



California Practitioners Advisory Group Meeting

Analysis, Measurement, and Accountability Reporting Division October 13, 2016



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Agenda

Item 3:

- Update on the College/Career Indicator (CCI)
- Update on the Academic Indicator
- Review Cut Points for the Academic Indicator



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Purpose and Goal

- The purpose of this presentation is to:
 - Provide the California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG) with updates on the CCI and Academic Indicator since the June CPAG meeting.
 - Obtain feedback from the CPAG regarding the proposed Academic Indicator cut points. Input obtained from this meeting will be taken to the State Board of Education (SBE).



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Update on the College/Career Indicator



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

CPAG Feedback

- At the June 2016 CPAG meeting, the CDE provided CPAG members with a methodology for calculating the CCI.
- CPAG members:
 - Supported including the CCI as a state indicator



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

CPAG Feedback (Cont.)

- Supported the CCI methodology
- Expressed the importance of using multiple measures
- Expressed concern regarding the ability for special education students to demonstrate progress, specifically those with the most severe cognitive disabilities
- Recommended a review of the criteria for the four CCI performance levels.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Revisions to the CCI

- Since the June CPAG meeting, the CDE:
 - Held two statewide Stakeholder Webinars (in July 2016) and polled the participants to obtain feedback on the CCI criteria for each level.
 - Reviewed the polling results with the Technical Design Group (TDG) at their August 2016 meeting and revised the placement of measures across the CCI performance levels.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Revisions to the CCI (Cont.)

- Removed students with the most severe cognitive disabilities (i.e., students who take the California Alternate Assessment) from the calculation of the CCI.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Revisions to the CCI (Cont.)

- Temporarily reduced the number of performance levels from four to three. Originally the CCI Model had four performance levels with the “Well Prepared” level as the highest performance level. This level was removed until more robust, valid, and reliable statewide career data becomes available at the student level.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Revisions to the CCI (Cont.)

- Handouts 2 and 3 reflect the updated CCI Model. Both handouts **contain the same information** except that:
 - Handout 2 is in table format and provides more detailed information.
 - Handout 3 is in graphic format.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

CCI Formula

*Students Who Meet the CCI
Benchmark of "Prepared"*

divided by

Current Year Graduation Cohort



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

SBE Decisions on the CCI

- At the September 2016 SBE meeting, the SBE approved the CCI based on the CDE's recommended revisions (as described in the prior slides) and cut points for Status and Change.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

SBE Decisions on the CCI (Cont.)

- For the initial release of the CCI (2016–17), the SBE approved that the performance categories (or colors) be based on **Status only** using data from the graduating class of 2014.
- Recall that at the July 2016 meeting, the SBE approved moving the grade 11 Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments from the Academic Indicator to the CCI.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

SBE Decisions on the CCI (Cont.)

- Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments were included in the CCI because all students are required to take the assessment. Thereby, providing all students with an opportunity to demonstrate postsecondary readiness.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

CCI Implementation Timeline

- The Class of 2016 will be the first graduating class to have Smarter Balanced assessment results (i.e., 2016 graduates took the grade 11 assessment in 2015).
- As a result, the 2017–18 CCI will also be based on **Status Only**.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

CCI Implementation Timeline (Cont.)

- Status and Growth will be calculated for the first time in 2018–19:
 - **Class of 2016**—took Smarter Balanced assessments in the Spring of 2015
 - **Class of 2017**—took the Smarter Balanced assessments in the spring of 2016



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

The Academic Indicator



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

June CPAG Meeting

- When the Academic Indicator was presented at the June 2016 CPAG meeting, only one year of Smarter Balanced Assessment results were available (i.e., 2015 results). Therefore, a Change level could not be considered at that time.
- As a result, performance categories (or colors) were based on **Status only**.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

CPAG Feedback

- At the June meeting, CPAG members expressed concern over using “proficient and above” as the basis for determining performance for the Academic Indicator and suggested that scale scores be used.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Updates to the Academic Indicator

- The CDE is currently working with the TDG and our test vendor to explore multiple options to incorporate scale scores in the Academic Indicator for the 2017–18 release of the evaluation rubrics.
- The CDE will provide updates to the CPAG at future meetings and will bring recommended revisions to the SBE in May 2017.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Updates to the Academic Indicator (Cont.)

- Now that the 2016 Smarter Balanced assessment results are available, the CDE can pursue the development of a student-level growth model.
- The first step in the development of a student-level growth model is to obtain direction from the SBE on a framework.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Growth Model

- The CDE is planning to present options for the growth model framework to the SBE in July 2017.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Growth Model (Cont.)

- Between January and July 2017, the CDE will work with the TDG and test vendor to develop options for the growth model framework.
- In addition, the CDE will seek input from CPAG and a number of external groups.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Academic Indicator Proposed Cut Points for Status and Change



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Cut Points for Status and Change

- With the 2016 Smarter Balanced assessment results available, the SBE directed the CDE (at its September 2016 meeting) to bring recommended Status and Change cut points to the SBE in November 2016.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Cut Points for Status and Change (Cont.)

- Consistent with how the cut points were determined and applied for the majority of other state indicators, LEA-level data were used to set cut points. These cut points will be applied to all LEAs and traditional schools.

Note: The SBE had directed the CDE to develop an alternate accountability system for alternative schools. Therefore, alternative school data was excluded from the data used to set cut points.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Proposed ELA Status Cut Points

***ELA Status:** The following table provides the proposed cut points for each level:

ELA Status Level	ELA Status Cut Point
Very Low	Proficiency rate is less than 20%
Low	Proficiency rate is 20% to less than 51%
Median	Proficiency rate is 51% to less than 60%
High	Proficiency rate is 60% to less than 75%
Very High	Proficiency rate is 75% or greater

*English
Language Arts

Proposed ELA Status Cut Points (Cont.)



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Percentile s	% Proficient	Status Level
5	19.1200	Very Low
5.8	20.0000	Low
10	24.7000	
15	28.2800	
20	31.3000	
25	33.7000	
30	35.8000	
35	38.1000	
40	40.4800	
45	43.0000	
50	45.4000	
55	47.8000	
60	50.5200	Medium
60.8	51.0000	
65	53.5800	
70	56.9000	High
74.7	60.0000	
75	60.3000	
80	63.1600	
85	67.5000	
90	72.9800	Very High
91.8	75.0000	

Total Number of Districts = 1,691



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Proposed Math Status Cut Points

Math Status: The following table provides the proposed cut points for each level:

Math Status Level	Math Status Cut Point
Very Low	Proficiency rate is less than 15%
Low	Proficiency rate is 15% to less than 40%
Median	Proficiency rate is 40% to less than 51%
High	Proficiency rate is 51% to less than 70%
Very High	Proficiency rate is 70% or greater



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Proposed Math Status Cut Points (Cont.)

Percentiles	% Proficient	Status Level
5	10.4500	Very Low
9.8	15.0000	Low
10	15.2000	
15	18.0500	
20	20.7000	
25	23.0000	
30	25.2000	
35	27.2000	
40	29.4000	
45	31.7000	
50	34.2000	
55	37.0500	
60	39.8000	
61.3	40.0000	Medium
65	42.4500	
70	45.8000	
75	50.0000	
76.4	51.0000	High
80	54.1000	
85	59.4500	
90	64.6000	
92.9	70.0000	Very High
95	74.5000	

Total Number of
Districts = 1,689



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Proposed ELA Change Cut Points

Change: The following table provides the proposed cut points for each Change level:

Change Level	Change Cut Point
Declined Significantly	Proficiency rate declined by more than 5%
Declined	Proficiency rate declined by 1% to 5%
Maintained	Declined or increased by more than 1% to less than 2%
Increased	Proficiency rate increased by 2% to less than 5%
Increased Significantly	Proficiency rate increased by 5% or more



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Proposed ELA Change Cut Points (Cont.)

Percentiles	% Change from Prior Year to Current Year	Change Level
5	-6.7000	Declined Significantly
6.9	-5.0000	Declined
10	-3.2000	
15	-1.4000	
16.5	-1.0000	
20	-.1000	Maintained
25	.8750	
30	1.6000	
32.6	2.0000	Increased
35	2.3000	
40	2.9000	
45	3.5000	
50	4.0000	
55	4.5050	
59.3	5.0000	Increased Significantly
60	5.1000	
65	5.8000	
70	6.5000	
75	7.2000	
80	8.1000	
85	9.5000	
90	11.5000	
95	15.8000	

Total Number of
Districts = 1,670



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Proposed Math Change Cut Points

Change: The following table provides the proposed cut points for each Change level:

Change Level	Change Cut Point
Declined Significantly	Proficiency rate declined by more than 5%
Declined	Proficiency rate declined by 1% to 5%
Maintained	Declined or increased by more than 1% to less than 2%
Increased	Proficiency rate increased by 2% to less than 5%
Increased Significantly	Proficiency rate increased by 5% or more



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Proposed Math Change Cut Points (Cont.)

Percentiles	% Change from Prior Year to Current Year	Change Level
5	-7.2000	Declined Significantly
7.7	-5.0000	Declined
10	-3.8100	
15	-2.0000	
19.8	-1.0000	
20	-.9000	Maintained
25	.1000	
30	.8000	
35	1.4000	
40	1.9000	
41.1	2.0000	
45	2.5000	
50	3.0000	
55	3.4000	
60	3.9000	
65	4.5000	
69.2	5.0000	Improved Significantly
70	5.2000	
75	5.9000	
80	7.0000	
85	8.1000	
90	9.7000	
95	13.3550	

Total Number of
Districts = 1,668



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

ELA Statewide Summary Results

	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
ALL Districts* (1,587)	102 (6.4%)	263 (16.6%)	692 (43.6%)	283 (17.8%)	247 (15.6%)
ALL SCHOOLS* (7,184)	471 (6.6%)	1,365 (19.0%)	3,037 (42.3%)	1,159 (16.1%)	1,152 (16.0%)

See Handouts 8

See Handout 10 and 11 for student group results.

* Alternative schools, county offices of education, and schools with less than 30 enrolled students were excluded from the count.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Math Statewide Summary Results

	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
ALL Districts* (1,586)	144 (9.1%)	374 (23.6%)	559 (35.3%)	287 (18.1%)	222 (14.0%)
ALL SCHOOLS* (7,182)	720 (10.0%)	1643 (22.9%)	2463 (34.3%)	1191 (16.6%)	1165 (16.2%)

See Handout 9

See Handouts 10 and 11 for student group results.

* Alternative schools, county offices of education, and schools with less than 30 enrolled students were excluded from the count.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Discussion Questions

- Is the Red performance category, which will trigger interventions for schools, and possibly for LEAs (starting in 2017–18), appropriately set for LEAs and traditional schools?
 - **ELA:** Less than 20%
 - **Math:** Less than 15%



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Discussion Questions (Cont.)

- Is the Green performance category, which establishes a statewide goal, appropriate for all LEAs and traditional schools?
 - **ELA: 60%**
 - **Math: 51%**



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Comments And/Or Questions?