



---

# **Public Schools Accountability Act (PSAA) Advisory Committee Meeting February 3, 2015**



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Agenda

- Present California Department of Education (CDE) update and review agenda
- Review December and October 2014 PSAA Advisory Committee activities



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Agenda (Cont.)

- Discuss advantages and disadvantages of using a single index versus multiple measures to represent the new State Accountability System
- Revise the Academic Performance Index (API) Guiding Principles to reflect the new State Accountability System



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Agenda (Cont.)

- Discuss the Timing for the Release of the new State Accountability System
- Present an Overview of the College and Career Indicator (CCI) Working Models – *Time Permitting*
- Recommend CCI Measures



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# **Review December and October 2014 PSAA Advisory Committee Activities**



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# December 2, 2014 Activities

## Presentations:

- *Measures for a College and Career Indicator: Final Report*
- *Recognizing College and Career Readiness in the California School Accountability System*
- *Update on Developing a New Accountability System*
- *Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID): A College Readiness Indicator*

# October 3, 2014 Activities

- Request the CDE to provide Early Assessment Program (EAP) information as it becomes available
- Request the CDE to survey country offices of education (COE) regarding State Seal of Biliteracy



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# October 3, 2014 Activities (Cont.)



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

- Include a-g and Career Technical Education (CTE) as possible CCI measures
- Continue to work with the Technical Design Group (TDG) on the CCI Working Model and bring technical guidance back to the PSAA Advisory Committee for discussion



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Request by the State Board of Education

- At the January 2015 State Board of Education (SBE) meeting, the SBE approved the CDE's recommendation to request the TDG and the PSAA Advisory Committee to provide recommendations to the SBE in the following three areas:



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Request by the SBE (Cont.)

1. Offer recommendation for moving the State Accountability System from a single index (based on assessments only) to multiple measures that would highlight the state priorities
2. Revise the API Guiding Principles to construct a foundation that can be used to develop the new State Accountability System
3. Advise when the next state accountability reports should be released



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Single Index Versus Multiple Measures to Represent the New Accountability System

# TDG Recommendation



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

- At the January 2015 TDG meeting, the members discussed the advantages and disadvantages (noted in the following slides) of developing a new State Accountability System that would report either a single index or multiple measures.
- The members recommended that the new State Accountability System should report multiple measures in a way that allows comparability across schools and local educational agencies (LEAs).



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Single Index: Advantages

- Represents a single number that allows schools and districts to be compared
- Provides a consistent methodology for combining multiple measures to form a single index for comparison purposes
- Can easily be understood by the public



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Single Index: Disadvantages

- Requires complex calculations, including weights, to produce a single accountability index
- Masks areas needing improvement across various measures
- Fails to provide unique information about schools and LEAs



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Multiple Measures: Advantages

- Provides finer distinctions about student performance and progress across various measures
- Aligns with expectations that schools and LEAs are multi-dimensional
- Aligns better with Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) requirements



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Multiple Measures: Advantages (Cont.)

- Provides more focused information for parental decision-making, school and district decision-making, etc.
- Groups “like measures” together rather than combining items that are conceptually different from each other
- Provides more flexibility for designing a system for alternative schools



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Multiple Measures: Disadvantages

- Requires multiple scales across measures and multiple cut-scores within the measures
- May result in losing direct comparisons among schools and LEAs
- May be seen as “No Child Left Behind (NCLB)-like” report in which there are multiple ways to penalize a school



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Discuss and Make Recommendation to the SBE



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Revise the Guiding Principles to Reflect the New State Accountability System



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Revising Current Guiding Principles

- Revise the current API Guiding Principles to add, delete, and/or edit applicable principles to better represent the goals of the new State Accountability System
- Further, the purpose of this revision is to address relevant *Standards*

# Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (*Standards*; 2014)



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

- Prepared by the American Educational Research and Association, American Psychological Association, and National Council on Measurement in Education
- Applicable to the new State Accountability System and its Guiding Principles



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (Cont.)

- “The purpose of the *Standards* is to provide criteria for the development and evaluation of tests and testing practices and to provide guidelines for assessing the validity of interpretations of test scores for the intended test uses” (p. 1).



**TOM TORLAKSON**

State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Intent of New State Accountability System

- To complement the Local Control Accountability Plans (LCAPs) and the State Priorities
- To provide transparent and comprehensive feedback and measurement of schools and LEAs performance
- To provide more accessible and graphical reports for a wide audience (schools, LEAs, students, parents/guardians, the public, etc.)



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Intent of New State Accountability System (Cont.)

- To create opportunities for students, schools, and LEAs to take ownership of their performance as it relates to state accountability
- To have a system that objectively monitors a common set of measures statewide



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Purpose of Guiding Principles

- The Guiding Principles provide the foundation for the development of the new State Accountability System to:
  - Establish the core beliefs that should be considered in the design process
  - Minimize the possibility of adverse effects



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Current Guiding Principles...

Of the thirteen existing principles, eight were selected by the PSAA Advisory Committee as the most relevant to the CCI. These eight principles were used as criteria in the Educational Policy Improvement Center (EPIC) literature reviews, and were reviewed at the June 2014 PSAA meeting.

The remaining five principles will also be reviewed at today's meeting.

The CDE is proposing to change 11 of the original 13 principles and is recommending the addition of three new principles



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Eight Principles

- The eight principles reviewed at the June 2014 PSAA meeting will be covered first:
  1. Must be technically sound.
  2. Must emphasize student performance, not educational processes.
  3. Must measure content, skills, and competencies that can be taught and learned in school and that reflect the state standards.
  4. Must allow for fair comparisons.
  5. Should include as many students as possible in each school and LEA.

# Eight Principles (Cont.)

6. Should be flexible and its component indicators should be stable.
7. Should be understandable, particularly to educators and parents. Should be transparent and comprehensive, particularly to students, parents, and educators.
8. Should minimize burden.

**Note:** In the following slides, the numbers assigned to each principle match the number assigned in the original Guiding Principles (see Agenda Item 5 Handout 1).



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Current Guiding Principle 1

- **Must be technically sound.**  
Comparable, valid, and reliable measures must be used to the greatest extent feasible in order to maximize the validity of the API for its intended purposes. Decisions in developing the API will involve trade-offs between technical soundness and efficiency, but fairness must not be sacrificed.



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Revised Guiding Principle 1

- **Must be technically sound.**  
Comparable and reliable measures must be used to produce interpretations that maximize the validity of the decisions made about schools and LEAs. Developing the new State Accountability System will involve trade-offs between technical soundness and efficiency, but fairness must not be sacrificed.

Note: Linked to *Standards 13.4*; see Agenda Item 5 Handout 2



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Current Guiding Principle 2

- **Must emphasize student performance, not educational processes.** As important as it is to focus on the many central features of schooling that might be considered as indicators (e.g., teachers, instructional resources, curriculum, and school organization), the primary emphasis of the API is student performance.



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Revised Guiding Principle 2

- **Must emphasize student knowledge and skills.** A key emphasis of the State Accountability System is to determine how successful schools are at preparing students to advance to the next level of their education and/or career (i.e. elementary to middle school, middle school to high school, high school to postsecondary).



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Current Guiding Principle 3

- **Must measure content, skills, and competencies that can be taught and learned in school and that reflect the state standards.**

Note: [Linked to Standard 13.4](#)



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Revised Guiding Principle 3

- **Must measure content, skills, and competencies that can be taught and learned in school and that reflect the state standards and state priorities.**



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Current Guiding Principle 4

- **Must allow for fair comparisons.** The API must give all students a fair chance to show what they know and have learned. The API should also be constructed in such a way that improvement is possible regardless of current level of performance.



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Revised Guiding Principle 4

- **Must allow for fair comparisons.**

The State Accountability System:

1. Must give all schools a fair chance to show what their students know and have learned.
2. Should differentiate measures accordingly to better reflect the performance of students attending alternative schools that serve high-risk students as defined by the SBE.
3. Should be constructed in such a way that improvement is possible regardless of current level of performance.

Note: Linked to Standard 13.4



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Current Guiding Principle 5

- **Should include as many students as possible in each school and district.**

(No changes are being recommended)

Note: Linked to Standard 13.4



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Intentionally Left Blank



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Current Guiding Principle 8

- **Should be flexible and its component indicators should be stable.** The API should be flexible to accommodate incorporation of future indicators or components and should evolve in an orderly fashion as indicators become available and are incorporated over time.



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Revised Guiding Principle 8

- **Should be flexible and its component indicators should be stable.** The State Accountability System should be flexible to accommodate incorporation of future indicators or components and should evolve in an orderly fashion as indicators become available and are incorporated over time.



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Current Guiding Principle 9 and Revision

## Current

- Should be understandable, particularly to educators and parents.

## Revised

- Should be transparent and comprehensive, particularly to students, parents/guardians, and educators.

Note: Linked to Standard 13.5



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Intentionally Left Blank



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Current Guiding Principle 11

- **Should minimize burden.** The API should be designed so it does not strain current levels of state and local expense in data collection, analysis, and use; and creates a limited respondent burden.



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Revised Guiding Principle 11

- **Should minimize burden.** The State Accountability System should be designed so it does not strain current levels of state and local expense in data collection, analysis, and use; and creates a limited respondent burden.



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Five Principles

- The following five principles are those that have yet to be reviewed by the PSAA Advisory Committee
- As before, the numbers assigned to each principle matches the number assigned in the original Guiding Principles



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Intentionally Left Blank



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Current Guiding Principle 6

- **Must measure school performance and growth as accurately as possible.** Changes from the base year to the growth year within each overlapping two-year API cycle should reflect actual changes in school performance, not changes in testing procedures, inclusion criteria, or other variables.



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Revised Guiding Principle 6

- **Must measure school and LEA results as accurately as possible.** Changes in performance, and subsequently growth, should reflect actual changes in student, school, and LEA performance, not changes in testing procedures, inclusion criteria, or the inclusion of other indicators.

Note: Linked to Standards 13.6 and 13.7



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Current Guiding Principle 7

- **Should strive in the long-term to measure growth based on student-level longitudinal data.** As California transitions to the implementation of the California School Information Services (CSIS), the API should accommodate indicators emanating from CSIS.



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Revised Guiding Principle 7

- **Should strive to measure growth based on student-level longitudinal data.** The State Accountability System should utilize the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) to obtain measures and to match individual student-level data from outside sources (College Board, ACT, etc.)

Note: Linked to Standard 13.7



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Current Guiding Principle 10

- **The API is part of an overall accountability system that must include comprehensive information which incorporates contextual and background indicators beyond those required by law.**



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Revised Guiding Principle 10

- **The State Accountability System must include comprehensive information which incorporates contextual and background indicators beyond those currently required by law.**



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Current Guiding Principle 12

- **Should support local accountability systems.** The API should be the foundation of a statewide accountability system that serves as a model for local accountability systems. The use of local indicators, systems, and reporting for local uses should be encouraged in order to augment statewide comparative and longitudinal information.



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Revised Guiding Principle 12

- **Should complement the Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP).** The State Accountability System should complement LCAP requirements, as applicable to statewide accountability. Further, use of LCAP indicators within a statewide accountability system should abide by the principles associated with comparability, fairness, reliability, and validity.

Note: [Linked to Standard 13.9](#)



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Current Guiding Principle 13

- **Must conform to the requirements and intent of the PSAA as well as related information.**
- *Education Code* Section 52052 will need to be amended in order to move to a new State Accountability System that reflects the state priorities.



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Proposed New Guiding Principles

- **Should be relevant to a variety of education stakeholder groups, including the student.** The State Accountability System should not only value data that impacts school-level determinations, but it should also have *currency for the student* in that it creates engagement directly affecting or improving a student's prospects for success after high school (e.g., CCI).

Note: This proposed principle is from the additional criteria offered by EPIC for the literature reviews. [Linked to Standard 13.9](#)



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Proposed New Guiding Principles (Cont.)

- **Should forecast how students will perform in postsecondary pathways.** The CCI portion of the State Accountability System should demonstrate evidence of *predictive validity* in that the CCI measures are related to performance in a postsecondary pathway.

Note: This proposed principle is from the additional criteria offered by EPIC for the literature reviews. Linked to Standard 13.4



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Proposed New Guiding Principles (Cont.)

- **Must allow for all students to have equal access to educational opportunities.** The State Accountability System should be designed to encourage schools and LEAs to provide equal access to educational opportunities (e.g., advanced coursework, exams) for all students and student groups.

Note: Linked to Standard 13.4



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# The Timing of the Release of the New Accountability System



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# TDG Recommendation

- At the January 2015 meeting, the TDG also discussed when the new state accountability report could be released.
- Although there are still many “moving parts” and many decisions that have yet to be made (what data the report will contain; consideration of technical matters such as targets; inclusion of the Smarter Balanced assessment results), the TDG’s core focus was on “**when**” the new state accountability report could be released.



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# TDG Recommendation (Cont.)

- The TDG recommended that the earliest a new State Accountability System could be reported is in the fall of 2016.



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Report in Fall 2016: Advantages

- Allows time for the development of a new State Accountability System in a meaningful manner. Having results from the Smarter Balanced assessments would allow for the following advantages:



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Report in Fall 2016: Advantages (Cont.)

- Statewide goals
- Weights (if applicable),
- An accountability system for alternative schools, and
- An individual student growth model



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Report in Fall 2016: Advantages (Cont.)

- Prevents misalignment of outcomes between state's CCI results and the "college and career readiness" results from Smarter Balanced assessments



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Report in Fall 2016: Advantages (Cont.)

- Allows for the use of two data points needed to incorporate a student-level growth model into the new system



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Report in Fall 2016: Advantages (Cont.)

- Allows time for the CDE to perform data simulations using results from the Smarter Balanced assessments and share the results and analyses with the TDG
  - Similarly, this would also allow the TDG and the PSAA time to review, analyze, and make recommendations



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Report in Fall 2016: Advantages (Cont.)

- Allows time to communicate and obtain feedback on the new State Accountability System from LEAs, schools, parents/guardians, stakeholders, and the public



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Report in Fall 2016: Disadvantages

- Concern that schools and LEAs may not be held accountable for another year
- Will cause a delay in providing feedback to parents/guardians and school/LEA administrators regarding the school or LEA's performance



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Discuss and Make Recommendation to the SBE



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Overview of CCI Working Models (Time Permitting)



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Conceptual CCI Models

- At the February 2013 meeting, the PSAA Advisory Committee approved the current CCI Working Model (see Handout 3).
  - This model has been shared with stakeholders at regional meetings/Webcast and at multiple PSAA Advisory Committee meetings.

# Conceptual CCI Models (Cont.)



**TOM TORLAKSON**

State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

- In working with the TDG on how to include the proposed measures into the model, another alternative CCI model hereafter referred to as the Point System Model (see Handout 4), was discussed as a possible option.

# Conceptual CCI Models (Cont.)



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

- The fundamental purpose of both models are the same. The goal is to have a CCI that can be easily understood and allows students to demonstrate how well they are prepared for postsecondary.
- The TDG is still in the process of analyzing both models.



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

## College and Career Indicator Working Model

Assigned based on a student's highest achievement on any one measure\*.  
Student data from CALPADS 4-year cohort (same cohort as grad rate)

Level 4  
(Highest Level)

Does the student meet at least one of the measures in Level 4?  
If yes, assigned to Level 4.  
If not, go to Level 3.

Level 3

Does the student meet at least one of the measures in Level 3?  
If yes, assigned to Level 3.  
If not, go to Level 2.

Level 2

Does the student meet at least one of the measures in Level 2?  
If yes, assigned to Level 2.  
If not, go to Level 1.

Student Did Not Meet Any Measure Above  
Assigned Level 1 (Lowest Level)

Level 1

\* Measure: Each measure identified in this conceptual model may be a college measure, a career measure, or a combination of both.

See Agenda  
Item 7 Handout 1

# Current CCI Working Model



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

- The current CCI Working Model proposes *specific* measures at each level. Students would be placed in the “level” based on their highest achievement of a measure. The measures could require meeting either a college measure, a career measure, or a combination of both:
  - For example, a student meets completion of a-g and CTE, or meets a specific SAT score to be placed in a level.

# Strengths of Current CCI Working Model



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

- Multiple opportunities (i.e., measures) for students to demonstrate postsecondary preparedness
- Basic or simple concepts to understand
- Possible to incentivize schools to move modest performing students from lower levels (i.e., progressive weighting)



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Weaknesses of Current CCI Working Model

- Complex equating required
- Possible arbitrary benchmarks
- Focus appears to be more college-directed
- Could result in “measurement overload” (i.e., too many combinations of measures/benchmarks)



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Point System Model



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Career and College Indicator (CCI) – Draft

## Proposed Point System Example

The point system allows a student to take advantage of various types of preparedness opportunities. There are multiple ways to obtain preparedness in addition to following a CTE pathway or completing AP with SAT. As more data become available, indicators could be added to the CCI for more options showcasing preparedness.

Flexibility to add amplifiers

### a-g Requirements

Graduated high school completing all a-g course requirements – X pts.

### Advanced Placement (AP)

AP exam with score of 5 – X pts. Took AP Exam but did not pass – X pts.  
AP exam with score of 4 – X pts. Took AP course with no exam attempted – X pts.  
AP exam with score of 3 – X pts.

### International Baccalaureate (IB)

IB Diploma – X pts. IB exam with 4 or higher – X pts.  
IB exam with 7 or higher – X pts. IB exam but did not score 4 or higher – X pts.  
IB exam with 6 or higher – X pts. IB course with no exam attempted – X pts.  
IB exam with 5 or higher – X pts.

### SAT (based on 2400 scale)

Scored 1550 or above on SAT – X pts.  
Scored 1200 – 1549 on SAT – X pts.  
Attempted SAT but did not score 1200 or higher – X pts.

### ACT

Scored 24 or above on ACT – X pts.  
Scored 20-23 on ACT – X pts.  
Attempted ACT but did not score 20 or higher – X pts.

Students may only score up to 150 pts total in the SAT/ACT.

### Career Technical Education (CTE)

CTE Concentrator – X pts.  
Each CTE Pathway – X pts.

### Amplifiers

State Seal of Biliteracy – X pts.  
12<sup>th</sup> grade math course Algebra II or higher – X pts.  
Participating in college-level course(s) – X pts.

### Example Student Score

X	Student graduated as a-g completer
X	Student passed 1 <sup>st</sup> AP exam and attempted but did not pass a 2 <sup>nd</sup> AP exam.
X	Student did not participate in IB
X	Student scored 1350 on SAT exam.
X	Student attempted the ACT but did not score 20 or higher
X	Student did not participate in CTE.
X	Student took 12 <sup>th</sup> grade math course in Algebra II or higher.

Total Points = **XXX**

XX and below <b>Not Prepared</b>	XX and below <b>Almost Prepared</b>	XX-XX <b>Prepared</b>	XX and Above <b>Fully Prepared</b>
-------------------------------------	--	--------------------------	---------------------------------------



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Point System Model (Cont.)

- The Point System Model lists all college and career measures available. Each measure is attributed a point value. Students will be placed in a college and career level based on their accumulation of points.
  - **As an example**, if a student completed:
    - A CTE pathway = a points,
    - Two Advanced Placement (AP) exams = b points, and
    - Scored “X” on the SAT = c points
  - The student’s final CCI score would be a sum of all the points earned ( $a+b+c = y$  points)



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Strengths of Point System Model

- Multiple opportunities (i.e., measures) for students to contribute points
- Flexible (i.e., easy to add measures and award points)
- Distinctly different scale from prior API
- Intuitive (e.g., similar to college admissions process)
- Presents a more balanced approach between college and career
- Individualized



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Weaknesses of Point System Model

- Complex equating required
- Possible arbitrary benchmark
- May be more difficult to identify lower performing students
- Schools may focus on “lowest hanging fruit”



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

## College and Career Indicator (CCI) Conceptual Models

### Point System Model

(e.g. Student A)	Measure 1 (x points)	Measure 2 (y points)	Measure 3 (z points)	Final Level ( $x+y+z$ = very high points = Level 4)
Level 4	Range of points	Range of points	Range of points	Very High
Level 3	Range of points	Range of points	Range of points	High
Level 2	Range of points	Range of points	Range of points	Medium
Level 1	Range of points	Range of points	Range of points	Low

Students receive composite scores by adding their measure points. Student performance on different measures are compensatory and additive

### Current CCI Working Model

(e.g. Student A)	Measure 1 (level 3)	Measure 2 (level 4)	Measure 3 (level 2)	Final Level (highest of levels 3, 4, or 2 = Level 4)
Level 4	Level bubbles	Level bubbles	Level bubbles	Very High
Level 3	Level bubbles	Level bubbles	Level bubbles	High
Level 2	Level bubbles	Level bubbles	Level bubbles	Medium
Level 1	Level bubbles	Level bubbles	Level bubbles	Low

Students receive level assignments by reaching at least one of the minimum measure requirements at corresponding levels

See Agenda  
Item 7 Handout 3



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# CCI Measures

Agenda Item 8



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# CCI Measures

- At the June 2014 PSAA meeting, SAT/ACT and AP/IB were confirmed as possible measures within the CCI.
- At the October 2014 PSAA meeting, a-g and CTE were added to that list.
- The State Seal of Biliteracy, however, was designated to the “parking lot” list while data issues are investigated.



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Recommendation

- Based on discussion and TDG input, the CDE requests that the PSAA Advisory Committee formally recommend that the CCI be initially composed of the following measures: SAT, ACT, AP, IB, a-g, and CTE.



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Recommendation (Cont.)

- Other measures (State Seal of Biliteracy, dual enrollment, etc.) will be put forth for further consideration when information becomes available and relevant criteria associated with the Guiding Principles are met.
- It is important to note that the recommendation only pertains to the measures themselves and not to the logistics of how the individual measures will be incorporated into the CCI (cut-offs, weights, etc.).



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Recommendation (Cont.)

- The intent of providing this recommendation is to allow LEAs to begin preparing for the CCI portion of the new State Accountability System and to comply with *Education Code* Section 52052(a)(4)(F).



**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

# Questions/Comments

- ❖ Next PSAA Advisory Committee meeting is May 18, 2015