



# **California State Board of Education**

**Meeting Agenda Items for September 7-8, 2011**

## **ITEM 5 ADDENDUM**

## ITEM ADDENDUM

**DATE:** August 24, 2011

**TO:** MEMBERS, State Board of Education

**FROM:** TOM TORLAKSON, State Superintendent of Public Instruction

**SUBJECT:** Item 5 – Elementary and Secondary Education Act Update: School Improvement Grant: Status of Renewal of Funding for Year 2 of Cohort 1 Fiscal Year 2009 Local Educational Agencies and Schools for the Sub-Grants Under Section 1003(g), and other Elementary and Secondary Education Act Updates as Appropriate.

### Summary of Key Issues

Attachment 2 provides an update on the summary of findings and proposed resolutions that have been made to ensure compliance with the statutory requirements as defined by the U.S. Department of Education (ED).

Attachment 5 provides a draft letter to the ED Acting Assistant Secretary requesting a waiver of the timeline to implement teacher and principal evaluation systems. California seeks this waiver because most California local educational agencies (LEAs) that are implementing the Transformation model in their Cohort 1 SIG schools have not been able to meet the timeline required for implementation of the teacher and principal evaluation system required under this model. While many of these LEAs are in the process of identifying, negotiating, and implementing this component, very few are ready to fully implement their system to meet the requirements outlined by the ED.

### Attachment(s)

Attachment 2: School Improvement Grant Cohort 1 Local Educational Agency and School Renewal Corrective Action Plan Status.

Attachment 5: Draft Letter to Michael Yudin, Acting Assistant Secretary, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, requesting a waiver of the timeline to implement teacher and principal evaluation systems.

## **School Improvement Grant Cohort 1 Local Educational Agency and School Renewal Corrective Action Plan Status**

An initial letter was e-mailed to all Cohort 1 sub-grantees, providing a detailed definition of increased learning time (ILT), the timeline for the Corrective Action Plan, and resources to assist with ILT compliance. A copy of the letter is provided as Attachment 1 to the original SBE item. A conference call was held on Thursday, August 18, 2011 with all Cohort 1 sub-grantees to explain the contents of the letter and provide information on individual follow up calls with individual subgrantees. A schedule of the follow up calls is provided on page 2 of this Attachment along with the Corrective Action Plan instructions and forms.

Each applicable LEA is required to submit a Corrective Action Plan containing a (1) Cover Page which provides a summary of the implementation concerns and a narrative outlining the proposed resolution(s); (2) a corrected Proposed Budget and Budget Narrative; and (3) revised SIG Form 10 Implementation Chart that reflects the activities identified in the Corrective Action Plan and includes a list of any applicable documentation or evidence. Once received, the RCSO will review the Corrective Action Plan and provide technical assistance to each LEA. Please note that pursuant to SBE action, Year 2 Grant Award Notifications and funding may not be released until all implementation concerns have been addressed and the LEA's Corrective Action Plan has been approved by the CDE.

The timeline of the Corrective Action Plan Review process is outlined below:

<b>Important Events</b>	<b>Dates</b>
Notification of Implementation Concerns provided to LEAs by CDE staff	August 15–26, 2011
Proposed Resolution of Implementation Concerns due to CDE	September 12, 2011
CDE Approval of Proposed Resolution of Implementation Concerns	September 21, 2011
Year 2 Grant Award Notifications released	September 23, 2011

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
15	16	17	18	19
			<b>Conference Call with all Cohort 1 Subgrantees</b> 2 pm – 3 pm	<b>Hayward Unified</b> 8:30am–9am
22	23	24	25	26
<b>Stanford New School</b> 9am–10am <b>Santa Ana Unified</b> 11am–12pm <b>Ravenswood City Elementary</b> 2pm–3pm <b>King Chavez Arts Academy</b> 11am–12:30PM <b>Los Angeles Unified School District (USD)</b> 3pm–4:30pm <b>Greenfield Union Elementary</b> 9am–10am <b>San Diego Unified</b> 1pm–2pm <b>West Contra Costa Unified</b> 3pm–4pm	<b>San Francisco USD</b> 9am–10am <b>Twin Rivers Unified</b> 11am–12pm <b>McFarland Unified</b> 11am–12:30pm <b>Lakeside Union Elementary</b> 2pm–3:30pm <b>ABC Unified</b> 10am–11am <b>Riverside County</b> 1pm–2pm <b>Antelope USD</b> 3pm–4pm <b>Escondido Union Elementary</b> 2pm–3pm <b>Buttonwillow Union</b> 3pm–4pm	<b>Oakland USD</b> 9am–10am <b>Pajaro Valley USD</b> 1:30pm–2:30pm <b>Monterey Peninsula Unified</b> 11am–12pm <b>Fresno Unified</b> 8am–9am <b>Moreno Valley Unified</b> 9am–10am <b>Pomona USD</b> 2:30pm–3:30pm	<b>Marysville Joint Unified</b> 9am–10:30am <b>La-Honda Pescadero</b> 2pm–3:30pm <b>Wasco Union Elementary</b> 11am–12pm <b>Coachella Valley Unified</b> 11:30am–12:30pm <b>San Bernardino City Unified</b> 2pm–3pm <b>Chualar Union Elementary</b> 3pm–4pm <b>Alvord Unified</b> 9am–10am <b>San Juan USD</b> 11am–12pm <b>San Lorenzo Unified</b> 2pm–3pm	<b>Adelante Charter</b> 2pm–3:30pm <b>Mt. Diablo Unified</b> 1pm–2pm <b>Fontana Unified</b> 3pm–4pm <b>Aromas/San Juan Unified</b> 1pm–2pm
29	30	31	1	2

❖ Not Scheduled

- Lindsay Unified
- Palmdale Elementary
- Semitropic Elementary
- Soledad Unified

## **Corrective Action Plan for Local Educational Agencies School Improvement Grant Year 2 of Cohort 1**

### **Introduction**

All School Improvement Grant (SIG) implementation concerns identified as a result of the SIG Fiscal and Programmatic Annual Monitoring Review are to be addressed with a Corrective Action Plan before renewal of funding for Year 2 of Cohort I. Corrective Action Plans should address the corrections that will be made to ensure compliance with the statutory requirements of the grant and SIG final requirements as defined by the U.S. Department of Education.

This document provides Year 2 Cohort I SIG local educational agencies (LEAs) with instructions for completing and submitting a Corrective Action Plan.

### **Instructions for Corrective Action**

The description of each heading and the information to be included in the Corrective Action Plan are as follows:

#### **1. Implementation Concerns Cover Page (Form 1a)**

Please complete all contact and LEA information. The LEA Superintendent's signature acknowledges the corrective action plan and verifies his or her support and understanding of the revised SIG plan.

#### **2. Implementation Concerns and Implementation Concerns Proposed Resolution (Forms 1b and 1c)**

Form 1b identifies implementation concerns that require corrective action. Form 1c provides the LEA with an opportunity to summarize the proposed resolution for each identified implementation concern. When summarizing the corrective actions and activities, please be specific as to the relationship between the implementation concern, the selected intervention model and its related model component, and the proposed correction. Be sure to address each identified implementation concern. Complete one proposed resolution for each Tier I and Tier II school served. ***There is a one-page limit per school.***

#### **3. Revised Implementation Chart (Form 10.1 or Form 10.2)**

Using Form 1c Implementation Concerns as a reference, please complete one Form 10.1 or Form 10.2 Implementation Chart for each Tier I and Tier II school served and include the following:

- Corrective steps to be taken that specifically address the elements of non-compliance and ensure that the proposed actions will eliminate all implementation concerns and prevent their recurrence
- The timeline to complete each step, including beginning and ending implementation dates using both month and year designations
- Persons responsible for ensuring that each corrective step is completed according to the proposed timeline
- Evidence that will be submitted to the CDE, upon request, to verify implementation of the Corrective Action Plan.

#### **4. Corrected Proposed Budget and Budget Narrative (Forms 4a, 4b, 5a, and 5b)**

If the revised Form 10.1 or 10.2 Implementation Chart necessitates a corrected or revised budget and budget narrative, please complete one for the LEA and each Tier I and Tier II school served. Forms 4a, 4b, 5a, and 5b are provided in this Corrective Action Plan for your convenience.

**\* Please highlight all proposed corrected actions and activities on Forms 10.1 and/or 10.2 using bold-face font. If using Forms 4a, 4b, 5a, and 5b, please highlight all proposed corrected expenditures using bold-face font.**

#### **Submission of the Corrective Action Plan**

Submit the original, one hard copy, and one electronic Microsoft Word 2003 or later copy (all single spaced in **12 point Arial font using one inch margins**) and ensure that the original and copy are received by the Regional Coordination and Support Office (RCSO) on or before (not postmarked by) 4 p.m., September 12, 2011. Submit an electronic copy to [RCSO@cde.ca.gov](mailto:RCSO@cde.ca.gov) on or before September 12, 2011. Mailed documents must arrive on or before the September 12, 2011, deadline and should be sent to the following address:

California Department of Education  
District and School Improvement Division  
Regional Coordination and Support Office  
1430 N Street, Suite 6208  
Sacramento, CA 95814-5901

To comply with Federal ADA Regulations, please adhere to the following guidelines:

- Submit text based documents only (no scanned images)
- If images are included, also include alternative text for that image
- Do not use color to convey information

Also, do not include images of handwritten signatures for privacy reasons.

**Corrective Action Plan Form 1a –Implementation Concerns Cover Page**

**School Improvement Grant (SIG)  
Corrective Action Plan**

**SUBMISSION DEADLINE  
September 12, 2011, 4 p.m.**

Submit to:  
California Department of Education  
District and School Improvement Division  
Regional Coordination and Support Office  
1430 N Street, Suite 6208  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**NOTE:** Please print or type all information.

<b>County Name:</b>		<b>County/District Code:</b>	
<b>Local Educational Agency (LEA) Name</b>		<b>LEA NCES Number:</b>	
<b>Name of Primary Grant Coordinator</b>		<b>Telephone Number</b>	
<b>E-mail Address</b>		<b>Fax Number</b>	
<b>CERTIFICATION/ASSURANCE SECTION:</b> As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I have read all assurances, certifications, terms, and conditions associated with the enclosed SIG Corrective Action Plan; and I agree to comply with all requirements as a condition of funding. I certify that all applicable state and federal rules and regulations will be observed and that to the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this application is correct and complete.			
<b>Printed Name of Superintendent or Designee</b>		<b>Telephone Number</b>	
<b>Superintendent or Designee Signature</b>		<b>Date</b>	

**Corrective Action Plan Form 1b—Implementation Concerns**

**INSERT LEA IMPLEMENTATION CONCERNS HERE**

**Corrective Action Plan Form 1c—Implementation Concerns Proposed Resolution**

**Please provide a Proposed Resolution for each Tier I and Tier II school served.  
There is a one-page limit per school.**

**Corrective Action Plan Form 4a—Local Educational Agency Projected Budget**

**LEA Projected Budget**

Fiscal Year (FY) 2011–12

Name of LEA:	
County/District (CD) Code:	
County:	
LEA Contact:	Telephone Number:
E-Mail:	Fax Number:
SACS Resource Code: 3180 Revenue Object: 8920	

Object Code	Description of Line Item	SIG Funds Budgeted		
		FY 2010–11	FY 2011–12	FY 2012–13
1000– 1999	Certificated Personnel Salaries			
2000– 2999	Classified Personnel Salaries			
3000– 3999	Employee Benefits			
4000– 4999	Books and Supplies			
5000– 5999	Services and Other Operating Expenditures			
6000– 6999	Capital Outlay			
7310 & 7350	Indirect Costs			
<b>Total Amount Budgeted</b>				

**Corrective Action Plan Form 4b—School Projected Budget**

**School Projected Budget**

Fiscal Year 2011–12

Name of School:	
County/District (CD) Code:	
County:	
LEA Contact:	Telephone Number:
E-Mail:	Fax Number:
SACS Resource Code: 3180 Revenue Object: 8920	

Object Code	Description of Line Item	SIG Funds Budgeted		
		FY 2010–11	FY 2011–12	FY 2012–13
1000– 1999	Certificated Personnel Salaries			
2000– 2999	Classified Personnel Salaries			
3000– 3999	Employee Benefits			
4000– 4999	Books and Supplies			
5000– 5999	Services and Other Operating Expenditures			
6000– 6999	Capital Outlay			
7310 & 7350	Indirect Costs			
<b>Total Amount Budgeted</b>				

**Corrective Action Plan Form 5a—Local Educational Agency Budget Narrative**

**LEA Budget Narrative**

Provide sufficient detail to justify the LEA budget. The LEA budget narrative page(s) must provide sufficient information to describe activities and costs associated with each object code. Include LEA budget items that reflect the actual cost of implementing the selected intervention models and other activities described for each participating school. Please duplicate this form as needed.

**Corrective Action Plan Form 5b—School Budget Narrative**

Activity Description (See instructions)	SIG Funds Budgeted (Identified per year)			Object Code
	FY 2010–11	FY 2011–12	FY 2012–13	

**Corrective Action Plan Form 5b—School Budget Narrative**

**School Budget Narrative**

Provide sufficient detail to justify the school budget. The school budget narrative page(s) must provide sufficient information to describe activities and costs associated with each object code. Include budget items that reflect the actual cost of implementing the selected intervention models and other activities described for each participating school. Please duplicate this form as needed.

**School Name:**

Activity Description (See instructions)	SIG Funds Budgeted (Identified per year)			Object Code
	FY 2010–11	FY 2011–12	FY 2012–13	

**Corrective Action Plan Form 10.1—Turnaround Implementation Chart for a Tier I or Tier II School**

Complete this form for each identified Tier I and Tier II school planning to implement the **Turnaround Model** that the LEA intends to serve. Include actions and activities required to implement the model, a timeline with specific start and end dates of implementation, the name of the position (and person, if known) responsible for oversight, and the type of evidence that will be submitted to the CDE, upon request, to verify implementation. The Implementation Chart shall address the statutory requirements of the grant and SIG final requirements as defined by the U.S. Department of Education.

School:		Tier: I or II (circle one)			
Required Components	Actions & Activities	Timeline		Oversight	Description of Evidence
		Start	End		
a. Replace the principal and grant the new principal sufficient operational flexibility.					
b. Use locally-adopted competencies to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment, screen all existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent, and select new staff.					
c. Implement strategies that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school.					

**Corrective Action Plan Form 10.1—Turnaround Implementation Chart for a Tier I or Tier II School (Cont.)**

School:		Tier: I or II (circle one)			
Required Components	Actions & Activities	Timeline		Oversight	Description of Evidence
		Start	End		
d. Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program.					
e. Adopt a new governance structure which may include, but is not limited to, requiring the school to report to a new "turnaround office" in the LEA, or hiring a "turnaround leader" who reports directly to the LEA.					
f. Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with California's adopted academic standards.					

**Corrective Action Plan Form 10.1—Turnaround Implementation Chart for a Tier I or Tier II School (Cont.)**

School:		Tier: I or II (circle one)			
Required Components	Actions & Activities	Timeline Start End		Oversight	Description of Evidence
<b>g.</b> Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.					
<b>h.</b> Establish scheduled and implement strategies that provide increased learning time.	Core  Amount Increased: _____  Enrichment  Amount Increased: _____  Teacher Collaboration  Amount Increased: _____				

**Corrective Action Plan Form 10.1—Turnaround Implementation Chart for a Tier I or Tier II School (Cont.)**

**Note: See the Program Guidelines section of the request for applications for a list of optional Turnaround Model components.**

School: _____ Tier: I or II (circle one)					
Required Components	Actions & Activities	Timeline		Oversight	Description of Evidence
		Start	End		
i. Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.					

Optional Component	Actions & Activities	Timeline		Oversight	Description of Evidence
		Start	End		

**Corrective Action Plan Form 10.2—Transformation Implementation Chart for a Tier I or Tier II School**

Complete this form for each identified Tier I and Tier II school planning to implement the **Transformation Model** that the LEA intends to serve. Include actions and activities required to implement the model, a timeline with specific start and end dates of implementation, the name of the position (and person, if known) responsible for oversight, and the type of evidence that will be submitted to the CDE, upon request, to verify implementation. The Implementation Chart shall address the statutory requirements of the grant and SIG final requirements as defined by the U.S. Department of Education.

School:		Tier: I or II (circle one)			
Required Components	Actions & Activities	Timeline		Oversight	Description of Evidence
		Start	End		
a(1) Replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model.					
a(2) Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that take into account data on student growth as a significant factor and that are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement.					

**Corrective Action Plan Form 10.2—Transformation Implementation Chart for a Tier I or Tier II School (Cont.)**

School:		Tier: I or II (circle one)			
Required Components	Actions & Activities	Timeline Start End		Oversight	Description of Evidence
<b>a(3)</b> Identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model, have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates; and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice, have not done so.					
<b>a(4)</b> Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program.					

**Corrective Action Plan Form 10.2—Transformation Implementation Chart for a Tier I or Tier II School (Cont.)**

School:		Tier: I or II (circle one)			
Required Components	Actions & Activities	Timeline Start End		Oversight	Description of Evidence
<b>c(1)</b> Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time.	Core  Amount Increased: _____				
	Enrichment  Amount Increased: _____				
	Teacher Collaboration  Amount Increased: _____				
<b>c(2)</b> Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.					

**Corrective Action Plan Form 10.2—Transformation Implementation Chart for a Tier I or Tier II School (Cont.)**

School: _____ Tier: I or II (circle one)					
Required Components	Actions & Activities	Timeline		Oversight	Description of Evidence
		Start	End		
d(1) Give the school sufficient operational flexibility (such as staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates.					
d(2) Ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, the state educational agency, or a designated external lead partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an educational management organization[EMO]).					

**Corrective Action Plan Form 10.2—Transformation Implementation Chart for a Tier I or Tier II School (Cont.)**

**Note: See the Program Guidelines section of the RFA for a list of optional Transformation Model components.**

School: _____ Tier: I or II (circle one)					
Optional Component	Actions & Activities	Timeline		Oversight	Description of Evidence
		Start	End		



CALIFORNIA  
DEPARTMENT OF  
EDUCATION

**TOM TORLAKSON**  
STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

September 12, 2011

Michael Yudin, Acting Assistant Secretary  
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education  
U.S. Department of Education  
400 Maryland Avenue, SW  
Washington, DC 20202

Dear Acting Assistant Secretary Yudin:

I am writing on behalf of California to request a waiver of the requirement in Section I.A.2(d)(1)(i)(B) of the final requirements for the School Improvement Grant (SIG) program, which requires a local educational agency (LEA) to develop and implement teacher and principal evaluation systems that meet certain requirements during the first year a school is implementing the transformation model. Those systems must be rigorous, transparent, and equitable and take into account data about student academic growth as a significant factor as well as other factors, such as multiple observation-based assessments of performance, ongoing collections of information on professional practice reflective of student achievement, and increased high school graduation rates. This waiver would permit California, in accordance with criteria California develops, to permit an LEA that is implementing the transformation model in one or more schools to take additional time to develop and implement high-quality evaluation systems that meet these requirements. I understand that this waiver would apply only to evaluation systems for Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 SIG schools as follows:

- A school that began implementing the transformation model during the 2010–11 school year (Cohort 1) and that was not able to complete the development and implementation of its evaluation systems during that year must develop them during the 2011–12 school year and, at a minimum, pilot them for all teachers and principals no later than the 2012–13 school year. The piloted systems should be capable of being used for decisions regarding, for example, retention, promotion, compensation, and rewards, no later than the 2013–14 school year.
- A school that begins implementing the transformation model in the 2011–12 school year (Cohort 2) must develop its evaluation systems during that year, pilot them for all teachers and principals during the 2012–13 school year, and use the system in the school to inform decisions regarding, for example, retention, promotion, compensation, and rewards, no later than the 2013–14 school year.

Michael Yudin, Acting Assistant Secretary  
September 12, 2011  
Page 2

California seeks this waiver because fewer than half of California LEAs implementing the Transformation model in their Cohort 1 SIG schools have been able to meet the timeline required for implementation of the teacher and principal evaluation system required under this model. While many of these LEAs are in the progress of identifying, negotiating, and implementing this component, very few are ready to fully implement their system to meet the requirements outlined by the U.S. Department of Education (ED). California believes that the additional time will enable qualifying LEAs to meet the SIG final requirements while encouraging the development and implementation of high-quality teacher and principal evaluation systems that will increase the quality of instruction for students and improve the academic achievement of students.

California has set specific annual measurable objectives (AMOs) in reading and mathematics for the 2011–12 school year. (See Enclosure 1.) California will determine adequate yearly progress (AYP) based on assessments administered in the 2011–12 school year in accordance with the requirements of section 1111(b)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. California believes that affording an LEA more time to develop and implement teacher and principal evaluation systems for a school that is implementing the transformation model will improve teaching and learning in the school and increase student achievement by providing necessary time to ensure that the evaluation systems will meet the SIG final requirements.

If granted a waiver of the implementation timeline for the evaluation systems requirements of the transformation model, California assures it will:

- Develop criteria that:
  - Will be used to evaluate LEA requests for timeline extensions, including by evaluating whether an LEA has demonstrated sufficient commitment to, and progress in, implementing principal and teacher evaluation systems for its Cohort 1 or Cohort 2 schools to justify the receipt of a timeline extension and whether, if an extension is granted, the LEA will be able to meet the timelines described above for developing and implementing evaluation systems.
  - Enable California to distinguish among LEAs that have met the requirements, those that are making sufficient progress toward meeting the requirements, and those that have not made a good-faith effort to meet the requirements.

Michael Yudin, Acting Assistant Secretary  
September 12, 2011  
Page 3

- Approve an LEA request to implement the waiver only if California determines, based on its criteria, that the LEA warrants an extension of the evaluation systems timeline.
- Develop a technical assistance and support plan that outlines how California will differentiate support to LEAs based on their current level of implementation and will provide LEAs with the assistance they need to meet the evaluation system requirements (e.g., by assisting LEAs in selecting observational rubrics, developing student growth metrics, disseminating guidance for developing student learning outcomes, and training raters).
- Develop a monitoring plan for the 2011–12 school year, specifically for the LEAs that receive timeline extensions, that will help ensure that the LEAs are on track to pilot the required evaluation systems no later than the 2012–13 school year (Cohorts 1 and 2) and fully implement the evaluation systems no later than the 2013–14 school year (Cohort 2), as required.
- Within 30 days of receiving the waiver from the ED, post on its public Web site the criteria, process, and timeline for reviewing an LEA's extension request.
- Within 30 days of California approving LEA extension requests, post on its public Web site and submit by e-mail to the ED at [school.improvement.grants@ed.gov](mailto:school.improvement.grants@ed.gov) the names of the LEAs (including their National Center for Education Statistics [NCES] District Identification Number) for which it has approved a timeline extension and the schools (including their NCES School Identification Number) within those LEAs that will benefit from the extension, including an indication of the cohort to which each school belongs.
- Determine what action it will take with respect to LEAs that have not made a good-faith effort to meet the evaluation system requirements.

Prior to submitting this waiver request, California provided all LEAs in California, and the public, with notice and a reasonable opportunity to comment on the request. California provided such notice by posting a public item on the September 2011 Agenda for the California State Board of Education. (See Enclosure 2.) Copies of the comments that California received from LEAs, and the public, in response to this notice are also provided. (See Enclosure 2.)

Michael Yudin, Acting Assistant Secretary  
September 12, 2011  
Page 4

If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Deborah V.H. Sigman, Deputy Superintendent, Curriculum, Learning, and Accountability Branch, by phone at 916-319-0812 or by e-mail at [dsigman@cde.ca.gov](mailto:dsigman@cde.ca.gov).

Sincerely,

Deborah V.H. Sigman, Deputy Superintendent  
Curriculum, Learning, and Accountability Branch

DS:cs  
Enclosures

DRAFT

**Criteria for Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) for  
2011 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)**

Schools and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs)	Percent Proficient or Above on the California Standards Test, California High School Exit Exam, California Modified Assessment, and California Alternate Performance Assessment for 2011	
	English-Language Arts	Mathematics
<b>Schools</b>	2011	2011
• Elementary and Middle Schools	67.6	68.5
• High Schools	66.7	66.1
<b>LEAs</b>		
• Elementary School Districts	67.6	68.5
• High School Districts (with grade levels 9–12)	66.7	66.1
• Unified School Districts • High School Districts, and • County Offices of Education (with grade levels 2–8 and 9–12) • Elementary School Districts	67.0	67.3
<p>These criteria apply to schools or LEAs that have at least 100 students with valid scores or to numerically significant subgroups that have at least 50 students with valid scores. Different criteria are applied to small schools, LEAs, or subgroups in AYP calculations. Small schools and LEAs with fewer than 100 valid scores have adjusted Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) to account for the small number of test scores—the AMOs are adjusted using a confidence interval methodology. Small subgroups are those with between 50 to 99 valid scores. AMO criteria for small subgroups are the same as the targets listed above but are only applied if the school or LEA has at least 100 valid scores. Subgroups with fewer than 50 valid scores have no AMO criteria.</p>		

**Notice and Public Comment PLACEHOLDER**

DRAFT



# **California State Board of Education**

**Meeting Agenda Items for September 7-8, 2011**

## **ITEM 13 ADDENDUM**

## ITEM ADDENDUM

**DATE:** August 31, 2011

**TO:** MEMBERS, State Board of Education

**FROM:** TOM TORLAKSON, State Superintendent of Public Instruction

**SUBJECT:** Item 13 – Assessment and Accountability Update, Including, but not Limited to, Standardized Testing and Reporting Results, California High School Exit Examination Results, and the Accountability Progress Reporting System 2011 Release.

### Summary of Key Issues

On August 31, 2011, State Superintendent of Public Instruction Tom Torlakson released the 2010–11 Accountability Progress Report results. The news release and accompanying summary of results is attached (Attachment 5).

### Attachment(s)

Attachment 5: News Release: State Schools Chief Tom Torlakson Releases 2010–11 Accountability Progress Report (3 Pages).

Attachment 6: 2010–11 Accountability Progress Reporting (APR) System: Summary of Results (9 Pages).



CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
**NEWS RELEASE**

**TOM TORLAKSON**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

REL#11-62  
**EMBARGOED UNTIL 11:45 a.m.**  
**Wednesday, August 31, 2011**

CONTACT: Pam Slater  
PHONE: 916-319-0818  
E-MAIL: [communications@cde.ca.gov](mailto:communications@cde.ca.gov)

**Torlakson: Record Share of Schools Meet State Academic Goals**  
*Flawed Federal Standards Mislabeled 913 Newly Identified Schools as 'Failing'*

SACRAMENTO – State Superintendent of Public Instruction Tom Torlakson announced today that a record 49 percent of California schools met or exceeded the state's Academic Performance Index (API) target, even as the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) formula threatened to label 913 newly identified campuses as failing.

In all, 55 percent of elementary schools, 43 percent of middle schools and 28 percent of high schools met or surpassed the state API target of 800, with the proportion of schools making the target rising 3 percentage points from last year, from 46 percent to 49 percent. (See Table 1)

"I applaud the hard work our students, teachers, parents, school employees and administrators are doing to improve—even in the face of severe cuts to school funding," Torlakson said. "At school, after school, and among every significant ethnic group, California's students are performing better than ever. The failure here is in our politics, not our public schools."

Torlakson's release of California's 2010-11 Accountability Progress Report, which provides results of both state and federal school accountability systems, came less than a week after his letter to U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan requesting immediate relief from the flawed policies of NCLB.

Both accountability systems are based upon results from the statewide Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program, which showed nine consecutive years of rising scores among California students, and from the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE).

Each state defines what it considers to be a proficient level of performance for students in English-language arts (ELA) and mathematics. California is widely recognized for having some of the most rigorous standards in the nation.

The API is a numeric index that ranges from a low of 200 to a high of 1,000. School and subgroup targets are set at 5 percent of the difference between the school or subgroup's Base API score and the statewide target of 800, with a minimum target of 5 points. All numerically significant subgroups at a school must meet their growth targets for a school to meet its API growth target.

API scores showed continued improvement across the board, with statewide growth of 11 points, propelled by a 14-point gain among English learners and Hispanic students and a 10-point gain among African American students. Asian and white students posted smaller gains of 8 and 7 points, respectively. (See Table 2)

While the results indicate a slight narrowing of the gap between subgroups, a significant achievement gap remains.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), the federal NCLB target for students scoring at or above proficiency, increased 11 percentage points this year. It is slated to continue rising until 100 percent of students will be expected to be proficient in 2013-14.

Using this yardstick, 35 percent of elementary schools, 18 percent of middle schools and 41 percent of high schools met their AYP targets for 2011. The results represent a decline in the proportion of schools meeting AYP targets from the previous year of 5 percentage points, 8 percentage points, and 1 percentage point, respectively. (See Table 7)

NCLB requires schools, school districts, and county offices of education that receive federal Title I funds and do not make AYP criteria for two consecutive years to be identified for Program Improvement (PI). For the 2011-12 school year, 913 newly identified schools were identified for PI. Eighty-five schools exited from PI after making AYP for two consecutive years, with a total of 3,892 schools in PI status. Schools in PI are subject to a five-year timeline of intervention activities. (See Table 8)

States are also required to identify local educational agencies (LEAs), which include school districts, county offices of education, and statewide benefit charters for PI. For 2011-12, 95 new LEAs were identified for PI status, with 1 LEA exiting PI status, leaving a total of 445 LEAs in PI. (See Table 9)

In Torlakson's letter to Duncan, Torlakson proposed that California be allowed to freeze the imposition of sanctions and mandatory identifications for the coming school year at last year's levels.

**###**

The California Department of Education (CDE) is a state agency led by State Superintendent of Public Instruction Tom Torlakson. For more information, please visit <http://www.cde.ca.gov> or by mobile device at <http://m.cde.ca.gov/>. You may also follow Superintendent Torlakson on Twitter at <http://www.twitter.com/TorlaksonSSPI> and Facebook at <http://www.facebook.com/CAEducation>.

## **2010–11 Accountability Progress Reporting (APR) System: Summary of Results**

### **Background**

- Since 2005, the California Department of Education (CDE) has reported accountability results under the Accountability Progress Reporting (APR) system umbrella.
- Through the APR Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ar/index.asp> schools are able to easily view their results under both the state and federal accountability systems.
- The 2010–11 APR system includes the:
  - 2010 Base Academic Performance Index (API);
  - 2011 Growth API;
  - 2011 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP);
  - 2011–12 Program Improvement (PI).
- The 2010 Base API was released in April 2011.
- The Base API represents a recalibration of the API system that occurs each spring. Also included with the 2010 Base API score are API growth targets for the school and for every numerically significant subgroup at the school, the school's statewide rank, and its similar schools rank.
- Data reported today are current as of August 31, 2011, and are subject to change as appeals of AYP determinations are processed and approved and as data corrections are made with the testing contractor and provided to the CDE. The API, AYP, and PI reports have regularly scheduled updates in September 2011, February 2012, and July 2012.

### **APR System Results**

- API and AYP results are reported for the school overall and for all student groups considered to be numerically significant. A numerically significant student group is 100 students or 50 students that make up at least 15 percent of the school's population. Information is reported for all major race and ethnicity student groups, socioeconomically disadvantaged students (SED), English learners (ELs), and students with disabilities (SWDs).
- API scores range between 200 and 1000 with a state target of 800 points. In addition to the API score for the school overall and for all numerically significant student groups, the 2011 Growth API report also tells whether the API targets were met for the school and for each numerically significant student group.

- The federal AYP consists of four components: participation rate, percent proficient (also known as Annual Measurable Objectives or AMOs), the API, and the high school graduation rate.
- The federal PI report includes the Title I funding status for all schools and local educational agencies (LEAs) in the state as well as information on whether the school or LEA has been identified for PI. If the school or LEA is in PI, the year of interventions (Year 1-5 for schools and Year 1-3 for LEAs) is also noted.

### **Key Differences Between the State and Federal Accountability Systems**

- The state accountability system is an index model that measures improvement in student achievement from one year to the next. Under the API system, schools are given credit for improving the overall performance of their students. School growth targets are set based upon the starting point of the school and are re-set each year depending on the level of growth each school site shows.
- The federal AYP system is often referred to as a "status" model because it rewards schools for the percent of students the school has scoring at the proficient or above level on state assessments. No matter where a school began, all schools are expected to meet the same target at the same time.

### **Summary of 2011 Growth API Results**

- The API is a composite score that combines information across grade levels and content areas to yield a single accountability metric for a school site.
- The API includes assessment results from the California Standards Tests (CSTs) in English-language arts (ELA), mathematics, history/social science and science, and the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE) in grades ten through twelve. All SWDs who take the California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA) and SWDs who take the California Modified Assessment (CMA) in grades three through nine in ELA and grades three through eleven in mathematics are also included in the API calculation.
- One key feature of the API system is that schools are rewarded more for moving students from scoring at the lowest performance levels. For example, a student who moves from the far below basic level to the below basic level contributes 300 points toward the school's API score. A student who moves from the proficient level to the advanced level contributes 125 points toward the school's API score.

## Schools At or Above the State Target of 800

- The State Board of Education has established an API score of 800 points as the state target that all schools and student subgroups should achieve.
- The percentage of schools overall meeting or exceeding this state target has increased each year over the past nine years. In 2011, 49 percent of all schools attained this target.
- Based on 2011 data, 55 percent of elementary schools, 43 percent of middle schools, and 28 percent of high schools are now at or above the state target of 800. See [Table 1](#).

## The Achievement Gap

- Results from the 2011 Growth API show that Black or African American and Hispanic or Latino, students improved by 10 and 14 points respectively while white students improved by 7 points. See Table 2.
- SED, EL, and SWD student groups also improved more than the state as a whole; 14 points, 14 points, and 15 points compared to 11 points.
- However, white and Asian students continued to have significantly higher API scores.
- [Tables 3, 4, and 5](#) show improvement from 2010 to 2011 for elementary schools, middle schools, and high schools respectively.

## Summary of 2011 AYP Results

- Every LEA, school, and subgroup in California is expected to achieve a 95 percent participation rate on ELA and mathematics state assessments used to calculate AYP each year.
- In addition, all LEAs, schools, and subgroups are expected to meet state targets for the percentage of students scoring at or above the proficient level. These state targets will increase annually by about 11 percentage points until 2013–14 when 100 percent of students are expected to be performing at or above the proficient level on state assessments in both ELA and mathematics.
- The participation rate and percent proficient calculations for elementary and middle schools are based on the CSTs, the CAPA, and the CMA, in ELA and mathematics. For high schools, the participation rate and percent proficient calculations are based on the CAHSEE and the CAPA for grade ten students in ELA and mathematics. The API is an additional AYP indicator for all schools.

- The graduation rate is an additional indicator only applicable for schools with grade twelve data (i.e., enrollment, graduation, or dropout).
- The percentage of schools making their AYP targets differs by school type with 35 percent elementary schools, 18 percent middle schools, and 41 percent high schools making their AYP targets in 2011. See [Table 7](#).
- Schools receiving Title I funds meet their AYP targets at a lower rate than schools that do not receive Title I funds. In 2011, 35 percent of all elementary schools made their AYP targets compared to 27 percent of Title I elementary schools. See [Table 7](#).

### Summary of 2011–12 PI Results

- Schools that receive Title I funds are identified for PI if they miss AYP in the same content area (ELA or mathematics) or for the same indicator (API or graduation rate) for two consecutive years. Once identified for PI, a school advances to the next year each time it misses AYP. More information about how schools are identified for PI can be found on the Title I PI Status Determinations Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ay/tidetermine.asp>.
- PI for schools is designed on a five-year timeline. Schools in Year 1 of PI must offer students an option to attend a non-PI school in the same LEA with paid transportation. Schools in Year 2 of PI must also offer supplemental education services (SES) to eligible students. Additional information about the intervention activities associated with each year of PI can be found on the Program Improvement Web page at Program Improvement - Title I, Part A-Accountability.
- There were 6,157 schools with 2011 AYP data that received federal Title I funds in 2010–11.
- Of those schools, 3,892 or 63 percent of those are in PI in the following years:
  - Year 1 – 1,053
  - Year 2 – 614
  - Year 3 – 518
  - Year 4 – 249
  - Year 5 – 1,458
- Nine hundred and thirteen schools are being identified for PI for the first time in 2011–12 after missing AYP in 2010 and 2011. In addition, 254 schools advanced to Year 5 of PI. See Table 8 for a full summary.

- Schools exit from PI after making AYP for two consecutive years. In 2011, 85 schools exited from PI after making AYP in 2010 and 2011.
- An LEA (school district, county office of education, or statewide benefit charter) is identified for PI when, for each of two consecutive years, it misses AYP in the same content area (ELA or mathematics) LEA-wide or for any numerically significant subgroup, and does not meet AYP criteria in the same content area in each grade span (grades two-five, grades six-eight, and grade ten), or does not make AYP on the same indicator (API or graduation rate) LEA-wide.
- PI for LEAs is on a three-year timeline. Information about the requirements of each PI year can be found on the CDE PI Web page.
- In 2010–11, 931 LEAs received federal Title I funds.
- Of those LEAs, 445 or 47.8 percent were identified for PI for the 2011–12 school year in the following years:
  - Year 1 – 100
  - Year 2 – 59
  - Year 3 – 286
- A database of all 2010–11 Title I schools and LEAs along with their PI status (in PI/not in PI) and their PI Year (1 through 5 for schools and 1 through 3 for LEAs) can be found on the CDE Title I PI Status Data Files Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ay/tidatafiles.asp>
- In addition, a database of schools and LEAs at risk for being identified for PI in 2012–13 will be available soon on the CDE Title I PI Status Data Files Web page listed above. Schools and LEAs at risk for PI identification missed AYP in 2011.

## Statewide Accountability

### Academic Performance Index (API) 2011 Growth Results

**Table 1**  
**Percentage of Schools At or Above Target of 800 on Growth API Scores, 2002–11**

School Type	2001–02	2002–03	2003–04	2004–05	2005–06	2006–07	2007–08	2008–09	2009–10	2010–11
Elementary	23%	26%	27%	32%	35%	36%	41%	48%	51%	55%
Middle	16%	14%	18%	21%	24%	25%	30%	36%	40%	43%
High	6%	7%	8%	12%	14%	15%	17%	21%	25%	28%
All Schools	20%	21%	23%	27%	30%	31%	36%	42%	46%	49%

Note: Table excludes schools in the Alternative Schools Accountability Model (ASAM), special education schools, and schools with fewer than 100 valid scores.

**Table 2**  
**API Growth by Student Group Statewide, 2010–11**

Type	2010 State Base API	2011 State Growth API	2010–11 API Point Growth
Statewide	767	778	11
Black or African American	686	696	10
American Indian or Alaska Native	728	733	5
Asian	890	898	8
Filipino	851	859	8
Hispanic or Latino	715	729	14
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	753	763	10
White	838	845	7
Two or More Races	808	836	28
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	712	726	14
English Learners	692	706	14
Students with Disabilities	580	595	15

**Table 3**  
**Elementary School API Growth by Student Group Statewide, 2010–11**

Type	2010 State Base API	2011 State Growth API	2010–11 API Point Growth
Statewide	800	808	8
Black or African American	732	738	6
American Indian or Alaska Native	753	763	10
Asian	911	918	7
Filipino	880	886	6
Hispanic or Latino	752	763	11
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	792	800	8
White	868	873	5
Two or More Races	862	871	9
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	748	758	10
English Learners	743	756	13
Students with Disabilities	648	662	14

**Table 4**  
**Middle School API Growth by Student Group Statewide, 2010–11**

Type	2010 State Base API	2011 State Growth API	2010–11 API Point Growth
Statewide	765	778	13
Black or African American	677	692	15
American Indian or Alaska Native	719	730	11
Asian	905	913	8
Filipino	863	871	8
Hispanic or Latino	706	724	18
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	756	768	12
White	842	850	8
Two or More Races	814	837	23
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	702	719	17
English Learners	668	680	12
Students with Disabilities	544	566	22

**Table 5**  
**High School API Growth by Student Group Statewide, 2010–11**

Type	2010 State Base API	2011 State Growth API	2010–11 API Point Growth
Statewide	729	742	13
Black or African American	638	650	12
American Indian or Alaska Native	703	703	0
Asian	856	866	10
Filipino	812	824	12
Hispanic or Latino	672	688	16
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	706	720	14
White	801	810	9
Two or More Races	747	786	39
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	668	684	16
English Learners	627	640	13
Students with Disabilities	494	501	7

**Federal Accountability: 2011 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)**

**Table 6**  
**School Percent Proficient Targets for AYP, 2010 and 2011**

School Type	2010 English-Language Arts	2011 English-Language Arts	2010 Mathematics	2011 Mathematics
Elementary and Middle Schools	56.8%	67.6%	58.0%	68.5%
High Schools	55.6%	66.7%	54.8%	66.1%

**Table 7**  
**Percentage of All Schools and of Title I Schools Making AYP, 2010 and 2011**

School Type	2010 All Schools	2011 All Schools	2010 Title I-Funded Schools Only	2011 Title I-Funded Schools Only
Elementary Schools	40%	35%	31%	27%
Middle Schools	26%	18%	19%	12%
High Schools	42%	41%	36%	37%
Total Number of Schools	9,852	9,858	6,128	6,157

Note: The number of Title I schools statewide for 2011 was taken from the 2010–11 Consolidated Application, Part 2. The number of Title I schools statewide for 2010 was updated using the 2010–11 Consolidated Application, Part 1, that each LEA is responsible for completing annually.

**Federal Accountability: 2011-12 Program Improvement (PI)**

**Table 8  
2011-12 Title I PI Status Statewide Summary of Schools**

Year	New	Remain	Total	Exit
Year 1	913*	140	1,053	29
Year 2	499	115	614	9
Year 3	473	45	518	9
Year 4	207	42	249	13
Year 5	254	1,204**	1,458	25
Total	2,346	1,546	3,892	85

\* These schools were newly identified for PI in 2011-12.

\*\* The federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) does not allow for a school PI designation beyond Year 5. Of the 1,458 schools in Year 5 of PI, 1,204 schools have been identified for PI for at least six years.

**Table 9  
2011-12 Title I PI Status Statewide Summary of LEAs**

Year	New	Remain	Total	Exit
Year 1	95*	5	100	0
Year 2	58	1	59	1
Year 3	55	231**	286	0
Total	208	237	445	1

\*These LEAs were newly identified for PI in 2011-12.

\*\* ESEA does not allow for an LEA PI designation beyond Year 3. Of the 286 LEAs in Year 3 of PI, 231 LEAs have been identified for PI for at least four years.



# **California State Board of Education**

**Meeting Agenda Items for September 7-8, 2011**

## **ITEM 15 ADDENDUM**

## ITEM ADDENDUM

**DATE:** August 31, 2011

**TO:** MEMBERS, State Board of Education

**FROM:** TOM TORLAKSON, State Superintendent of Public Instruction

**SUBJECT:** Item 15 – Standardized Testing and Reporting Program: Approval of California Modified Assessment Proposed Performance Standards Setting for English-Language Arts in Grade Ten and Eleven and Geometry and to Conduct the Regional Public Hearings.

### Summary of Key Issues

The California Department of Education (CDE) recommends that the State Board of Education (SBE) approve the State Superintendent of Public Instruction's (SSPI's) proposed performance standards (levels) for the California Modified Assessment (CMA) for English-language arts (ELA) in grades ten and eleven and Geometry.

The standard setting panel's recommendation is the product of a process that involves a teacher-group's professional judgment in setting recommended cuts to an ordered item book (e.g., bookmark method). The CDE takes the professional judgments of the group and modifies the recommended cut scores to be consistent with the SBE approved performance levels that have already been established for the other grades. The modification ensures that the effort that it takes a student to reach established performance levels will be consistent from grade to grade.

The CDE also recommends that the SBE direct CDE and SBE staff to conduct regional public hearings on the proposed performance standards (levels) for the CMA for ELA in grades ten and eleven and Geometry to be brought to the SBE in November 2011 for adoption; in compliance with California *Education Code (EC)* Section 60605 requiring the SBE to adopt statewide performance standards (levels).

### Attachment(s)

Attachment 1: State Superintendent of Public Instruction's Recommendations for the Proposed Performance Standards (Levels) for the California Modified Assessment (2 Pages).

Attachment 2: Standard Setting Panel's Recommendations for the Proposed Performance Standards (Levels) for the California Modified Assessment (2 Pages).

## State Superintendent of Public Instruction’s Recommendations for the Proposed Performance Standards (Levels) for the California Modified Assessment

To be used in reporting the results of the California Modified Assessment  
for English-language arts (grades 10 and 11), spring 2011 administration and thereafter

Grade Level	Far Below Basic			Below Basic			Basic			Proficient			Advanced		
	% Students	Raw Cut Score*	% at or above	% Students	Raw Cut Score*	% at or above	% Students	Raw Cut Score*	% at or above	% Students	Raw Cut Score*	% at or above	% Students	Raw Cut Score*	% at or above
<b>10</b>	22.1	<b>&lt;23</b>	100	37.4	<b>23</b>	77.9	23.5	<b>31</b>	40.4	13	<b>38</b>	17	4.0	<b>45</b>	4.0
	Range 0 – 22			Range 23 – 30			Range 31 – 37			Range 38 – 44			Range 45 – 60		
<b>11</b>	31.4	<b>&lt;23</b>	100	37.3	<b>23</b>	68.6	20.9	<b>30</b>	31.3	8.0	<b>37</b>	10.4	2.3	<b>44</b>	2.3
	Range 0 – 22			Range 23 – 29			Range 30 – 36			Range 37 – 43			Range 44 – 60		

Percent of students	Percent of students statewide who would be placed at this performance standard (level) on the basis of the results of the 2011 administration.
Raw cut score	Minimum raw score needed to achieve this performance standard (level) on the 2011 administration of tests.
Percent at or above	Percent of students statewide who would be at or above this performance standard (level) on the basis of the results of the 2011 administration.

*NOTE:* The California Modified Assessment for English-language arts (grades 10 and 11) has 60 items.

*EXAMPLES OF HOW TO READ THIS CHART:* (1) Students with a raw score of less than 23 would be designated as far below basic.  
(2) Raw scores of at least 49 in grade 10 and 44 in grade 11 would be designated as advanced.

\*For future administrations, raw cut scores will be expressed in the corresponding scale scores.

## State Superintendent of Public Instruction's Recommendations for the Proposed Performance Standards (Levels) for the California Modified Assessment

To be used in reporting the results of the California Modified Assessment  
for Geometry, spring 2011 administration and thereafter

Grade Level	Far Below Basic			Below Basic			Basic			Proficient			Advanced		
	% Students	Raw Cut Score*	% at or above	% Students	Raw Cut Score*	% at or above	% Students	Raw Cut Score*	% at or above	% Students	Raw Cut Score*	% at or above	% Students	Raw Cut Score*	% at or above
<b>GEO</b>	23.5	<b>&lt;23</b>	100	41.3	<b>23</b>	76.5	24.1	<b>31</b>	35.2	9.1	<b>40</b>	11.1	2.0	<b>49</b>	2.0
	Range 0 – 22			Range 23 – 30			Range 31 – 39			Range 40 – 48			Range 49 – 60		

Percent of students	Percent of students statewide who would be placed at this performance standard (level) on the basis of the results of the 2011 administration.
Raw cut score	Minimum raw score needed to achieve this performance standard (level) on the 2011 administration of tests.
Percent at or above	Percent of students statewide who would be at or above this performance standard (level) on the basis of the results of the 2011 administration.

*NOTE:* The California Modified Assessment for Geometry has 60 items.

*EXAMPLES OF HOW TO READ THIS CHART:* (1) Students with a raw score of less than 23 would be designated as far below basic.  
(2) Raw scores of at least 49 would be designated as advanced.

\*For future administrations, raw cut scores will be expressed in the corresponding scale scores.

## Standard Setting Panel’s Recommendations for the Proposed Performance Standards (Levels) for the California Modified Assessment

To be used in reporting the results of the California Modified Assessment  
for English-language arts (grades 10 and 11), spring 2011 administration and thereafter

Grade Level	Far Below Basic			Below Basic			Basic			Proficient			Advanced		
	% Students	Raw Cut Score*	% at or above	% Students	Raw Cut Score*	% at or above	% Students	Raw Cut Score*	% at or above	% Students	Raw Cut Score*	% at or above	% Students	Raw Cut Score*	% at or above
<b>10</b>	<b>&lt;23</b>		100	51.9	<b>23</b>	77.9	13.6	<b>35</b>	25.9	4.0	<b>40</b>	12.3	8.3	<b>42</b>	8.3
	Range 0 – 22			Range 23 – 34			Range 35 – 39			Range 40 – 41			Range 42 – 60		
<b>11</b>	<b>&lt;23</b>		100	51.3	<b>23</b>	68.6	11.7	<b>34</b>	17.3	2.7	<b>40</b>	5.6	2.9	<b>43</b>	2.9
	Range 0 – 22			Range 23 – 33			Range 34 – 39			Range 40 – 42			Range 43 – 60		

Percent of students	Percent of students statewide who would be placed at this performance standard (level) on the basis of the results of the 2011 administration.
Raw cut score	Minimum raw score needed to achieve this performance standard (level) on the 2011 administration of tests.
Percent at or above	Percent of students statewide who would be at or above this performance standard (level) on the basis of the results of the 2011 administration.

*NOTE:* The California Modified Assessment for English-language arts (grades 10 and 11) has 60 items.

*EXAMPLES OF HOW TO READ THIS CHART:* (1) Students with a raw score of less than 23 would be designated as far below basic.  
(2) Raw scores of at least 42 in grade 10 and 43 in grade 11 would be designated as advanced.

\*For future administrations, raw cut scores will be expressed in the corresponding scale scores.

## Standard Setting Panel's Recommendations for the Proposed Performance Standards (Levels) for the California Modified Assessment

To be used in reporting the results of the California Modified Assessment  
for Geometry, spring 2011 administration and thereafter

Grade Level	Far Below Basic			Below Basic			Basic			Proficient			Advanced		
	% Students	Raw Cut Score*	% at or above	% Students	Raw Cut Score*	% at or above	% Students	Raw Cut Score*	% at or above	% Students	Raw Cut Score*	% at or above	% Students	Raw Cut Score*	% at or above
<b>GEO</b>	23.5	<b>&lt;23</b>	100	52.0	<b>23</b>	76.5	11.6	<b>34</b>	24.4	6.4	<b>39</b>	12.8	6.4	<b>43</b>	6.4
	Range 0 – 22			Range 23 – 33			Range 34 – 38			Range 39 – 42			Range 43 – 60		

Percent of students	Percent of students statewide who would be placed at this performance standard (level) on the basis of the results of the 2011 administration.
Raw cut score	Minimum raw score needed to achieve this performance standard (level) on the 2011 administration of tests.
Percent at or above	Percent of students statewide who would be at or above this performance standard (level) on the basis of the results of the 2011 administration.

*NOTE:* The California Modified Assessment for Geometry has 60 items.

*EXAMPLES OF HOW TO READ THIS CHART:* (1) Students with a raw score of less than 23 would be designated as far below basic.  
(2) Raw scores of at least 43 would be designated as advanced.

\*For future administrations, raw cut scores will be expressed in the corresponding scale scores.