figure 7: 2016 CAASPP English Language Arts/Literacy Overall Results, Percent of Santa Clara County Subgroups at each Achievement Level


Table 3: 2016 CAASPP English Language Arts/Literacy Overall Results, Percent of Santa Clara County Subgroups Above and Below Standard Met

|  | All | African <br> Amer. | Asian | Filipino | Hispanic | White | Not <br> Econ. <br> Dis. | Econ. <br> Dis. | EL | SWD |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of <br> Students | 142,401 | 2,855 | 41,602 | 6,238 | 54,685 | 29,307 | 85,278 | 57,123 | 27,263 | 13,496 |
| Percent Met/ <br> Exceeded | $62 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $84 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $76 \%$ | $78 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $20 \%$ |
| Percent Not/ <br> Nearly Met | $38 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $62 \%$ | $81 \%$ | $80 \%$ |
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Figure 8: 2016 CAASPP Mathematics Overall Results, Percent of Santa Clara County Subgroups at each Achievement Level


Table 4: 2016 CAASPP Mathematics Overall Results, Percent of Santa Clara County Subgroups Above and Below Standard Met

|  | All | African <br> Amer. | Asian | Filipino | Hispanic | White | Not <br> Econ. <br> Dis. | Econ. <br> Dis. | EL | SWD |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of <br> Students | 143,202 | 2,847 | 41,994 | 6,279 | 54,795 | 29,435 | 85,796 | 57,406 | 27,869 | 13,408 |
| Percent Met/ <br> Exceeded | $55 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $83 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $69 \%$ | $73 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $19 \%$ |
| Percent Not/ <br> Nearly Met | $45 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $74 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $71 \%$ | $78 \%$ | $82 \%$ |

Figure 9: 2016 CAASPP English Language Arts/Literacy Results, Percent of SCC Students Meeting or Exceeding Standard; Displaying the Achievement Gap between Asian Students and Other Subgroups


Figure 10: 2016 CAASPP Mathematics Results, Percent of SCC Students Meeting or Exceeding Standard; Displaying the Achievement Gap between Asian Students and Other Subgroups
$■$ Mathematics $\quad$ Gap (between Subgroup \& Asian Students)
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Figure 11: 2016 CAASPP English Language Arts/Literacy Overall Results, Percent of Grade Level Meeting or Exceeding Standard, Santa Clara County vs. California


Table 5: 2016 CAASPP English Language Arts/Literacy, Santa Clara County Students Tested by Grade Level, with Mean Scale Scores

|  | \# of <br> Students <br> Enrolled | \# of <br> Students <br> Tested | \% of <br> Enrolled <br> Students <br> Tested | \# of <br> Students <br> with Scores | Mean Scale <br> Score |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All | 148,724 | 142,695 | $95.9 \%$ | 142,401 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Grade 3 | 21,315 | 20,495 | $96.2 \%$ | 20,463 | 2444.6 |
| Grade 4 | 22,062 | 21,296 | $96.5 \%$ | 21,270 | 2488.6 |
| Grade 5 | 21,785 | 21,137 | $97.0 \%$ | 21,115 | 2533.5 |
| Grade 6 | 21,503 | 20,756 | $96.5 \%$ | 20,709 | 2555.9 |
| Grade 7 | 21,421 | 20,766 | $96.9 \%$ | 20,720 | 2577.8 |
| Grade 8 | 20,855 | 20,334 | $97.5 \%$ | 20,296 | 2597.0 |
| Grade 11 | 19,783 | 17,911 | $90.5 \%$ | 17,828 | 2629.1 |
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Figure 12: 2016 CAASPP Mathematics Overall Results, Percent of Grade Level Meeting or Exceeding Standard, Santa Clara County vs. California


Table 6: 2016 CAASPP Mathematics, Santa Clara County Students Tested by Grade Level, with Mean Scale Scores Achievement

|  | \# of <br> Students <br> Enrolled | \# of <br> Students <br> Tested | \% of <br> Enrolled <br> Students <br> Tested | \# of <br> Students <br> with Scores | Mean Scale <br> Score |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All | 148,724 | 143,674 | $96.6 \%$ | 143,202 | N/A |
| Grade 3 | 21,314 | 20,717 | $97.2 \%$ | 20,669 | 2459.6 |
| Grade 4 | 22,061 | 21,457 | $97.3 \%$ | 21,392 | 2497.7 |
| Grade 5 | 21,787 | 21,305 | $97.8 \%$ | 21,261 | 2529.4 |
| Grade 6 | 21,502 | 20,901 | $97.2 \%$ | 20,862 | 2558.4 |
| Grade 7 | 21,420 | 20,915 | $97.6 \%$ | 20,873 | 2578.2 |
| Grade 8 | 20,857 | 20,427 | $97.9 \%$ | 20,372 | 2598.2 |
| Grade 11 | 19,783 | 17,952 | $90.7 \%$ | 17,773 | 2618.9 |
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Figure 13: Percent of Santa Clara County Students Meeting or Exceeding Standard in English Language Arts/Literacy by Grade Level, by Year
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Figure 14: Percent of Santa Clara County Students Meeting or Exceeding Standard in Mathematics by Grade Level, by Year
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Figure 15: Change over Time: Percentage of Santa Clara County Students Meeting or Exceeding Standard in English Language Arts/Literacy


Figure 16: Change over Time: Percentage of Santa Clara County Students Meeting or Exceeding Standard in Mathematics
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Table 7: Change over Time: Percentage of Santa Clara County Students Meeting or Exceeding Standard in English Language Arts/Literacy by Subgroup

| Student Group | Grade 4 |  | Grade 5 |  | Grade 6 |  | Grade 7 |  | Grade 8 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Gr. 3 (2015) to Gr. 4 (2016) |  | Gr. 4 (2015) to Gr. 5 (2016) |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Gr. } 5 \text { (2015) to } \\ \text { Gr. } 6 \text { (2016) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | Gr. 6 (2015) to Gr. 7 (2016) |  | Gr. 7 (2015) to Gr. 8 (2016) |  |
|  | Gr. 3 | Gr. 4 | Gr. 4 | Gr. 5 | Gr. 5 | Gr. 6 | Gr. 6 | Gr. 7 | Gr. 7 | Gr. 8 |
| All | 53\% | 58\% | 56\% | 63\% | 61\% | 62\% | 57\% | 63\% | 58\% | 58\% |
| African American | 35\% | 40\% | 37\% | 45\% | 45\% | 46\% | 41\% | 45\% | 41\% | 47\% |
| Asian | 76\% | 80\% | 80\% | 84\% | 83\% | 85\% | 82\% | 85\% | 82\% | 86\% |
| Filipino | 56\% | 63\% | 59\% | 67\% | 61\% | 65\% | 58\% | 66\% | 61\% | 67\% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 27\% | 33\% | 28\% | 40\% | 35\% | 37\% | 29\% | 35\% | 32\% | 39\% |
| White | 69\% | 74\% | 72\% | 79\% | 76\% | 78\% | 72\% | 77\% | 73\% | 77\% |
| Not Econ. Disadvan. | 70\% | 76\% | 73\% | 80\% | 77\% | 79\% | 74\% | 79\% | 74\% | 79\% |
| Econ. Disadvan. | 27\% | 33\% | 28\% | 40\% | 35\% | 38\% | 32\% | 37\% | 33\% | 40\% |
| English Learners | 28\% | 24\% | 18\% | 22\% | 18\% | 16\% | 12\% | 13\% | 8\% | 11\% |
| Students w/ Disab. | 24\% | 24\% | 22\% | 22\% | 21\% | 17\% | 16\% | 16\% | 15\% | 17\% |

Table 8: Change over Time: Percentage of Santa Clara County Students Meeting or Exceeding Standard in Mathematics by Subgroup

| Student Group | Grade 4 |  | Grade 5 |  | Grade 6 |  | Grade 7 |  | Grade 8 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Gr. } 3 \text { (2015) to } \\ \text { Gr. } 4 \text { (2016) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | Gr. 4 (2015) to Gr. 5 (2016) |  | Gr. 5 (2015) to Gr. 6 (2016) |  | Gr. 6 (2015) to Gr. 7 (2016) |  | Gr. 7 (2015) to Gr. 8 (2016) |  |
|  | Gr. 3 | Gr. 4 | Gr. 4 | Gr. 5 | Gr. 5 | Gr. 6 | Gr. 6 | Gr. 7 | Gr. 7 | Gr. 8 |
| All | 57\% | 56\% | 53\% | 53\% | 50\% | 54\% | 50\% | 56\% | 53\% | 55\% |
| African American | 32\% | 30\% | 31\% | 28\% | 29\% | 31\% | 31\% | 35\% | 30\% | 31\% |
| Asian | 83\% | 84\% | 81\% | 80\% | 77\% | 82\% | 79\% | 85\% | 82\% | 84\% |
| Filipino | 59\% | 58\% | 51\% | 50\% | 43\% | 51\% | 44\% | 54\% | 49\% | 53\% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 31\% | 27\% | 24\% | 24\% | 20\% | 24\% | 19\% | 26\% | 23\% | 24\% |
| White | 73\% | 71\% | 67\% | 68\% | 64\% | 69\% | 65\% | 71\% | 68\% | 69\% |
| Not Econ. Disadvan. | 71\% | 73\% | 71\% | 71\% | 67\% | 73\% | 68\% | 74\% | 71\% | 73\% |
| Econ. Disadvan. | 33\% | 29\% | 26\% | 24\% | 22\% | 27\% | 22\% | 29\% | 25\% | 28\% |
| English Learners | 37\% | 25\% | 21\% | 15\% | 14\% | 14\% | 11\% | 15\% | 12\% | 13\% |
| Students w/ Disab. | 27\% | 24\% | 22\% | 18\% | 18\% | 15\% | 14\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% |
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Figure 17: 2016 CAASPP English Language Arts/Literacy Overall Results, Percent of Santa Clara County Grade Levels at each Achievement Level


Table 9: 2016 CAASPP English Language Arts/Literacy Overall Results, Percent of Santa Clara County Grades Above and Below Standard Met

|  | All | Grade 3 | Grade 4 | Grade 5 | Grade 6 | Grade 7 | Grade 8 | Grade 11 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of <br> Students | 142,401 | 20,463 | 21,270 | 21,115 | 20,709 | 20,720 | 20,296 | 17,828 |
| Percent Met/ <br> Exceeded | $62 \%$ | $57 \%$ | $58 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $62 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $64 \%$ | $68 \%$ |
| Percent Not/ <br> Nearly Met | $38 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $32 \%$ |
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Figure 18: 2016 CAASPP Mathematics Overall Results, Percent of Santa Clara County Grade Levels at each Achievement Level


Table 10: 2016 CAASPP Mathematics Overall Results, Percent of Santa Clara County Grades Above and Below Standard Met

|  | All | Grade 3 | Grade 4 | Grade 5 | Grade 6 | Grade 7 | Grade 8 | Grade 11 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of <br> Students | 143,202 | 20,669 | 21,392 | 21,261 | 20,862 | 20,873 | 20,372 | 17,773 |
| Percent Met/ <br> Exceeded | $55 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $56 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $54 \%$ | $56 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $49 \%$ |
| Percent Not/ <br> Nearly Met | $45 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $52 \%$ |

Figure 19: Santa Clara County CAASPP English Language Arts/Literacy Mean Scale Scores, 2015 to 2016 by Grade Level


[^1]Jon R. Gundry, County Superintendent of Schools
August 24, 2016
Page 26

Figure 20: Santa Clara County CAASPP Mathematics Mean Scale Scores, 2015 to 2016 by Grade Level
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Table 11: 2016 CAASPP English Language Arts/Literacy Claims (Areas), Santa Clara County Performance by Sub Groups

|  | All | Afr. Am | Asian | Fili- <br> pino | Hispanic | White | Not ED | ED | EL | SWD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reading: Demonstrating Understanding of Literacy and Non-Fictional Texts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Above Standard | 34\% | 19\% | 52\% | 29\% | 14\% | 45\% | 47\% | 14\% | 6\% | 9\% |
| Near Standard ${ }^{2}$ | 42\% | 47\% | 38\% | 51\% | 45\% | 42\% | 41\% | 45\% | 36\% | 30\% |
| Below Standard | 24\% | 34\% | 10\% | 20\% | 41\% | 13\% | 12\% | 41\% | 58\% | 61\% |
| Writing: Producing Clear and Purposeful Writing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Above Standard | 40\% | 23\% | 63\% | 42\% | 16\% | 49\% | 54\% | 18\% | 7\% | 9\% |
| Near Standard | 40\% | 46\% | 30\% | 45\% | 47\% | 40\% | 36\% | 46\% | 40\% | 30\% |
| Below Standard | 20\% | 32\% | 7\% | 13\% | 36\% | 11\% | 10\% | 36\% | 52\% | 61\% |
| Listening: Demonstrating Effective Communication Skills |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Above Standard | 25\% | 16\% | 39\% | 20\% | 11\% | 34\% | 35\% | 11\% | 6\% | 8\% |
| Near Standard | 62\% | 65\% | 56\% | 69\% | 66\% | 59\% | 59\% | 66\% | 60\% | 50\% |
| Below Standard | 13\% | 19\% | 5\% | 11\% | 24\% | 6\% | 6\% | 24\% | 34\% | 42\% |
| Research/Inquiry: Investigating, Analyzing, and Presenting Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Above Standard | 40\% | 23\% | 61\% | 41\% | 20\% | 49\% | 53\% | 21\% | 10\% | 11\% |
| Near Standard | 45\% | 53\% | 34\% | 49\% | 53\% | 43\% | 40\% | 53\% | 51\% | 42\% |
| Below Standard | 15\% | 24\% | 5\% | 10\% | 27\% | 8\% | 7\% | 27\% | 39\% | 46\% |

Table 12: 2015 CAASPP English Language Arts/Literacy Claims (Areas), Santa Clara County Performance by Sub Groups

|  | All | Afr. Am | Asian | Filipino | Hispanic | White | Not ED | ED | EL | SWD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reading: Demonstrating Understanding of Literacy and Non-Fictional Texts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Above Standard | 31\% | 18\% | 50\% | 27\% | 12\% | 42\% | 44\% | 12\% | 6\% | 9\% |
| At or Near Standard | 43\% | 45\% | 40\% | 50\% | 43\% | 43\% | 42\% | 43\% | 34\% | 29\% |
| Below Standard | 26\% | 37\% | 10\% | 23\% | 45\% | 14\% | 14\% | 45\% | 60\% | 62\% |
| Writing: Producing Clear and Purposeful Writing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Above Standard | 36\% | 20\% | 58\% | 35\% | 13\% | 46\% | 49\% | 14\% | 7\% | 9\% |
| At or Near Standard | 42\% | 46\% | 34\% | 49\% | 47\% | 42\% | 39\% | 46\% | 39\% | 29\% |
| Below Standard | 22\% | 33\% | 8\% | 16\% | 39\% | 12\% | 11\% | 39\% | 54\% | 61\% |
| Listening: Demonstrating Effective Communication Skills |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Above Standard | 23\% | 13\% | 36\% | 18\% | 9\% | 31\% | 31\% | 9\% | 5\% | 7\% |
| At or Near Standard | 61\% | 63\% | 58\% | 68\% | 63\% | 61\% | 60\% | 63\% | 56\% | 47\% |
| Below Standard | 16\% | 23\% | 6\% | 14\% | 28\% | 8\% | 8\% | 28\% | 39\% | 45\% |
| Research/Inquiry: Investigating, Analyzing, and Presenting Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Above Standard | 35\% | 21\% | 55\% | 33\% | 16\% | 44\% | 47\% | 16\% | 8\% | 10\% |
| At or Near Standard | 48\% | 54\% | 38\% | 53\% | 54\% | 46\% | 44\% | 54\% | 50\% | 44\% |
| Below Standard | 16\% | 24\% | 6\% | 13\% | 29\% | 9\% | 9\% | 29\% | 41\% | 45\% |

[^2]Jon R. Gundry, County Superintendent of Schools
August 24, 2016
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Table 13: 2016 CAASPP Mathematics Claims (Areas), Santa Clara County Performance by Sub Groups

|  | All | Afr. <br> Am. | Asian | Fili- <br> pino | Hisp- <br> anic | White | Non- <br> ED | ED | EL | SWD |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Concepts and Procedure: Applying mathematical concepts and procedures |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Above Standard | $42 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $72 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $52 \%$ | $58 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $12 \%$ |
| Near Standard | $28 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| Below Standard | $30 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $54 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $52 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $71 \%$ |

Problem Solving/Modeling and Data Analysis: Using appropriate tools and strategies to solve real world and mathematical problems

| Above Standard | $36 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $62 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Near Standard | $40 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $29 \%$ |
| Below Standard | $24 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $61 \%$ |

Communicating Reasoning: Demonstrating ability to support mathematical conclusions

| Above Standard | $36 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Near Standard | $43 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $54 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $36 \%$ |
| Below Standard | $20 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $54 \%$ |

Table 14: 2015 CAASPP Mathematics Claims (Areas), Santa Clara County Performance by Sub Groups

|  | All | Afr. <br> Am. | Asian | Filipino | Hispanic | White | NonED | ED | EL | SWD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Concepts and Procedures: Applying mathematical concepts and procedures |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Above Standard | 38\% | 16\% | 67\% | 31\% | 12\% | 47\% | 53\% | 14\% | 13\% | 12\% |
| At or Near Standard | 30\% | 32\% | 23\% | 40\% | 31\% | 33\% | 29\% | 31\% | 25\% | 17\% |
| Below Standard | 32\% | 51\% | 10\% | 29\% | 57\% | 19\% | 18\% | 55\% | 62\% | 71\% |
| Problem Solving/Modeling and Data Analysis: Using appropriate tools and strategies to solve real world and mathematical problems |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Above Standard | 33\% | 13\% | 59\% | 25\% | 9\% | 43\% | 47\% | 11\% | 9\% | 9\% |
| At or Near Standard | 42\% | 46\% | 33\% | 52\% | 46\% | 44\% | 40\% | 45\% | 37\% | 30\% |
| Below Standard | 25\% | 41\% | 8\% | 23\% | 45\% | 13\% | 14\% | 44\% | 54\% | 60\% |
| Communicating Reasoning: Demonstrating ability to support mathematical conclusions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Above Standard | 33\% | 13\% | 59\% | 26\% | 9\% | 41\% | 46\% | 11\% | 9\% | 9\% |
| At or Near Standard | 45\% | 51\% | 34\% | 54\% | 51\% | 46\% | 41\% | 51\% | 45\% | 37\% |
| Below Standard | 22\% | 35\% | 7\% | 20\% | 40\% | 12\% | 12\% | 38\% | 46\% | 54\% |

Jon R. Gundry, County Superintendent of Schools
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Table 15: 2016 CAASPP English Language Arts/Literacy Claims (Areas), Santa Clara County Performance by Grades

|  | All | Grade <br> $\mathbf{3}$ | Grade <br> $\mathbf{4}$ | Grade <br> $\mathbf{5}$ | Grade <br> $\mathbf{6}$ | Grade <br> $\mathbf{7}$ | Grade <br> $\mathbf{8}$ | Grade <br> $\mathbf{1 1}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reading: Demonstrating Understanding of Literacy and Non-Fictional Texts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Above Standard | $34 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $39 \%$ |
| Near Standard | $42 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $45 \%$ |
| Below Standard | $24 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $16 \%$ |
| Writing: Producing Clear and Purposeful Writing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Above Standard | $40 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $46 \%$ |
| Near Standard | $40 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $37 \%$ |
| Below Standard | $20 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| Listening: Demonstrating Effective Communication Skills |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Above Standard | $25 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $28 \%$ |
| Near Standard | $62 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $62 \%$ | $58 \%$ | $65 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $64 \%$ | $59 \%$ |
| Below Standard | $13 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
| Research/Inquiry: Investigating, Analyzing, and Presenting Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Above Standard | $40 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $48 \%$ |
| Near Standard | $45 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $48 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $41 \%$ |
| Below Standard | $15 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $11 \%$ |

Table 16: 2015 CAASPP English Language Arts/Literacy Claims (Areas), Santa Clara County Performance by Grades

|  | All | Grade <br> $\mathbf{3}$ | Grade <br> $\mathbf{4}$ | Grade <br> $\mathbf{5}$ | Grade <br> $\mathbf{6}$ | Grade <br> $\mathbf{7}$ | Grade <br> $\mathbf{8}$ | Grade <br> $\mathbf{1 1}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reading: Demonstrating Understanding of Literacy and Non-Fictional Texts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Above Standard | $31 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $41 \%$ |
| At or Near Standard | $43 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $43 \%$ |
| Below Standard | $26 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $16 \%$ |
| Writing: Producing Clear and Purposeful Writing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Above Standard | $36 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $45 \%$ |
| At or Near Standard | $42 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $38 \%$ |
| Below Standard | $22 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| Listening: Demonstrating Effective Communication Skills |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Above Standard | $23 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $24 \%$ |
| At or Near Standard | $61 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $58 \%$ | $59 \%$ | $65 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $64 \%$ | $59 \%$ |
| Below Standard | $16 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $16 \%$ |
| Research/Inquiry: Investigating, Analyzing, and Presenting Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Above Standard | $35 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $45 \%$ |
| At or Near Standard | $48 \%$ | $48 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $52 \%$ | $48 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $43 \%$ |
| Below Standard | $16 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $12 \%$ |
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Table 17: 2016 CAASPP Mathematics Claims (Areas), Santa Clara County Performance by Grades

|  |  | Grade | Grade | Grade | Grade | Grade | Grade | Grade |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 11 |

Concepts and Procedures: Applying mathematical concepts and procedures

| Above Standard | $42 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $38 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Near Standard | $28 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $26 \%$ |
| Below Standard | $30 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $36 \%$ |

Problem Solving/Modeling and Data Analysis: Using appropriate tools and strategies to solve real world and mathematical problems

| Above Standard | $36 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $30 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Near Standard | $40 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $44 \%$ |
| Below Standard | $24 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $26 \%$ |

Communicating Reasoning: Demonstrating ability to support mathematical conclusions

| Above Standard | $36 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $32 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Near Standard | $43 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $49 \%$ |
| Below Standard | $20 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $20 \%$ |

Table 18: 2015 CAASPP Mathematics Claims (Areas), Santa Clara County Performance by Grades

|  | All | Grade <br> $\mathbf{3}$ | Grade <br> $\mathbf{4}$ | Grade <br> $\mathbf{5}$ | Grade <br> $\mathbf{6}$ | Grade <br> $\mathbf{7}$ | Grade <br> $\mathbf{8}$ | Grade <br> $\mathbf{1 1}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Concepts and Procedures: Applying mathematical concepts and procedures |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Above Standard | $38 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $36 \%$ |
| At or Near Standard | $30 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $29 \%$ |
| Below Standard | $32 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $35 \%$ |
| Problem Solving/Modeling and Data Analysis: Using appropriate tools and strategies to solve real <br> world and mathematical problems |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Above Standard | $33 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $29 \%$ |
| At or Near Standard | $42 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $46 \%$ |
| Below Standard | $25 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $25 \%$ |
| Communicating Reasoning: Demonstrating ability to support mathematical conclusions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Above Standard | $33 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $31 \%$ |
| At or Near Standard | $45 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $49 \%$ |
| Below Standard | $22 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $21 \%$ |
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Table 19: 2016 CAASPP Testing, Santa Clara County Subgroups by Percent

| Subgroup | Percent of <br> Students Tested |
| :--- | :---: |
| African American | $2.0 \%$ |
| Asian | $29.3 \%$ |
| Filipino | $4.4 \%$ |
| Hispanic | $38.3 \%$ |
| White | $20.6 \%$ |
| Not Economically Disadvantaged | $59.9 \%$ |
| Economically Disadvantaged | $40.1 \%$ |
| English Learners | $19.5 \%$ |
| Students with Disability | $9.4 \%$ |

Table 20: Smarter Balanced English Language Arts/Literacy Scale Score Ranges

| Grade | Minimum <br> Scale Score | Maximum <br> Scale Score | Standard <br> Not Met | Standard <br> Nearly Met | Standard <br> Met | Standard <br> Exceeded |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | 2114 | 2623 | $2114-2366$ | $2367-2431$ | $2432-2489$ | $2490-2623$ |
| 4 | 2131 | 2663 | $2131-2415$ | $2416-2472$ | $2473-2532$ | $2533-2663$ |
| 5 | 2201 | 2701 | $2201-2441$ | $2442-2501$ | $2502-2581$ | $2582-2701$ |
| 6 | 2210 | 2724 | $2210-2456$ | $2457-2530$ | $2531-2617$ | $2618-2724$ |
| 7 | 2258 | 2745 | $2258-2478$ | $2479-2551$ | $2552-2648$ | $2649-2745$ |
| 8 | 2288 | 2769 | $2288-2486$ | $2487-2566$ | $2567-2667$ | $2668-2769$ |
| 11 | 2299 | 2795 | $2299-2492$ | $2493-2582$ | $2583-2681$ | $2682-2795$ |

Table 21: Smarter Balanced Mathematics Scale Score Ranges

| Grade | Minimum <br> Scale Score | Maximum <br> Scale Score | Standard <br> Not Met | Standard <br> Nearly Met | Standard <br> Met | Standard <br> Exceeded |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | 2189 | 2621 | $2189-2380$ | $2381-2435$ | $2436-2500$ | $2501-2621$ |
| 4 | 2204 | 2659 | $2204-2410$ | $2411-2484$ | $2485-2548$ | $2549-2659$ |
| 5 | 2219 | 2700 | $2219-2454$ | $2455-2527$ | $2528-2578$ | $2579-2700$ |
| 6 | 2235 | 2748 | $2235-2472$ | $2473-2551$ | $2552-2609$ | $2610-2748$ |
| 7 | 2250 | 2778 | $2250-2483$ | $2484-2566$ | $2567-2634$ | $2635-2778$ |
| 8 | 2265 | 2802 | $2265-2503$ | $2504-2585$ | $2586-2652$ | $2653-2802$ |
| 11 | 2280 | 2862 | $2280-2542$ | $2543-2627$ | $2628-2717$ | $2718-2862$ |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Economically Disadvantaged students include students eligible for the free and reduced priced meal program (FRPM), foster youth, homeless students, migrant students, and students for whom neither parent is a high school graduate.

[^1]:    $■$ Standard Not Met $\square$ Standard Nearly Met $\boxminus$ Standard Met $\square$ Standard Exceeded $\triangle$ 2014-15 $■$ 2015-16

[^2]:    ${ }^{2}$ The Near Standard level was reported as At or Near Standard in 2015.

