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# **MEMORANDUM**

**DATE:** December 9, 2019

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

**FROM:** TONY THURMOND, State Superintendent of Public Instruction

**SUBJECT:** California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress 2019 Independent Evaluation Report.

## Summary of Key Issues

As part of the continuous improvement efforts of the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) System, the California Department of Education (CDE) contracts with an independent evaluator to provide ongoing review and feedback on aspects of the system pursuant to California *Education Code* (*EC*) Section 60649. The Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO) has completed its annual report on evaluation activities, the *CAASPP 2019 Independent Evaluation Report*, and an executive summary of the report is attached.

### Purpose of the Studies

The law establishing the CAASPP System includes a requirement for an independent evaluation (*EC* Section 60649). The purpose of the evaluation is to support the continuous improvement of the assessments developed and administered pursuant to *EC* Section 60640, recommending the inclusion of “a variety of internal and external studies such as validity studies, alignment studies, and studies evaluating test fairness, testing accommodations, testing policies, and reporting procedures, and consequential validity studies specific to pupil populations such as English learners and pupils with disabilities.” The evaluation also provides critical evidence in support of California’s submission for federal assessment peer review.

The CDE contracted with HumRRO in July 2018 to conduct an independent three-year evaluation of the CAASPP, the second such contract since the implementation of the CAASPP System. The scope of the current independent evaluation is to conduct three research studies through December 2020 and to provide objective technical advice and consultation on activities related to the implementation of specific components of the CAASPP System. HumRRO produces annual evaluation reports that summarize all work completed during the previous year, stand-alone reports for individual research studies, and a comprehensive final report. The second report in this series, the *CAASPP 2019 Independent Evaluation Report*, will be posted in December 2019 on the CAASPP Technical Reports and Studies web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ca/caaspprptstudies.asp>.

This annual report describes the activities HumRRO conducted during the 2018−19 school year for each of the following studies:

* Impact on Instruction and Student Learning Case Study (year one complete)
* California Science Test Alignment Study (in progress)
* California Alternate Assessment for Science Alignment Study (in progress)

The executive summary of the report is provided as Attachment 1. Future reports will be provided to the California State Board of Education as they become available.

## Attachment(s)

* Attachment 1: Executive Summary of the *California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress 2019 Independent Evaluation Report* (12 Pages)

# **Executive Summary of the *California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress 2019 Independent Evaluation Report***

## Executive Summary

Pursuant to California *Education Code* (*EC*) Section 60649, the Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO) is continuing its independent evaluation of the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) System. The scope of the current evaluation is to conduct three research studies from July 2018 through December 2020 and provide objective technical advice and consultation on activities related to the implementation of specific components of the CAASPP.

The 2018–20 CAASPP Evaluation Plan is presented in HumRRO’s publicly available *2018 CAASPP Evaluation Report* (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ca/documents/caaspp18evalrpt.pdf>). The report consists of the CAASPP System’s theory of action (CDE, 2018a) and detailed plans for each evaluation study. The plan also includes a timeline for major study milestones; the timeline is based on CDE priorities and the anticipated dates of operational administration of assessments.

This annual report covers the activities HumRRO conducted during the 2018−19 school year for each of the following studies:

* Impact on Instruction and Student Learning Case Study (hereafter, Impact Case Study)
* California Science Test (CAST) Alignment Study
* California Alternate Assessment (CAA) for Science Alignment Study

The multiple systems that form the California assessment environment are complex. Across the state, local educational agencies (LEAs), schools, and teachers continue to implement the various components of the expanded CAASPP System, which now includes two new science tests (the CAST became operational in 2018–19, and the CAA for Science will become operational in 2019–20); the new English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (operational as of 2017–18); and the California Spanish Assessment (operational as of 2018–19). The CDE, its testing contractors, and the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium continue to enhance the Smarter Balanced components.

The CAASPP System includes assessments as well as resources to help teachers, administrators, students, and parents prepare for the assessments and understand subsequent results. HumRRO’s Impact Case Study addresses three well-established Smarter Balanced components: Summative and Interim Assessments for English language arts/literacy (ELA) and mathematics, and the Digital Library (DL). The two alignment studies address the newest CAASPP components, the CAST and the CAA for Science. This executive summary provides an overview of each study, detailing progress made to date in terms of data collection, data analysis, and summarization of findings and recommendations. HumRRO will complete year two of the Impact Case Study, both alignment studies, and reports on each study during the remainder of the contract.

### Impact Case Study

#### Overview

According to the CAASPP program theory of action, the Smarter Balanced components—working together to accurately assess student achievement relative to grade-level curriculum standards, the Common Core State Standards (CCSS)—provide information to educators to improve instruction and thus improve student achievement. The first year of the Impact Case Study examined LEAs that are implementing Smarter Balanced Interim Assessment Blocks (IABs) for ELA or mathematics (in addition to the mandated summative assessments) to explore how the theory of action may be driving efforts to improve student achievement.

HumRRO employed a case-study approach during the first year of this two-year study. HumRRO defined a case as an LEA that had at least a modest threshold of use of the Smarter Balanced IABs in 2017–18 and planned to continue its use during 2018–19. During the 2018–19 school year, HumRRO collaborated with seven LEAs, including one direct-funded charter, encompassing 19 schools.

The primary goal of the Impact Case Study is to elicit concrete examples of how and why specific CAASPP components (i.e., Smarter Balanced components for ELA and mathematics) are used, their impact on instruction and student learning, and the perceived benefits, strengths, and challenges of using the components. For this first year of the study, the evidence we collected about “impact” was related mostly to policies and practices for implementing CAASPP components. The very specific group of LEAs, schools, and educators that participated in our study provided very few examples of impacts on student learning, and the impacts on instruction we identify are not generalizable beyond our small sample. However, we feel the information from this first year is meaningful for the CDE and for LEAs as they consider how CAASPP components can be used in combination with other resources and what aspects might need to be improved. Chapter 2 presents the 13 research questions addressed by this study; descriptions of the LEA sample selection, data collection activities, and data analysis methods; and overall findings across LEAs, by research question. Appendices present in-depth and summary findings, by LEA.

#### Summary of Findings

This section provides a high-level summary of the findings (across the sample of LEAs and schools in the study) associated with the use of three well-established Smarter Balanced components: summative assessments; interim assessments (IAs), which include shorter Interim Assessment Blocks (IABs) and longer Interim Comprehensive Assessments (ICAs), and the DL.

##### ***Summative Assessments***

School staff participating in the study reviewed summative assessment data from the prior year (2017–18) during the first semester of the 2018–19 school year. Some schools reviewed data as a school-wide team early in the year, while other schools did not do so until November or December. Delays in review of data were due to decisions made at the district level or confusion about the allowable uses of preliminary results. However, when scores were made available to districts in the Online Reporting System (ORS) in June 2018, the Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction’s letter to LEAs specifically stated the ORS results were not embargoed and encouraged use of the early results to inform educational programs and support local planning around the improvement of teaching and learning. The degree to which data were reviewed and used varied among schools. Almost all school leaders and teachers at the elementary and middle schools reviewed grade-level results of the percentage of students who fell into each overall achievement level for ELA and mathematics. Many also reviewed results by claim, and a few accessed target reports. Some teachers in our study had trouble recalling anything about the prior year’s summative assessment scores and thus did not describe how the results influenced instructional activities. In contrast, some schools described how summative assessment scores were a central piece of evidence for identifying annual achievement goals, and in some cases the summative assessment scores influenced instructional foci and/or the selection of IABs to administer during 2018–19.

##### ***Interim Assessments***

IAs were used by all schools in the study except one high school. Some LEAs mandated IA use, either by indicating the minimum number of IABs and/or ICAs to be administered per subject and grade level, or by mandating the specific IABs to administer. Other LEAs allowed schools and/or individual teachers or teacher groups to make these decisions. In LEAs with mandates, teachers were allowed to administer additional IAs.

Many teachers felt IAs were beneficial for preparing their students for the content, rigor, item types, and technology they would face on the summative assessments. Teachers believed exposure via IAs would benefit students’ ability to demonstrate their knowledge and skills on the summative assessments. Some teachers saw additional benefits of IAs, finding them useful to identify gaps in student understanding and determine what content needed to be retaught. Some teachers chose to give the same IAB twice, as pre-test and post-test, to measure growth in student knowledge, though the CDE advises LEAs to be cautious in interpreting the results when IAs are used in this manner. Other teachers gave IAs only because of LEA-level mandates. There were mixed feelings on the utility of the IA Reporting System. In some cases, especially when results were accessed through the LEA’s student information system, it seems teachers were not aware of the various features (e.g., reporting levels, item analysis, etc.) available to them through the IA Reporting System.

##### ***Digital Library***

The study schools reported extremely limited use of DL resources. Most teachers were aware of the resources and had logged directly into the DL at least once; however, teachers noted time constraints, accessibility of sufficient materials through their curriculum or other familiar sources, and difficulty navigating through the system as reasons they were not using the DL. Only two teachers across the entire study indicated the DL was beneficial for classroom instruction in 2018–19. HumRRO did not investigate teachers’ use of the alternate route to the DL resources via the IA Reporting System.

#### Summary of Best Practices

This section provides a high-level summary of a sample of the best practices evidenced among the collaborating LEAs and schools in response to the Impact Case Study research questions. The research questions addressed use of the three Smarter Balanced components studied (i.e., summative assessments, IAs, and the DL). For this report, HumRRO defined a “best practice” as an approach used by participating LEAs, schools, or teachers that (a) aligns well with the intended purpose of and guidance for implementing components within the CAASPP System and (b) resulted in educators having a positive experience using the CAASPP System to inform their teaching. We believe these practices may benefit other schools or LEAs, though we acknowledge there are multiple ways to achieve the goals of the CAASPP System. Additionally, schools and LEAs need to balance approaches to meet their available resources.

Across the studied LEAs and schools, HumRRO identified the following sample of best practices used by participating LEAs for successful implementation of the Smarter Balanced components:

* Provide support and training at the school and LEA levels for using CAASPP resources. Teachers and staff who attended CAASPP professional development or reviewed resources available online increased their comfort level with the CAASPP components, including hand scoring of IABs and using and interpreting assessment results.
* Provide leadership guidance and encouragement for using CAASPP components while allowing grade-level or content-area professional learning communities (PLCs) flexibility regarding what interim assessments and DL resources to incorporate into their classrooms.
* Facilitate school-wide data discussions to ensure teachers know how to access and interpret results, and how these data can inform instructional practices.
* Provide time and resources to support collaboration among grade-level and/or content-area PLCs to plan instruction and use formative assessments effectively.

#### Recommendations and Planned CAASPP System Improvements

HumRRO reviewed the full scope of study findings based on the perspective of the participants—a small number of teachers within a small number of schools in a small number of LEAs—to develop suggestions for the CDE to consider as part of its continuous improvement of the CAASPP System.

Based on the first-year findings across the case study LEAs, we offer the following recommendations. Some recommendations are already being addressed by enhancements the CDE will implement during the 2019–20 school year. Where applicable, recommendations are followed by brief descriptions of important CAASPP System improvements that will respond to areas of need described by LEA and school staff or observed by HumRRO.

**Recommendation 1: The CDE should continue providing regional training opportunities and updated online resources for LEA- and school-level staff.** The in-person trainings and CAASPP.org and CDE website resources are critical to helping educators throughout the state (a) accurately interpret Smarter Balanced summative and interim assessment results, (b) implement existing and new Smarter Balanced components, and (c) learn about enhancements to existing components.

Planned CAASPP System Improvements:

* The CDE will host a statewide 2019 California Assessment Conference in October 2019. The three-day conference will offer a variety of sessions for classroom educators to explore the connection between assessments and classroom instruction and to explore ways of using assessment resources for improved teaching and learning.
* Beginning September 3, 2019, educators will use a single username and password (i.e., single sign on) to access the various CAASPP and ELPAC online systems, including the Test Administrator Interface, Interim Assessment Systems (Viewing System, Hand Scoring System, and Reporting System), Online Reporting System (ORS), DL, and Practice and Training Tests.
* The CDE will release a new interface to the DL, currently referred to as the DL 2.0. The updated DL will address many of the concerns with the current DL. It is expected to be easy to use, will include step-by-step directions, and will be accessible (WCAG 2.1AA compliant). The DL 2.0 is being purposefully developed to align with Smarter Balanced grade-level claims and targets and provides options and ideas for differentiation and student access of content. Instructional resources will be embedded with the formative assessment process strategies. In addition, the DL 2.0 is aligned with new Smarter Balanced quality control criteria. Finally, the DL 2.0 resources will be specifically tied to Connections Playlists, tools that link interim assessment results with teaching resources in the Digital Library to help optimize student learning.

**Recommendation 2: Regarding interim assessments, the CDE should work with the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium to provide an expanded pool of ELA and mathematics tests, including multiple versions of existing IABs, ICAs for grades nine and ten, and shorter interim assessments that examine student achievement at the target level.** Teachers using the existing interim assessments find them of high quality and requested more options for tests for classroom use.

Planned CAASPP System Improvements:

* New Smarter Balanced ICAs in ELA and mathematics will be available for administration to students in grades nine and ten in 2019–20, with different cut points for each grade level.
* New Smarter Balanced Focused IABs will measure one to three targets compared to up to eight targets measured by the current IABs. These focused IABs will measure smaller bundles of content to (a) give teachers a better understanding of students’ knowledge and academic performance and (b) provide teachers with precise next steps for instruction. In addition to the more than 100 IABs already available to teachers, approximately 40 focused IABs are slated for release in 2019–20, followed by approximately 90 more over the following two school years.

Recommendation 3: Regarding the **hand scoring requirements of some interim assessments, the CDE should explore how to address concerns related to the challenges some LEAs and schools have finding time for training and hand scoring.** Some teachers in our sample who participated in hand scoring found it an excellent professional development activity, and others found instructional value in reviewing scored responses. However, constraints on time and resources often caused schools to decide against giving IABs that involve hand scoring.Perhaps the CDE could include an option for scoring via artificial intelligence techniques (currently in progress by Educational Testing Service, ETS). At the local level, support could take the form of (a) increasing the number of in-person hand-scoring training opportunities, (b) expanding the number of participants in such training, (c) providing teacher release time to engage in hand-scoring activities, or (d)sharing examples of teachers enthusiastic about their experiences with hand scoring (e.g., the CAASPP in Action series).

**Recommendation 4: The CDE should encourage LEA and school leaders to provide local training opportunities, including time and resources, to help teachers (a) accurately interpret Smarter Balanced summative and interim assessment results, (b) implement existing and new Smarter Balanced components, and (c) learn about enhancements to Smarter Balanced components.** LEA and school leadership receive CAASPP training on Smarter Balanced components, and sometimes these trainings are made available to teachers. However, many schools have not had the time to pass along information to all their staff. Some teachers had not tried logging on to the IA Reporting System since the many enhancements to it were launched in 2018–19. Most teachers in the small study sample had not explored the DL, often because they found logging on confusing or because they felt they had sufficient resources already. Teachers in the study who tried the DL noted frequently that navigation was difficult and time consuming, though some of these teachers may have been referring to earlier versions of the system before it was enhanced.

**Recommendation 5: The CDE should seek ways to streamline or provide additional guidance on rostering within the IA Reporting System, including recommendations regarding what access LEAs should be providing to their teachers.** Some CAASPP coordinators found the CAASPP rostering process to be cumbersome, and for one LEA there was confusion in 2017–18 that resulted in teachers not having student-level results. In addition, some teachers would like more access than they are currently provided by their school or LEA. Accessibility of IA report features at the educator level is dependent upon the creation of rosters by the coordinator. Teachers may benefit if their CAASPP coordinators are given more direction regarding what level of access they should provide their teachers.

### California Science Test Alignment Study

#### Overview

HumRRO’s alignment studies for the CAASPP evaluation are designed to gather evidence to help demonstrate the validity of intended interpretations and uses of the assessment scores. The CAST alignment study will evaluate how well the 2019 test items fully sample the construct represented by the associated content standards, the California Next Generation Science Standards (CA NGSS). That is, the alignment study will indicate whether the CAST effectively measures what it is intended to measure.

The CAST is a computer-based, fixed-form (non-adaptive) assessment administered to students in grades five, eight, and one time in high school (i.e., grade ten, eleven, or twelve). The CAST was administered operationally for the first time in January–July 2019. The assessment included three segments: Segment A, consisting of discrete items (e.g., selected-response, short constructed-response, technology enhanced items); Segment B, consisting of two performance tasks; and Segment C, consisting of field test items (discrete) or a performance task. The CAST alignment study is based on Segments A and B only because only Segments A and B were administered operationally in 2019.

HumRRO modified traditional alignment methods to account for CAST’s structure and design, a process in keeping with best practices in test validation that facilitates using alignment study results in an overall validity argument. This modified process also supports federal peer review goals. The CAST was developed to measure student achievement in the CA NGSS performance expectations (PEs), which are assessable statements of what students should know and be able to do. The three major components of the CA NGSS—Disciplinary Core Ideas (DCIs), Crosscutting Concepts (CCCs), and Science and Engineering Practices (SEPs)—are the dimensions that operationalize the PEs. Developing tests and test items that adequately sample such complex and integrated content as the CA NGSS is especially challenging. When an item measures a single standard or concept, the alignment process is relatively straightforward. However, test development and alignment become more complex when standards are designed as interactions among statements about the three dimensions of standards. HumRRO responded to these challenges with our study design, described in depth in the 2018–20 CAASPP Evaluation Plan.

To allow the CAST to address the full breadth of the CA NGSS, it was designed to rotate content across a three-year span, such that different content from the CA NGSS is sampled each year. Because HumRRO is conducting this alignment study after the first operational year of testing, it will not be possible to evaluate how well CAST addresses the full breadth of the content standards over three years. However, HumRRO will use the initial year’s data to estimate whether one administration can address roughly one-third of the intended PEs. If so, the three-year rotation is feasible as a sampling plan for addressing the full breadth of the CA NGSS.

The next sections describe activities conducted to date. Chapter 3 presents the study in greater depth, including the research questions and methods and activities conducted during 2018–19. Upon conclusion of the study in 2020, HumRRO will provide responses to the research questions in an alignment study report, which should guide future item development and provide validity evidence for the CAST suitable for submission for federal peer review under ESSA.

#### Progress Made to Date

##### ***Evaluation of CAST Contractor Documentation***

HumRRO conducted an initial review of contractor documentation to evaluate how alignment issues were considered during test development. This review was guided by the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (APA, AERA, NCME, 2014, hereafter referred to as the *Test Standards*). The *Test Standards* describe requirements for developing, reviewing, and piloting test items as well as requirements for documenting the processes used. In a draft report submitted to the CDE on January 24, 2019, HumRRO summarized preliminary findings based on the initial review of CAST documentation provided by the CDE and the testing contractor, ETS. Following that preliminary report, HumRRO requested additional documentation, which was provided by the testing contractor. HumRRO will review and evaluate the additional documentation and include these findings in the 2020 CAST alignment study report.

##### ***CAST Alignment Criteria***

HumRRO developed alignment criteria for the CAST study based on the Webb alignment method (1997, 1999, 2005), which includes the following four indicators: categorical concurrence, depth-of-knowledge consistency, range-of-knowledge correspondence, and balance-of-knowledge representation. While it was not appropriate to implement Webb’s alignment method for the CAST study, mainly because of the multidimensional nature of the content standards and the way the content is sampled across years, HumRRO did use Webb’s criteria to modify the method and develop criteria to judge alignment of the CAST.

HumRRO’s draft criteria were reviewed by staff from the National Center for Improvement in Educational Assessment (Center for Assessment) in January 2019. Reviewers offered several comments to clarify how the criteria would be communicated and operationalized for the study. The criteria were presented to the CDE and its CAASPP Technical Advisory Group (TAG) in February 2019 and finalized prior to the CAST alignment workshop.

##### ***Panel Evaluation of CAST Item Content***

HumRRO worked collaboratively with the CDE to recruit and select a group of 18 educators to serve on three CAST alignment review panels (one elementary, one middle, and one high school panel). Panelists were very familiar with the CA NGSS and were required to have at least three years of experience as California educators.

HumRRO conducted a two-day CAST Alignment Study Workshop in the Sacramento area on February 28–March 1, 2019. During the workshop, panels of educators evaluated how well each CAST item assessed the CA NGSS. The panelists made ratings regarding what content standards the items assessed, accounting for the three-dimensional nature of the CA NGSS. Panelists also rated each item according to its cognitive complexity requirements. Panels discussed discrepant ratings and reached clear consensus or near-consensus when they disagreed about ratings. HumRRO is analyzing the CAST alignment workshop data and will include outcomes in the 2020 CAST alignment study report.

### California Alternate Assessment for Science Alignment Study

#### Overview

The CAA for Science alignment study aims to provide validity evidence as a measure of science achievement for the population of students for which the assessment was designed. The CAA for Science is a fixed-form (non-adaptive) assessment administered to students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in accordance with each student’s active individualized education program (IEP). This group makes up approximately 1% of the total population of students in California. The CAA for Science is given in grades five, eight, and high school as three separate operational test sessions. Each session consists of one fixed-form embedded performance task (i.e., one for life sciences, one for physical sciences, and one for earth and space sciences). Each performance task includes 10 items and is intended to function similarly to an “end-of-instruction” test rather than an “end-of-year” summative assessment. The test is structured such that the first five items measure one standard and the last five items measure a second standard. The CAA will be administered operationally for the first time September 2019–July 2020.

The alignment study research questions and method were designed specifically to address the structure and design of the CAA for Science and the results to be reported. This study will focus on links between the Science Core Content Connectors (alternate achievement standards) and the test forms and items developed to assess them. The Science Core Content Connectors (hereafter referred to as “Science Connectors”) are based on the performance expectations of the CA NGSS, which also define the science construct(s) to be measured.

The next sections describe activities conducted to date. Chapter 4 presents the study in greater depth, including the research questions and methods and activities conducted during 2018–19. Upon conclusion of the study in 2020, HumRRO will provide responses to the research questions in an alignment study report, which should guide future item development and provide validity evidence for the CAA suitable for submission for federal peer review under ESSA.

#### Progress Made to Date

##### ***Coordination with CAA for Science Test Contractor and the CDE***

HumRRO’s project manager and the CAA for Science Alignment Study director met with staff from the testing contractor (ETS) for CAA for Science and CDE staff to coordinate study activities. Meeting participants discussed (a) HumRRO’s plans for data collection, (b) CAA for Science assessment materials (e.g., online test content, Directions for Administration, planning guides), (c) documentation needed from ETS and CDE, (d) estimates of dates when files would be available to HumRRO from ETS, and (e) panelist recruitment. Based on when ETS could provide all materials and process support for the alignment workshop, HumRRO scheduled the alignment workshop for November 2019.

##### ***Evaluation of CAA for Science Contractor Documentation***

Similar to the initial steps for the CAST Alignment Study, HumRRO requested contractor documentation for the CAA for Science and began reviewing the first submittals to evaluate how alignment issues were considered during test development. As for the CAST Alignment Study, the review of CAA for Science documentation is guided by the *Test Standards*. After initial review, HumRRO will produce a preliminary report of findings and identify any gaps in the documentation. HumRRO will follow up with the testing contractor to ask questions and request additional documentation until all *Test Standards* are independently rated. HumRRO will include findings from the CAA for Science alignment workshop in the 2020 CAA for Science alignment study report.

##### ***Preparing for the CAA for Science Alignment Workshop***

HumRRO is working collaboratively with the CDE contract monitor to recruit 18 educators to serve on three CAA for Science alignment review panels (one grade five, one grade eight, and one high school panel). Panelists are required to have a bachelor’s degree and experience as a California teacher, to include experience working with severely cognitively disabled students or students with mild to moderate disabilities. Ideally, most panelists will also have familiarity with the CA NGSS and the Science Connectors.

HumRRO secured a venue in the Sacramento area for the two-day workshop and began arranging lodging and travel for confirmed panelists and planning for all necessary materials, processes, and equipment.

### Summary and Next Steps

The first year of HumRRO’s Impact Case Study provided an in-depth look at how a modest number of diverse LEAs and schools are implementing Smarter Balanced components, especially the interim assessments. Overall findings indicate the IABs, which are high quality, CCSS-aligned online assessments, are still mainly used to prepare students for the rigor and format of the summative assessments. However, for the general education population of students, teachers are increasingly using IABs, along with other measures of student progress, in creative and effective ways to assist with instructional decisions, plans, and goals. The CDE and its vendors continue to make substantive improvements to the various components supporting the Smarter Balanced assessments; however, not all LEAs and schools are keeping current on the training and resources available to understand and use the enhanced features. We fully support the CDE’s continued efforts to implement solutions to areas identified for improvement, internally and by our independent evaluation, as the CAASPP System matures.

For the second year of the Impact Case Study, HumRRO will continue to focus on the Smarter Balanced components of the CAASPP System. For the most part, the same data collection activities will be conducted, although with a different group of LEAs and schools. HumRRO’s research will aim to learn how best to support teachers’ awareness of the full range of CAASPP components and what kinds of experiences teachers need to be able to implement the interim assessments and DL for instructional purposes. HumRRO’s progress on the CAST and CAA for Science alignment studies is on track for concluding the studies and producing their respective technical reports in 2020.