FR-05-43

HumRRO

Human Resources Research Organization

Independent Evaluation of the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE): 2005 Evaluation Report—Appendices A Through D

Volume 2

Lauress L. Wise
D. E. (Sunny) Becker
Carolyn DeMeyer Harris
Leslie R. Taylor
Christopher J. Johnstone [National Center for Educational Outcomes]
Nicole A. Miller [National Center for Educational Outcomes]
Sandra J. Thompson [National Center for Educational Outcomes]
Shaobang Sun
Xuejun Shen
Felicia L. Butler
Xiaolei Wang
Lisa E. Koger
Robin Moody
Richard Deatz
Milton Koger
Emily Dickinson
Sally Gensberg [Professional Management and Evaluation Services, Inc.]
Robert A. Hilton
Nelson L. Kelley
Christine Stevens

Prepared for: **California Department of Education**
Sacramento, CA
Contract Number: 00-07

September 30, 2005

66 Canal Center Plaza, Suite 400 • Alexandria, VA 22314 • 703.549.3611 • fax. 703.549.9025
www.humrro.org

Volume 2 – Appendices A Through D

Table of Contents

Appendix A: Data Collection Methods A-1
Methods A-1
Districts A-1
High Schools A-2
Feeder Middle Schools A-3
Monitoring Survey Response A-4
Processing Surveys A-5
Processing District Executive Summaries A-6
Site Visits A-7
Training A-7
Scheduling A-8
Site Visit Calling A-9
Site Visit Interview Coding A-10

Appendix B: Survey Instruments B-1
District ELA Curriculum Head B-3
District Mathematics Curriculum Head B-9
High School Principal B-15
High School Department Head—ELA, Part 1 ..... B-19
High School Department Head—Mathematics, Part 1 ..... B-27
High School Teacher, Part 2 ..... B-35
Middle School Principal B-41
Middle School Department Head/Lead Teacher—ELA, Part 1 ..... B-45
Middle School Department Head/Lead Teacher—Mathematics, Part 1 ..... B-53
Middle School Teacher, Part 2 ..... B-61

Appendix C: Interview Protocols C-1
Method C-1
Principal Interview Protocol C-3
General Education (Math/ELA) Interview Protocol C-9
English Learner Interview Protocol C-15
Special Education Interview Protocol C-19
Special Courses Interview Protocol—CAHSEE Remediation Course, CAHSEE Prep Course C-23
Program/Course Questions C-27
CAHSEE-2 Site Visit Protocols—Recommended “Short” Forms C-31
Protocol Crosswalk C-39

Table of Contents (Continued)

Appendix D: Item Review Forms..... D-1
CAHSEE Language Arts Blueprint*, Depth-of-Knowledge (DOK) Rating Sheet..... D-1
CAHSEE Mathematics Blueprint*, Depth-of-Knowledge (DOK) Rating Sheet..... D-11
CAHSEE English-Language Arts Item Rating Sheet..... D-23
CAHSEE Mathematics Item Rating Sheet..... D-27
Alignment Instructions and Definitions for English-Language Arts D-33
Alignment Instructions and Definitions for Mathematics D-37
Debriefing Survey CAHSEE Review Workshop 2005 ..... D-41
Research Supporting Considerations for Universally Designed Assessments D-45
Item Review Form & Whole Test Review Form D-51
Item Review Form D-53
Whole Test Review Form D-55

Appendix A: Data Collection Methods

Methods

HumRRO collected data on instruction related to the CAHSEE at the district, high school, and middle school levels. We used surveys at all levels. At the district level, we collected executive summaries that described instruction aligned to state standards. We conducted site visits at a sample of high schools and their feeder schools. The schedule provided for us to contact districts first, in February, asking them to provide related school information. Based on their responses, we would ship the high school and feeder middle school surveys. However, surveys were approved by CDE later than anticipated and a letter of endorsement from the state superintendent was delayed. Consequently materials were shipped later. We waited for two weeks following the district shipment and then shipped to the high schools. A mailing company in California shipped and tracked all original packages and school replacement packages of the 2005 Instruction Study via Federal Express. HumRRO shipped district replacement packages via Federal Express.

Districts

All 467 districts with high schools that have 10th grade and CAHSEE scores from a CDE 2004 database were included. Superintendents' names and their contact information were taken from another CDE database. The package sent to each superintendent was shipped around March 17, 2005 and contained the following:

- a cover letter describing the 2005 Instruction Study and its requirements;
- a letter from Deb Sigman, Director of the Standards and Assessment Division at CDE, encouraging each district superintendent to support the effort, which was substituted for the State Superintendent's letter;
- guidelines for writing a 2-page executive summary;
- a survey for the district English/ELA curriculum head;
- a survey for the district mathematics curriculum head;
- a FaxBack Form for updating contact information; and
- return FedEx shipping materials.

In addition, for districts that had one or more high schools from the selected sample of 400, the cover letter informed the superintendent of that part of the study. The FaxBack Form gave the school name and contact information and asked that the information be verified or corrected and faxed back to HumRRO. Superintendents were informed in general that some of the sampled high schools also were part of the sample of 50 schools selected for a site visit.

The FaxBack Form was the mechanism for identifying the intended sample of 200 feeder middle schools. Superintendents were asked to provide the school name and contact information—even when the feeder school was in a different district.

Because of the delay in shipping caused by late approval of the surveys and the State Superintendent's letter, we ran into unanticipated problems with spring break

schedules across the state. Most breaks were from one to two weeks (a few were longer) and occurred from March 21st–April 8th; although some spring breaks were also later in April. Since we could not begin contacting schools until after March 17th, these spring break schedules limited our ability to reach districts and schools in a timely manner.

In the first week after shipping the district materials, we realized that the listed due date for returning materials was not feasible. We also discovered that we did not include a blank diskette in the original shipment—as indicated in the cover letter. We mailed a letter correcting the due date and enclosing a blank diskette. Although this material was mailed to exactly the same list of superintendents as the original package, numerous telephone calls from people who ended up with the second package revealed that the second package did not always take the same path in a district as the original package. Consequently, we needed to re-ship the original materials to many districts. (See "Monitoring Survey Response" below for details.)

To help increase the district response rate to the surveys, e-mails were sent in the third week of April to district contacts, using e-mail addresses in the database augmented with e-mail addresses from the test developer (ETS) list and from Internet searches. The e-mail reminded the districts of the deadline and the procedures for responding. They were given instructions on what to do if they did not receive the survey package. We also made phone calls to schools in the second week of May to check on the status of surveys, answer questions, and encourage participation.

The expected endorsement letter from Superintendent Jack O'Connell had been delayed, but we were told it had been approved. On May 13th we sent a fax to all non-responding and non-returning districts stating that it was our understanding that they soon would receive such a letter and encouraged them to complete the district instruction study materials. It would have been preferable to have high state-level endorsement/encouragement by CDE sent to the districts prior to or with the initial shipping. Several recipients made reference to not recognizing the identity of Deb Sigman, Director of CDE's Standards and Assessment Division. The endorsement letter from Superintendent O'Connell was sent May 26th, too late to have much effect, and just days before the revised deadline for receiving material. Some districts responded to the O'Connell letter, but most needed materials shipped again as they had thrown away the package either because of lack of interest or, as some reported, because they thought they had missed the deadline.

Of the 467 districts, 120 participated with the return of at least one curriculum survey or the executive summary, 15 declined explicitly to participate, 61 contacted us but never completed the study materials, 6 returned materials after the data collection window closed, and 265 never responded.

High Schools

The sample of 400 high schools was selected to represent the entire state. The sampling design assured that, across all districts, the sample would match overall state distributions for academic performance (based on results from the 2004 10th grade ELA

STAR assessment), school size, and the percent of English learners. The package sent to each principal or CAHSEE point-of-contact (POC) was shipped around March 30, 2005 and contained the following:

- a cover letter describing the 2005 Instruction Study and its requirements;
- a survey for the principal;
- a survey for the school mathematics head;
- a survey for the school English/ELA head;
- an instruction sheet to the math and ELA heads regarding distribution of the teacher surveys;
- 20 surveys for teachers; and
- return FedEx shipping materials.

A replacement sample was selected based on similar demographic and achievement characteristics. Twenty-three replacement schools were identified, and contact was made with 14 of them. Six districts without sampled high schools contacted us and asked that their schools be included in the study, so we shipped materials to nine high schools that were not part of the original or replacement samples (three of these schools returned the surveys).

As with districts, when we realized the extent of spring break across the state, we recognized that the listed due date for returning surveys might be challenging to meet. Our first round of follow-up was a fax to all schools extending the due date to May 31st. We followed up a second time in May, with telephone calls to each non-responding district. In late May we sent a fax to all non-responding and non-returning schools encouraging them to complete and return the surveys by June 10th.

Of 424 high schools contacted, 223 participated with the return of at least one survey; 10 participated in the site visits but did not return surveys; 42 declined explicitly to participate or were part of a district that declined; 8 were categorized as “non-schools” (e.g., closed, FedEx packages returned saying incorrect or not an address, district could not identify a “school” based on the information we had in the database); 33 contacted us but never completed the surveys; 6 returned surveys after the data collection window closed; and 102 never responded.

Feeder Middle Schools

The intended sample of feeder middle schools was 200. Each feeder school was associated with a sampled high school, and to that extent should have been equally representative of the state. The challenge was that HumRRO was reliant upon the districts and high schools for identification of the appropriate schools so that survey packages could be shipped. The final identified sample was 97 feeder middle schools.

Packages shipped to feeder middle schools contained the same types and numbers of surveys as for the high schools, but they were tailored for the middle schools. A package was shipped as soon as we received contact information, with shipments being made from early April to late May. Since the districts or high schools identified feeder schools, there was no mechanism for replacements.

Of 97 feeder middle schools contacted, 37 participated with the return of at least one survey, 6 participated in the site visits but did not return surveys, 11 declined explicitly to participate, 1 returned surveys after the data collection window closed, and 42 neither contacted us nor returned surveys. Eleven potential feeder schools were eliminated because their districts declined, and two were associated with two of the high school "non-schools."

Monitoring Survey Response

HumRRO and PMES, a partner company in this study, answered district and high school calls for clarification. The majority of district calls came from special districts such as County Offices of Education explaining why they were not typical districts and asking how the evaluation study related to them. After we provided the explanation of why they were chosen—the need for representation of all types of districts—and the type or extent of response they might be expected to provide, most were satisfied. Some made clear that they were disappointed that they could not avoid participating in this way.

Many of the phone calls were from people who had not carefully read the materials provided them before calling. This was particularly true of the irate callers who usually had another issue on their minds and were on the offensive for us to give them a justification of why not to participate. When we systematically led them through the materials and defused their concerns, the majority thanked us for the clarification and indicated a willingness to respond.

Some of the questions/problems arose because the materials were not reaching the right people, especially in larger districts and schools. This may have been because superintendents or principals forwarded the materials on to someone else without properly reading the letter addressed to them. In many cases the person they chose to forward to was not the appropriate person (e.g., at the district level, administrators often overlooked the need for participation by district curriculum specialists and sent the whole packet to a high school principal). At the high school level, when the word CAHSEE was seen, the packet was directly sent to the CAHSEE testing coordinator, who was at that time usually involved in CAHSEE testing. Sometimes this was not the person who was also involved in monitoring the curriculum related to CAHSEE. This misdirection of materials at best delayed the responses; in many cases, the surveys were lost or destroyed.

In communicating with the districts and schools we identified several factors that affected participation. One of these was receiving official confirmation that the district was participating in the study. Some principals were reluctant to participate without such confirmation. In at least one case where many schools were involved, we received e-mail notification of district approval on March 31st, but the memo to the schools wasn't sent until April 11th, which was then during the STAR April testing period, delaying site visits until mid- to late May. Even when we mentioned that the district was participating, some principals stated that they needed to check with the district to get approval.

Another factor was the testing schedule, which not only affected our ability to schedule site visits at this time, but also greatly affected the ability to even get a call back from the school contact. For most schools, the month of April was predominately filled with required testing. In some cases schools reported that they had four weeks of testing. Tests included the Golden State, CAHSEE, and AP. Schools' comments implied that this was heavier testing than usual, perhaps, made worse by the Easter/spring breaks.

Several schools commented that during the time we wanted their attention, they were required to spend time on other evaluations or documentations. These included additional CAHSEE evaluations of underperforming schools, and providing documentation to the State relative to the Williams and Chapman lawsuits as well as some NCLB studies. The multiple studies seemed to be affecting the underachieving districts. The districts and schools clearly felt inundated by too many requests and requirements on top of their regular work and found it difficult to add one more task, no matter how worthy, to the responsibilities of their staffs.

A factor for some districts and schools was the 2006 CAHSEE requirement. Some people implied that they did not feel the urgency of the 2006 deadline because they thought there were legal actions in process that would delay the CAHSEE requirement again.

Participation by feeder middle schools was affected by identification with instruction that supports the CAHSEE. Some feeder middle school contacts often indicated that they still did not understand how the courses offered and student performance in feeder school related to the CAHSEE requirement. They implied that the CAHSEE was not encountered until later in high school and generally did not seem to see their responsibility to or connection with later student performance.

Processing Surveys

Each district and school was assigned a random identification number that was used on all materials and as the login code in the database. Upon receipt of a package, the contents were reviewed for notes and quality of response markings, and the number of each type of instrument received was entered into the database. Executive summaries and diskettes, if provided, were separated from other materials, surveys were sorted by type, and each was stored in labeled folders.

Each survey type was electronically scanned to create a data file, and paper copies were organized into numerical order by survey type. An Excel™ spreadsheet was created to keep track of each data file (with the file numbers). A Word™ template was created for each survey type, and open-ended responses were entered. Content analysis of the survey open-ended responses was performed with N6™, a qualitative data analysis software program developed by QSR International. An N6 outline was made to categorize each response type for every question. The response results were

then printed out and put into an Excel spreadsheet for further analysis. After the data were analyzed, they were placed into organized charts and tables.

Processing District Executive Summaries

District superintendents received the following guidelines for completing an executive summary:

Your Executive Summary is an opportunity for you to indicate—in your own words—what your district has done to ensure that its curriculum and instruction offer your students the opportunity to learn the material assessed in the CAHSEE, and to make parents and students aware of the importance of meeting the CAHSEE requirement for students to receive a high school diploma. The summary will be reported anonymously. Although we ask for your name and the district name when you submit the summary to us, they will not be included when the summary appears in an addendum to HumRRO's final report. We ask that in the text of your executive summary you try not to include any identifiable information. We will make every effort to remove such information before the summaries are reported.

We do not want to be overly formulaic or rigid in the Executive Summary format. However, we provide the following guidelines to ensure a certain level of consistency across the hundreds of California districts providing such a document. Also, to clarify the sorts of information we are seeking we have attached sample questions that are being asked on the 2005 Instruction Study surveys for district and school personnel. In your own style, please be sure to:

- Title your document:

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
[Enter Your DISTRICT NAME]
[Enter Superintendent's Name]
Spring 2005

- Limit the document to two (2) pages.
- Address the following questions clearly:

1. *Awareness* (How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?)
2. *Curriculum Validity* (What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grades and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials?)
3. *Instructional Validity* (To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction—that is, both regular and remedial instruction—that is well-aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students?) What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?
4. *Student Remediation* (To what extent are all students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?)

The executive summary should be saved on the provided diskette and included in the package you return to HumRRO. We would prefer to receive the report in MS Word format, but we would accept another word processor format or simply a printed copy. At a minimum, please include a printed copy of the Executive Summary.

Please feel free to contact the HumRRO 2005 Instruction Study Director, Dr. Carolyn Harris [1-800-301-1508, (703) 706-5620 or charris@humrro.org] if you have any questions about the content or format of this Executive Summary.

We received 104 executive summaries, 60 percent of which were in electronic format; paper versions were scanned so that all were in digital format. All identifying information was removed from each executive summary and from the file name. Files were then merged to create a single document, which appears as Appendix G. Content analysis of the executive summaries was performed with N6™. Those results are incorporated into Chapters 4 and 5.

Site Visits

Training

Before site visits began, potential interviewers attended a training session on March 8, 2005, at HumRRO headquarters in Alexandria, Virginia. Approximately 22 people attended the training; 12 were full-time HumRRO employees, 6 were part-time HumRRO employees, and 5 were subcontractors. Two HumRRO employees were unable to attend training in Alexandria and were trained later; however, both were experienced field data collectors from the AB 1609 instruction study. Of those trained, 13 actually served as interviewers during the site visits. The training was developed and presented by a HumRRO employee who had directed the previous CAHSEE site visit data collection for the AB 1609 study.

During the training, potential interviewers covered a variety of topics, some of which included: CAHSEE background and the previous CAHSEE AB1609 study, an overview of the current CAHSEE project and the role of the site visits in it, confidentiality, and logistics issues

A major focus of the training was the interview process. Potential interviewers were told that they would be interviewing five groups of school personnel: administrators, general education math and English-language arts teachers, special education teachers, English learner teachers, and teachers of remediation or preparation courses geared toward CAHSEE. As each group had its own interview protocol, matching the correct protocol to the person being interviewed was important. Interviewers were given hard copies and CD versions of the protocols. Because of the expected workload during site visits, each interviewer was given a laptop computer with which to capture interviews and to use during training.

Interviewers were given time to practice using the protocols. Four of the HumRRO part-time employees at the training were retired school administrators who also had extensive experience in conducting school visits for another state's department of education; they had also conducted site visits as part of a previous HumRRO project. They agreed to act as administrators during the practice session, and were able to give realistic answers to protocol questions based on their previous experiences. The benefits to using these experts were twofold: interviewers were exposed to authentic school-based responses, thus giving them a better idea of what they would be hearing during an actual site visit; they were also exposed to the practice of directly entering notes on a computer during the actual interview process rather than taking handwritten notes and having to transcribe them later.

During training, interviewers were also instructed on the interview naming convention. An interview name consisted of three parts: a two-digit school code; an interview code comprised of a two-digit sequential interview number with a letter to identify the interviewer; and a letter code for the interview type. Feeder schools used the same two-digit school code as their high school, with the addition of an "f" to designate

feeder school status. Because there were always two interviewers per school, they were directed to select an “A” or “B” to identify the interviewer to accompany the two-digit interview number. For example, Interviewer A’s first interview of the day was designated as 01A; Interviewer B’s third interview was 03B. An interviewer would use the same letter during all of his or her interviews at a particular school. Finally, the letter code designated the type of interview (e.g., A for Administrator, EL for English Learner teacher, GE for General English). Thus, an interview named and saved as “56f03AGM” would be interpreted as the feeder school assigned to High School 56, the third interview conducted by Interviewer A, involving a general education mathematics teacher. Also, interviewers were given a list of schools with the two-digit school code, which was updated regularly during the course of the visit phase as schools that were unable to participate were replaced.

Trainers also discussed the use of the School Report Form (see copy at end of Appendix A), explaining that, at the end of each day, the interview team would complete this form. The School Report Form served two purposes: 1) to capture a snapshot of the school by having interviewers list concerns they heard, things the school was proud of, and common expressions or phrases they might have heard; and 2) to provide an interview log in the form of a simple matrix (Interviewer A and B on one axis, and numbered spaces from 01 through 10 on the other axis). Each interviewer was to list the type of interview he or she completed in the appropriate cell of the matrix. If Interviewer A completed an Administrator interview as the first interview of the day, an A would be written in the Interviewer A/01 cell of the matrix. When completed, this form was e-mailed to HumRRO’s Louisville office, where the interview information was logged into the Interview Tracking Database. This enabled us to track which interviews were expected but had not yet been submitted, to check them off when they were sent in, and to mark them as completed when they had been entered into the computer program that would help analyze the data.

Finally, potential interviewers were instructed on how to prepare interviews for submission to HumRRO. Interview write-ups had to be compatible with the QSR International N6 qualitative data analysis software program. We supplied interviewers with CDs including the required N6 format they were to use in the write-up process. Interviewers were instructed to e-mail completed interviews immediately to HumRRO’s Louisville, Kentucky office, where it would be entered and analyzed. The interviews were conducted in two-person teams at 47 high schools and 17 feeder schools from the last week in March to the last week in May, 2005.

Scheduling

PMES created an Access™ database program for scheduling the 50 high school and 24 feeder middle school site visits and assigning available researchers. The schools selected for the site visits were imported from an Excel™ file into the database and assigned a region code for grouping geographically. The corresponding feeder middle school was entered as “received.” An Excel™ file was used to create call sheets by region to facilitate phone scheduling. When a school declined the site visit, that school was deleted from the database and the appropriate school from a replacement list was entered.

Replacement schools were identified for similar CAHSEE characteristics and were often not within the same geographic region as the original school, necessitating frequent revisions to the scheduling plan for the efficient scheduling of researchers.

We used the database to create site visit schedules and assign available researchers. PMES created an Excel™ spreadsheet of researchers' availability. After verifying the dates with the researchers, we imported this information into the scheduling database program. Researchers were assigned to teams by availability and a preliminary schedule for teams was created. As school visits were confirmed, we created weekly schedules and communicated them to the teams in time for them to make travel arrangements for the subsequent week. Each team was provided via e-mail a weekly schedule, copies of the information sheets provided by their assigned schools, hotel recommendations, and suggestions for airports.

Site Visit Calling

The initial plan for the study included sending districts a survey packet that contained a FaxBack Form requesting confirmation of the contact information for the district, for listed high schools, and identification of the appropriate feeder middle schools for the high schools listed and the contact information for those feeder schools. When it became apparent that the district data collection materials could not be shipped until mid-February and that the Easter holiday and spring break schedules would have a major impact on the site visits, changes in processes were made. PMES accessed the websites for the school districts selected for site visits to identify the spring break schedules and was able to find this information for approximately 90 percent of the districts related to the selected site visit schools. Having the spring break schedules allowed us to determine the priority of phone calls to the site visit schools.

Because shipment of high school surveys was delayed until the end of March, it was necessary to start contacting schools before we received the district FaxBack Form with any update information. As soon as the surveys were received in the districts, starting on March 17th, PMES began to call the principals of the individual schools to schedule site interviews; we used the spring break schedules to determine the priority of calls and the groupings of visits. A valuable lesson learned was that the site visits were not sufficiently highlighted to the districts and schools in any of the communications they received. The letter sent to the districts from Deb Sigman, Director of the CAHSEE office at the CDE, did not mention site visits as part of the study. Further, the HumRRO cover letter to the superintendents with schools who were to be sent surveys only had a minor reference to site visits as part of the instruction study. There was no specific alert to possible visits – as was included in the prior instruction study in 2003. The 2003 preliminary explanatory letter was omitted in 2005 as time did not allow for this step.

Since the school principals did not have any background information on the study (information had not filtered down from the districts), in the phone calls we needed to briefly describe the study including site visits, verify a fax number to which study/site visit information could be sent, and set a time for a follow-up call with the principal. These materials included a memo introducing the purpose of the CAHSEE study,

including the survey, site interviews, and a brief overview of the extent of the site visit, including a description of the type of people who were to be scheduled for interviews.

The process was most efficient when we were able to speak to the principal directly the first time we tried to call. More often, however, it was necessary to explain the purpose of the call to the principal's secretary and fax the material to her or him to forward to the principal. In most cases this was helpful because the secretary was most familiar with the principal's schedule and did help to draw the principal's attention to the study and in many cases also determine another contact person designated by the principal. There were also a good number of times when the secretary acted as a buffer for the principal and lack of response/decision resulted in the need for multiple follow-up phone calls, resulting in further delays.

PMES contacted 104 schools. This number included the original high schools as well as the replacement high schools and the feeder middle schools. Sometimes it was necessary to make multiple calls just to identify the appropriate feeder schools as well as the replacement schools for those that declined. We conservatively estimate that completing a site visit required an average of six calls; in some cases, we needed to make up to 12 calls. We estimate that with the calls to the researchers, we made between 624 and 750 calls related to the site visits.

At the end of each day, PMES created a status report documenting district cancellation of participation, schools that declined site visits and noting the replacement schools and names of feeder schools identified by the high school principals (or in some cases principal's designee, such as a secretary). PMES had to work in conjunction with the leader of the site visit data entry system who designed the numbering system and codes for the schools. This cooperation allowed for a code list that would not have to be updated when replacement schools were added. This number could be part of the database and would be printed on the site visit schedule given to the researchers. Consequently, there was a time savings in revising and resending the school list to the researchers.

Site Visit Interview Coding

As we received interviews submitted via e-mail, we logged them into the Interview Tracking Database and printed hard copies of each one. The hard copies were placed in school folders using the same two-digit school code, after first being entered into a preliminary folder where they were checked for proper formatting. Once they were cleaned, they were entered into one of five holding folders (administrator, special education, etc.) in preparation for entering into the appropriate N6 project[1]. The interviews were then loaded into the N6 program for analysis.

N6 processes data in several ways. First, a researcher can create a command file that permits data to be coded as it is brought into the N6 program. An example would be a command file that imports an interview or document and then appropriately

1 Each type of interview (administrator, special education, etc.) had its own N6 project due to the variations between protocols.

codes sections of the document as belonging to Question 1, Question 2, etc. No content analysis is being conducted; rather, the document is being “marked up” to recognize that a certain portion of the response belongs to a particular question and multiple documents can be done in batches. Once documents are entered and coded by section, a researcher can run a report on all responses to a particular question for use in the analysis phase. This involves reading and decision making on the part of the researcher; it is not done automatically by N6. As the researcher identifies common responses, he or she can label them and create a hierarchical tree (folders) in N6 (referred to as nodes) in which specific data are placed. These trees can be very detailed. An example of a simple hierarchical tree are the responses “yes,” “no,” or “blank,” to a particular question. The researcher can read the responses to a question, select the code that best matches the response, and highlight the appropriate text much as one would do with colored markers. Finally, N6 can search for words or phrases if told what to look for. In this project, all three types of analysis were used.

Because of the differences in protocols among the various types of interviews, we created separate N6 projects for administrator interviews, general education math and English-language arts teachers, special education teachers, English learner teachers, and teachers of special courses designed to prepare or remediate students for the CAHSEE. For coding consistency among projects, typically one researcher would develop codes for common questions; these codes were then shared with other researchers who used them in their projects.

[SAMPLE REPORT FILLED OUT BY INTERVIEWERS]

School Report

(Note: this report is to be completed as a team; only one report/school should be sent in.)

School ID number	Visit date	Site visitor names

Did you hear any repeating words or phrases? (example, “apples to oranges”)

People at this school are concerned about:

People at this school feel good about:

Overall impression of this school:

Please complete this table by entering the type of interview (A, GM, GE, SP, EL, RM, RE, PM, PE, O) in the appropriate space.

Int. #	Interview Type	Int. #	Interview Type
01A		01B	
02A		02B	
03A		03B	
04A		04B	
05A		05B	
06A		06B	
07A		07B	
08A		08B	
09A		09B	
10A		10B	

When completed, please e-mail to lkoger@humrro.org or fax to Lee Koger at (502) 339-9432.

Appendix B: Survey Instruments

District ELA Curriculum Head

District ELA Curriculum Head

California High School Exit Examination Evaluation—Spring 2005
Information on Instruction that Covers
California Content Standards Associated with the CAHSEE

GENERAL DIRECTIONS: Please answer each item by filling in the circle of your response or writing your response.

SURVEY MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

- **Use a No. 2 pencil only.**
- **Darken the circle completely.**
- **Erase cleanly any marks you wish to change.**
- **Make no stray marks on this form.**

CORRECT MARK

INCORRECT MARKS

1. PRIMARY OR SUPPLEMENTAL COURSES—High School English-Language Arts

For each of the following courses, mark the appropriate circle to indicate how many of your high schools offer the course during the current academic year. If there are other common high school ELA courses in your district that offer primary instruction to your students related to the California Content Standards contained in the blueprints adopted for CAHSEE for ELA, space is provided to write in the title and CBEDS number of up to eight (8) courses. If a particular course is not offered in your district or does not include materials covered on the CAHSEE, fill in the circle under N/A (not applicable).

How many high schools in your district offer this course during current academic year?

					N/A
			Only a few (less than 25%)		
		Most (75% - 90%)			
Course Title and CBEDS Number:					
Comprehensive English Grade 9 (2101)	○	○	○	○	○
Comprehensive English Grade 10 (2101)	○	○	○	○	○
Comprehensive English Grade 11 (2101)	○	○	○	○	○
Comprehensive English Grade 12 (2101)	○	○	○	○	○
English Literature (2106)	○	○	○	○	○
World/Other Literature (2107—2109)	○	○	○	○	○
Composition (2113)	○	○	○	○	○
Language Structure/Language Arts (2116)	○	○	○	○	○
English as a Second Language (2110)	○	○	○	○	○
Developmental Reading (2100)	○	○	○	○	○
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____	○	○	○	○	○
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____	○	○	○	○	○
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____	○	○	○	○	○
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____	○	○	○	○	○
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____	○	○	○	○	○
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____	○	○	○	○	○
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____	○	○	○	○	○
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____	○	○	○	○	○

*** Numbers in parenthesis refer to CBEDS courses taken from http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/cb/english.asp. [Note: the preceding Web address is no longer valid.]**

2. PRIMARY OR SUPPLEMENTAL COURSES—Middle School English-Language Arts

For each of the following courses, mark the appropriate circle to indicate how many of your middle schools offer the course during the current academic year. If there are other common middle school ELA courses in your district that offer primary instruction to your students related to the California Content Standards contained in the blueprints adopted for CAHSEE for ELA, space is provided to write in the title and CBEDS number of up to four (4) courses. If a particular course is not offered in your district or does not include materials covered on the CAHSEE, fill in the circle under N/A (not applicable).

How many middle schools in your district offer this course during current academic year?

Middle School English-Language Arts Primary or Supplemental Courses *	**Nearly all (more than 90%)**	**Most (75% - 90%)**	**Some (25% - 74%)**	**Only a few (less than 25%)**	**None**	**N/A**
Course Title and CBEDS Number:						
Comprehensive English Grade 6 (2101)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Comprehensive English Grade 7 (2101)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Comprehensive English Grade 8 (2101)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Comprehensive English Grade 9 (2101)	○	○	○	○	○	○
English as a Second Language (2110)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Language Structure/Language Arts (2116)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____	○	○	○	○	○	
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____	○	○	○	○	○	
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____	○	○	○	○	○	
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____	○	○	○	○	○	

*** Numbers in parenthesis refer to CBEDS courses taken from http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/cb/english.asp. [Note: the preceding Web address is no longer valid.]**

PLEASE DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA.

3. INTERVENTION PROGRAMS—High & Middle School English-Language Arts

Although these English-language arts programs have been adopted by the state for middle school basic and intervention programs, high schools in your district also may be using them. If you offer other common programs that are not listed, space is provided to write in the title of up to eight (8) programs that have content related to the California Content Standards associated with the CAHSEE. Mark the appropriate circle to indicate how many of your high schools and/or middle schools offer the program during the current academic year. If you don't use a listed program in your district, fill in the circle under N/A (not applicable).

	How many high schools offer program during current academic year?						How many middle schools offer program during current academic year?					
						N/A						N/A
				Only a few (less than 25%)						Only a few (less than 25%)		
			Most (75% - 90%)						Most (75% - 90%)			
Houghton Mifflin Reading: A Legacy of Literacy	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
SRA/Open Court Reading (SRA/McGraw-Hill)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
The Reader's Choice (Glencoe/McGraw-Hill)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Literature and Language (Holt, Rinehart, and Winston)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
McDougal Littell Reading & Language Arts Program	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Prentice-Hall Literature: Timeless Voices, Timeless Themes	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Language! A Literacy Intervention Curriculum (Glencoe/McGraw-Hill)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
High Point (Hampton Brown)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
High Point for English Learners (Hampton Brown)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
READ 180 (Glenco/McGraw-Hill)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
SRA/Reach Program (SRA/McGraw-Hill)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Fast Track Reading Program (Wright Group/ McGraw-Hill)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Program Title: _____	○	○	○	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	
Program Title: _____	○	○	○	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	
Program Title: _____	○	○	○	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	
Program Title: _____	○	○	○	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	
Program Title: _____	○	○	○	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	
Program Title: _____	○	○	○	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	
Program Title: _____	○	○	○	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	
Program Title: _____	○	○	○	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	

Note: You may want to consult with your district specialists for Special Education and English Learners.

*** Programs taken from http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/rla2002pub.asp. [Note: the preceding Web address is no longer valid.]**

4. **What proportion of students who did not pass the ELA portion of the CAHSEE by spring 2004 subsequently enrolled in a remedial summer school course?**
   - ○ Nearly all (greater than 90%)
   - ○ Most (75% to 90%)
   - ○ Some (25% to 74%)
   - ○ Only a few (less than 25%)
   - ○ Did not have summer school courses
   - ○ Data not readily available at school level

5. **What proportion of students in the ELA-related summer school course passed the ELA portion of the CAHSEE in July or September 2004?**
   - ○ Nearly all (greater than 90%)
   - ○ Most (75% to 90%)
   - ○ Some (25% to 74%)
   - ○ Only a few (less than 25%)
   - ○ Not applicable
   - ○ Data not readily available at school level

---

6. **What percentage of grade 6 - 10 students in each of the following categories receives their ELA instruction from teachers with an ELA credential?** *(You may want to consult with your district specialists for Special Education and English Learners.)*

	0	1 - 10%	11 - 20%	21 - 30%	31 - 40%	41 - 50%	51 - 60%	61 - 70%	71 - 80%	81 - 90%	91 - 100%
All students in grades 6 - 10	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
English learners in grades 6 - 10	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Students receiving special education services in grades 6 - 10 (include Special Day)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Students with IEPs in grades 6 - 10	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Return this survey to your Superintendent or designee no later than April 8th, 2005.

The success of this evaluation effort relies on your support, and we thank you for your help with the 2005 Instruction Study. We look forward to receiving your completed survey.

R21568-PFI-54321

District Mathematics Curriculum Head

District Mathematics Curriculum Head

California High School Exit Examination Evaluation—Spring 2005
Information on Instruction that Covers
California Content Standards Associated with the CAHSEE

GENERAL DIRECTIONS: Please answer each item by filling in the circle of your response or writing your response.

SURVEY MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

- **Use a No. 2 pencil only.**
- **Darken the circle completely.**
- **Erase cleanly any marks you wish to change.**
- **Make no stray marks on this form.**

CORRECT MARK

INCORRECT MARKS

1. PRIMARY OR SUPPLEMENTAL COURSES—High School Mathematics

For each of the following courses, mark the appropriate circle to indicate how many of your high schools offer the course during the current academic year. If there are other common high school mathematics courses in your district that offer primary instruction to your students related to the California Content Standards contained in the blueprints adopted for CAHSEE for mathematics, space is provided to write in the title and CBEDS number of up to eight (8) courses. If a particular course is not offered in your district or does not include materials covered on the CAHSEE, fill in the circle under N/A (not applicable).

How many high schools in your district offer this course during current academic year?

					N/A
			Only a few (less than 25%)		
		Most (75% - 90%)			
Course Title and CBEDS Number:					
General Math (2400)	○	○	○	○	○
Math A (2420)	○	○	○	○	○
Math B (2421)	○	○	○	○	○
Pre-Algebra (2424)	○	○	○	○	○
Beginning Algebra (2403)	○	○	○	○	○
Intermediate Algebra (2404)	○	○	○	○	○
Beginning Algebra Part I (2428)	○	○	○	○	○
Beginning Algebra Part II (2429)	○	○	○	○	○
Integrated Math I (2425)	○	○	○	○	○
Integrated Math II (2426)	○	○	○	○	○
Consumer Math (2401)	○	○	○	○	○
Remedial Math (2402)	○	○	○	○	○
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____	○	○	○	○	○
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____	○	○	○	○	○
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____	○	○	○	○	○
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____	○	○	○	○	○
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____	○	○	○	○	○
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____	○	○	○	○	○

*** Numbers in parenthesis refer to CBEDS courses taken from http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/cb/math.asp. [Note, the preceding Web address is no longer valid.]**

1. PRIMARY OR SUPPLEMENTAL COURSES—High School Mathematics *(continued)*

How many high schools in your district offer this course during current academic year?

High School Mathematics Primary or Supplemental Courses *	N/A	None	Only a few (less than 25%)	Some (25% - 74%)	Most (75% - 90%)	Nearly all (more than 90%)
Course Title and CBEDS Number:						
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____		○	○	○	○	○
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____		○	○	○	○	○

2. PRIMARY OR SUPPLEMENTAL COURSES—Middle School Mathematics

For each of the following courses, mark the appropriate circle to indicate how many of your middle schools offer the course during the current academic year. If there are other common middle school mathematics courses in your district that offer primary instruction to your students related to the California Content Standards contained in the blueprints adopted for CAHSEE for mathematics, space is provided to write in the title and CBEDS number of up to four (4) courses. If a particular course is not offered in your district or does not include materials covered on the CAHSEE, fill in the circle under N/A (not applicable).

How many middle schools in your district offer this course during current academic year?

Middle School Mathematics Primary or Supplemental Courses *	N/A	None	Only a few (less than 25%)	Some (25% - 74%)	Most (75% - 90%)	Nearly all (more than 90%)
Course Title and CBEDS Number:						
General Math Grade 7 (2400)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Pre-Algebra (2424)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Beginning Algebra (2403)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Beginning Algebra Part I (2428)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Beginning Algebra Part II (2429)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Integrated Math I (2425)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Integrated Math II (2426)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Math A (2420)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Math B (2421)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____		○	○	○	○	○
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____		○	○	○	○	○
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____		○	○	○	○	○
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____		○	○	○	○	○

*** Numbers in parenthesis refer to CBEDS courses taken from http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/cb/math.asp [Note, the preceding Web address is no longer valid.]**

3. INTERVENTION PROGRAMS—High & Middle School Mathematics

Although these mathematics programs have been adopted by the state for middle school basic and intervention programs, high schools in your district also may be using them. If you offer other common programs that are not listed, space is provided to write in the title of up to eight (8) programs that have content related to the California Content Standards associated with the CAHSEE. Mark the appropriate circle to indicate how many of your high schools and/or middle schools offer the program during the current academic year. If you don't use a listed program in your district, fill in the circle under N/A (not applicable).

	How many high schools offer program during current academic year?						How many middle schools offer program during current academic year?					
						N/A						N/A
				Only a few (less than 25%)						Only a few (less than 25%)		
			Most (75% - 90%)						Most (75% - 90%)			
Success with Mathcoach (CSL Associates, Inc.)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Harcourt Math @ 2002 (w/Spanish as Alternate Format K-6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Mathematics by Houghton Mifflin	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Concepts and Skills (McDougal Littell, Inc.)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Structure and Method (McDougal Littell, Inc.)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
McGraw-Hill Mathematics (w/Spanish as Alternate Format K-6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Prentice Hall Pre-Algebra, CA Edition	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Prentice Hall Algebra 1, CA Edition	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Progress in Mathematics, CA Edition (William H. Sadlier, Inc.)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Saxon Math K-3, An Incremental Development	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
(w/Spanish as Alternate Format K-6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Math 54, 65, 76, and 87 (Saxon Publishers, Inc.)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Scott Foresman CA Mathematics	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Program Title: _____	○	○	○	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	
Program Title: _____	○	○	○	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	
Program Title: _____	○	○	○	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	
Program Title: _____	○	○	○	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	
Program Title: _____	○	○	○	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	
Program Title: _____	○	○	○	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	
Program Title: _____	○	○	○	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	

Note: You may want to consult with your district specialists for Special Education and English Learners.

*** Programs taken from http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/math2001pub.asp. [Note: the preceding Web address is no longer valid.]**

4. **What proportion of students who did not pass the math portion of the CAHSEE by spring 2004 subsequently enrolled in a remedial summer school course?**
   - ○ Nearly all (greater than 90%)
   - ○ Most (75% to 90%)
   - ○ Some (25% to 74%)
   - ○ Only a few (less than 25%)
   - ○ Did not have summer school courses
   - ○ Data not readily available at school level

5. **What proportion of students in the math-related summer school course passed the math portion of the CAHSEE in July or September 2004?**
   - ○ Nearly all (greater than 90%)
   - ○ Most (75% to 90%)
   - ○ Some (25% to 74%)
   - ○ Only a few (less than 25%)
   - ○ Not applicable
   - ○ Data not readily available at school level

---

6. **What percentage of grade 6 - 10 students in each of the following categories receives their mathematics instruction from teachers with a mathematics credential?** *(You may want to consult with your district specialists for Special Education and English Learners.)*

	0	1 - 10%	11 - 20%	21 - 30%	31 - 40%	41 - 50%	51 - 60%	61 - 70%	71 - 80%	81 - 90%	91 - 100%
All students in grades 6 - 10	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
English learners in grades 6 - 10	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Students receiving special education services in grades 6 - 10 (include Special Day)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Students with IEPs in grades 6 - 10	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Return this survey to your Superintendent or designee no later than April 8th, 2005.

The success of this evaluation effort relies on your support, and we thank you for your help with the 2005 Instruction Study. We look forward to receiving your completed survey.

R21569-PFI-54321

High School Principal

High School Principal

California High School Exit Examination Evaluation—Spring 2005
Information on Instruction that Covers
California Content Standards Associated with the CAHSEE

GENERAL DIRECTIONS: Please answer each item by filling in the circle of your response or writing your response.

SURVEY MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

- Use a No. 2 pencil only.
- Darken the circle completely.
- Erase cleanly any marks you wish to change.
- Make no stray marks on this form.

CORRECT MARK ○ ● ○ ○

INCORRECT MARKS ✓ ✗ ◔ ◕

1. How completely did your school cover the California Content Standards contained in the blueprints adopted for CAHSEE for English-Language Arts in each of the following years?

	Do Not Know	Little Covered (less than 40%)	Partially Covered (40% - 60%)	Mostly Covered (61% - 95%)	Completely Covered (96% - 100%)
2004 - 2005 (projected)	○	○	○	○	○
2003 - 2004	○	○	○	○	○
2002 - 2003	○	○	○	○	○
Before 2002	○	○	○	○	○

2. How completely did your school cover the California Content Standards contained in the blueprints adopted for CAHSEE for mathematics in each of the following years?

	Do Not Know	Little Covered (less than 40%)	Partially Covered (40% - 60%)	Mostly Covered (61% - 95%)	Completely Covered (96% - 100%)
2004 - 2005 (projected)	○	○	○	○	○
2003 - 2004	○	○	○	○	○
2002 - 2003	○	○	○	○	○
Before 2002	○	○	○	○	○

3. What proportion of teachers at your school participated in ELA-related professional development designed to help them teach the California Content Standards associated with CAHSEE?

- ○ Nearly all (more than 90%)
- ○ Most (75% to 90%)
- ○ Some (25% to 74%)
- ○ Only a few (less than 25%)
- ○ Not applicable

4. What proportion of teachers at your school participated in mathematics-related professional development designed to help them teach the California Content Standards associated with CAHSEE?

- ○ Nearly all (greater than 90%)
- ○ Most (75% to 90%)
- ○ Some (25% to 74%)
- ○ Only a few (less than 25%)
- ○ Not applicable

5. **What kind of system do you use to monitor and report student proficiency levels on content standards** *(Mark all that apply.)*

- ○ District-based tracking system
- ○ School-based tracking system
- ○ Department-based (ELA or Math) tracking system
- ○ Individual teachers keep track of mastery
- ○ Other *(describe below)*

_____

_____

- ○ None

6. **How developed are systems at your school to coordinate coverage of the California Content Standards associated with the CAHSEE between the following four groups?** *(Please answer for all four groups.)*

	Not developed	Partially developed	Fully developed
Middle School/High School	○	○	○
Special Education/General Education	○	○	○
English Language Development/General Education	○	○	○
Alternative (Continuation)/General Education	○	○	○

7. **Do you have regular articulation meetings with your feeder middle schools?**

- ○ Yes, with all of them
- ○ Yes, with some of them
- ○ No
- ○ Does not apply to our situation

7A. **If MEETINGS ARE HELD, what are the primary topics discussed during articulation meetings?**

_____

_____

_____

_____

8. **Rate the importance of regular articulation meetings with your feeder middle schools in preparing students for success on the CAHSEE.**

- ○ Very important
- ○ Important
- ○ Neither important nor unimportant
- ○ Unimportant
- ○ Very unimportant

Thank you for your cooperation!

High School Department Head—ELA, Part 1

High School Department Head - ELA, Part 1

California High School Exit Examination Evaluation—Spring 2005
Information on Instruction that Covers
California Content Standards Associated with the CAHSEE

PRIMARY COURSES

A. This **Part 1 survey** seeks a listing of all courses at your school that offer initial (primary) instruction covering the California Content Standards in English-Language Arts to students in grades 9 through 12. This listing should not include courses that are beyond the scope of the CAHSEE such as British Literature or expository writing or AP and IB courses. The most common courses listed in CBEDS have been included. If you offer other courses that are not listed, space is provided for you to write in the title and CBEDS number of up to five (5) additional courses.

- For each listed or added English-Language Arts course (1) mark the academic year in which the course was first offered at your school and (2) enter the number of sections currently offered at your school in the 2004-05 school year. If you don't use a listed course, fill in the circle under N/A (not applicable). A sample is shown on the next page that demonstrates how to complete the survey.

For the Part 2 - Teacher Survey, select up to five (5) of your English-Language Arts courses that have content ***most*** closely related to the California Content Standards associated with the CAHSEE. Include courses that have the highest enrollments of students receiving special education services and English learners. Identify a teacher in your department who currently (or most recently) teaches each course and ask him or her to complete a Part 2 - Teacher Survey and return it to you. Try to distribute the surveys to teachers with a variety of experience and skill levels, and include any teachers who are working without an appropriate ELA credential.

INTERVENTION PROGRAMS

B. The **Part 1 survey** also seeks a listing of remedial instructional programs - instruction that supports/assists students performing below grade level. We have provided a list of state-adopted instructional materials that you might be using. Again, if you offer other programs that are not listed, space is provided to write in titles of up to five (5) programs that have content related to the California Content Standards associated with the CAHSEE.

- For each selected program (1) mark the academic year in which the course was first offered at your school and (2) enter the number of sections currently offered at your school in the 2004-05 school year. If you don't use a listed program, fill in the circle under N/A (not applicable).

For the Part 2 - Teacher Survey, select up to five (5) of your remedial English-Language Arts programs that have content ***most*** closely related to the California Content Standards associated with the CAHSEE. Identify a teacher who currently (or most recently) teaches each program and ask him or her to complete a Part 2 - Teacher Survey and return it to you when finished.

GENERAL DIRECTIONS: Please answer each item by filling in the circle of your response or writing your response.

SURVEY MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

- **Use a No. 2 pencil only.**
- **Darken the circle completely.**
- **Erase cleanly any marks you wish to change.**
- **Make no stray marks on this form.**

CORRECT MARK

INCORRECT MARKS

SAMPLE LISTING OF PRIMARY OR SUPPLEMENTAL COURSES

English-Language Arts Primary or Supplemental Courses *	In what academic year was this course first offered?				Number of Sections During Current Academic Year										
	Before 2002	2002 - 03	2003 - 04	2004 - 05	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more		N/A
Comprehensive English (2101)	○	○	○	●	○	○	○	○	●	○	○	○	○		○
English Literature (2106)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○		●
Developmental Reading (2100)	○	●	○	○	○	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○		○
Composition (2113)	○	○	●	○	○	○	●	○	○	○	○	○	○		○

PLEASE BEGIN ON THE NEXT PAGE

PRIMARY OR SUPPLEMENTAL COURSES—English-Language Arts

For each of the following courses you offer, (1) mark the academic year in which the course was first offered at your school and (2) enter the number of sections currently offered at your school. If a particular course is not offered, fill in the circle under N/A (not applicable). If you offer other courses that are not listed, space is provided to write in the title and CBEDS number of up to five (5) courses that have content related to the California Content Standards associated with the CAHSEE. For additional courses also mark the academic year in which the course was first offered and the number of sections offered this year.

English-Language Arts Primary or Supplemental Courses *	In what academic year was this course first offered?				Number of Sections During Current Academic Year									
	Before 2002	2002 - 03	2003 - 04	2004 - 05	2	4	6	8						N/A
Comprehensive English - Grade 9 (2101)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Comprehensive English - Grade 10 (2101)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Comprehensive English - Grade 11 (2101)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Comprehensive English - Grade 12 (2101)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
English Literature (2106)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
World/OtherLiterature (2107 - 2109)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Composition (2113)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Language Structure/Language Arts (2116)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
English as a Second Language (2110)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Developmental Reading (2100)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	

*** Numbers in parenthesis refer to CBEDS courses taken from http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/cb/english.asp. [Note: the preceding Web address is no longer valid.]**

INTERVENTION PROGRAMS—English-Language Arts

Although these English-Language Arts programs have been adopted by the state for middle school basic and intervention programs, you may be using them at your school. If you offer other courses that are not listed, space is provided to write in the titles of up to five (5) programs that have content closely related to the California Content Standards associated with the CAHSEE. For each program you use (1) mark the academic year in which the program was first offered at your school and (2) enter the number of sections offered at your school. If you don't use a listed program, fill in the circle under N/A (not applicable).

	In what academic year was this course first offered?				Number of Sections During Current Academic Year									
			2002 - 03	2004 - 05	2	4	6	8	N/A					
Houghton Mifflin Reading: A Legacy of Literacy	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
SRA/Open Court Reading (SRA/McGraw-Hill)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
The Reader's Choice (Glencoe/McGraw-Hill)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Literature and Language (Holt, Rinehart, and Winston)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
McDougal Littell Reading & Language Arts Program	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Prentice-Hall Literature: Timeless Voices, Timeless Themes	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Language! A Literacy Intervention Curriculum (Glencoe/McGraw-Hill)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
High Point (Hampton Brown)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
High Point for English Learners (Hampton Brown)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
READ 180 (Glenco/McGraw-Hill)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
SRA/Reach Program (SRA/McGraw-Hill)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Fast Track Reading Program (Wright Group/ McGraw-Hill)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Program Title: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	
Program Title: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	
Program Title: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	
Program Title: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	
Program Title: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	

*** Programs taken from http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/rla2002pub.asp. [Note: the preceding Web address is no longer valid.]**

CONCLUDING QUESTIONS

1. How many full-time teachers work in your department? *(Mark one.)*

○ 1	○ 5	○ 9	○ 13
○ 2	○ 6	○ 10	○ 14
○ 3	○ 7	○ 11	○ 15
○ 4	○ 8	○ 12	○ 16 or more

2. How many teachers in your department have as their most advanced degree: *(Mark one for each.)*

Bachelor's degree

○ 0	○ 4	○ 8	○ 12
○ 1	○ 5	○ 9	○ 13
○ 2	○ 6	○ 10	○ 14
○ 3	○ 7	○ 11	○ 15 or more

Some graduate school

○ 0	○ 4	○ 8	○ 12
○ 1	○ 5	○ 9	○ 13
○ 2	○ 6	○ 10	○ 14
○ 3	○ 7	○ 11	○ 15 or more

Master's degree

○ 0	○ 4	○ 8	○ 12
○ 1	○ 5	○ 9	○ 13
○ 2	○ 6	○ 10	○ 14
○ 3	○ 7	○ 11	○ 15 or more

Doctoral degree

○ 0	○ 4	○ 8	○ 12
○ 1	○ 5	○ 9	○ 13
○ 2	○ 6	○ 10	○ 14
○ 3	○ 7	○ 11	○ 15 or more

Other *(Specify below)*

_____

○ 0	○ 4	○ 8	○ 12
○ 1	○ 5	○ 9	○ 13
○ 2	○ 6	○ 10	○ 14
○ 3	○ 7	○ 11	○ 15 or more

3. How many teachers in your department work with an appropriate ELA credential?

○ Nearly all (more than 90%)
○ Most (75% - 90%)
○ Some (25% - 74%)
○ Only a few (less than 25%)
○ None

4. How many teachers in your department work with an emergency credential or are a district intern?

○ Nearly all (more than 90%)
○ Most (75% - 90%)
○ Some (25% - 74%)
○ Only a few (less than 25%)
○ None

5. How would you characterize the experience of the teachers who teach the Primary or Supplemental courses you listed above?

○ Most have 5 or more years teaching experience
○ About half have 5 or more years teaching experience
○ Few have 5 or more years teaching experience

6. How would you characterize the experience of the teachers who teach the Basic or Intervention Programs you listed above?

○ Most have 5 or more years teaching experience
○ About half have 5 or more years teaching experience
○ Few have 5 or more years teaching experience

7. How are the following subgroups of students who may be challenged to satisfy the CAHSEE requirements placed in sections of the Primary/ Supplemental Courses you listed above?

	Students are distributed across most or all sections	Students are clustered in one or a few sections
"At-risk" (economically disadvantaged) students in general	○	○
English learners	○	○
Remedial students in general	○	○
Students receiving special education services	○	○

8. In the Primary/Supplemental Courses you listed above, what percentage of the students in the following subgroups is receiving their ELA instruction from teachers who are experienced in working with these subgroups of students?

	Nearly all (more than 90%)	Most (75% - 90%)	Some (25% - 74%)	Only a few (less than 25%)	None
"At-risk" (economically disadvantaged) students in general	○	○	○	○	○
English learners	○	○	○	○	○
Remedial students in general	○	○	○	○	○
Students receiving special education services	○	○	○	○	○

9. What percentage of the students in the following subgroups is receiving their ELA instruction from teachers without an appropriate ELA credential?

	None	Only a few (less than 25%)	Some (25% - 74%)	Most (75% - 90%)	Nearly all (more than 90%)
"At-risk" (economically disadvantaged) students in general	○	○	○	○	○
English learners	○	○	○	○	○
Remedial students in general	○	○	○	○	○
Students receiving special education services	○	○	○	○	○

10. In the Intervention/Basic Programs you listed above, what percentage of the students in the following subgroups is receiving their ELA instruction from teachers who are experienced in working with these subgroups of students?

	None	Only a few (less than 25%)	Some (25% - 74%)	Most (75% - 90%)	Nearly all (more than 90%)
"At-risk" (economically disadvantaged) students in general	○	○	○	○	○
English learners	○	○	○	○	○
Remedial students in general	○	○	○	○	○
Students receiving special education services	○	○	○	○	○

11. To what extent, in general, are teachers in your department experienced in teaching the California Content Standards associated with the CAHSEE requirements?

- ○ Very great extent
- ○ Great extent
- ○ Moderate extent
- ○ Slight extent
- ○ Not at all

12. To what extent would you characterize your ELA course offerings as being demanding courses for students?

- ○ Very great extent
- ○ Great extent
- ○ Moderate extent
- ○ Slight extent
- ○ Not at all

Thank you for your cooperation!

Please prepare a Part 2 survey for the 5 Primary/Supplemental Courses and 5 Basic/Intervention Programs you identified above and distribute them to the appropriate teachers.

High School Department Head—Mathematics, Part 1

High School Department Head - Mathematics, Part 1
California High School Exit Examination Evaluation—Spring 2005
Information on Instruction that Covers
California Content Standards Associated with the CAHSEE

PRIMARY COURSES

A. This **Part 1 survey** seeks a listing of all courses at your school that offer initial (primary) instruction covering the California Content Standards in mathematics to students in grades 9 through 12. This listing should not include courses that are beyond the scope of the CAHSEE such as geometry or calculus or AP and IB courses. The most common courses listed in CBEDS have been included. If you offer other courses that are not listed, space is provided for you to write in the title and CBEDS number of up to five (5) additional courses.

- For each listed or added Mathematics course (1) mark the academic year in which the course was first offered at your school and (2) enter the number of sections currently offered at your school in the 2004-05 school year. If you don't use a listed course, fill in the circle under N/A (not applicable). A sample is shown on the next page that demonstrates how to complete the survey.

For the Part 2 - Teacher Survey, select up to five (5) of your Mathematics courses that have content ***most*** closely related to the California Content Standards associated with the CAHSEE. Include courses that have the highest enrollments of student receiving special education services and English learners. Identify a teacher in your department who currently (or most recently) teaches each course and ask him or her to complete a Part 2 - Teacher Survey and return it to you. Try to distribute the surveys to teachers with a variety of experience and skill levels, and include any teachers who are working <u>without</u> an appropriate Mathematics credential.

INTERVENTION PROGRAMS

B. The **Part 1 survey** also seeks a listing of remedial instructional programs - instruction that supports/assists students performing below grade level. We have provided a list of state-adopted instructional materials that you might be using. Again, if you offer other programs that are not listed, space is provided to write in titles of up to five (5) programs that have content related to the California Content Standards associated with the CAHSEE.

- For each selected program (1) mark the academic year in which the course was first offered at your school and (2) enter the number of sections currently offered at your school in the 2004-05 school year. If you don't use a listed course, fill in the circle under N/A (not applicable).

For the Part 2 - Teacher Survey, select up to five (5) of your remedial Mathematics programs that have content ***most*** closely related to the California Content Standards associated with the CAHSEE. Identify a teacher who currently (or most recently) teaches each program and ask him or her to complete a Part 2 - Teacher Survey and return it to you when finished.

GENERAL DIRECTIONS: Please answer each item by filling in the circle of your response or writing your response.

SURVEY MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

- **Use a No. 2 pencil only.**
- **Darken the circle completely.**
- **Erase cleanly any marks you wish to change.**
- **Make no stray marks on this form.**

CORRECT MARK

INCORRECT MARKS

SAMPLE LISTING OF PRIMARY OR SUPPLEMENTAL COURSES

Mathematics Primary or Supplemental Courses *	In what academic year was this course first offered?				Number of Sections During Current Academic Year										
	Before 2002	2002 - 03	2003 - 04	2004 - 05	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more		N/A
Beginning Algebra (2403)	○	○	○	●	○	○	○	○	●	○	○	○	○		○
Pre-Algebra (2424)	○	○	●	○	○	○	○	●	○	○	○	○	○		○
Algebra A (1st half of course in 1 year) (2428)	○	●	○	○	○	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○		○
Remedial Mathematics/Proficiency Development (2402)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○		●

PLEASE BEGIN ON THE NEXT PAGE

PRIMARY OR SUPPLEMENTAL COURSES—Mathematics

For each of the following courses you offer, (1) mark the academic year in which the course was first offered at your school and (2) enter the number of sections currently offered at your school. If a particular course is not offered, fill in the circle under N/A (not applicable). If you offer other courses that are not listed, space is provided to write in the title and CBEDS number of up to five (5) courses that have content related to the California Content Standards associated with the CAHSEE. For additional courses also mark the academic year in which the course was first offered and the number of sections offered.

Mathematics Primary or Supplemental Courses *	In what academic year was this course first offered?				Number of Sections During Current Academic Year									
	Before 2002	2002 - 03	2003 - 04	2004 - 05	2	4	6	8						N/A
General Math (2400)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Math A (2420)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Math B (2421)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Pre-Algebra (2424)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Beginning Algebra (2403)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Intermediate Algebra (2404)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Beginning Algebra Part I (2428)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Beginning Algebra Part II (2429)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Integrated Math I (2425)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Integrated Math II (2426)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Consumer Math (2401)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Remedial Math (2402)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	

*** Numbers in parenthesis refer to CBEDS courses taken from http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/cb/math.asp. [Note: the preceding Web address is no longer valid.]**

INTERVENTION PROGRAMS—Mathematics

Although these mathematics programs have been adopted by the state for middle school basic and intervention programs, you may be using them at your school. If you offer other courses that are not listed, space is provided to write in the titles of up to five (5) programs that have content closely related to the California Content Standards associated with the CAHSEE. For each program you use (1) mark the academic year in which the program was first offered at your school and (2) enter the number of sections currently offered at your school. If you don't use a listed program, fill in the circle under N/A (not applicable).

	In what academic year was this course first offered?				Number of Sections During Current Academic Year									
			2002 - 03	2004 - 05	1		3		5		6		8	N/A
Success with Mathcoach (CSL Associates, Inc.)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Harcourt Math @ 2002 (w/Spanish as Alternate Format K-6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Mathematics by Houghton Mifflin	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Concepts and Skills (McDougal Littell, Inc.)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Structure and Method (McDougal Littell, Inc.)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
McGraw-Hill Mathematics (w/Spanish as Alternate Format K-6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Prentice Hall Pre-Algebra, CA Edition	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Prentice Hall Algebra 1, CA Edition	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Progress in Mathematics, CA Edition (William H. Sadlier, Inc.)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Saxon Math K-3, An Incremental Development (w/Spanish as Alternate Format K-6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Math 54, 65, 76, and 87 (Saxon Publishers, Inc.)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Scott Foresman CA Mathematics	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Program Title: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	
Program Title: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	
Program Title: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	
Program Title: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	
Program Title: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	

*** Programs taken from http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/math2001pub.asp. [Note: the preceding Web address is no longer valid.]**

CONCLUDING QUESTIONS

1. How many full-time teachers work in your department? *(Mark one.)*

○ 1	○ 5	○ 9	○ 13
○ 2	○ 6	○ 10	○ 14
○ 3	○ 7	○ 11	○ 15
○ 4	○ 8	○ 12	○ 16 or more

2. How many teachers in your department have as their most advanced degree: *(Mark one for each.)*

Bachelor's degree

○ 0	○ 4	○ 8	○ 12
○ 1	○ 5	○ 9	○ 13
○ 2	○ 6	○ 10	○ 14
○ 3	○ 7	○ 11	○ 15 or more

Some graduate school

○ 0	○ 4	○ 8	○ 12
○ 1	○ 5	○ 9	○ 13
○ 2	○ 6	○ 10	○ 14
○ 3	○ 7	○ 11	○ 15 or more

Master's degree

○ 0	○ 4	○ 8	○ 12
○ 1	○ 5	○ 9	○ 13
○ 2	○ 6	○ 10	○ 14
○ 3	○ 7	○ 11	○ 15 or more

Doctoral degree

○ 0	○ 4	○ 8	○ 12
○ 1	○ 5	○ 9	○ 13
○ 2	○ 6	○ 10	○ 14
○ 3	○ 7	○ 11	○ 15 or more

Other *(Specify below)*

_____

○ 0	○ 4	○ 8	○ 12
○ 1	○ 5	○ 9	○ 13
○ 2	○ 6	○ 10	○ 14
○ 3	○ 7	○ 11	○ 15 or more

3. How many teachers in your department work with an appropriate mathematics credential?

○ Nearly all (more than 90%)
○ Most (75% - 90%)
○ Some (25% - 74%)
○ Only a few (less than 25%)
○ None

4. How many teachers in your department work with an emergency credential or are a district intern?

○ Nearly all (more than 90%)
○ Most (75% - 90%)
○ Some (25% - 74%)
○ Only a few (less than 25%)
○ None

5. How would you characterize the experience of the teachers who teach the Primary or Supplemental courses you listed above?

○ Most have 5 or more years teaching experience
○ About half have 5 or more years teaching experience
○ Few have 5 or more years teaching experience

6. How would you characterize the experience of the teachers who teach the Basic or Intervention Programs you listed above?

○ Most have 5 or more years teaching experience
○ About half have 5 or more years teaching experience
○ Few have 5 or more years teaching experience

7. How are the following subgroups of students who may be challenged to satisfy the CAHSEE requirements placed in sections of the Primary/Supplemental Courses you listed above?

	Students are distributed across most or all sections	Students are clustered in one or a few sections
"At-risk" (economically disadvantaged) students in general	○	○
English learners	○	○
Remedial students in general	○	○
Students receiving special education services	○	○

8. In the Primary/Supplemental Courses you listed above, what percentage of the students in the following subgroups is receiving their mathematics instruction from teachers who are experienced in working with these subgroups?

	Nearly all (more than 90%)	Most (75% - 90%)	Some (25% - 74%)	Only a few (less than 25%)	None
"At-risk" (economically disadvantaged) students in general	○	○	○	○	○
English learners	○	○	○	○	○
Remedial students in general	○	○	○	○	○
Students receiving special education services	○	○	○	○	○

9. What percentage of the students in the following subgroups is receiving their mathematics instruction from teachers without an appropriate mathematics credential?

	None	Only a few (less than 25%)	Some (25% - 74%)	Most (75% - 90%)	Nearly all (more than 90%)
"At-risk" (economically disadvantaged) students in general	○	○	○	○	○
English learners	○	○	○	○	○
Remedial students in general	○	○	○	○	○
Students receiving special education services	○	○	○	○	○

10. In the Intervention/Basic Programs you listed above, what percentage of the students in the following subgroups is receiving their mathematics instruction from teachers who are experienced in working with these subgroups of students?

	None	Only a few (less than 25%)	Some (25% - 74%)	Most (75% - 90%)	Nearly all (more than 90%)
"At-risk" (economically disadvantaged) students in general	○	○	○	○	○
English learners	○	○	○	○	○
Remedial students in general	○	○	○	○	○
Students receiving special education services	○	○	○	○	○

11. To what extent, in general, are teachers in your department experienced in teaching the California Content Standards associated with the CAHSEE requirements?

- ○ Very great extent
- ○ Great extent
- ○ Moderate extent
- ○ Slight extent
- ○ Not at all

12. To what extent would you characterize your mathematics course offerings as being demanding courses for students?

- ○ Very great extent
- ○ Great extent
- ○ Moderate extent
- ○ Slight extent
- ○ Not at all

Thank you for your cooperation!

Please prepare a Part 2 survey for the 5 Primary/Supplemental Courses and 5 Basic/Intervention Programs you identified above and distribute them to the appropriate teachers.

High School Teacher, Part 2

High School Teacher, Part 2

California High School Exit Examination Evaluation—Spring 2005
Information on Instruction that Covers
California Content Standards Associated with the CAHSEE - Grades 9-12

GENERAL DIRECTIONS: Please answer each item by filling in the circle of your response or writing your response.

SURVEY MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

- **Use a No. 2 pencil only.**
- **Darken the circle completely.**
- **Erase cleanly any marks you wish to change.**
- **Make no stray marks on this form.**

CORRECT MARK

INCORRECT MARKS

You have been selected by your department head to complete the Teacher Survey (Part 2) of the 2005 Instruction Study. This survey covers the course or instructional program listed in Question 1. As you answer the questions, please make sure you keep only this particular course or instructional program in mind. The estimated time for completion is 15 minutes.

TITLE OF COURSE OR INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

1. **Course/Instructional program title as listed in department head's survey (Part 1).** *(This question should already be completed by department head.)*

   _____

   _____

2. **With which subject area is this course or instructional program associated?**
   - ○ ELA
   - ○ Math

COURSE DESCRIPTION

3. **What type of course or instructional program is this?**
   - ○ Primary course in this subject at this grade open to all students who have met prerequisites
   - ○ Required alternative to primary course targeted to certain audience
   - ○ Required supplemental course targeted to remediation
   - ○ Elective course open to all students
   - ○ Elective course targeted to remediation
   - ○ Other *(specify below)*

   _____

4. **When is this course or instructional program offered?** *(Mark all that apply.)*
   - ○ Before/After school course or program
   - ○ Summer school course
   - ○ Summer program
   - ○ During normal school hours
   - ○ Intercession breaks
   - Other *(specify below)*

   _____

5. **What is the duration of this course or instructional program?**
   - ○ Few weeks
   - ○ Quarter
   - ○ Trimester
   - ○ Semester
   - ○ Full school year

6. **At what grade level(s) are the majority of your students who take this course or instructional program?**
   - ○ 9th
   - ○ 10th
   - ○ 11th
   - ○ 12th
   - ○ 9th and 10th
   - ○ 10th and 11th
   - ○ 11th and 12th
   - ○ Other (specify) _____

STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS OF THIS COURSE

Please answer for the current 2004 - 05 academic year.

7. What is the total number of students you are teaching in this course or instructional program this academic year? *Include all of your sections in the count.*

- ○ 10 or fewer
- ○ 11 - 30
- ○ 31 - 60
- ○ 61 - 100
- ○ More than 100

8. What proportion of your students enrolled in this course or instructional program are English learners?

- ○ Nearly all (more than 90%)
- ○ Most (75% - 90%)
- ○ Some (25% - 74%)
- ○ Only a few (less than 25%)
- ○ Not sure

9. What proportion of your students enrolled in this course or instructional program are students receiving special education services?

- ○ Nearly all (more than 90%)
- ○ Most (75% - 90%)
- ○ Some (25% - 74%)
- ○ Only a few (less than 25%)
- ○ Not sure

10. What proportion of your students enrolled in this course or instructional program are "at-risk" (economically disadvantaged) students?

- ○ Nearly all (more than 90%)
- ○ Most (75% - 90%)
- ○ Some (25% - 74%)
- ○ Only a few (less than 25%)
- ○ Not sure

11. How would you describe your students who are taking this course or instructional program?

- ○ Almost all students are well prepared to succeed.
- ○ Some students do not yet have prerequisite skills.
- ○ Most students do not yet have prerequisite skills.

12. What proportion of your students taking this course or instructional program achieved at least basic performance on last year's corresponding STAR CST test?

- ○ Nearly all (more than 90%)
- ○ Most (75% - 90%)
- ○ Some (25% - 74%)
- ○ Only a few (less than 25%)
- ○ Not sure

13. To what extent do the following factors limit the overall effectiveness of this course?

	Not at all	Slight extent	Moderate extent	Great extent	Very great extent
Low student attendance	○	○	○	○	○
Low student motivation	○	○	○	○	○
Low student English proficiency	○	○	○	○	○
Low parental support	○	○	○	○	○
Lack of materials/resources	○	○	○	○	○
Limitations in my own knowledge or experience	○	○	○	○	○
My own difficulty in engaging these students	○	○	○	○	○

14. Do you use a textbook for this course or instructional program?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No

14A. If you use a textbook, provide the exact title of the current textbook and author's or publisher's name.

Title: _____

_____

Author/Publisher: _____

_____

14B. If you use a textbook for the primary content source, when did your school adopt this textbook?

- ○ 2004 - 2005
- ○ 2003 - 2004
- ○ 2002 - 2003
- ○ Before 2002
- ○ Not applicable

14C. If you use a textbook, approximately how much of it do you use?

- ○ All (96% - 100%)
- ○ Most (61% - 95%)
- ○ About half (40% - 60%)
- ○ Some (less than 40%)
- ○ Too variable to categorize
- ○ Not applicable

15. Indicate how often you use the following supplemental materials in this course or instructional program (Mark all that apply.)

	Less than 1x per month or never	1x per month	1x per week	2 - 3x per week	Daily
Other text(s)	○	○	○	○	○
Commercially prepared material(s) *(not computer-based)*	○	○	○	○	○
Computer-based program(s)	○	○	○	○	○

15A. If you selected any supplemental materials above, please describe them.

Other text(s)
Exact Title: _____

_____

Commercially prepared material(s) *(not computer-based)*
Description: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Computer-based program(s)
Description: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

15B. What is the primary reason you use supplemental materials?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

TEACHER DEMOGRAPHICS

16. What is your most advanced degree?

- ○ Bachelor's degree
- ○ Some graduate school
- ○ Master's degree
- ○ Doctoral degree
- ○ Other (specify below)

_____

17. What teaching credential(s) do you hold?

_____

_____

_____

_____

18. How many years of experience do you have teaching this course or instructional program?

- ○ 1 year or less
- ○ 2 - 3 years
- ○ 4 - 5 years
- ○ 6 - 10 years
- ○ 11 - 20 years
- ○ More than 20 years

19. How many total years of teaching experience do you have?

- ○ 1 year or less
- ○ 2 - 3 years
- ○ 4 - 5 years
- ○ 6 - 10 years
- ○ 11 - 20 years
- ○ More than 20 years

Return this survey to your department head no later than April 29th, 2005.

The success of this evaluation effort relies on your support, and we thank you for your help with the 2005 Instruction Study. We look forward to receiving your completed survey.

If you have questions about the origin or purpose of the study, how your school was selected, or how you were selected, please contact your principal or department head, who have more complete information sheets.

We treat your information with great care. Although school names are used to help us get the information to the right places in the database for analysis purposes, any individually identifiable information is stripped away after that process.

If you have other questions or concerns about the 2005 Instruction Survey, feel free to contact Carolyn Harris at HumRRO 1-800-301-1508 or charris@humrro.org.

Middle School Principal

Middle School Principal

California High School Exit Examination Evaluation—Spring 2005
Information on Instruction that Covers
California Content Standards Associated with the CAHSEE- Grades 6-9

GENERAL DIRECTIONS: Please answer each item by filling in the circle of your response or writing your response.

SURVEY MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

- Use a No. 2 pencil only.
- Darken the circle completely.
- Erase cleanly any marks you wish to change.
- Make no stray marks on this form.

CORRECT MARK

INCORRECT MARKS

1. How completely did your school cover the California Content Standards contained in the blueprints adopted for CAHSEE for English-Language Arts in each of the following years?

	Do Not Know	Little Covered (less than 40%)	Partially Covered (40% - 60%)	Mostly Covered (61% - 95%)	Completely Covered (96% - 100%)
2004 - 2005 (projected)	○	○	○	○	○
2003 - 2004	○	○	○	○	○
2002 - 2003	○	○	○	○	○
Before 2002	○	○	○	○	○

2. How completely did your school cover the California Content Standards contained in the blueprints adopted for CAHSEE for mathematics in each of the following years?

	Do Not Know	Little Covered (less than 40%)	Partially Covered (40% - 60%)	Mostly Covered (61% - 95%)	Completely Covered (96% - 100%)
2004 - 2005 (projected)	○	○	○	○	○
2003 - 2004	○	○	○	○	○
2002 - 2003	○	○	○	○	○
Before 2002	○	○	○	○	○

3. What is the highest mathematics course completed by your 8th grade students? Please enter the percent of students at each level from "No Pre-Algebra" through "Algebra I". Percents in each row should total 100%

Year Completing Grade 8	No Pre-Algebra, Algebra A, or Algebra 1		Pre-Algebra only		Algebra A (1st Year of a 2-year Algbra course		Algebra 1 (or higher)	
2004 - 2005 (projected)	☐	+	☐	+	☐	+	☐	= 100%
2003 - 2004	☐	+	☐	+	☐	+	☐	= 100%
2002 - 2003	☐	+	☐	+	☐	+	☐	= 100%
Before 2002	☐	+	☐	+	☐	+	☐	= 100%

4. What proportion of the teachers at your school participated in ELA-related professional development designed to help them teach the California Content Standards associated with CAHSEE?

- ○ Nearly all (more than 90%)
- ○ Most (75% to 90%)
- ○ Some (25% to 74%)
- ○ Only a few (less than 25%)
- ○ Not applicable

5. What proportion of teachers at your school participated in mathematics-related professional development designed to help them teach the California Content Standards associated with CAHSEE?

- ○ Nearly all (more than 90%)
- ○ Most (75% to 90%)
- ○ Some (25% to 74%)
- ○ Only a few (less than 25%)
- ○ Not applicable

6. **What kind of system do you use to monitor and report student proficiency levels on content standards** *(Mark all that apply.)*

- ○ District-based tracking system
- ○ School-based tracking system
- ○ Department-based (ELA or Math) tracking system
- ○ Individual teachers keep track of mastery
- ○ Other *(describe below)*

_____

- ○ None

7. **How developed are systems at your school to coordinate coverage of the California Content Standards associated with the CAHSEE between the following four groups?** *(Please answer for all four groups.)*

	Not developed	Partially developed	Fully developed
Middle School/High School	○	○	○
Special Education/General Education	○	○	○
English Language Development/General Education	○	○	○
Alternative (Continuation)/General Education	○	○	○

8. **Do you have regular articulation meetings with your receiving high schools?**

- ○ Yes, with all of them
- ○ Yes, with some of them
- ○ No
- ○ Does not apply to our situation

8A. **If MEETINGS ARE HELD, what are the primary topics discussed during articulation meetings?**

_____

_____

9. **Rate the importance of regular articulation meetings with your receiving high schools in preparing students for successfully learning the California Content Standards.**

- ○ Very important
- ○ Important
- ○ Neither important nor unimportant
- ○ Unimportant
- ○ Very unimportant

10. **Do you have regular articulation meetings with your feeder elementary schools?**

- ○ Yes, with all of them
- ○ Yes, with some of them
- ○ No
- ○ Does not apply to our situation

10A. **If MEETINGS ARE HELD, what are the primary topics discussed during articulation meetings?**

_____

_____

11. **Rate the importance of regular articulation meetings with your feeder elementary schools in preparing students for successfully learning the California Content Standards.**

- ○ Very important
- ○ Important
- ○ Neither important nor unimportant
- ○ Unimportant
- ○ Very unimportant

Thank you for your cooperation!

Middle School Department Head/Lead Teacher—ELA, Part 1

Middle School Department Head/Lead Teacher - ELA, Part 1

California High School Exit Examination Evaluation—Spring 2005
Information on Instruction that Covers
California Content Standards Associated with the CAHSEE - Grades 6-9

PRIMARY COURSES

A. This **Part 1 survey** seeks a listing of all courses at your school that offer initial (primary) instruction covering the California Content Standards in English-Language Arts to students in grades 6 through 9. The most common courses listed in CBEDS have been included. If you offer other courses that are not listed, space is provided for you to write in the title and CBEDS number of up to five (5) additional courses.

- For each listed or added English-Language Arts course (1) mark the academic year in which the course was first offered at your school and (2) enter the number of sections currently offered at your school in the 2004-05 school year. If you don't use a listed course, fill in the circle under N/A (not applicable). A sample is shown on the next page that demonstrates how to complete the survey.

For the Part 2 - Teacher Survey, select up to five (5) of your English-Language Arts courses that have content ***most*** closely related to the California Content Standards associated with the CAHSEE. Include courses that have the highest enrollments of students receiving special education services and English learners. Identify a teacher in your department who currently (or most recently) teaches each course and ask him or her to complete a Part 2 - Teacher Survey and return it to you. Try to distribute the surveys to teachers with a variety of experience and skill levels, and include any teachers who are working <u>without</u> an appropriate ELA credential.

INTERVENTION PROGRAMS

B. The **Part 1 survey** also seeks a listing of remedial instructional programs - instruction that supports/assists students performing below grade level. We have provided a list of state-adopted instructional materials that you might be using. Again, if you offer other programs that are not listed, space is provided to write in titles of up to five (5) programs that have content related to the California Content Standards associated with the CAHSEE.

- For each selected program (1) mark the academic year in which the course was first offered at your school and (2) enter the number of sections currently offered at your school in the 2004-05 school year. If you don't use a listed program, fill in the circle under N/A (not applicable).

For the Part 2 - Teacher Survey, select up to five (5) of your remedial English-Language Arts programs that have content ***most*** closely related to the California Content Standards associated with the CAHSEE. Identify a teacher who currently (or most recently) teaches each program and ask him or her to complete a Part 2 - Teacher Survey and return it to you when finished.

GENERAL DIRECTIONS: Please answer each item by filling in the circle of your response or writing your response.

SURVEY MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

- **Use a No. 2 pencil only.**
- **Darken the circle completely.**
- **Erase cleanly any marks you wish to change.**
- **Make no stray marks on this form.**

CORRECT MARK

INCORRECT MARKS

SAMPLE LISTING OF PRIMARY OR SUPPLEMENTAL COURSES

English-Language Arts Primary or Supplemental Courses *	In what academic year was this course first offered?				Number of Sections During Current Academic Year										
	Before 2002	2002 - 03	2003 - 04	2004 - 05	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more	N/A
Comprehensive English - Grade 7 (2101)	○	○	○	●	○	○	○	○	●	○	○	○	○	○
Comprehensive English - Grade 8 (2101)	○	○	○	●	○	○	○	○	●	○	○	○	○	○
Comprehensive English - Grade 9 (2101)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	●
English as a Second Language (2110)	○	○	●	○	○	○	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

PLEASE BEGIN ON THE NEXT PAGE

PRIMARY OR SUPPLEMENTAL COURSES—English-Language Arts

For each of the following courses you offer, (1) mark the academic year in which the course was first offered at your school and (2) enter the number of sections currently offered at your school. If a particular course is not offered, fill in the circle under N/A (not applicable). If you offer other courses that are not listed, space is provided to write in the title and CBEDS number of up to five (5) courses that have content related to the California Content Standards associated with the CAHSEE. For additional courses also mark the academic year in which the course was first offered and the number of sections offered this year.

English-Language Arts Primary or Supplemental Courses *	In what academic year was this course first offered?				Number of Sections During Current Academic Year									
	Before 2002	2002 - 03	2003 - 04	2004 - 05	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more	N/A
Comprehensive English - Grade 6 (2101)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Comprehensive English - Grade 7 (2101)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Comprehensive English - Grade 8 (2101)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Comprehensive English - Grade 9 (2101)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
English as a Second Language (2110)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	

*** Numbers in parenthesis refer to CBEDS courses taken from http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/cb/english.asp. [Note: the preceding Web address is no longer valid.]**

INTERVENTION PROGRAMS—English-Language Arts

These English-Language Arts programs have been adopted by the state for middle school basic and intervention programs, and you may be using them at your school. If you offer other courses that are not listed, space is provided to write in the titles of up to five (5) programs that have content closely related to the California Content Standards associated with the CAHSEE. For each program you use (1) mark the academic year in which the program was first offered at your school and (2) enter the number of sections offered at your school. If you don't use a listed program, fill in the circle under N/A (not applicable).

	In what academic year was this course first offered?				Number of Sections During Current Academic Year									
			2002 - 03	2004 - 05	2		4		6		8			N/A
Houghton Mifflin Reading: A Legacy of Literacy	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
SRA/Open Court Reading (SRA/McGraw-Hill)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
The Reader's Choice (Glencoe/McGraw-Hill)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Literature and Language (Holt, Rinehart, and Winston)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
McDougal Littell Reading & Language Arts Program	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Prentice-Hall Literature: Timeless Voices, Timeless Themes	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Language! A Literacy Intervention Curriculum (Glencoe/McGraw-Hill)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
High Point (Hampton Brown)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
High Point for English Learners (Hampton Brown)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
READ 180 (Glenco/McGraw-Hill)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
SRA/Reach Program (SRA/McGraw-Hill)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Fast Track Reading Program (Wright Group/ McGraw-Hill)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Program Title: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	
Program Title: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	
Program Title: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	
Program Title: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	
Program Title: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	

*** Programs taken from http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/rla2002pub.asp. [Note: the preceding Web address is no longer valid.]**

CONCLUDING QUESTIONS

1. How many full-time teachers work in your department? *(Mark one.)*

○ 1	○ 5	○ 9	○ 13
○ 2	○ 6	○ 10	○ 14
○ 3	○ 7	○ 11	○ 15
○ 4	○ 8	○ 12	○ 16 or more

2. How many teachers in your department have as their most advanced degree: *(Mark one for each.)*

Bachelor's degree

○ 0	○ 4	○ 8	○ 12
○ 1	○ 5	○ 9	○ 13
○ 2	○ 6	○ 10	○ 14
○ 3	○ 7	○ 11	○ 15 or more

Some graduate school

○ 0	○ 4	○ 8	○ 12
○ 1	○ 5	○ 9	○ 13
○ 2	○ 6	○ 10	○ 14
○ 3	○ 7	○ 11	○ 15 or more

Master's degree

○ 0	○ 4	○ 8	○ 12
○ 1	○ 5	○ 9	○ 13
○ 2	○ 6	○ 10	○ 14
○ 3	○ 7	○ 11	○ 15 or more

Doctoral degree

○ 0	○ 4	○ 8	○ 12
○ 1	○ 5	○ 9	○ 13
○ 2	○ 6	○ 10	○ 14
○ 3	○ 7	○ 11	○ 15 or more

Other *(Specify below)*

_____

○ 0	○ 4	○ 8	○ 12
○ 1	○ 5	○ 9	○ 13
○ 2	○ 6	○ 10	○ 14
○ 3	○ 7	○ 11	○ 15 or more

3. How many teachers in your department work with an appropriate ELA credential?

○ Nearly all (more than 90%)
○ Most (75% - 90%)
○ Some (25% - 74%)
○ Only a few (less than 25%)
○ None

4. How many teachers in your department work with an emergency credential or are a district intern?

○ Nearly all (more than 90%)
○ Most (75% - 90%)
○ Some (25% - 74%)
○ Only a few (less than 25%)
○ None

5. How would you characterize the experience of the teachers who teach the Primary or Supplemental Courses you listed above?

○ Most have 5 or more years teaching experience
○ About half have 5 or more years teaching experience
○ Few have 5 or more years teaching experience

6. How would you characterize the experience of the teachers who teach the Basic or Intervention Programs you listed above?

○ Most have 5 or more years teaching experience
○ About half have 5 or more years teaching experience
○ Few have 5 or more years teaching experience

7. How are the following subgroups of students who may be challenged to satisfy the CAHSEE requirements placed in sections of the Primary/ Supplemental Courses you listed above?

	Students are distributed across most or all sections	Students are clustered in one or a few sections
"At-risk" (economically disadvantaged) students in general	○	○
English learners	○	○
Remedial students in general	○	○
Students receiving special education services	○	○

8. What percentage of the students in the following subgroups is receiving their ELA instruction from teachers <u>without</u> an appropriate ELA credential?

	Nearly all (more than 90%)	Most (75% - 90%)	Some (25% - 74%)	Only a few (less than 25%)	None
"At-risk" (economically disadvantaged) students in general	○	○	○	○	○
English learners	○	○	○	○	○
Remedial students in general	○	○	○	○	○
Students receiving special education services	○	○	○	○	○

9. To what extent, in general, are teachers in your department experienced in teaching the California Content Standards associated with the CAHSEE requirements?

- ○ Very great extent
- ○ Great extent
- ○ Moderate extent
- ○ Slight extent
- ○ Not at all

10. To what extent would you characterize your ELA course offerings as being demanding courses for students?

- ○ Very great extent
- ○ Great extent
- ○ Moderate extent
- ○ Slight extent
- ○ Not at all

Thank you for your cooperation!

Please prepare a Part 2 survey for the 5 Primary/Supplemental Courses and 5 Basic/Intervention Programs you identified above and distribute them to the appropriate teachers.

Middle School Department Head/Lead Teacher—Mathematics, Part 1

Middle School Department Head/Lead Teacher - Mathematics, Part 1

California High School Exit Examination Evaluation—Spring 2005
Information on Instruction that Covers
California Content Standards Associated with the CAHSEE - Grades 6-9

PRIMARY COURSES

A. This **Part 1 survey** seeks a listing of all courses at your school that offer initial, primary instruction covering the California Content Standards in mathematics to students in grades 6 through 9. The most common courses listed in CBEDS have been included. If you offer other courses that are not listed, space is provided for you to write in the title and CBEDS number of up to five (5) additional courses.

- For each listed or added mathematics course (1) mark the academic year in which the course was first offered at your school and (2) enter the number of sections currently offered at your school in the 2004-05 school year. If you don't use a listed course, fill in the circle under N/A (not applicable). A sample is shown on the next page that demonstrates how to complete the survey.

For the Part 2 - Teacher Survey, select up to five (5) of your mathematics courses that have content ***most*** closely related to the California Content Standards associated with the CAHSEE. Include courses that have the highest enrollments of students receiving special education services and English learners. Identify a teacher in your department who currently (or most recently) teaches each course and ask him or her to complete a Part 2 - Teacher Survey and return it to you. Try to distribute the surveys to teachers with a variety of experience and skill levels, and include any teachers who are working <u>without</u> an appropriate mathematics credential.

INTERVENTION PROGRAMS

B. The **Part 1 survey** also seeks a listing of remedial instructional programs - instruction that supports/assists students performing below grade level. We have provided a list of state-adopted instructional materials that you might be using. Again, if you offer other programs that are not listed, space is provided to write in titles of up to five (5) programs that have content related to the California Content Standards associated with the CAHSEE.

- For each selected program (1) mark the academic year in which the course was first offered at your school and (2) enter the number of sections currently offered at your school in the 2004-05 school year. If you don't use a listed program, fill in the circle under N/A (not applicable).

For the Part 2 - Teacher Survey, select up to five (5) of your remedial mathematics programs that have content ***most*** closely related to the California Content Standards associated with the CAHSEE. Identify a teacher who currently (or most recently) teaches each program and ask him or her to complete a Part 2 - Teacher Survey and return it to you when finished.

GENERAL DIRECTIONS: Please answer each item by filling in the circle of your response or writing your response.

SURVEY MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

- **Use a No. 2 pencil only.**
- **Darken the circle completely.**
- **Erase cleanly any marks you wish to change.**
- **Make no stray marks on this form.**

CORRECT MARK

INCORRECT MARKS

SAMPLE LISTING OF PRIMARY OR SUPPLEMENTAL COURSES

Mathematics Primary or Supplemental Courses *	In what academic year was this course first offered?				Number of Sections During Current Academic Year										
	Before 2002	2002 - 03	2003 - 04	2004 - 05	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more		N/A
Beginning Algebra (2403)	○	○	○	●	○	○	○	○	●	○	○	○	○		○
Pre-Algebra (2424)	○	○	●	○	○	○	○	●	○	○	○	○	○		○
Algebra A (1st half of course in 1 year) (2428)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○		●
Remedial Mathematics/Proficiency Development (2402)	○	●	○	○	○	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○		○

PLEASE BEGIN ON THE NEXT PAGE

PRIMARY OR SUPPLEMENTAL COURSES—Mathematics

For each of the following courses you offer, (1) mark the academic year in which the course was first offered at your school and (2) enter the number of sections currently offered at your school. If a particular course is not offered, fill in the circle under N/A (not applicable). If you offer other courses that are not listed, space is provided to write in the title and CBEDS number of up to five (5) courses that have content related to the California Content Standards associated with the CAHSEE. For additional courses also mark the academic year in which the course was first offered and the number of sections offered this year.

Mathematics Primary or Supplemental Courses *	In what academic year was this course first offered?				Number of Sections During Current Academic Year									
	Before 2002	2002 - 03	2003 - 04	2004 - 05	2	4	6	8						N/A
General Math (2400)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Math A (2420)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Math B (2421)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Pre-Algebra (2424)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Beginning Algebra (2403)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Intermediate Algebra (2404)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Beginning Algebra Part I (2428)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Beginning Algebra Part II (2429)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Integrated Math I (2425)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Integrated Math II (2426)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Consumer Math (2401)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Remedial Math (2402)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	
Course Title and CBEDS Number: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	

*** Numbers in parenthesis refer to CBEDS courses taken from http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/cb/math.asp. [Note: the preceding Web address is no longer valid.]**

INTERVENTION PROGRAMS—Mathematics

These mathematics programs have been adopted by the state for middle school basic and intervention programs, and you may be using them at your school. If you offer other courses that are not listed, space is provided to write in the titles of up to five (5) programs that have content closely related to the California Content Standards associated with the CAHSEE. For each program you use (1) mark the academic year in which the program was first offered at your school and (2) enter the number of sections offered at your school. If you don't use a listed program, fill in the circle under N/A (not applicable).

	In what academic year was this course first offered?				Number of Sections During Current Academic Year									
			2002 - 03	2004 - 05	2		4		6		8			N/A
Success with Mathcoach (CSL Associates, Inc.)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Harcourt Math @ 2002 (w/Spanish as Alternate Format K-6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Mathematics by Houghton Mifflin	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Concepts and Skills (McDougal Littell, Inc.)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Structure and Method (McDougal Littell, Inc.)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
McGraw-Hill Mathematics (w/Spanish as Alternate Format K-6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Prentice Hall Pre-Algebra, CA Edition	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Prentice Hall Algebra 1, CA Edition	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Progress in Mathematics, CA Edition (William H. Sadlier, Inc.)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Saxon Math K-3, An Incremental Development (w/Spanish as Alternate Format K-6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Math 54, 65, 76, and 87 (Saxon Publishers, Inc.)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Scott Foresman CA Mathematics	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Program Title: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	
Program Title: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	
Program Title: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	
Program Title: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	
Program Title: _____	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	

*** Programs taken from http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/math2001pub.asp. [Note: the preceding Web address is no longer valid.]**

CONCLUDING QUESTIONS

1. How many full-time teachers work in your department (or subject area)? *(Mark one.)*

○ 1	○ 5	○ 9	○ 13
○ 2	○ 6	○ 10	○ 14
○ 3	○ 7	○ 11	○ 15
○ 4	○ 8	○ 12	○ 16 or more

2. How many teachers in your department have as their most advanced degree: *(Mark one for each.)*

Bachelor's degree

○ 0	○ 4	○ 8	○ 12
○ 1	○ 5	○ 9	○ 13
○ 2	○ 6	○ 10	○ 14
○ 3	○ 7	○ 11	○ 15 or more

Some graduate school

○ 0	○ 4	○ 8	○ 12
○ 1	○ 5	○ 9	○ 13
○ 2	○ 6	○ 10	○ 14
○ 3	○ 7	○ 11	○ 15 or more

Master's degree

○ 0	○ 4	○ 8	○ 12
○ 1	○ 5	○ 9	○ 13
○ 2	○ 6	○ 10	○ 14
○ 3	○ 7	○ 11	○ 15 or more

Doctoral degree

○ 0	○ 4	○ 8	○ 12
○ 1	○ 5	○ 9	○ 13
○ 2	○ 6	○ 10	○ 14
○ 3	○ 7	○ 11	○ 15 or more

Other *(Specify below)*

_____

○ 0	○ 4	○ 8	○ 12
○ 1	○ 5	○ 9	○ 13
○ 2	○ 6	○ 10	○ 14
○ 3	○ 7	○ 11	○ 15 or more

3. How many teachers in your department work with an appropriate mathematics credential?

○ Nearly all (more than 90%)
○ Most (75% - 90%)
○ Some (25% - 74%)
○ Only a few (less than 25%)
○ None

4. How many teachers in your department work with an emergency credential or are a district intern?

○ Nearly all (more than 90%)
○ Most (75% - 90%)
○ Some (25% - 74%)
○ Only a few (less than 25%)
○ None

5. How would you characterize the experience of the teachers who teach the Primary or Supplemental Courses you listed above?

○ Most have 5 or more years teaching experience
○ About half have 5 or more years teaching experience
○ Few have 5 or more years teaching experience

6. How would you characterize the experience of the teachers who teach the Basic or Intervention Programs you listed above?

○ Most have 5 or more years teaching experience
○ About half have 5 or more years teaching experience
○ Few have 5 or more years teaching experience

7. How are the following subgroups of students who may be challenged to satisfy the CAHSEE requirements placed in sections of the Primary/ Supplemental Courses you listed above?

	Students are distributed across most or all sections	Students are clustered in one or a few sections
"At-risk" (economically disadvantaged) students in general	○	○
English learners	○	○
Remedial students in general	○	○
Students receiving special education services	○	○

8. What percentage of the students in the following subgroups is receiving their mathematics instruction from teachers <u>without</u> an appropriate mathematics credential?

	Nearly all (more than 90%)	Most (75% - 90%)	Some (25% - 74%)	Only a few (less than 25%)	None
"At-risk" (economically disadvantaged) students in general	○	○	○	○	○
English learners	○	○	○	○	○
Remedial students in general	○	○	○	○	○
Students receiving special education services	○	○	○	○	○

9. To what extent, in general, are teachers in your department experienced in teaching the California Content Standards associated with the CAHSEE requirements?

- ○ Very great extent
- ○ Great extent
- ○ Moderate extent
- ○ Slight extent
- ○ Not at all

10. To what extent would you characterize your mathematics course offerings as being demanding courses for students?

- ○ Very great extent
- ○ Great extent
- ○ Moderate extent
- ○ Slight extent
- ○ Not at all

Thank you for your cooperation!

Please prepare a Part 2 survey for the 5 Primary/Supplemental Courses and 5 Basic/Intervention Programs you identified above and distribute them to the appropriate teachers.

Middle School Teacher, Part 2

Middle School Teacher, Part 2

California High School Exit Examination Evaluation—Spring 2005
Information on Instruction that Covers
California Content Standards Associated with the CAHSEE - Grades 6-9

GENERAL DIRECTIONS: Please answer each item by filling in the circle of your response or writing your response.

SURVEY MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

- **Use a No. 2 pencil only.**
- **Darken the circle completely.**
- **Erase cleanly any marks you wish to change.**
- **Make no stray marks on this form.**

CORRECT MARK

INCORRECT MARKS

You have been selected by your department head to complete the Teacher Survey (Part 2) of the 2005 Instruction Study. This survey covers the course or instructional program listed in Question 1. As you answer the questions, please make sure you keep only this particular course or instructional program in mind. The estimated time for completion is 15 minutes.

TITLE OF COURSE OR INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

1. **Course/Instructional program title as listed in department head's survey (Part 1).** *(This question should already be completed by department head.)*

   _____

   _____

2. **With which subject area is this course or instructional program associated?**
   - ○ ELA
   - ○ Math

COURSE DESCRIPTION

3. **What type of course or instructional program is this?**
   - ○ Primary course in this subject at this grade open to all students who have met prerequisites
   - ○ Required alternative to primary course targeted to certain audience
   - ○ Required supplemental course targeted to remediation
   - ○ Elective course open to all students
   - ○ Elective course targeted to remediation
   - ○ Other *(specify below)*

   _____

4. **When is this course or instructional program offered?** *(Mark all that apply.)*
   - ○ Before/After school course or program
   - ○ Summer school course
   - ○ Summer program
   - ○ During normal school hours
   - ○ Intercession breaks
   - ○ Other *(specify below)*

   _____

5. **What is the duration of this course or instructional program?**
   - ○ Few weeks
   - ○ Quarter
   - ○ Trimester
   - ○ Semester
   - ○ Full school year

STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS OF THIS COURSE

Please answer for the current 2004 - 05 academic year.

6. What is the total number of students you are teaching in this course or instructional program this academic year? *Include all of your sections in the count.*

- ○ 10 or fewer
- ○ 11 - 30
- ○ 31 - 60
- ○ 61 - 100
- ○ More than 100

7. What proportion of your students enrolled in this course or instructional program are English learners?

- ○ Nearly all (more than 90%)
- ○ Most (75% - 90%)
- ○ Some (25% - 74%)
- ○ Only a few (less than 25%)
- ○ Not sure

8. What proportion of your students enrolled in this course or instructional program are students receiving special education services?

- ○ Nearly all (more than 90%)
- ○ Most (75% - 90%)
- ○ Some (25% - 74%)
- ○ Only a few (less than 25%)
- ○ Not sure

9. What proportion of your students enrolled in this course or instructional program are "at-risk" (economically disadvantaged) students?

- ○ Nearly all (more than 90%)
- ○ Most (75% - 90%)
- ○ Some (25% - 74%)
- ○ Only a few (less than 25%)
- ○ Not sure

10. How would you describe your students who are taking this course or instructional program?

- ○ Almost all students are well prepared to succeed.
- ○ Some students do not yet have prerequisite skills.
- ○ Most students do not yet have prerequisite skills.

11. What proportion of your students taking this course or instructional program achieved at least basic performance on last year's corresponding STAR CST test?

- ○ Nearly all (more than 90%)
- ○ Most (75% - 90%)
- ○ Some (25% - 74%)
- ○ Only a few (less than 25%)
- ○ The course or program is too new to tell
- ○ Not sure

12. To what extent do the following factors limit the overall effectiveness of this course?

	Not at all	Slight extent	Moderate extent	Great extent	Very great extent
Low student attendance	○	○	○	○	○
Low student motivation	○	○	○	○	○
Low student English proficiency	○	○	○	○	○
Low parental support	○	○	○	○	○
Lack of materials/resources	○	○	○	○	○
Limitations in my own knowledge or experience	○	○	○	○	○
My own difficulty in engaging these students	○	○	○	○	○

13. Do you use a textbook for this course or instructional program?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No

13A. If you use a textbook, provide the exact title of the current textbook and author's or publisher's name.

Title: _____

_____

Author/Publisher: _____

_____

13B. If you use a textbook for the primary content source, when did your school adopt this textbook?

- ○ 2004 - 2005
- ○ 2003 - 2004
- ○ 2002 - 2003
- ○ Before 2002
- ○ Not applicable

13C. If you use a textbook, approximately how much of it do you use?

- ○ All (96% - 100%)
- ○ Most (61% - 95%)
- ○ About half (40% - 60%)
- ○ Some (less than 40%)
- ○ Too variable to categorize
- ○ Not applicable

14. Indicate how often you use the following supplemental materials in this course or instructional program (Mark all that apply.)

	Less than 1x per month or never	1x per month	1x per week	2 - 3x per week	Daily
Other text(s)	○	○	○	○	○
Commercially prepared material(s) *(not computer-based)*	○	○	○	○	○
Computer-based program(s)	○	○	○	○	○

14A. If you selected any supplemental materials above, please describe them.

Other text(s)
Exact Title: _____

_____

Commercially prepared material(s) *(not computer-based)*
Description: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Computer-based program(s)
Description: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

14B. What is the primary reason you use supplemental materials?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

TEACHER DEMOGRAPHICS

15. What is your most advanced degree?

- ○ Bachelor's degree
- ○ Some graduate school
- ○ Master's degree
- ○ Doctoral degree
- ○ Other (specify below)

_____

16. What teaching credential(s) do you hold?

_____

_____

_____

_____

17. How many years of experience do you have teaching this course or instructional program?

- ○ 1 year or less
- ○ 2 - 3 years
- ○ 4 - 5 years
- ○ 6 - 10 years
- ○ 11 - 20 years
- ○ More than 20 years

18. How many total years of teaching experience do you have?

- ○ 1 year or less
- ○ 2 - 3 years
- ○ 4 - 5 years
- ○ 6 - 10 years
- ○ 11 - 20 years
- ○ More than 20 years

Return this completed survey to your department head no later than April 29th, 2005.

The success of this evaluation effort relies on your support, and we thank you for your help with the 2005 Instruction Study. We look forward to receiving your completed survey.

If you have questions about the origin or purpose of the study, how your school was selected, or how you were selected, please contact your principal or department head, who have more complete information sheets.

We treat your information with great care. Although school names are used to help us get the information to the right places in the database for analysis purposes, any individually identifiable information is stripped away after that process.

If you have other questions or concerns about the 2005 Instruction Study, feel free to contact Carolyn Harris at HumRRO 1-800-301-1508 or charris@humrro.org.

Appendix C: Interview Protocols

Contains (a) forms used at the Item Review Workshops and
(b) forms used in the Universal Design Workshops

Method

Interview protocols for the site visit portion of the CAHSEE Independent Evaluation were developed following the meeting of HumRRO's Outside Consultant Panel Meeting, held in Sacramento on January 14–15, 2005. During the meeting, it was decided to refocus the protocols used in the 2003 CAHSEE AB 1609 study. Those protocols emphasized the implementation of standards-based instruction among several groups: administrators, general education math and English/language arts teachers, special education teachers, and teachers of special courses designed to help prepare or remediate students for the CAHSEE. While the new protocols focus on the same groups of education professionals, they would examine more specifically the needs of special education and English Learner students and the programs developed to assist them, while also retaining some original questions.

The time allotted for an interview did not change between the first and second CAHSEE Instruction Studies. Teacher interviews for both studies were limited to between 30 and 40 minutes, since it was expected that the majority of interviews would be conducted during a teacher's planning or preparation period. Based on previous experience in working in school environments, researchers recognized the importance of planning periods to the smooth running of a teacher's day. In order to give them at least a few minutes of their planning periods, the protocol developers tried to adhere to the planned interview time limit. Administrators were another issue; since they were less likely to be constrained to a particular period for their interview, developers believed that their interviews could run a little longer.

Based on previous experience, developers realized that sometimes there would not be enough time to complete an entire interview. Reasons are varied; teachers show up late for scheduled interviews; teachers report at the beginning that they have only 20 minutes instead of 40; or an unforeseen circumstance (fire drill, medical emergency, etc.) causes an interview to be terminated prematurely. For situations such as the first two examples, developers created a shorter version of the protocols by identifying a core set of questions. Interviewers were instructed to use the short version if their interviewee was running late. They also used the short form if the interviewees told them at the beginning that they had to leave early. Because of this, interviewers were able to obtain more consistent information. Of course, having a short form did not resolve all problems, as in the case of an interviewee who gave such detailed answers that the interviewer simply ran out of time.

Before being distributed to interviewers, protocols were submitted to officials at the California Department of Education (CDE) for approval. Copies of the regular and short protocol forms were then provided to interviewers both in hard copy and CD format. Copies of these protocols are included on the following pages of this appendix.

Also included in this appendix is a chart titled “Protocol Crosswalk.” This shows how questions are linked across protocols. A question that appears in several protocols with only minor wording differences is considered a common question; a question that appears on only one protocol is a unique question.

Principal Interview Protocol

Principal Interview Protocol

1.	A.	At what point in the process of implementing instruction based on the California Content Standards is your school? (1, not at all implemented; 5, fully implemented)
	B.	What rating would you have given 2 years ago?
	C.	*(Probe for example or clarification)* Can you give me an example of how implementation has increased/decreased?
2.	A.	Generally speaking, do you think your incoming students are better or less prepared than students were 2 years ago?
	B.	Can you give me an example of what you are categorizing as better/worse preparation?
	C.	On a 1 to 5 scale, 1 being "very poorly prepared" and 5 being "very well prepared," where would you place this year's group of incoming students?
	D.	In comparison, using the same 1-5 scale, where would you have placed incoming students 2 years ago?
	E.	Would you give subpopulations (ethnic groups, high poverty, EL, special ed) the same ratings as population as a whole? If not, explain.
3.		Are the California Content Standards **written** into your curriculum?
4.		What ensures that teachers are actually **teaching** the California Content Standards? (monitoring/accountability, such as including standards in lesson plans, principal observation, district-wide tests, etc.)
5.		What ensures that the California Content Standards are being taught at the **appropriate instructional level or grade level that is expected** by all teachers of a particular course—that "mastery" means the same thing to all teachers?
6.	A.	How does the school monitor an individual student's mastery of the California Content Standards? *(Looking for evidence of IEPs for all students, advisor-advisee activities, systematic review of test data, etc.)*
	B.	Is the same process used for all students? If not, describe how the process is modified.
7.	A.	Have there been any changes in instructional practices or strategies in classrooms to meet needs of individual students?
	B.	Have there been changes in professional development opportunities centered around individual student needs?
	C.	How do you ensure that teachers are actually using what they learned during professional development?

8.		Have there been any changes made to your school's curriculum that you attribute to CAHSEE's impact? *(Note: for A, B, and C, you will need to obtain specific information using the Program Questions sheet. Also ask if interviews are scheduled with any teachers of courses in A, B, and C.)*
	A.	*(Skip for middle school principal)* CAHSEE remediation class for those who have not passed one or both parts of the test?
	B.	CAHSEE preparation class for those you suspect are at risk of not passing CAHSEE, but who haven't taken it yet?
	C.	Courses specifically targeted to certain populations (EL, special ed, low SES) to help pass the CAHSEE? (For middle schools, to help them prepare for CAHSEE)
	D.	Changes to courses in your regular curriculum? Describe changes.
	E.	Changes in electives that you are able to offer as a result of CAHSEE impact? Describe changes.
	F.	Any other program or curriculum changes attributable to CAHSEE? Describe changes. (such as tutoring, extended hours for library, etc.)
9.	A.	How would you rate the degree of CAHSEE support shown to your student population as a whole by this school? (1, doing what is required; 5, couldn't ask for more/better; innovative, cutting edge kind of things.)
	B.	VERY IMPORTANT to ask for specifics if they give ratings of 3, 4, or 5—need to find out what kind of support the school is giving.
	C.	What rating would you have given 2 years ago?
	D.	What recommendations would you make to improve the level of CAHSEE support for your population as a whole?
10.	A.	How would you rate the degree of CAHSEE support shown to your student subpopulations by this school? (1, doing what is required; 5, couldn't ask for more/better; innovative, cutting edge kind of things.)
	B.	VERY IMPORTANT to ask for specifics if they give ratings of 3, 4, or 5—need to find out what kind of support the school is giving.
	C.	What rating would you have given 2 years ago?
	D.	What recommendations could you make to improve the level of CAHSEE support for your subpopulations?
11.	A.	Have you seen any changes in student motivation or attitude that you attribute to CAHSEE in your population as a whole? *(changes in dropout rates, increased/decreased absence rates, changes in amount of discipline referrals, for example).*
	B	How has the school responded to those changes?

Principal Interview Protocol

12.	A.	Have you seen any changes in student motivation or attitude that you attribute to CAHSEE in any subpopulations—such as EL, special ed, low SES? *(changes in dropout rates, increased/decreased absence rates, changes in amount of discipline referrals, for example).*
	B.	How has the school responded to those changes?
13.	A.	Do you anticipate changes in student motivation or attitude in your population as a whole when students in the Class of 2006 are held to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?
	B.	If so, describe anticipated changes.
	C.	What possible action might your school take in response to those anticipated changes?
14.	A.	Do you anticipate changes in student motivation or attitude in your various subpopulations when students in the Class of 2006 are held to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?
	B.	If so, describe anticipated changes.
	C.	What possible action might your school take in response to those anticipated changes?
15.	A.	In your opinion, are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?
	B.	Why or why not?

General Education (Math/ELA) Interview Protocol

General Education (Math/ELA) Interview Protocol

Note: Keep in mind CAHSEE's scope:

- ELA—through Grade 10 (reading and writing)
- Math—through Algebra I

We hope to interview those teachers whose students are most directly impacted by CAHSEE (those students who are getting ready to take CAHSEE or those students who have already taken it but who have not passed one or both parts). Ask teachers what grades/courses they teach; ask them to keep in mind CAHSEE's scope during the interview. For example, if a teacher replies Grade 10 ELA and Grade 12 AP English literature, remind the teacher to focus on the Grade 10 course rather than the AP course.

General Education (Math/ELA) Interview Protocol

1.	A.	At what point in the process of implementing instruction based on the California Content Standards is your department? (1, not at all implemented; 5, fully implemented)
	B.	What rating would you have given 2 years ago?
	C.	*(Probe for example or clarification)* Can you give me an example of how implementation has increased/decreased?
2.	A.	Generally speaking, do you think your incoming students are better or less prepared than students were 2 years ago?
	B.	Can you give me an example of what you are seeing as better/worse preparation?
	C.	On a 1 to 5 scale, 1 being "very poorly prepared" and 5 being "very well prepared," where would you place this year's group of incoming students?
	D.	In comparison, using the same 1 to 5 scale, where would you have placed incoming students 2 years ago?
3.		Are the California Content Standards **written** into your curriculum?
4.		What ensures that teachers are actually **teaching** the California Content Standards? (monitoring/accountability, such as including standards in lesson plans, principal observation, district-wide tests, etc.)
5.	A.	What ensures that the California Content Standards are being taught at the **appropriate instructional level or grade level that is expected** by all teachers of a particular course—that "mastery" means the same thing to all teachers?
	B.	Is the same process used for special ed or EL students, as well as general ed, or is it modified? If modified, have them explain it.
	C.	(If there is no formal process) Does teacher use an informal method to monitor individual student mastery of standards?
6.	A.	Is there a system in place at this school to monitor an individual student's mastery of the California Content Standards? *(Looking for evidence of IEPs for all students, advisor-advisee activities, systematic review of test data, etc.)*
	B.	If so, describe the system. If not, does teacher use an informal system?

General Education (Math/ELA) Interview Protocol

7. A. About how many students do you have in each class this semester?

   B. Of those students, about how many have already passed CAHSEE, have failed CAHSEE, or are at risk of failing CAHSEE?

8. A. I'd like you to think about students in your department who have not passed CAHSEE or may be at risk of not passing CAHSEE. Are these students spread pretty evenly through the general population of the school, or are they concentrated in certain groups?

   B. If response is "certain groups," have them list which ones. *(We're expecting special ed, low English ability/EL, high poverty, low motivation, low ability but not classified as special ed, lack of parental involvement, maybe others, as well.)*

I'm going to ask you a series of questions to find out what methods teachers in your department use to meet the individual educational needs of students.

General Education (Math/ELA) Interview Protocol

9. A. Describe how often you meet with a special education teacher to plan or collaborate on instruction or to discuss a particular student's needs. *(We're looking for evidence of regular, ongoing meetings instead of one-shot or as-needed.)*

   B. Describe how often you meet with an EL teacher to plan or collaborate on instruction or to discuss a particular student's needs. *(We're looking for evidence of regular, ongoing meetings instead of one-shot or as-needed.)*

10. A. How often does your district require general education teachers to take professional development on topics related to needs of special ed students?

    B. How often does your district require general education teachers to take professional development on topics related to needs of EL students?

    C. How does the administration ensure that teachers actually use what they learn in professional development training?

11. A. Give me some recent examples of tailored instruction you've used or accommodations you've made for individual students.

    B. Is that something you have to do on a pretty regular basis?

12. A How would you rate the degree of CAHSEE support shown to the general student population by this school? (1, doing what is required; 5 couldn't ask for more/better; innovative, cutting edge kind of things.)

    B. VERY IMPORTANT to ask for specifics if they give ratings of 3, 4, or 5—need to find out what kind of support the school is giving.

    C. What rating would you have given 2 years ago?

    D. What recommendations would you make to improve the level of CAHSEE support for the general student population at this school?

General Education (Math/ELA) Interview Protocol

13.	A	How would you rate the degree of CAHSEE support shown to student subpopulations (ethnic groups, special ed, EL, high poverty) by this school? (1, doing what is required; 5 couldn't ask for more/better; innovative, cutting edge kind of things.)
	B.	VERY IMPORTANT to ask for specifics if they give ratings of 3, 4, or 5—need to find out what kind of support the school is giving.
	C.	What rating would you have given 2 years ago?
	D.	What recommendations would you make to improve the level of CAHSEE support for the special groups at this school?
14.	A	Have you seen any changes in student motivation or attitude in your student population as a whole that you attribute to CAHSEE? *(changes in dropout rates, increased/decreased absence rates, changes in amount of discipline referrals, for example).*
	B.	How has your school responded to those changes?
15.	A	Have you seen any changes in student motivation or attitude in your student subpopulations that you attribute to CAHSEE? *(changes in dropout rates, increased/decreased absence rates, changes in amount of discipline referrals, for example).*
	B.	How has your school responded to those changes?
16.	A.	Do you anticipate changes in student motivation or attitude in your student population as a whole when students in the Class of 2006 are held to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?
	B.	If so, describe anticipated changes.
	C.	What possible action might your school take in response to those anticipated changes?
17.	A.	Do you anticipate changes in student motivation or attitude in your student subpopulations when students in the Class of 2006 are held to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?
	B.	If so, describe anticipated changes.
	C.	What possible action might your school take in response to those anticipated changes?
18.	A.	In your opinion, are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?
	B.	Why or why not?

English Learner Interview Protocol

English Learner Interview Protocol

Note: EL students are tested annually on the **CELDT** (California English Language Development Test) and are placed in one of five levels (Beginner, Advanced Beginner, Intermediate, Advanced Intermediate, Advanced). Eventually they can test out of the EL program and be placed in regular English courses—this is called being "**RFEP**-ed." Stands for Redesignated (or Reclassified) Fluent English Proficient. Other terms you may hear are **ELD**—English Language Development, **SDAIE**—Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English, **CLAD**—Crosscultural Language and Academic Development, and **BCLAD**—Bilingual Crosscultural Language and Academic Development.

English Learner Interview Protocol

1.		Describe EL population at this school. *(overall percent of EL/RFEP, distribution of students among different languages, etc.)*
2.	A.	At what point in the process of implementing EL instruction based on the California Content Standards is your department? (1, not at all implemented; 5, fully implemented)
	B.	What rating would you have given 2 years ago?
	C.	*(Probe for example or clarification)* Can you give me an example of how implementation of EL instruction based on California Content Standards has increased/decreased?
3.	A.	Generally speaking, do you think your incoming EL students are better or less prepared for your course than students were 2 years ago?
	B.	Can you give me an example of what you are seeing as better/worse preparation?
	C.	On a 1 to 5 scale, 1 being "very poorly prepared" and 5 being "very well prepared," where would you place this year's group of incoming EL students?
	D.	In comparison, using the same 1-5 scale, where would you have placed incoming EL students 2 years ago?
4.		Are the California Content Standards **written** into your curriculum?
5.		What ensures that teachers are actually **teaching** the California Content Standards? *(monitoring/accountability, such as including standards in lesson plans, principal observation, district-wide tests, etc.)*
6.	A.	What ensures that the California Content Standards are being taught at the **appropriate instructional level or grade level that is expected** by all teachers of a particular course—that "mastery" means the same thing to all teachers?
	B.	Is the same process used for EL students, or is it modified? If modified, have them explain it.

English Learner Interview Protocol

7.	A.	How does the school monitor an individual student's mastery of the California Content Standards? *(Looking for evidence of IEPs for all students, advisor-advisee activities, systematic review of test data, etc.)*
	B.	Is the same process used for EL students, or is it modified? If modified, have them explain it.
	C.	*(If there is no formal process)* Does teacher use an informal method to monitor individual student mastery of standards?
8.	A.	Do EL students ever receive content instruction in math or reading in their native language, or is content taught only in English (SDAIE)?
	B.	What percent of EL students receive content instruction in their native language?
9.	A.	Do you ever have the opportunity to team teach with the general education teacher (actually going into the other teacher's class and presenting material or vice versa)?
	B.	If so, how often is this done?
10.		Describe how often you meet with a general education/special education teacher to plan or collaborate on instruction or to discuss a particular student's needs. *(We're looking for evidence of regular, ongoing meetings instead of one-shot or as-needed.)*
11.	A.	How often does your district require general education teachers to take professional development on topics related to the needs of EL students?
	B.	Is the EL department involved in any formal or informal professional development for your school's general ed teachers?
	C.	How does the administration ensure that teachers actually use what they learn in professional development training?
12.	A.	Does the school or district have any programs designed especially for parents of EL students? *(information presentations, liaison with community assistance, EL classes for adults, translation services, etc.)*
	B.	If so, describe them.
	C.	What role does your department play in these programs?
13.	A	How would you rate the degree of CAHSEE support shown to EL students by this school? (1, doing what is required; 5 couldn't ask for more/better; innovative, cutting edge kind of things.)
	B.	VERY IMPORTANT to ask for specifics if they give ratings of 3, 4, or 5—need to find out what kind of support the school is giving.
	C.	What rating would you have given 2 years ago?
	D.	What recommendations would you make to improve the level of CAHSEE support for the EL students at this school?

English Learner Interview Protocol

14.	A	Have you seen any changes in student motivation or attitude in your EL students that you attribute to CAHSEE? *(changes in dropout rates, increased/decreased absence rates, changes in amount of discipline referrals, for example).*
	B.	How has your school responded to those changes?
15.	A.	Do you anticipate changes in student motivation or attitude in your EL students when students in the Class of 2006 are held to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?
	B.	If so, describe anticipated changes.
	C.	What possible action might your school take in response to those anticipated changes?
16.	A.	In your opinion, are EL students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?
	B.	Why or why not?

Special Education Interview Protocol

Special Education Interview Protocol

Note: California recognizes several types of special education student, the most common being **"special day"** students, whose disabilities are so severe that they are not working towards a high school diploma but rather working towards gaining life skills, and **"resource"** or **"mainstreamed"** students, who spend at least half the school day in regular classrooms and who are working towards a high school diploma. During the interview, have the respondents focus primarily on the resource students, since they are the ones most directly impacted by CAHSEE.

Special Education Interview Protocol

1.	A.	At what point in the process of implementing instruction based on the California Content Standards is your department? (1, not at all implemented; 5, fully implemented)
	B.	What rating would you have given 2 years ago?
	C.	*(Probe for example or clarification)* Can you give me an example of how implementation has increased/decreased?
2.	A.	Generally speaking, do you think incoming special education students are better or less prepared for your course than students were 2 years ago?
	B.	Can you give me an example of what you are seeing as better/worse preparation?
	C.	On a 1 to 5 scale, 1 being "very poorly prepared" and 5 being "very well prepared," where would you place this year's group of incoming special ed students?
	D.	In comparison, using the same 1 to 5 scale, where would you have placed incoming students 2 years ago?
3.		Are the California Content Standards **written** into your curriculum?
4.		What ensures that teachers are actually **teaching** the California Content Standards? *(monitoring/accountability, such as including standards in lesson plans, principal observation, district-wide tests, etc.)*
5.	A.	What ensures that the California Content Standards are being **taught at the appropriate instructional level or grade level that is expected** by all teachers of a particular course—that "mastery" means the same thing to all teachers?
	B.	Is the same process used for special ed students, or is it modified? If modified, have them explain it.
6.		How does the school monitor an individual student's mastery of the California Content Standards? *(Looking for evidence of IEPs for all students, advisor-advisee activities, systematic review of test data, etc.)*
7.		Describe how often you meet with your resource students' general education teachers to plan, collaborate, or to discuss a particular student. *(looking for evidence of regular, ongoing meetings or common planning period instead of one-shot, infrequent or "as needed" meetings.)*
8.	A.	Do you ever have the opportunity to team teach with the general education teacher (actually going into the other teacher's class and presenting material or vice versa)?
	B.	If so, how often is this done?

Special Education Interview Protocol

9.	A.	Do you know how often your district requires general education teachers to take professional development on topics related to special education (needs, instructional strategies)?
	B.	Are special ed teachers involved in any formal or informal professional development for your school's general ed teachers?
	C.	How does the administration ensure that teachers actually use what they learn in professional development training?
10.	A.	Does the district or school have any programs especially for parents of special ed students (information presentations, liaison with community assistance programs)?
	B.	If so, describe them.
11.	A.	How would you rate the degree of CAHSEE support shown to special education students by this school? (1, doing what is legally required; 5, couldn't ask for more/better; innovative, cutting edge kind of things.)
	B.	VERY IMPORTANT to ask for specifics if they give ratings of 3, 4, or 5—need to find out what kind of support that the school is giving.)
	C.	What rating would you have given 2 years ago?
	D.	What recommendations would you make to improve the level of CAHSEE support for special ed students at this school?
12.	A	Have you seen any changes in student motivation or attitude in your special ed students that you attribute to CAHSEE? *(changes in dropout rates, increased/decreased absence rates, changes in amount of discipline referrals, for example).*
	B.	How has your school responded to those changes?
13.	A.	Do you anticipate changes in student motivation or attitude in your special ed students when students in the Class of 2006 are held to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?
	B.	If so, describe anticipated changes.
	C.	What possible action might your school take in response to those anticipated changes?
14.	A.	In your opinion, are special education students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?
	B.	Why or why not? *(Note: there is a bill that is being discussed that is investigating alternative paths to graduation for special ed students—you may hear about this.)*

Special Courses Interview Protocol—CAHSEE Remediation Course, CAHSEE Prep Course

Special Courses Interview Protocol
CAHSEE Remediation Course, CAHSEE Prep Course

Note: Many schools have developed CAHSEE remediation courses (for students who have not passed one or both parts of the test) and CAHSEE preparation courses (for students identified as at risk of not passing the test). There may be some overlap between these courses—some courses may contain those who have not passed the CAHSEE and those in danger of not passing it. If you encounter any other types of interviews (special tutoring program, for example), this interview protocol will probably be the best fit, with some on-the-spot adjustments.

Special Courses Interview Protocol

1.	A.	At what point in the process of implementing instruction based on the California Content Standards is your department? (1, not at all implemented; 5, fully implemented)
	B.	What rating would you have given 2 years ago?
	C.	*(Probe for example or clarification)* Can you give me an example of how implementation has increased/decreased?
2.		Are the California Content Standards **written** into your curriculum?
3.		What ensures that teachers are actually **teaching** the California Content Standards? *(monitoring/accountability, such as including standards in lesson plans, principal observation, district-wide tests, etc.)*
4.	A	What ensures that the California Content Standards are being taught at the **appropriate instructional level or grade level that is expected** by all teachers of a particular course—that "mastery" means the same thing to all teachers?
	B.	Is the same process used for at-risk students, or is it modified? If modified, have them explain it.
5.	A.	How does the school monitor an individual student's mastery of the California Content Standards? *(Looking for evidence of IEPs for all students, advisor-advisee activities, systematic review of test data, etc.)*
	B.	Is the same process used for at-risk students, or is it modified? If modified, have them explain it.
	C.	(If there is no formal process) Does teacher use an informal method to monitor individual student mastery of standards?
6.		You are being interviewed because you teach either a CAHSEE remediation course or a CAHSEE preparation course. We'd like to get some more detailed information about the CAHSEE-related course you teach. *(Go to Program/Course Questions protocol.)*

Special Courses Interview Protocol

7.	A.	How would you rate the degree of CAHSEE support shown to at-risk students by this school (1, doing what is required; 5, couldn't ask for more/better; innovative, cutting edge kind of things.)
	B.	VERY IMPORTANT to ask for specifics if they give ratings of 3, 4, or 5—need to find out what kind of support the school is giving.
	C.	What rating would you have given 2 years ago?
	D.	What recommendations would you make to improve the level of CAHSEE support for at-risk students at this school?
8.	A.	Have you seen any changes in student motivation or attitude that you attribute to CAHSEE in your at-risk students? *(changes in dropout rates, increased/decreased absence rates, changes in amount of discipline referrals, for example).*
	B.	How has your school responded to those changes?
9.	A.	Do you anticipate changes in student motivation or attitude in your at-risk students when students in the Class of 2006 are held to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?
	B.	If so, describe anticipated changes.
	C.	What possible actions might your school take in response to those anticipated changes?
10.	A.	In your opinion, are at-risk students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?
	B.	Why or why not?

Program/Course Questions

Program/Course Questions

For each course/program described in Principal Question 7 (A, B, and C), please obtain the following information. We anticipate that teachers of the particular course (a CAHSEE remediation course, for example) will provide the most in-depth information, with the principal providing the broader information. Between the two interview sources, you should get answers to most of these questions.

Principal	Teacher	Questions
X	X	a. How are students selected for this program/course? (Voluntary or not, based on not passing CAHSEE, based on other grades?)
X	X	b. How many students are in this program/course? Has the demand for this course increased or decreased over the past 2 years?
X	X	c. Of those students, how many are EL? Special ed? Low SES? Other subpopulations? (Was it designed for a particular subpopulation?)
X	X	d. How long has the school had this program/course?
X	X	e. Do students receive any type of credit for the program/course? If so, describe what kind. (Elective credit only? No credit—just tutoring? Credit first time only?)
	X	f. How long is the program/course? (for example, semester, full year, few weeks, can a student retake it?)
	X	g. When does it meet? (during school, before/after school, Saturday?)
X		h. How is this program/course funded? (Local/district, state, national? Title 1, levy, grant, reallocation of available funding?)
X	X	i. How was the program/course's curriculum developed/designed? ("off the shelf" purchase, developed locally, through an educational consortium? Who was involved in development?)
	X	j. What materials does the course use?
	X	k. How were the materials selected?
	X	l. Are materials aligned to the California Content Standards?
X	X	m. How was the teacher for this program/course selected? (volunteered, involuntary assignment, selection based on special skills, such as reading specialist, special ed certification, new teacher? Extra pay involved?)
X	X	n. Did the teacher have to have any special training, certification, or credential in order to teach this program/course? (beyond regular teaching certification)
X	X	o. How do you evaluate the program's effectiveness?
X	X	p. Based on that evaluation, is the program doing what it was designed to do?
X	X	q. Are there any changes to this program anticipated? If so, describe them.
X	X	r. Anything else we should know about this program/course that we failed to ask?

Program/Course Questions

For each course/program described in Principal Question 7 (A, B, and C), please obtain the following information. We anticipate that teachers of the particular course (a CAHSEE remediation course, for example) will provide the most in-depth information, with the principal providing the broader information. Between the two interview sources, you should get answers to most of these questions.

Principal	Teacher	Questions
X	X	a. How are students selected for this program/course? (Voluntary or not, based on not passing CAHSEE, based on other grades?)
X	X	b. How many students are in this program/course? Has the demand for this course increased or decreased over the past 2 years?
X	X	c. Of those students, how many are EL? Special ed? Low SES? Other subpopulations? (Was it designed for a particular subpopulation?)
X	X	d. How long has the school had this program/course?
X	X	e. Do students receive any type of credit for the program/course? If so, describe what kind. (Elective credit only? No credit—just tutoring? Credit first time only?)
	X	f. How long is the program/course? (for example, semester, full year, few weeks, can a student retake it?)
	X	g. When does it meet? (during school, before/after school, Saturday?)
X		h. How is this program/course funded? (Local/district, state, national? Title 1, levy, grant, reallocation of available funding?)
X	X	i. How was the program/course's curriculum developed/designed? ("off the shelf" purchase, developed locally, through an educational consortium? Who was involved in development?)
	X	j. What materials does the course use?
	X	k. How were the materials selected?
	X	l. Are materials aligned to the California Content Standards?
X	X	m. How was the teacher for this program/course selected? (volunteered, involuntary assignment, selection based on special skills, such as reading specialist, special ed certification, new teacher? Extra pay involved?)
X	X	n. Did the teacher have to have any special training, certification, or credential in order to teach this program/course? (beyond regular teaching certification)
X	X	o. How do you evaluate the program's effectiveness?
X	X	p. Based on that evaluation, is the program doing what it was designed to do?
X	X	q. Are there any changes to this program anticipated? If so, describe them.
X	X	r. Anything else we should know about this program/course that we failed to ask?

CAHSEE-2 Site Visit Protocols—Recommended “Short” Forms

Principal

ITEM	KEEP	SKIP	COMMENT
1	X		
2	X		
3		X	We'll get this from teachers
4	X		
5		X	
6	X		
7	X		
8A-D	X		
8E		X	
8F	X		
9	X		
10	X		
11	X		
12	X		
13		X	Survey asks this
14		X	Survey asks this
15		X	

General Education (Math/ELA)

ITEM	KEEP	SKIP	COMMENT
1	X		
2A-B		X	C & D capture the gist.
2C-D	X		
3	X		
4	X		
5	X		
6		X	Asked principal
7		X	
8	X		
9	X		
10	X		
11	X		
12	X		
13	X		
14	X		
15	X		
16		X	Predictions less critical than hard facts
17		X	Predictions less critical than hard facts
18	X		

English Learner

ITEM	KEEP	SKIP	COMMENT
1	X		
2	X		
3A-B		X	
3C-D	X		
4		X	Item 5 may elicit this
5	X		
6	X		
7	X		
8	X		
9	X		
10	X		
11	X		
12	X		Parents of EL students face some of the same language challenges as their students, so I think we should leave this in; whereas I recommended skipping it for parents of special ed students.
13	X		
14	X		
15	X		
16	X		

Special Education

ITEM	KEEP	SKIP	COMMENT
1	X		
2A-B		X	C & D capture the gist.
2C-D	X		
3		X	
4	X		
5	X		
6	X		
7	X		
8	X		
9	X		
10		X	
11	X		
12	X		
13	X		
14	X		

Special Courses

ITEM	KEEP	SKIP	COMMENT
1		X	We'll have this from other teachers
2	X		
3	X		
4	X		
5	X		
6	X		
7	X		
8	X		
9		X	Predictions less critical
10	X		

Program/Course Questions

ITEM	KEEP	SKIP	COMMENT
A	X		
B	X		
C	X		
D		X	
E		X	
F	X		
G	X		
H		X	
I		X	
J		X	
K		X	
L	X		
M	X		
N	X		
O	X		
P	X		
Q	X		
R	X		

Protocol Crosswalk

Protocol Crosswalk

GM_GE	Admin	EL	Sp Ed	Sp Courses
1A	1A	2A	1A	1A
1B	1B	2B	1B	1B
1C	1C	2C	1C	1C
2A	2A	3A	2A	
2B	2B	3B	2B	
2C	2C	3C	2C	
2D	2D	3D	2D	
3	3	4	3	2
4	4	5	4	3
5A	5	6A	5A	4A
5B		6B	5B	4B
5C				
6A	6A	7A	6	5A
6B		7C		5C
7A				
7B				
8A				
8B				
9A			7	
9B		10		
10A			9A	
10B		11A		
10C	7C	11C	9C	
11A				
11B				
12A	9A			
12B	9B			
12C	9C			
12D	9D			
13A	10A	13A	11A	7A
13B	10B	13B	11B	7B
13C	10C	13C	11C	7C
13D	10D	13D	11D	7D
14A	11A			
14B	11B			
15A	12A	14A	12A	8A
15B	12B	14B	12B	8B
16A	13A			
16B	13B			
16C	13C			
17A	14A	15A	13A	9A
17B	14B	15B	13B	9B
17C	14C	15C	13C	9C
18A	15A	16A	14A	10A
18B	15B	16B	14B	10B

Sp Ed	EL
8A	9A
8B	9B
9B	11B
10A	12A
10B	12B
Admin	Sp Courses
8	6

Unique questions

Admin

- 2E
- 7A, 7B
- 8D, 8E, 8F

EL

- 1
- 8A, 8B

GM-GE

- 7A, 7B
- 8A, 8B
- 11A, 11B

Appendix D: Item Review Forms

Contains (a) forms used at the Item Review Workshops and (b) forms used in the Universal Design Workshops

CAHSEE Language Arts Blueprint*, Depth-of-Knowledge (DOK) Rating Sheet

Reviewer Number: _____

CAHSEE Language Arts Blueprint*

Depth-of-Knowledge (DOK)
Rating Sheet

Standard	Goal	Objective	DOK Rating
Reading (Grades Nine and Ten with two standards from Grade Eight as noted*)			
1.0	Word Analysis, Fluency, and Systematic Vocabulary Development.		
	Students apply their knowledge of word origins to determine the meaning of new words encountered in reading materials and use those words accurately.		
		1.1 Identify and use the literal and figurative meanings of words and understand word derivations.	
		1.2 Distinguish between the denotative and connotative meanings of words and interpret the connotative power of words.	
2.0	Reading Comprehension (Focus on Informational Materials)		
	Students read and understand grade-level-appropriate material. They analyze the organizational patterns, arguments, and positions advanced. The selections in Recommended Literature, Grades Nine Through Twelve (1990) illustrate the quality and complexity of the materials to be read by students. In addition, by grade twelve, students read two million words annually on their own, including a wide variety of classic and contemporary literature, magazines, newspapers, and online information. In grades nine and ten, students make substantial progress toward this goal.		
	Structural Features of Informational Materials		
		†8.2.1 Compare and contrast the features and elements of consumer materials to gain meaning from documents (e.g., warranties, contracts, product information, instruction manuals).	
		2.1 Analyze the structure and format of functional workplace documents, including the graphics and headers, and explain how authors use the features to achieve their purposes.	

† Eighth-grade content standard.

**Blueprint approved by the State Board of Education on July 9, 2003.*
Note: Strikethroughs within a standard indicate that this particular part of the standard is not to be assessed on the CAHSEE but is still part of the original standard.

Standard	Goal	Objective	DOK Rating
	Comprehension and Analysis of Grade-Level-Appropriate Text		
		2.4 Synthesize the content from several sources or works by a single author dealing with a single issue; paraphrase the ideas and connect them to other sources and related topics to demonstrate comprehension.	
		2.5 Extend ideas presented in primary or secondary sources through original analysis, evaluation, and elaboration.	
	Expository Critique		
		2.7 Critique the logic of functional documents by examining the sequence of information and procedures in anticipation of possible reader misunderstandings.	
		2.8 Evaluate the credibility of an author's argument or defense of a claim by critiquing the relationship between generalizations and evidence, the comprehensiveness of evidence, and the way in which the author's intent affects the structure and tone of the text (e.g., in professional journals, editorials, political speeches, primary source material).	

**Blueprint approved by the State Board of Education on July 9, 2003.*

Note: Strikethroughs within a standard indicate that this particular part of the standard is not to be assessed on the CAHSEE but is still part of the original standard.

Standard	Goal	Objective	DOK Rating
3.0 Literary Response and Analysis			
	Students read and respond to historically or culturally significant works of literature that reflect and enhance their studies of history and social science. They conduct in-depth analysis of recurrent patterns and themes. The selections in Recommended Literature, Grades Nine Through Twelve illustrate the quality and complexity of the materials to be read by students.		
	Structural Features of Literature		
		3.1 Articulate the relationship between the expressed purposes and the characteristics of different forms of dramatic literature (e.g., comedy, tragedy, drama, dramatic monologue).	
	Narrative Analysis of Grade-Level-Appropriate Text		
		3.3 Analyze interactions between main and subordinate characters in a literary text (e.g., internal and external conflicts, motivations, relationships, influences) and explain the way those interactions affect the plot.	
		3.4 Determine characters' traits by what the characters say about themselves in narration, dialogue, dramatic monologue, and soliloquy.	
		3.5 Compare works that express a universal theme and provide evidence to support the ideas expressed in each work.	
		3.6 Analyze and trace an author's development of time and sequence, including the use of complex literary devices (e.g., foreshadowing, flashbacks).	
		3.7 Recognize and understand the significance of various literary devices, including figurative language, imagery, allegory, and symbolism, and explain their appeal.	

**Blueprint approved by the State Board of Education on July 9, 2003.*

Note: Strikethroughs within a standard indicate that this particular part of the standard is not to be assessed on the CAHSEE but is still part of the original standard.

Standard	Goal	Objective		DOK Rating
		3.8	Interpret and evaluate the impact of ambiguities, subtleties, contradictions, ironies, and incongruities in a text.	
		3.9	Explain how voice, persona, and the choice of a narrator affect characterization and the tone, plot, and credibility of a text.	
		3.10	Identify and describe the function of dialogue, scene designs, soliloquies, asides, and character foils in dramatic literature.	
	Literary Criticism			
		†8.3.7	Analyze a work of literature, showing how it reflects the heritage, traditions, attitudes, and beliefs of its author. (Biographical approach)	
		3.11	Evaluate the aesthetic qualities of style, including the impact of diction and figurative language on tone, mood, and theme, using the terminology of literary criticism. (Aesthetic approach)	
		3.12	Analyze the way in which a work of literature is related to the themes and issues of its historical period. (Historical approach)	
Writing (Grades Nine and Ten)				
1.0	Writing Strategies			
	Students write clear, coherent, and focused essays. The writing exhibits students' awareness of audience and purpose. Essays contain formal introductions, supporting evidence, and conclusions. Students progress through the stages of the writing process as needed.			
	Organization and Focus			
		1.1	Establish a controlling impression or coherent thesis that conveys a clear and distinctive perspective on the subject and maintain a consistent tone and focus throughout the piece of writing.	
		1.2	Use precise language, action verbs, sensory details, appropriate modifiers, and the active rather than the passive voice.	

† Eighth-grade content standard.

**Blueprint approved by the State Board of Education on July 9, 2003.*

Note: Strikethroughs within a standard indicate that this particular part of the standard is not to be assessed on the CAHSEE but is still part of the original standard.

Standard	Goal	Objective	DOK Rating
	Research and technology		
		1.4 Develop the main ideas within the body of the composition through supporting evidence (e.g., scenarios, commonly held beliefs, hypotheses, definitions).	
		1.5 Synthesize information from multiple sources and identify complexities and discrepancies in the information and the different perspectives found in each medium (e.g., almanacs, microfiche, news sources, in-depth field studies, speeches, journals, technical documents).	
	Evaluation and Revision		
		1.9 Revise writing to improve the logic and coherence of the organization and controlling perspective, the precision of word choice, and the tone by taking into consideration the audience, purpose, and formality of the context.	
2.0	Writing Applications (Genres and Their Characteristics)		
	Students combine the rhetorical strategies of narration, exposition, persuasion, and description to produce texts of at least 1,500 words each. Student writing demonstrates a command of standard American English and the research, organizational, and drafting strategies outlined in Writing Standard 1.0.		

**Blueprint approved by the State Board of Education on July 9, 2003.*

Note: Strikethroughs within a standard indicate that this particular part of the standard is not to be assessed on the CAHSEE but is still part of the original standard.

Standard	Goal	Objective	DOK Rating
Using the writing strategies of grades nine and ten outlined in Writing Standard 1.0, students:			
	2.1 Write biographical ~~or autobiographical~~ narratives ~~or short stories~~:		
		a. Relate a sequence of events and communicate the significance of the events to the audience.	
		b. Locate scenes and incidents in specific places.	
		c. Describe with concrete sensory details the sights, sounds, and smells of a scene and the specific actions, movements, gestures, and feelings of the characters; use interior monologue to depict the characters' feelings.	
		d. Pace the presentation of actions to accommodate changes in time and mood.	
		e. Make effective use of descriptions of appearance, images, shifting perspectives, and sensory details.	
	2.2 Write responses to literature:		
		a. Demonstrate a comprehensive grasp of the significant ideas of literary works.	
		b. Support important ideas and viewpoints through accurate and detailed references to the text or to other works.	
		c. Demonstrate awareness of the author's use of stylistic devices and an appreciation of the effects created.	
		d. Identify and assess the impact of perceived ambiguities, nuances, and complexities within the text.	
	2.3 Write expository compositions, including analytical essays and research reports:		
		a. Marshal evidence in support of a thesis and related claims, including information on all relevant perspectives.	

**Blueprint approved by the State Board of Education on July 9, 2003.*

Note: Strikethroughs within a standard indicate that this particular part of the standard is not to be assessed on the CAHSEE but is still part of the original standard.

Standard	Goal	Objective	DOK Rating
		b. Convey information and ideas from primary and secondary sources accurately and coherently.	
		c. Make distinctions between the relative value and significance of specific data, facts, and ideas.	
		~~d. Include visual aids by employing appropriate technology to organize and record information on charts, maps, and graphs.~~	
		e. Anticipate and address readers' potential misunderstandings, biases, and expectations.	
		f. Use technical terms and notations accurately.	
	2.4 Write persuasive compositions:		
		a. Structure ideas and arguments in a sustained and logical fashion.	
		b. Use specific rhetorical devices to support assertions (e.g., appeal to logic through reasoning; appeal to emotion or ethical belief; relate a personal anecdote, case study, or analogy).	
		c. Clarify and defend positions with precise and relevant evidence, including facts, expert opinions, quotations, and expressions of commonly accepted beliefs and logical reasoning.	
		d. Address readers' concerns, counterclaims, biases, and expectations.	
	2.5 Write business letters:		
		a. Provide clear and purposeful information and address the intended audience appropriately.	
		b. Use appropriate vocabulary, tone, and style to take into account the nature of the relationship with, and the knowledge and interests of, the recipients.	
		c. Highlight central ideas or images.	

**Blueprint approved by the State Board of Education on July 9, 2003.*

Note: Strikethroughs within a standard indicate that this particular part of the standard is not to be assessed on the CAHSEE but is still part of the original standard.

Standard	Goal	Objective	DOK Rating
		d. Follow a conventional style with page formats, fonts, and spacing that contribute to the documents' readability and impact.	
	2.6	Write technical documents (e.g., a manual on rules of behavior for conflict resolution, procedures for conducting a meeting, minutes of a meeting):	
		a. Report information and convey ideas logically and correctly.	
		b. Offer detailed and accurate specifications.	
		c. Include scenarios, definitions, and examples to aid comprehension (e.g., troubleshooting guide).	
		d. Anticipate readers' problems, mistakes, and misunderstandings.	
1.0	Written and Oral English Language Conventions		
	Students write and speak with a command of standard English conventions.		
	Grammar and Mechanics of Writing		
		1.1 Identify and correctly use clauses (e.g., main and subordinate), phrases (e.g., gerund, infinitive, and participial), and mechanics of punctuation (e.g., semicolons, colons, ellipses, hyphens).	
		1.2 Understand sentence construction (e.g., parallel structure, subordination, proper placement of modifiers) and proper English usage (e.g., consistency of verb tenses).	
		1.3 Demonstrate an understanding of proper English usage and control of grammar, paragraph and sentence structure, diction, and syntax.	

**Blueprint approved by the State Board of Education on July 9, 2003.*
Note: Strikethroughs within a standard indicate that this particular part of the standard is not to be assessed on the CAHSEE but is still part of the original standard.

CAHSEE Mathematics Blueprint*, Depth-of-Knowledge (DOK) Rating Sheet

Reviewer Number: _____

CAHSEE Mathematics Blueprint*

Depth-of-Knowledge (DOK)
Rating Sheet

Standard	Goal	Objective	DOK Rating
Grade 6—Statistics, Data Analysis, and Probability			
	1.0 Students compute and analyze statistical measurements for data sets:		
		1.1 Compute the ~~range~~, mean, median, and mode of data sets.	
	2.0 Students use data samples of a population and describe the characteristics and limitations of the samples:		
		2.5 Identify claims based on statistical data and, in simple cases, evaluate the validity of the claims.	

**Blueprint approved by the State Board of Education on July 9, 2003.*

Note: Strikethroughs within a standard indicate that this particular part of the standard is not to be assessed on the CAHSEE but is still part of the original standard.

Standard	Goal	Objective	DOK Rating
	3.0 Students determine theoretical and experimental probabilities and use these to make predictions about events:		
		3.1 Represent all possible outcomes for compound events in an organized way (e.g., tables, grids, tree diagrams) and express the theoretical probability of each outcome.	
		3.3 Represent probabilities as ratios, proportions, decimals between 0 and 1, and percentages between 0 and 100 and verify that the probabilities computed are reasonable; know that if P is the probability of an event, 1-P is the probability of an event not occurring.	
		3.5 Understand the difference between independent and dependent events.	
Grade 7 – Number Sense			
	1.0 Students know the properties of, and compute with, rational numbers expressed in a variety of forms:		
		1.1 Read, write, and compare rational numbers in scientific notation (positive and negative powers of 10) with approximate numbers using scientific notation.	
		1.2 Add, subtract, multiply, and divide rational numbers (integers, fractions, and terminating decimals) and take positive rational numbers to whole-number powers.	
		1.3 Convert fractions to decimals and percents and use these representations in estimations, computations, and applications.	

**Blueprint approved by the State Board of Education on July 9, 2003.*

Note: Strikethroughs within a standard indicate that this particular part of the standard is not to be assessed on the CAHSEE but is still part of the original standard.

Standard	Goal	Objective	DOK Rating
		1.6 Calculate the percentage of increases and decreases of a quantity.	
		1.7 Solve problems that involve discounts, markups, commissions, and profit, and compute simple and compound interest.	
	2.0 Students use exponents, powers, and roots, and use exponents in working with fractions:		
		2.1 Understand negative whole-number exponents. Multiply and divide expressions involving exponents with a common base.	
		2.2 Add and subtract fractions by using factoring to find common denominators.	
		2.3 Multiply, divide, and simplify rational numbers by using exponent rules.	
		2.4 Use the inverse relationship between raising to a power and extracting the root of a perfect square integer; for an integer that is not square, determine without a calculator the two integers between which its square root lies and explain why.	
		2.5 Understand the meaning of the absolute value of a number; interpret the absolute value as the distance of the number from zero on a number line; and determine the absolute value of real numbers.	

**Blueprint approved by the State Board of Education on July 9, 2003.*

Note: Strikethroughs within a standard indicate that this particular part of the standard is not to be assessed on the CAHSEE but is still part of the original standard.

Standard	Goal	Objective	DOK Rating
Grade 7—Algebra and Functions			
	1.0 Students express quantitative relationships by using algebraic terminology, expressions, equations, inequalities, and graphs:		
		1.1 Use variables and appropriate operations to write an expression, an equation, an inequality, or a system of equations or inequalities that represents a verbal description (e.g., three less than a number, half as large as area A).	
		1.2 Use the correct order of operations to evaluate algebraic expressions such as $3(2x+5)^2$.	
		1.5 Represent quantitative relationships graphically and interpret the meaning of a specific part of a graph in the situation represented by the graph.	
	2.0 Students interpret and evaluate expressions involving integer powers and simple roots:		
		2.1 Interpret positive whole-number powers as repeated multiplication and negative whole-number powers as repeated division or multiplication by the multiplicative inverse. Simplify and evaluate expressions that include exponents.	
		2.2 Multiply and divide monomials; extend the process of taking powers and extracting roots to monomials when the latter results in a monomial with an integer exponent.	

**Blueprint approved by the State Board of Education on July 9, 2003.*

Note: Strikethroughs within a standard indicate that this particular part of the standard is not to be assessed on the CAHSEE but is still part of the original standard.

Standard	Goal		Objective		DOK Rating
	3.0	Students graph and interpret linear and some nonlinear functions:			
			3.1	Graph functions of the form $y=nx^2$ and $y=nx^3$ and use in solving problems.	
			3.3	Graph linear functions, noting that the vertical change (change in y-value) per unit of horizontal change (change in x-value) is always the same and know that the ratio ("rise over run") is called the slope of a graph.	
			3.4	Plot the values of quantities whose ratios are always the same (e.g., cost to the number of an item, feet to inches, circumference to diameter of a circle). Fit a line to the plot and understand that the slope of a line equals the quantities.	
	4.0	Students solve simple linear equations and inequalities over the rational numbers:			
			4.1	Solve two-step linear equations and inequalities in one variable over the rational numbers, interpret the solution or solutions in the context from which they arose, and verify the reasonableness of the results.	
			4.2	Solve multistep problems involving rate, average speed, distance, and time or a direct variation.	

**Blueprint approved by the State Board of Education on July 9, 2003.*

Note: Strikethroughs within a standard indicate that this particular part of the standard is not to be assessed on the CAHSEE but is still part of the original standard.

Stand.	Goal	Objective	DOK Rating
Grade 7—Measurement and Geometry			
	1.0 Students choose appropriate units of measure and use ratios to convert within and between measurement systems to solve problems:		
		1.1 Compare weights, capacities, geometric measures, times, and temperatures within and between measurement systems (e.g., miles per hour and feet per second, cubic inches to cubic centimeters).	
		1.2 Construct and read drawings and models made to scale.	
		1.3 Use measures expressed as rates (e.g., speed, density) and measures expressed as products (e.g., person-days) to solve problems; check the units of the solutions; and use dimensional analysis to check the reasonableness of the answer.	
	2.0 Students compute the perimeter, area, and volume of common geometric objects and use the results to find measures of less common objects. They know how perimeter, area and volume are affected by changes of scale:		
		2.1 Use formulas routinely for finding the perimeter and area of basic two-dimensional figures and the surface area and volume of basic three-dimensional figures, including rectangles, parallelograms, trapezoids, squares, triangles, circles, prisms, and cylinders.	
		2.2 Estimate and compute the area of more complex or irregular two- and three-dimensional figures by breaking the figures down into more basic geometric objects.	
		2.3 Compute the length of the perimeter, the surface area of the faces, and the volume of a three-dimensional object built from rectangular solids. Understand that when the lengths of all dimensions are multiplied by a scale factor, the surface area is multiplied by the square of the scale factor and volume is multiplied by the cube of the scale factor.	

**Blueprint approved by the State Board of Education on July 9, 2003.*

Note: Strikethroughs within a standard indicate that this particular part of the standard is not to be assessed on the CAHSEE but is still part of the original standard.

Standard	Goal	Objective	DOK Rating
		2 Relate the changes in measurement with a change of scale to the units used (e.g., square inches, cubic feet) and to conversions between units (1square foot = 144 square inches or [1 ft^2] = [144 in^2], 1 cubic inch is approximately 16.38 cubic centimeters or [1 in^3] = [16.38 cm^3]).	
	3.0 Students know the Pythagorean theorem and deepen their understanding of plane and solid geometric shapes by constructing figures that meet given conditions and by identifying attributes of figures:		
		3.2 Understand and use coordinate graphs to plot simple figures, determine lengths and areas related to them, and determine their image under translations and reflections.	
		3.3 Know and understand the Pythagorean theorem and its converse and use it to find the length of the missing side of a right triangle and the lengths of other line segments and, in some situations, empirically verify the Pythagorean theorem by direct measurement.	
		3.4 Demonstrate an understanding of conditions that indicate two geometrical figures are congruent and what congruence means about the relationships between the sides and angles of the two figures.	

**Blueprint approved by the State Board of Education on July 9, 2003.*

Note: Strikethroughs within a standard indicate that this particular part of the standard is not to be assessed on the CAHSEE but is still part of the original standard.

Standard	Goal	Objective	DOK Rating
Grade 7—Statistics, Data Analysis, and Probability			
	1.0 Students collect, organize, and represent data sets that have one or more variables and identify relationships among variables within a data set by hand and through the use of an electronic spreadsheet software program:		
		1.1 Know various forms of display for data sets, ~~including a stem-and-leaf plot or box-and-whisker plot~~; use the forms to display a single set of data or to compare two sets of data.	
		1.2 Represent two numerical variables on a scatterplot and informally describe how the data points are distributed and any apparent relationship that exists between the two variables (e.g., between time spent on homework and grade level).	
Grade 7—Mathematical Reasoning			
	1.0 Students make decisions about how to approach problems:		
		1.1 Analyze problems by identifying relationships, distinguishing relevant from irrelevant information, identifying missing information, sequencing and prioritizing information, and observing patterns.	
		1.2 Formulate and justify mathematical conjectures based on a general description of the mathematical question or problem posed.	

**Blueprint approved by the State Board of Education on July 9, 2003.*

Note: Strikethroughs within a standard indicate that this particular part of the standard is not to be assessed on the CAHSEE but is still part of the original standard.

Standard	Goal	Objective	DOK Rating
	2.0 Students use strategies, skills, and concepts in finding solutions:		
		2.1 Use estimation to verify the reasonableness of calculated results.	
		2.3 Estimate unknown quantities graphically and solve for them by using logical reasoning and arithmetic and algebraic techniques.	
		2.4 Make and test conjectures by using both inductive and deductive reasoning.	
	3.0 Students determine a solution is complete and move beyond a particular problem by generalizing to other situations:		
		3.3 Develop generalizations of the results obtained and the strategies used and apply them to new problem situations.	

**Blueprint approved by the State Board of Education on July 9, 2003.*

Note: Strikethroughs within a standard indicate that this particular part of the standard is not to be assessed on the CAHSEE but is still part of the original standard.

Standard	Goal	Objective		DOK Rating
		9.0	Students solve a system of two linear equations in two variables algebraically and are able to interpret the answer graphically. Students are able to solve a system of two linear inequalities in two variables and to sketch the solution sets.	
		10.0	Students add, subtract, multiply, and divide monomials and polynomials. Students solve multistep problems, including word problems, by using these techniques.	
		15.0	Students apply algebraic techniques to solve rate problems, work problems, and percent mixture problems.	

**Blueprint approved by the State Board of Education on July 9, 2003.*

Note: Strikethroughs within a standard indicate that this particular part of the standard is not to be assessed on the CAHSEE but is still part of the original standard.

CAHSEE English-Language Arts Item Rating Sheet

Reviewer Number: _____

California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE)
English-Language Arts
Item Rating Sheet

Item Number	Item DOK	Primary Objective (per Standard)	Secondary Objective (per Standard)	Secondary Objective (per Standard)	Source of Challenge	Notes (attach separate sheets if necessary)
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						
29						
30						
31						
32						
33						
34						
35						

Item Number	Item DOK	Primary Objective (per Standard)	Secondary Objective (per Standard)	Secondary Objective (per Standard)	Source of Challenge	Notes (attach separate sheets if necessary)
36						
37						
38						
39						
40						
41						
42						
43						
44						
45						
46						
47						
48						
49						
50						
51						
52						
53						
54						
55						
56						
57						
58						
59						
60						
61						
62						
63						
64						
65						
66						
67						
68						
69						
70						
71						
72						
73						
74						
75						

CAHSEE Mathematics Item Rating Sheet

Reviewer Number: _____

California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE)
Mathematics
Item Rating Sheet

Item Number	Item DOK	Primary Objective (per Standard)	Secondary Objective (per Standard)	Secondary Objective (per Standard)	Source of Challenge	Notes (attach separate sheets if necessary)
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						

Item Number	Item DOK	Primary Objective (per Standard)	Secondary Objective (per Standard)	Secondary Objective (per Standard)	Source of Challenge	Notes (attach separate sheets if necessary)
29						
30						
31						
32						
33						
34						
35						
36						
37						
38						
39						
40						
41						
42						
43						
44						
45						
46						
47						
48						
49						
50						
51						
52						
53						
54						
55						
56						
57						
58						
59						
60						

Reviewer: _____

Item Number	Item DOK	Primary Objective (per Standard)	Secondary Objective (per Standard)	Secondary Objective (per Standard)	Source of Challenge	Notes (attach separate sheets if necessary)
61						
62						
63						
64						
65						
66						
67						
68						
69						
70						
71						
72						
73						
74						
75						
76						
77						
78						
79						
80						
81						
82						
83						
84						
85						
86						
87						
88						
89						
90						
91						
92						

Alignment Instructions and Definitions for English-Language Arts

Alignment Instructions and Definitions for English-Language Arts

Matching Depth-of-Knowledge (DOK) to Objectives of Standards:

What you need: Depth-of-Knowledge Rating Sheet

What to do: Using the Depth-of-Knowledge Rating Sheet, evaluate each content expectation listed under the column 'Objective'. In the blank provided, write in the number of the depth-of-knowledge level you think the objective requires of the student. We first will do this task individually, and then we will review the objectives as a group to gain consensus.

Matching DOK and Objectives to Test Items:

What you need: Item Rating Sheet, CAHSEE Language Arts blueprints (standards), CAHSEE test booklet. (you may request a blank copy of the Depth-of-Knowledge Rating Sheet to identify the objectives).

What you do: Using the Item Rating Sheet and the CAHSEE blueprints, evaluate each test item in the CAHSEE test booklet. We first will do this task individually, and then we will review the objectives as a group to gain consensus.

1) The number listed in the 'Item Number' column refers to the test item number listed in the booklet.
2) In the column labeled 'Item DOK', write in the number of the depth-of-knowledge level you think that this item requires of the student.
3) In the column labeled 'Primary Objective', list the specific objective you think best matches the item (refer to the Depth-of-Knowledge Rating Sheet to identify the objective if necessary). Please include the standard number, goal number (if one is given), and objective number or letter. For example:

   R11 = Reading, Standard 1, Objective 1.1 (no goal number)
   R12 = Reading, Standard 1, Objective 1.2 (no goal number)
   R21 = Reading, Standard 2, Objective 2.1 (no goal number)
   W11= Writing, Standard 1, Objective 1.1 (no goal number)
   W21a=Writing, Standard 2, Goal 2.1, Objective a
   W22b=Writing, Standard 2, Goal 2.2, Objective b

4) If you find that another objective matches this item to the same degree as the Primary Objective, you may enter that standard, goal, and objective in the column labeled 'Secondary Objective'. Remember that most items should be matched to one objective in the test blueprints, so this option should be used sparingly.
5) In the column labeled 'Source of Challenge', you may make a notation if you find that the item is problematic based on the following guidelines. ***Please note that our goal is NOT to re-write the exam but to note major problems.***

   A) Item is confusing.
   B) Students are not expected to know material needed to answer item.
   C) Item does not discriminate student understanding well.

6) In the column labeled 'Notes', you may make a notation if you find that an item is problematic in a way that is not covered under 'Source of Challenge'. ***Please note that our goal is NOT to re-write the exam but to note major problems.***

If you need additional space, please ask for additional Notes Sheets.

Depth-of-Knowledge (DOK) Levels

- Level 1 (recall) item requires recall of information such as fact, definition, term or simple procedure.

- Level 2 (skill/concept) item calls for engagement of some mental processing beyond a habitual response, with students required to make some decisions as to how to approach a problem or activity.

- Level 3 (strategic thinking) items require students to reason, plan or use evidence.

- Level 4 (extended thinking) items require complex reasoning, planning, developing and thinking, typically over an extended period of time.

Alignment Instructions and Definitions for Mathematics

Alignment Instructions and Definitions for Mathematics

Matching Depth-of-Knowledge (DOK) to Objectives of Standards:

What you need: Depth-of-Knowledge Rating Sheet

What to do: Using the Depth-of-Knowledge Rating Sheet, evaluate each content expectation listed under the column 'Objective'. In the blank provided, write in the number of the depth-of-knowledge level you think the objective requires of the student. We first will do this task individually, and then we will review the objectives as a group to gain consensus.

Matching DOK and Objectives to Test Items:

What you need: Item Rating Sheet, CAHSEE Mathematics blueprints (standards), CAHSEE test booklet. (you may request a blank copy of the Depth-of-Knowledge Rating Sheet to identify the objectives).

What you do: Using the Item Rating Sheet and the CAHSEE blueprints, evaluate each test item in the CAHSEE test booklet. We first will do this task individually, and then we will review the objectives as a group to gain consensus.

7) The number listed in the 'Item Number' column refers to the test item number listed in the booklet.
8) In the column labeled 'Item DOK', write in the number of the depth-of-knowledge level you think that this item requires of the student.
9) In the column labeled 'Primary Objective', list the specific objective you think best matches the item (refer to the Depth-of-Knowledge Rating Sheet to identify the objective if necessary). Please include the grade number, standard label, goal number (if one is given), and objective number or letter. For example:

   6SD11 = Grade 6, Statistics/Data Analysis, Goal 1, Objective 1.1
   7NS13 = Grade 7, Number Sense, Goal 1, Objective 1.3
   7NS25 = Grade 7, Number Sense, Goal 2, Objective 2.5
   7AF12 = Grade 7, Algebra and Functions, Goal 1, Objective 1.2
   7MG21 = Grade 7, Measurement and Geometry, Goal 2, Objective 2.1
   7SD11 = Grade 7, Statistics/Data Analysis, Goal 1, Objective 1.1
   7MR12 = Grade 7, Mathematical Reasoning, Goal 1, Objective 1.2
   7MR9 = Grade 7, Mathematical Reasoning, Objective 9 (NO GOAL)

10) If you find that another objective matches this item to the same degree as the Primary Objective, you may enter that standard, goal, and objective in the column labeled 'Secondary Objective'. Remember that most items should be matched to one objective in the test blueprints, so this option should be used sparingly.
11) In the column labeled 'Source of Challenge', you may make a notation if you find that the item is problematic based on the following guidelines. ***Please note that our goal is NOT to re-write the exam but to note major problems.***

    A) Item is confusing.
    B) Students are not expected to know material needed to answer item.
    C) Item does not discriminate student understanding well.

12) In the column labeled 'Notes', you may make a notation if you find that an item is problematic in a way that is not covered under 'Source of Challenge'. ***Please note that our goal is NOT to re-write the exam but to note major problems.***

If you need additional space, please ask for additional Notes Sheets.

Depth-of-Knowledge (DOK) Levels

- Level 1 (recall) item requires recall of information such as fact, definition, term or simple procedure.

- Level 2 (skill/concept) item calls for engagement of some mental processing beyond a habitual response, with students required to make some decisions as to how to approach a problem or activity.

- Level 3 (strategic thinking) items require students to reason, plan or use evidence.

- Level 4 (extended thinking) items require complex reasoning, planning, developing and thinking, typically over an extended period of time.

Debriefing Survey CAHSEE Review Workshop 2005

Debriefing Survey
CAHSEE Review Workshop 2005

Content Area_____

A. For each standard, did the items cover the most important topics you expected by the standard? If not, what topics were not assessed that should have been?

B. For each standard, did the items cover the most important performance (DOK levels) you expected by the standard? If not, what performance was not assessed?

C. Was there any content you expected to be assessed, but found no items assessing that content? What was that content?

D. What is your general opinion of the alignment between the standards and assessment:

i. Perfect alignment
ii. Acceptable alignment
iii. Needs slight improvement
iv. Needs major improvement
v. Not aligned in any way?

E. Other comments.

Research Supporting Considerations for Universally Designed Assessments

Research Supporting Considerations for Universally Designed Assessments

(Source:Thompson, Johnstone, Anderson, & Miller, 2005).

Measures what it intends to measure

- Test development begins with a careful consideration of the skills proposed for measurement (Popham & Lindheim, 1980).
- Every item should reflect specified content and mental behaviors, as called for in test specifications (Haladyna, Downing, & Rodriguez, 2002).
- Removal of construct irrelevant variance increases tests scores for students with reading difficulties (Calhoun, Fuchs & Hamlett, 2000; Harker & Feldt, 1993; Koretz, 1997; Tindal, Heath, Hollenbeck, Almond & Harniss, 1998).
- Language in non-language arts assessments needs to be "transparent" enough to students to clearly determine construct being measured (Sharrocks-Taylor & Hargreaves, 1999).

Respects the diversity of the assessment population

- Items must be reviewed for bias that may exist against particular populations (National Research Council, 1999).
- Items that are designed from the start with equity and accessibility features are less likely to be biased against particular populations (Kopriva, 2000).
- Items must be free of content that makes a student's socioeconomic status or inherited academic aptitudes the dominant influence on how a student will respond to the item (Popham, 2001).
- Items must be free of content that may unfairly benefit or penalize students from diverse ethnic, socioeconomic, or linguistic backgrounds, or students with disabilities (Popham, 2001).
- Cultural norms, beliefs, and customs need to be respectfully reflected in illustrations (Schiffman, 1995).

Has a clear format for text

- The point sizes most often used are 10 and 12 point for documents to be read by people with excellent vision reading in good light (Gaster & Clark, 1995).
- Fourteen point type increases readability and can increase test scores for both students with and without disabilities, compared to 12-point type (Fuchs, Fuchs, Eaton, Hamlett, Binkley, & Crouch, 2000).
- Type size for captions, footnotes, keys, and legends needs to be at least 12 point (Arditi, 1999).
- Larger type sizes are most effective for young students who are learning to read and for students with visual difficulties (Hoerner, Salend, & Kay, 1997).
- Large print is beneficial for reducing eye fatigue (Arditi, 1999).
- Shapes of letters and numbers should enable people to read text "quickly, effortlessly, and with understanding" (Schriver, 1997).
- The relationship between readability and point size is also dependent on the typeface used (Gaster & Clark, 1995; Worden, 1991).
- Letters that are too close together are difficult for partially sighted readers. Spacing needs to be wide between both letters and words (Gaster & Clark, 1995).
- Fixed-space fonts seem to be more legible for some readers than proportional-spaced fonts (Gaster & Clark, 1995).

- Leading should be 25–30 percent of the point (font) size for maximum readability (Arditi, 1999).
- Leading alone does not make a difference in readability as much as the interaction between point size, leading, and line length (Worden, 1991).
- Standard typeface, upper and lower case, is more readable than italic, slanted, small caps, or all caps (Tinker, 1963).
- Text printed completely in capital letters is less legible than text printed completely in lower-case, or normal mixed-case text (Carter, Dey, & Meggs, 1985)
- Italic is far less legible and is read considerably more slowly than regular lower case (Worden, 1991).
- Boldface is more visible than lower case if a change from the norm is needed (Hartley, 1985)
- Staggered right margins are easier to see and scan than uniform or block style right justified margins (Arditi, 1999; Grise, Beattie, & Algozzine, 1982; Menlove & Hammond, 1998).
- Justified text is more difficult to read than unjustified text—especially for poor readers (Gregory & Poulton, 1970; Zachrisson, 1965).
- Justified text is also more disruptive for good readers (Muncer, Gorman, Gorman, & Bibel, 1986).
- A flush left/ragged right margin is the most effective format for text memory. (Thompson, 1991).
- Unjustified text may be easier for poorer readers to understand because the uneven eye movements created in justified text can interrupt reading (Gregory & Poulton, 1970; Hartley, 1985; Muncer, Gorman, Gorman, & Bibel, 1986; Schriver, 1997).
- Justified lines require the distances between words to be varied. In very narrow columns, not only are there extra wide spaces between words, but also between letters within the words (Gregory & Poulton, 1970).
- Longer lines, in general, require larger type and more leading (Schriver, 1997).
- Optimal length is 24 picas—about 4 inches (Worden, 1991).
- Lines that are too long make readers weary and may also cause difficulty in locating the beginning of the next line, causing readers to lose their place (Schriver, 1997; Tinker, 1963).
- Lines of text should be about 40–70 characters, or roughly eight to twelve words per line (Heines, 1984; Osborne, 2001; Schriver, 1997).
- Blank space anchors text on the paper and helps increase legibility (Menlove & Hammond, 1998; Smith & McCombs, 1971).
- A general rule is to allow text to occupy only about half of a page. Too many test items per page can make items difficult to read (Tinker, 1963).

Has clear pictures and graphics (when essential to item)

- Graphics with a clear sense of unity, a clear focal point, and balance reduce the cognitive load of perceiving information and computer-based tests should allow students to change the size of the font (see computer specific considerations below) and thus increase speed with which the user can access graphic material (Szabo and Kanuka, 1998).
- If illustrations are present they are at best essential information, good if they support the information, and unnecessary if they are unrelated to the construct or item (Sharrocks-Taylor & Hargreaves, 1999).
- Illustrations should be placed directly next to the information for which they refer

(Silver, 1994; West, 1997).

- Placing labels directly on plot lines of graphs reduces the load on short-term memory (Gregory & Poulton, 1970).
- Quantitative displays should be structured so that readers can easily construct appropriate inferences about the data (Schriver, 1997).
- Illustrations should be placed directly next to the information for which they refer (Silver, 1994; West, 1997).
- Graphs, illustrations, and other graphic aids can facilitate comprehension (Rakow & Gee, 1987)

Has concise and readable text

- General readability principles such as fewer words per sentence and the removal of irrelevant difficult words increases comprehension of items (Popham & Lindheim, 1980; Rakow & Gee, 1987).
- Flow of sentences is also an important feature. Caution should be taken when reducing reading load so that sentences do not become disjointed or incomprehensible (Anderson, Hiebert, Scott, & Wilkinson, 1985).
- Compound sentences can be written in two separate sentences (if sentences are still comprehensible) (Gaster & Clarke, 1995).
- Most important ideas should be stated first in a sentence (Gaster & Clarke, 1995).
- Noun-pronoun relationships should be clear (Gaster & Clarke, 1995).
- Illustrations should be placed close to the text they support (Gaster & Clarke, 1995), or removed if they do not support text.
- Readability increases when students have likely had experiences or prior knowledge relating to items (Rakow & Gee, 1987).
- Content within items is clearly organized (Rakow & Gee, 1987)
- The content of every item should be independent from content of other items on the test (Haladyna et al., 2000)
- Questions are clearly framed (Rakow & Gee, 1987)
- Limit the number of words, difficulty of words (Popham & Lindheim, 1980), and grammatical complexity of test materials (Popham & Lindheim, 1980)
- Keep vocabulary simple for the group of students being tested (Haladyna et al., 2000).
- Minimize the amount of reading in each item (Haladyna et al., 2000).
- Avoid window dressing (excessive verbiage; Haladyna et al., 2000).
- Simple, clear, commonly used words should be used whenever possible (Gaster & Clarke, 1995).
- Technical terms should be defined (Gaster & Clarke, 1995).
- One idea, fact, or process should be introduced at a time, then ideas developed logically (Gaster & Clarke, 1995).
- If time and setting are important to the sentence, they should be placed at the beginning of the sentence (Gaster & Clarke, 1995).
- Sequence steps of instructions in the exact order that they will be needed (Gaster & Clarke, 1995).
- Vocabulary should be grade-level appropriate (Rakow & Gee, 1987).
- Sentence complexity must be appropriate for grade level (Rakow & Gee, 1987).
- Definitions and examples must be clear and understandable (Rakow & Gee, 1987).

- Required reading skills are appropriate for students' cognitive level (Rakow & Gee, 1987).
- Use of plain language: "text-based language that is straightforward, concise, and uses everyday words to convey meaning. The goal of plain language editing strategies is to improve the comprehensibility of written text while preserving the essence of its message." (Hanson, Hayes, Schriver, LeMahieu, & Brown, 1998, p.2).
- Reduce the verbal and organizational complexity of test items while preserving their essential content (i.e., the skills and concepts they were intended to measure.) (Hanson et al, 1998, p.2).
- Reduce excessive length; reduce wordiness and remove irrelevant material (Brown, 1999).
- Eliminate unusual or low frequency words and replace with common words (e.g., replace "utilize" with "use") (Brown, 1999).
- Avoid ambiguous words (e.g., crane) (Brown, 1999).
- Avoid irregularly spelled words (e.g., trough, feign) (Brown, 1999).
- Avoid proper names, replace with common names or no names at all (Brown, 1999).
- Avoid inconsistent naming or graphic conventions (e.g., multiple names for the same concept–unless recognizing multiple names for the same concept is the construct being tested) (Brown, 1999).
- Avoid unclear signals about how to direct attention (e.g., phrases such as "in the table below" are helpful) (Brown, 1999).
- Mark all questions clearly (Brown, 1999).
- Simplified English on math tests enables comparable performance by English language learners and English proficient students (Abedi, Hofstetter, Baker, & Lord, 2001).
- Linguistic demands of tests often pose the greatest barrier to students' ability to demonstrate knowledge of mathematical concepts (Hanson, 1997).
- Plain language versions of tests assist students that understand content but are less proficient in English language. They do not help students who do not understand content (Brown, 1999).

Allows changes to its format without changing its meaning or difficulty (including visual or memory load)

- Construct irrelevant graphs, vertical text, untranslatable material, and decorative graphics all create situations where accommodating students who use Braille, American Sign Language, or non-English languages is difficult.

Additional considerations for computer-based assessments

- Students reported difficulties with computers including excessive need for forward and back buttons, unfamiliarity with response mechanisms, and an inability to see entire problems on screens (Trotter, 2001).
- Students may not be familiar with skills like scrolling or using text on multiple screens (Cole, Tindal, & Glasgow, 2000).
- Some students have had little access to computers and calculators prior to testing (Bridgeman, Harvey, & Braswell, 1995; MacArthur & Graham, 1987).

Item Review Form & Whole Test Review Form

Item Review Form

Considerations for Universally Designed Assessment Items Subject _____ Grade _____ Test form ___ Item #s on this page _1-5___ Initials _____

Star (*) areas of strength and Check (√) areas of concern for each item	Pass-age	Item #1	Item #2	Item #3	Item #4	Item #5	Describe Concerns and Suggestions for items and reading passages (include item # with comment)	Recommend review by expert or student in Content Area, Specific Disability, Language, Culture	
Item respects the diversity of the assessment population • Sensitive to test taker characteristics and experiences (gender, age, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, region, disability, language) • Avoids content that might unfairly advantage or disadvantage any student subgroup • Other								Expert review?	Student review?
Item has concise and readable text • Commonly used words (except vocabulary tested) • Vocabulary appropriate for grade level • Minimum use of unnecessary words • Technical terms and abbreviations avoided unless tested • Sentence complexity appropriate for grade level • Question to be answered identifiable • Other								Expert review?	Student review?
Item has a clear format for text • Standard typeface • Twelve (12) point minimum size for all print, • High contrast between text and background • Sufficient blank space • Staggered right margins • Other								Expert review?	Student review?

Star (*) areas of strength and Check (√) areas of concern for each item	Pass-age	Item #1	Item #2	Item #3	Item #4	Item #5	Describe Concerns and Suggestions for items and reading passages (include item # with comment)	Recommend review by expert or student in Content Area, Specific Disability, Language, Culture	
Item has clear visuals (use NA for none) • Visuals are needed to answer the question • Visuals have clearly defined features • High contrast between visuals and background • Visuals are clearly labeled • Other								Expert review?	Student review?
Item allows changes to format without changing meaning or difficulty (check allowed accommodations) • Braille or other tactile format • Sign language interpretation • Oral presentation • Assistive technology • Translation into another language • Other								Expert review?	Student review?
Describe other considerations specific to item on back									

Whole Test Review Form

Considerations for Universally Designed Whole Tests Subject _____ Grade _____ Test form ___ Reviewer Initials _____

	Star (*) areas of strength and Check (√) areas of concern for this test	Describe Concerns and Suggestions for Improvement,
This test measures what it intends to measure • Reflects the intended content standards (reviewers have information about the content being measured) • Minimizes knowledge and skills required beyond what is intended for measurement • Other		
Response format for extended response items • Number of points for extended response items is clear • Correct or possible responses are listed • Same amount of credit for written or numerical response (e.g., "explain or show work, "use words or symbols to describe" Leaves option of less writing for students who are not skilled writers but can "do the math" • Other		
Response format for multiple choice items • Division between items on response form is clear (change of color or shading) • Response bubbles are sufficiently large • Does test require separate response form (e.g., gr. 8) or do students write directly in test booklet (e.g., gr. 3) For grade 3, student write anywhere on page – besides just in circle • Other		
Overall comparison of types of items • Number/percent of strong items vs. number/percent with concerns • Number/percent of items with visuals • Number/percent of m.c. vs. extended response • Number/percent of items with other concerns (e.g., reading passage addressing urban vs. rural settings and other cultures		

	Star (*) areas of strength and Check (√) areas of concern for this test	Describe Concerns and Suggestions for Improvement,
Passages • Appropriate for grade level • Cognitive demands of all passages are balanced (all are not too easy or too difficult) • Visuals related to passages are clear • Format of passages is clear		
Other considerations for this test		