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Subject

The California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress System and English Language Proficiency Assessments for California: Approval of the 2019–20 California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress System and Summative Computer-Based English Language Proficiency Assessments for California Student Score Reports, California Spanish Assessment Preliminary Threshold Scores, and Update on Assessment Program Activities.

## Type of Action

Action, Information

## Summary of the Issue(s)

This item seeks approval of the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) and computer-based English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) summative Student Score Reports (SSRs), and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction’s proposed operational California Spanish Assessment (CSA) preliminary threshold scores for the 2018–19 administration and beyond. The updates include information on the status of the California Educator Reporting System; 2018–19 CAASPP public reporting; 2018–19 interim assessment testing volumes; new interim assessments for 2019–20, called focused Interim Assessment Blocks (IABs); the new Digital Library Connections Playlists for the focused IABs; and the Broadband Infrastructure Improvement Grant (BIIG).

## Recommendations

The California Department of Education (CDE) recommends that the California State Board of Education (SBE) approve the following:

1. The SSRs for the CAASPP and the ELPAC, as described in Attachment 2.
2. The State Superintendent’s proposed CSA preliminary threshold scores beginning with the 2018–19 administration, as shown in Attachment 3.

The CDE further recommends that the SBE authorize CDE staff to make technical edits, as necessary, in the documents associated with the recommendations above.

## Brief History of Key Issues

### CAASPP and Summative ELPAC Student Score Reports

The CDE recommends that the SBE approve the 2019–20 SSRs in Attachment 2. This section describes the process the CDE used to collect and implement stakeholder feedback on the design and usability of the CAASPP and Summative ELPAC SSRs.

In an October 2018 Information Memorandum to the SBE, the CDE provided details on the work that was done in June and July 2018 to obtain feedback from various stakeholders on the CAASPP SSRs to increase the accessibility of the reports. The Information Memorandum can be found at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-adad-oct18item01.docx>. Technical edits were applied on the basis of the stakeholders’ input, and the design of the summative SSRs was applied to the SSRs for all of the CAASPP System assessments, as shown in Attachment 2. Stakeholders included parent groups and representatives from the California Parent Teacher Association, Californians Together, and the California Association for Bilingual Education. In addition, the CDE implemented an electronic reporting process for the delivery of SSRs for the CAASPP and Summative ELPAC starting with the 2018–19 administration year. All LEAs have the option to deliver their SSRs to parents/guardians electronically, print them locally, or purchase paper SSRs from testing contractor Educational Testing Service (ETS).

The first set of ELPAC SSRs were presented to the SBE in a December 2017 Information Memorandum, which can be found at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-adad-dec17item03.docx>. The ELPAC SSRs have been revised to more closely align with the design of the CAASPP SSRs, as shown in Attachment 2. Additional changes were made on the basis of the feedback received from stakeholder groups in April and June 2019. These groups were given opportunities to discuss and provide feedback on the design of the Summative ELPAC SSRs. First, parent focus groups met on April 24 and 25. Native Spanish-speaking parents of English learners expressed their preferences on graphics, wording, and comprehensibility of the SSRs. Also on April 25, an ELPAC stakeholder group, including representatives from the California Parent Teacher Association, Californians Together, and the California Association for Bilingual Education, met to discuss the design of the ELPAC SSRs and provided input. Last, on June 7, one-on-one interviews were held with parents of California students whose primary language is Spanish or Mandarin. Feedback from this group included inquiry into the usability of Spanish and Chinese translations of the SSRs.

### Stakeholder Input on the Design

Stakeholder feedback has informed the design of both the CAASPP and Summative ELPAC SSRs; recommendations have included the following, as applicable:

* Use of color schemes that are easier on the eye
* Vertical representation of the graphics that allows for quick and easy understanding of results
* Larger graphics that compare state, school, and student averages that are easy to read and understand
* Score claim concepts that have a concise layout, a good use of vectors to emphasize labels, and easy to decipher classifications
* Additional color and dimension that make the SSR seem more modern
* Links to test questions and additional resources that are more evident to parents and guardians

### Student Score Reports Design

Information on the student’s overall score and progress for the assessment content area is now clearly presented using colors that attract the reader’s attention. The information is easy to read and understand; presented in a larger, contemporary format; and provides easy access to additional information through active links to a parent resource website. The modified electronic SSR format change, which was not possible with the paper version, addresses universal accessibility. The result is expanded access to the SSR for persons with visual impairments through text-to-speech applications.

The proposed SSR for the CSA has an intentionally different design layout compared to the other CAASPP and ELPAC SSRs. This layout appropriately conveys the preliminary SSPI-recommended threshold scores as presented in Attachment 3. The CDE and the testing contractor will continue to gather information on the test-taking population and student performance during these initial years of operational testing. If appropriate, revised threshold scores may be presented to the SBE for consideration, at which time additional changes to the SSR may be proposed.

Electronic SSRs are translated into Spanish, Chinese (traditional), Vietnamese, and Filipino for 2019–20. These languages represent the four languages most frequently spoken other than English by California students. Another important improvement resulting from the electronic SSR format is the inclusion of the mailing address on all reports, which was not possible on the paper version without a special request from and additional charge to LEAs. This improvement reduces work and costs for LEAs.

The proposed 2019–20 SSR designs for the CAASPP English language arts/literacy (ELA) and mathematics, and California Science Test (CAST) do not differ from the 2018–19, except for the inclusion of the student score history section, where applicable.

The recommended ELPAC SSR design prominently features an overall score level and a description of what the student can do at each level. The SSR displays Oral Language and Written Language composite scores that are easy to read and understand, a student score history, and links to online resources that may be useful to parents/guardians. The result is a parent-friendly SSR that is consistent with the design of SSRs for other California assessments.

### Support for Families

In May 2019, the CDE, in collaboration with Smarter Balanced, HCM Strategies, and ETS, launched the Starting Smarter website to provide resources to facilitate parents’/guardians’ understanding of the scores presented on their child’s score report and to help them have conversations with their child’s teacher. Website features include score reports, sample test questions, and no-cost resources available to parents/guardians to support their child’s learning. The May 2019 launch included coverage on the CAASPP Smarter Balanced summative assessments for ELA and mathematics, the California Alternate Assessments (CAAs) for ELA and mathematics, and the ELPAC assessments.

In fall 2019, the Starting Smarter website will be updated to include SSRs and resources for the CAST and CSA. In 2020–21, the ELPAC Alternate Assessment will be added. The Starting Smarter website for the CAASPP is located at <https://ca.startingsmarter.org/>, and the Starting Smarter website for the ELPAC is at <https://elpac.startingsmarter.org/>.

### Next Steps

In 2019–20, as part of redesign activities and feedback from parents, guardians, and educators, the CDE will continue to pilot personalized SSR videos for parents and guardians as a supplement to the SSR. The videos will be accessible on any device and will have dynamic elements that include on-screen text, animated graphics, and native-speaking voiceover. Translations will be available in languages other than those already available for electronic SSRs, depending on an LEA’s need. Embedded links at the end of video “chapters” provide immediate, targeted access to related information and resources.

As we transition to the computer-based Initial ELPAC, the CDE, in collaboration with ETS, will follow a similar process of engaging stakeholders in the revisions to the SSR for that assessment. The CDE anticipates presenting the Initial ELPAC SSR to the SBE in spring 2020.

## The State Superintendent’s Proposed Preliminary Threshold Scores for the CSA

The CSA has replaced the Standards-based Tests in Spanish (STS) as the CAASPP primary language assessment to provide a measure of a student’s proficiency in Spanish. Per *EC* Section 60640(b)(5)(A), the STS was administered until the CSA, aligned with the Common Core State Standards en Espaňol, was approved for development in September 2016 and became operational in April 2019. The computer-based CSA is administered to students in grades three through eight and high school and measures a student’s Spanish skills in reading, writing mechanics, and listening.

### Proposed Preliminary CSA Threshold Scores

In August 2019, an Information Memorandum, which included the Standard Setting Plan, was submitted to the SBE that provided details of the August 2019 CSA standard setting process to establish threshold scores for the CSA. The Memorandum can be found at<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-adad-aug19item02.docx>. The standard setting workshop was held from August 6 through August 9, 2019, and included 56 California educators who are Spanish bilingual and biliterate and have experience teaching Spanish in at least one of grades three through twelve.

The CDE recommends that the SBE adopt the proposed preliminary threshold scores as presented in Attachment 3. Attachment 3 provides the State Superintendent’s recommended preliminary threshold scores across the seven grade spans by overall scale score based on the general achievement level descriptors approved by the SBE in November 2017. The standard setting panel’s judgments (Attachment 4) were reviewed by CDE staff and members of the CAASPP Technical Advisory Group, as described in the August 2019 Memorandum. To maintain fidelity with the work of the standard-setting panel, the recommended thresholds presented in Attachment 3 are within one conditional standard error of measurement of the panel’s recommendations. That is, all adjustments are within the natural error variance around the panel’s recommended thresholds and therefore reflect only slight modifications of their judgments.

The 2018–19 CSA data were considered sufficient for use in the standard setting process; however, due to the small sample sizes and the optional nature of this assessment, impact data are likely to be less stable than on a required assessment. As a result, the SSPI-recommended thresholds in Attachment 3 are presented as preliminary. The CDE and the testing contractor will continue to gather information on the test-taking population and the instructional programs those students are receiving during these initial years of operational testing. Any future recommended threshold score adjustments will be brought before the SBE for consideration.

In the final evaluation of the standard setting workshop, all panelists indicated that they understood the process and supported the final recommendations. Attachment 5 contains background information about the panelists and characteristics of the CSA test taking population. In addition, Californians Together and the California Association for Bilingual Education were briefed on these recommended scores on August 20. There were no concerns brought up during the meeting. Once approved, these proposed threshold scores will be used in the development of SSRs and aggregate reports for the CSA and will be implemented starting with the 2018–19 CSA administration.

#### **Next Steps**

Following the SBE approval of the CSA threshold scores, the CDE will notify LEA superintendents and charter school administrators of the approved threshold scores for the 2018–19 year. Prior to the release of SSRs, ETS and the CDE will perform an internal quality control process to verify that the SSRs are generating accurately. This will include evaluating CSA student score data at both the individual and aggregate levels and producing a small sample of SSRs to ensure that all information reported is accurate. The SSRs are anticipated to be generated and sent to LEAs in fall 2019. In addition, once the threshold scores are approved, the CDE will work collaboratively with key stakeholder groups to update the requirements for inclusion of the CSA as a partial measure for the State Seal of Biliteracy.

## Updates to the Smarter Balanced Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines

In June 2019, members of the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium voted to approve updates to the *Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines* (*UAAG*) for the 2019–20 school year. The four approved motions included two new accessibility resources and clarifications to two existing policies.

The two new accessibility resources involve the embedded illustration glossaries designated support and the non-embedded illustration glossaries designated support. Illustration glossaries are a language support and are provided for selected construct-irrelevant terms for mathematics. The embedded illustrations for these terms appear on the computer screen when students select them. With the illustration glossary setting enabled, students can view the illustration glossary. Students also can adjust the size of the illustration and move it around the screen. The non-embedded illustrations for these terms appear in a supplement to the paper-pencil test and are identified by number. Illustration glossaries are available to students who are advancing toward English language proficiency or are deaf or hard of hearing but who are not proficient in American Sign Language.

A clarification to the existing embedded braille accommodation was made to include Unified English Braille technical code for mathematics. No further changes were made to the description or recommendations for use for students with visual impairments who may read text via braille.

A clarification also was made to the existing non-embedded medical device designated support to broaden the description and recommendations for use. The medical device resource was renamed the “medical supports designated support.” The change in name expands the description and recommendations for use beyond the use of an electronic device to nonelectronic device-based medical supports that students may need during testing.

The revised *UAAG* is located at <https://portal.smarterbalanced.org/library/en/usability-accessibility-and-accommodations-guidelines.pdf>.

### California Science Test Updates

As referenced in the SBE August 2019 Information Memorandum, which can be found at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-adad-aug19item02.docx>, the CDE and ETS convened a standard setting meeting in early August 2019 during which 45 California science educators provided recommendations for the CAST threshold scores. The CDE will provide additional information about the standard setting process in an SBE Information Memorandum in October 2019 and will bring recommended CSA threshold scores to the SBE for approval in November 2019.

If the SBE approves the CAST threshold scores in November 2019, the results for the 2018–19 CAST administration will be made available to LEAs and the public in January 2020. LEAs will receive the results in a separate SSR to be shared with students and parents/guardians. The CAST SSRs will provide overall scale scores as well as the students’ corresponding four achievement levels (i.e., Standard Exceeded [Level 4], Standard Met [Level 3], Standard Nearly Met [Level 2], and Standard Not Met [Level 1]) and three science-area performance levels (i.e., Above Standard, Near Standard, and Below Standard) for the Life Sciences, Physical Sciences, and Earth and Space Sciences. For more information on the CAST SSR structure, please refer to the November 2017 SBE Item, which is located at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/nov17item07.doc>.

### California Alternate Assessment for Science Updates

On September 3, 2019, the CDE will launch the first operational CAA for Science. The CAA for Science is administered online to students with the most significant cognitive disabilities whose individualized education program indicates the use of an alternate assessment. Eligible students take the CAA for Science in grades five and eight and one time in high school (i.e., grade ten, eleven, or twelve).

For the 2019–20 CAA for Science administration, eligible students will take four embedded performance tasks from the three science domains of the California Next Generation Science Standards (i.e., Physical Sciences, Life Sciences, and Earth and Space Sciences). Students must attempt all four performance tasks to complete the assessment. The CDE and ETS have worked to develop resources for test examiners to assist them in administering the first operational CAA for Science. Details about this assessment are included in the SBE August 2019 Information Memorandum, which can be found at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-adad-aug19item01.docx>.

The CDE has updated the Preliminary Indicator Toolkit web pages to include key messages, assessment transition and results time lines, frequently asked questions, and an optional parent/guardian letter template regarding the CAA for Science. This web page is located at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ca/prelimindicatortoolkit.asp>. For the 2018−19 administration, LEAs will receive the preliminary indicator results in a downloadable student-level data file in the Test Operations Management System in January 2020. The downloadable aggregation files (i.e., research file[s]) will be provided on the new CDE Public Web Reporting website.

### Broadband Infrastructure Improvement Grant

The CDE continues to assist the K–12 High Speed Network with the implementation of the BIIG programs. As of June 2019, all of the BIIG 1.0 projects are complete and 190 of the 214 BIIG 2.0 projects are complete. A fourth round of the BIIG 2.0 projects are going through the approval process. Both BIIG 1.0 and BIIG 2.0 grant awards are meant to be spent by June 30, 2020. In addition to the BIIG program, the 2019-20 California State budget allocated $7.5M to bring fiber to schools for digital learning opportunities. The CDE is to contract with the Corporation for Education Network Initiatives in California (CENIC) to do this work and the contract is currently being developed.

### Interim Assessments and Summer Training

Interim assessments are a part of the Smarter Balanced assessment system to support teaching and learning throughout the year. Use of interim assessments in California LEAs continues to grow. During the 2018–19 school year, more than 11.3 million interim assessments were administered across more than 1,700 LEAs. These numbers exceed the 2017–18 school year, during which more than 8.7 million interim assessments were started across nearly 1,600 LEAs. The CDE continues to support LEAs by providing professional development opportunities for the administration and hand scoring of the interim assessments.

On behalf of the CDE, WestEd and ETS conducted the 2019 Summer Institute for LEA teams in July and August at eight locations across the state. Approximately 1,200 classroom teachers, instructional coaches, teachers on special assignment, administrators, and other LEA staff participated in this two-day training, which focused on how to evaluate and score student responses to constructed response items and performance tasks. The goals of the Summer Institute were for educators to understand the following:

* The purpose of different types of assessment and how they work together to support learning
* The design of Smarter Balanced Interim Assessment items
* How to use interim assessment and Digital Library systems, including accessibility features
* The use of hand scoring to analyze interim assessment student responses, understand expectations, and use this information in determining instructional next steps

To support educator use of the Digital Library and interim assessments, including hand scoring, the 2019 Summer Institute workshop materials are available to teachers and staff from all LEAs through a secure web page.

**Site Administrator Feedback Sessions**

Three in-person meetings were held in July with California site administrators. These meetings, held at the Sacramento County Office of Education, represent the first time that the Assessment Development and Administration Division has reached out to principals to learn about their needs for training and information. Specific time was dedicated to the discussion of the Smarter Balanced Interim Assessments and the Digital Library, options for training tools, and additional resources needed. A full report of the site administrator meetings will be provided in an October 2019 Information Memorandum.

**Science—It’s Elementary!**

In January 2019, the CDE launched a new statewide contest for teachers at California public elementary schools, kindergarten through grade five, featuring classrooms where the formative assessment process is used to guide the study of science phenomena based on the California Next Generation Science Standards. Five finalists were selected in April and were interviewed for the production of a video in May. Finalists included Jennifer Munoz from Carmel Del Mar School in the Del Mar Union School District in San Diego; Kristen Peckham from Burt Ranch Elementary in the Burnt Ranch Elementary District; Joann Ormonde from Freiler School in the Tracy Unified School District; Celia De La Loza from Magee Academy of Arts and Sciences in the El Rancho Unified District; and Jillian Torres from William Orr Elementary in the Little Lake City Elementary School District. These finalists will be featured as part of this year’s Assessment Information Meeting in August and have been invited to present at the first annual California Assessment Conference in October.

### North-South Assessment Information Meetings

In August, the CDE hosted its annual North-South Assessment Information Meetings, held in Sacramento and Ontario. Changes were made to this year’s training as a result of LEA coordinator feedback regarding previous meetings. One significant change was to hold the meetings at an earlier date to disseminate information at the beginning of the school year. A valuable feature was added by embedding time for reflection and sharing at the end of each session.

Topics covered during this one-day training included new information about the CAST, CAA for Science, ELPAC, the CSA, and the latest CAASPP System enhancements. Between the two locations, approximately 850 LEA coordinators attended in person, and approximately 450 attended via live webinar.

Each Information Meeting followed a two-day New Coordinator Training, which served as an introduction for staff who are new to their positions.

**California Assessment Conference**

The CDE is making final preparations for its first California Assessment Conference, designed for classroom teachers. To be held October 16–18, 2019, at the Oakland Convention Center, the two-and-a-half-day conference will provide educators with a unique opportunity to explore connections between assessments and classroom instruction and learn how to utilize assessment tools and resources to support teaching and learning. A variety of sessions and key topics will allow for a customized learning experience while minimizing time away from the classroom.

## Summary of Previous State Board of Education Discussion and Action

In August 2019, the CDE provided the SBE with an Information Memorandum that gave an update on the CAA for Science <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-adad-aug19item01.docx>.

In August 2019, the CDE provided the SBE with an Information Memorandum that gave an update on the CSA Standard Setting Plan <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-adad-aug19item02.docx>.

In August 2019, the CDE provided the SBE with an Information Memorandum that gave an update on the notice received from the US Department of Education informing the CDE that the statewide percentage of students taking the alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards exceeded 1.0 percent <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-adad-aug19item03.docx>.

In July 2019, the CDE provided the SBE with updates on the CAASPP System and ELPAC activities (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr19/documents/jul19item02.docx>).

In June 2019, the CDE provided the SBE with an Information Memorandum about proposed rulemaking for the Initial and Summative ELPAC and the Alternate ELPAC based on transition to an online test delivery system (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-adad-jun19item03.docx>).

In May 2019, the CDE provided the SBE with updates on the CAASPP System and ELPAC activities. The SBE approved the proposed high-level test design (HLTD) for the transition of the Initial and Summative ELPAC to computer-based tests, the proposed HLTD for the development of the computer-based Initial and Summative Alternate ELPAC, and proposed revisions to the computer-based Summative ELPAC blueprints (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr19/documents/may19item01.docx>).

In April 2019, the CDE provided the SBE with an Information Memorandum that gave an update on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment blueprints for ELA and mathematics (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-adad-apr19item01.docx>).

In March 2019, the CDE provided the SBE with updates on the CAASPP System and ELPAC activities and requested approval of the HLTDs for the Initial and Summative ELPAC computer-based delivery and the Alternate ELPAC (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr19/documents/mar19item03.docx>).

In February 2019, the CDE provided the SBE with an Information Memorandum that gave an update on the ELPAC threshold score review study (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-adad-feb19item01.docx>).

In December 2018, the CDE provided the SBE with an Information Memorandum that gave an update on the 2017–18 public releases for the Initial California English Language Development Test, the Physical Fitness Test, and the preliminary indicators for the CAST field test and the CAA for Science, year two pilot (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-adad-dec18item01.docx>).

In November 2018, the CDE provided the SBE with updates on CAASPP System activities, requested approval of the proposed contract amendment for the CAASPP contract with ETS to include the integration of the ELPAC, and requested approval of the proposed contract amendment to the University of California, Santa Cruz (UCSC) interagency agreement to provide an educator reporting system (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/nov18item08.docx>)

(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/nov18item08a1.pdf>)

(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/nov18item08a2.pdf>)

(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/nov18item08a3.pdf>)

(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/nov18item08a4.xlsx>)

(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/nov18item08a5.pdf>)

(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/nov18item08a6.xlsx>).

In October 2018, the CDE provided the SBE with an Information Memorandum that provided an update on the SSR for 2018–19 and beyond (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-adad-oct18item01.docx>).

In September 2018, the CDE provided the SBE with updates on the CAASPP System, including a presentation on the electronic reporting pilot (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/sep18item03.docx>).

In August 2018, the CDE provided the SBE with an Information Memorandum that provided an update on the development of both new science assessments, the CAST and the CAA for Science

(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-adad-aug18item01.docx>).

In July 2018, the SBE approved a request for authority to enter into negotiations to amend ETS’s CAASPP contract to include the integration of the ELPAC and enter into negotiations with UCSC for an interagency agreement to provide an educator reporting system (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/jul18item03.docx>).

In June 2018, the CDE provided the SBE with an Information Memorandum that included an update on the ELPAC and a review of the preliminary results of the Enhanced Assessment Grant for the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-adad-jun18item02.docx>) (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-adad-jun18item02a01.pdf>).

In May 2018, the CDE provided the SBE with updates on the CAASPP System (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/may18item03.docx>).

In March 2018, the CDE provided the SBE with updates on the CAASPP System (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/mar18item08.docx>).

In January 2018, the SBE approved the CAA for Science test blueprint, general achievement level descriptors, and score reporting structure (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/jan18item06.docx>).

In December 2017, the SBE approved summative SSRs for the ELPAC (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-adad-dec17item03.docx>) (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-adad-dec17item03a01.pdf>) (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-adad-dec17item03a03.pdf>).

In November 2017, the SBE approved the CSA blueprints, the CSA general achievement level descriptors, the CSA score reporting structure, and the ELPAC apportionment rates (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/nov17item07.doc>).

In October 2017, an Information Memorandum provided the SBE with a review of the proposed CSA draft test blueprint, draft general achievement level descriptors, and draft score reporting structure (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-adad-oct17item02.doc>).

In September 2016, the SBE approved the *High-Level Test Design for the California Spanish Assessment*, which included the purpose of the assessment, its target population, and a high-level test development time line. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr16/documents/sep16item04.doc>).

In May 2015, the SBE designated ETS as the CAASPP contractor for the 2015–16, 2016–17, and 2017–18 test administrations, including the development, pilot testing, and field testing of three new California Next Generation Science Standards (CA NGSS) science assessments (including the CA NGSS alternate assessment for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities) in the grades and content areas to be approved by the SBE. This included a new primary language assessment aligned with Common Core State Standards.

(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr15/documents/may15item01.doc>).

## Fiscal Analysis (as appropriate)

The 2019–20 Budget Act provides a total of $87,537,000 in multiple CAASPP System contract costs, which includes $76,846,831 in funding for the ETS CAASPP contract activities, and, along with supplemental funds from 2018–19, provides a total of $36,793,235 in funding for ELPAC contract obligations, which includes $36,362,323 for the ETS ELPAC contract activities.

In the coming weeks, the CDE will provide the Department of Finance (DOF), for fiscal year 2020–21 Governor’s budget consideration, estimates on the funding amount necessary for the 2020–21 CAASPP and ELPAC contract activities. This funding amount will include apportionment payments for the 2019–20 CAASPP and ELPAC test administrations. The CDE will provide the DOF with a breakdown of estimated costs for statewide assessment apportionments for each test to be administered in 2019–20.

Funding for 2020–21 and beyond will be contingent on an annual appropriation being made available from the Legislature in future fiscal years.

## Attachment(s)

* Attachment 1: Outreach and Professional Development Activities (6 Pages)
* Attachment 2: Student Score Reports (20 Pages)
* Attachment 3: State Superintendent of Public Instruction’s Proposed Preliminary Threshold Score Recommendations for the California Spanish Assessment
(1 Page)
* Attachment 4: Educator Panel Proposed Threshold Score Recommendations for the California Spanish Assessment (1 Page)
* Attachment 5: California Spanish Assessment Threshold Score Summary Information (26 Pages)

# Outreach and Professional Development Activities

The California Department of Education (CDE), in coordination with California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) and English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) contractors, has provided a variety of outreach activities, including in-person workshops, focus group meetings, and presentations, throughout the state to prepare local educational agencies (LEAs) for the administration of the CAASPP System and ELPAC. In addition, the CDE continues to release information regarding assessment program updates, including weekly updates, on its website and through listserv email. The following tables provide descriptions of outreach and professional development activities during July and August 2019.

**Table 1. Trainings**

| **Date(s)** | **Location** | **Estimated Number of Attendees** | **Description** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7/8–9 | Sacramento | 175 | CAASPP Summer Institute: “Analyzing Student Work and Using the Interim and Digital Library Systems to Inform Teaching and Learning”A two-day, in-person, professional development opportunity intended for classroom teachers, instructional coaches, and teachers on special assignment in kindergarten through grade twelve.  |
| 7/16–17 | Downey | 243 | CAASPP Summer Institute: “Analyzing Student Work and Using the Interim and Digital Library Systems to Inform Teaching and Learning”A two-day, in-person, professional development opportunity intended for classroom teachers, instructional coaches, and teachers on special assignment in kindergarten through grade twelve.  |
| 7/18–19 | San Diego | 119 | CAASPP Summer Institute: “Analyzing Student Work and Using the Interim and Digital Library Systems to Inform Teaching and Learning”A two-day, in-person, professional development opportunity intended for classroom teachers, instructional coaches, and teachers on special assignment in kindergarten through grade twelve.  |
| 7/22–23 | Redding | 30 | CAASPP Summer Institute: “Analyzing Student Work and Using the Interim and Digital Library Systems to Inform Teaching and Learning”A two-day, in-person, professional development opportunity intended for classroom teachers, instructional coaches, and teachers on special assignment in kindergarten through grade twelve.  |
| 7/25–26 | Riverside | 115 | CAASPP Summer Institute: “Analyzing Student Work and Using the Interim and Digital Library Systems to Inform Teaching and Learning”A two-day, in-person, professional development opportunity intended for classroom teachers, instructional coaches, and teachers on special assignment in kindergarten through grade twelve.  |
| 7/29–30 | Fresno | 78 | CAASPP Summer Institute: “Analyzing Student Work and Using the Interim and Digital Library Systems to Inform Teaching and Learning”A two-day, in-person, professional development opportunity intended for classroom teachers, instructional coaches, and teachers on special assignment in kindergarten through grade twelve.  |
| 7/31–8/1 | Hayward | 36 | CAASPP Summer Institute: “Analyzing Student Work and Using the Interim and Digital Library Systems to Inform Teaching and Learning”A two-day, in-person, professional development opportunity intended for classroom teachers, instructional coaches, and teachers on special assignment in kindergarten through grade twelve. |
| 8/5–6 | Woodland Hills | 85 | CAASPP Summer Institute: “Analyzing Student Work and Using the Interim and Digital Library Systems to Inform Teaching and Learning”A two-day, in-person, professional development opportunity intended for classroom teachers, instructional coaches, and teachers on special assignment in kindergarten through grade twelve.  |
| 8/6 | Sacramento | 75 | Initial ELPAC Administration and Scoring Makeup TrainingsThis training prepared LEAs for the Initial ELPAC administration. |
| 8/14 | Montebello | 50 | Initial ELPAC Administration and Scoring Makeup TrainingsThis training prepared LEAs for the Initial ELPAC administration. |
| 8/15 | Costa Mesa | 40 | Initial ELPAC Administration and Scoring Makeup TrainingsThis training prepared LEAs for the Initial ELPAC administration. |
| 8/16 | Visalia | 75 | Initial ELPAC Administration and Scoring Makeup TrainingsThis training prepared LEAs for the Initial ELPAC administration. |

**Table 2. Advisory Panel/Review Committee Meetings**

| **Date(s)** | **Location** | **Estimated Number of Attendees** | **Description** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7/3 | Sacramento | 8 | California Alternate Assessment (CAA) for Science Data Review MeetingParticipants took part in the data review process to assess the performance of items on the CAA for Science and recommend whether they should be used operationally. |
| 7/9–10 | Sacramento | 11 | CAAs for English Language Arts/Literacy and Mathematics Data Review MeetingParticipants took part in the data review process to assess the performance of items and recommend whether they should be used operationally. |
| 7/11 | Sacramento | 23 | Site Administrator Feedback Session. A day-long meeting to discuss site-level needs, specifically with regard to the interim assessments and the Digital Library. |
| 7/16–17 | Sacramento | 20 | Alternate ELPAC Item Review MeetingEducators participated in reviewing items for content, bias, and sensitivity. These items will be included in the pilot test scheduled for January 2020. |
| 7/18 | Sacramento | 17 | Site Administrator Feedback Session. A day-long meeting to discuss site-level needs, specifically with regard to the interim assessments and the Digital Library. |
| 7/18–19 | Sacramento | 23 | California Spanish Assessment (CSA) Achievement Level Descriptors (ALDs) MeetingMeeting for participants to provide feedback and recommend edits on the draft, grade-specific ALDs and work with other educators to review the descriptions of the Spanish reading/language arts knowledge and skills necessary for students at each of the three achievement levels in order to develop a solid understand of the ALD process and their role in that process. |
| 7/25 | Sacramento | 23 | Site Administrator Feedback Session. A day-long meeting to discuss site-level needs, specifically with regard to the interim assessments and the Digital Library. |
| 7/30–8/2 | Sacramento | 45 | California Science Test (CAST) Standard Setting WorkshopEducators from grades three through eight and high school participated in determining draft preliminary threshold scores to go to the SBE for approval in November 2019. |
| 8/6–9 | Sacramento | 60 | CSA Standard Setting WorkshopEducators from grades three through eight and high school participated in determining draft preliminary threshold scores to go to the SBE for approval in September 2019. |
| 8/15 | (WebEx) | 450 | Statewide Assessment Stakeholders MeetingAssessment Stakeholder Members were invited to join the live Assessment Information Meeting Webinar |

**Table 3. Presentations by CDE Staff**

| **Date(s)** | **Location** | **Estimated Number of Attendees** | **Description** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 8/8 | Sacramento | 18 | Advisory Commission on Special Education MeetingAssessment updates were provided. |
| 8/15 | Sacramento | 350 | Assessment Information MeetingThis meeting provided CAASPP and ELPAC coordinators with the latest information and updates on California's assessments. |
| 8/22 | Ontario | 400 | Assessment Information MeetingThis meeting provided CAASPP and ELPAC coordinators with the latest information and updates on California's assessments. |
| 8/22 | Ontario | 25 | Open Forum on California AssessmentKey stakeholders were invited to provide feedback on the statewide assessment system and its performance |

# State Superintendent of Public Instruction’s Proposed Preliminary Threshold Score Recommendations for the California Spanish Assessment

## Grades Three through Grade Eight and High School

Table 1. State Superintendent’s Recommendations for the Proposed Preliminary Threshold Scores for Achievement Levels on the California Spanish Assessment (CSA)

| **Grade** | **Percentage of Students at Level 1[[1]](#footnote-2)** | **Percentage of Students[[2]](#footnote-3) at Level 1 or above** | **Percentage of Students at Level 2** | **Threshold Scale Score3 for Level 2** | **Percentage of Students at Level 2 or above** | **Percentage of Students at Level 3** | **Threshold Scale Score3 for Level 3** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | 52.7 | 100 | 33.0 | 401 | 47.3 | 14.3 | 413 |
| 4 | 53.5 | 100 | 31.5 | 401 | 46.5 | 15.0 | 414 |
| 5 | 45.6 | 100 | 38.4 | 398 | 54.4 | 16.0 | 413 |
| 6 | 41.4 | 100 | 40.8 | 398 | 58.6 | 17.8 | 411 |
| 7 | 58.2 | 100 | 37.0 | 402 | 41.8 | 4.8 | 418 |
| 8 | 57.4 | 100 | 32.9 | 402 | 42.6 | 9.7 | 415 |
| 9–12 | 59.6 | 100 | 31.4 | 403 | 40.4 | 9.0 | 414 |

# Educator Panel Proposed Threshold Score Recommendations for the California Spanish Assessment

## Grades Three through Grade Eight and High School

Table 2. Standard Setting Panel’s Judgments for the Threshold Scores for the Achievement Levels on the CSA

| **Grade** | **Percentage of Students at Level 1[[3]](#footnote-4)** | **Percentage of Students[[4]](#footnote-5) at Level 1 or above** | **Percentage of Students at Level 2** | **Threshold Scale Score3 for Level 2** | **Percentage of Students at Level 2 or above** | **Percentage of Students at Level 3** | **Threshold Scale Score3 for Level 3** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | 63.4 | 100 | 27.7 | 404 | 36.6 | 8.9 | 417 |
| 4 | 63.9 | 100 | 25.0 | 404 | 36.1 | 11.1 | 416 |
| 5 | 56.9 | 100 | 35.6 | 402 | 43.1 | 7.5 | 417 |
| 6 | 52.8 | 100 | 37.0 | 401 | 47.2 | 10.2 | 414 |
| 7 | 68.9 | 100 | 29.2 | 405 | 31.1 | 1.9 | 422 |
| 8 | 68.8 | 100 | 26.7 | 405 | 31.2 | 4.5 | 419 |
| 9–12 | 70.7 | 100 | 25.1 | 406 | 29.3 | 4.2 | 417 |

**Attachment 5: California Spanish Assessment Threshold Score Summary Information**

**Standard Setting Panelists Final Workshop Evaluation Responses**

At the end of the California Spanish Assessment (CSA) Standard Setting Workshop, panelists responded to a final workshop evaluation form that included questions about the educators’ experience and background; this information is provided in **Table 1** through **Table 5**. More than half of the 56 panelists had more than 10 years of experience teaching bilingual classes. The standard setting panels included educators who teach a variety of subjects in Spanish; panelists had experience teaching students in general education, students who are English learners, and students in special education. Panelists also represented the diversity of California geographically; participants included educators from Northern, Central, and Southern California.

**Table 1. Number of Panelists**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Panel | Number |
| Grades 3–4 | 15 |
| Grades 5–6 | 15 |
| Grade 7–8 | 12 |
| High School | 14 |
| **Total** | **56** |

**Table 2. Panelist Gender**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Gender | Grades 3–4 | Grades 5–6 | Grades 7–8 | High School | Total |
| Female | 13 | 10 | 8 | 11 | 42 |
| Male | 2 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 14 |

**Table 3. Years Experience Teaching Bilingual Classes**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Experience | Grades 3–4 | Grades 5–6 | Grades 7–8 | High School | Total |
| 0 years | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 6 |
| 1 to 3 years | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 8 |
| 4 to 6 years | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 6 |
| 7 to 10 years | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 6 |
| 10+ years | 9 | 7 | 9 | 5 | 30 |

**Table 4. Subject(s) Currently Teaching in Spanish**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Subject | Grades 3–4 | Grades 5–6 | Grades 7–8 | High School | Total |
| All Subjects | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Mathematics | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| Science | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 |
| Social Studies | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 7 |
| English | 3 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 16 |
| Other | 5 | 6 | 9 | 11 | 29 |

**Table 5. Experience Teaching Student Groups**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Population | Grades 3–4 | Grades 5–6 | Grades 7–8 | High School | Total |
| General Education | 15 | 15 | 12 | 14 | 56 |
| English Learners | 15 | 15 | 12 | 13 | 55 |
| Special Education | 11 | 13 | 10 | 8 | 42 |

The final standard setting workshop evaluation also included questions about the recommended threshold scores presented in **Table 6**. Panelists were asked if the threshold scores for entering each of the achievement levels were “too low,” “about right,” or “too high.” Across all four panels, the panelists thought the Level 2 threshold score was “about right” 93 percent of the time and the Level 3 threshold score was “about right” 91 percent of the time. All panelists indicated support for the final panel recommendations.

**Table 6. Final Evaluation for All Panelists on Appropriateness of Panel Recommendations**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Do you believe that the panel recommended threshold score for entering each of the achievement levels is too low, about right, or too high? | Too LowNumber | Too Low Percent | About RightNumber | About Right Percent | Too HighNumber | Too High Percent |
| Level 2 | 1 | 2 | 52 | 93 | 3 | 5 |
| Level 3 | 3 | 5 | 51 | 91 | 2 | 4 |

**Description of 2018–19 CSA Test Takers**

In addition, students taking the 2018–19 CSA responded to three survey questions about the students’ classroom instruction in Spanish. These responses are provided by grade. The responses are followed by results from the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System and describe the student English Language Acquisition Status for each grade. **Table 7** through [**Table 50**](#Table50) present a picture of the CSA test taking population at the time of administration and are the basis for the impact tables provided in attachments 3 and 4. Finally, **Table 51** shows the impact data for each high school grade. This additional information provides a more complete picture of the CSA high school test takers.

**Grade Three Survey Results**

**Table 7. Total Students Receiving Spanish Instruction in the 2017–18 School Year—Grade Three**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Students Receiving Spanish Instruction | Number | Percent  |
| Received instruction in Spanish in the 2017–18 School Year—Total | 8,729 | 94.2 |
| Did not receive instruction in Spanish in the 2017–18 School Year | 537 | 5.8 |
| Received instruction in Spanish in the 2017–18 school year—Unknown | 4 | 0.0 |
| Total Students who completed the test | 9,270 | 100.0 |

**Table 8. Program Enrollment for Students Who Received Instruction in Spanish —Grade Three**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Program | Number | Percent  |
| One-Way Immersion program | 488 | 5.3 |
| Dual-Language Immersion program | 7,492 | 80.8 |
| Developmental Bilingual Program | 364 | 3.9 |
| Heritage Language or Indigenous Language Program | 108 | 1.2 |
| None of the above | 277 | 3.0 |

**Table 9. Percentage of School-Day Instruction Provided in Spanish—Grade Three**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Percentage of School-Day Instruction Provided in Spanish | Number | Percent  |
| 0–25 | 184 | 2.0 |
| 26–50 | 3,160 | 34.1 |
| 51–75 | 4,150 | 44.8 |
| 76–100 | 1,235 | 13.3 |

**Table 10. English Language Acquisition Status—Grade Three**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Status | Number | Percent  |
| English only | 3,081 | 33.2 |
| English learner (EL) | 3,914 | 42.2 |
| Initial fluent English proficient | 425 | 4.6 |
| Reclassified fluent English proficient | 1,806 | 19.5 |
| To be determined | 38 | 0.4 |
| English proficiency unknown | 6 | 0.1 |

**Grade Four Survey Results**

**Table 11. Total Students Receiving Spanish Instruction—Grade Four**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Students Receiving Spanish Instruction | Number | Percent  |
| Received instruction in Spanish in the 2017–18 School Year—Total | 7,720 | 94.4 |
| Did not receive instruction in Spanish in the 2017–18 School Year | 458 | 5.6 |
| Received instruction in Spanish in the 2017–18 school year—Unknown | 0 | 0.0 |
| Total Students who completed the test | 8,178 | 100.0 |

**Table 12. Program Enrollment for Students Who Received Instruction in Spanish—Grade Four**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Program | Number | Percent  |
| One-Way Immersion program | 264 | 3.2 |
| Dual-Language Immersion program | 6,803 | 83.2 |
| Developmental Bilingual Program | 248 | 3.0 |
| Heritage Language or Indigenous Language Program | 86 | 1.1 |
| None of the above | 317 | 3.9 |

**Table 13. Percentage of School-Day Instruction Provided in Spanish—Grade Four**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Percentage of School-Day Instruction Provided in Spanish | Number | Percent  |
| 0–25 | 275 | 3.4 |
| 26–50 | 3,977 | 48.6 |
| 51–75 | 2,842 | 34.8 |
| 76–100 | 625 | 7.6 |

**Table 14. English Language Acquisition Status—Grade Four**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Status | Number | Percent  |
| English only | 2,586 | 31.6 |
| English learner (EL) | 3,362 | 41.1 |
| Initial fluent English proficient | 415 | 5.1 |
| Reclassified fluent English proficient | 1,764 | 21.6 |
| To be determined | 45 | 0.6 |
| English proficiency unknown | 6 | 0.1 |

**Grade Five Survey Results**

**Table 15. Total Students Receiving Spanish Instruction—Grade Five**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Students Receiving Spanish Instruction | Number | Percent  |
| Received instruction in Spanish in the 2017–18 School Year—Total | 6,530 | 95.0 |
| Did not receive instruction in Spanish in the 2017–18 School Year | 341 | 5.0 |
| Received instruction in Spanish in the 2017–18 school year—Unknown | 2 | 0.0 |
| Total Students who completed the test | 6,873 | 100.0 |

**Table 16. Program Enrollment for Students Who Received Instruction in Spanish—Grade Five**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Program | Number | Percent  |
| One-Way Immersion program | 228 | 3.3 |
| Dual-Language Immersion program | 5735 | 83.4 |
| Developmental Bilingual Program | 259 | 3.8 |
| Heritage Language or Indigenous Language Program | 66 | 1.0 |
| None of the above | 242 | 3.5 |

**Table 17. Percentage of School-Day Instruction Provided in Spanish—Grade Five**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Percent of School-Day Instruction Provided in Spanish | Number | Percent  |
| 0–25 | 267 | 3.9 |
| 26–50 | 4,088 | 59.5 |
| 51–75 | 1,633 | 23.8 |
| 76–100 | 542 | 7.9 |

**Table 18. English Language Acquisition Status—Grade Five**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Status | Number | Percent  |
| English only | 2,219 | 32.3 |
| English learner (EL) | 2,266 | 33.0 |
| Initial fluent English proficient | 295 | 4.3 |
| Reclassified fluent English proficient | 2,044 | 29.7 |
| To be determined | 45 | 0.7 |
| English proficiency unknown | 4 | 0.1 |

**Grade Six** **Survey Results**

**Table 19. Total Students Receiving Spanish Instruction—Grade Six**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Students Receiving Spanish Instruction | Number | Percent  |
| Received instruction in Spanish in the 2017–18 School Year—Total | 4,435 | 92.4 |
| Received instruction in Spanish in the 2017–18 school year—Unknown | 0 | 0.0 |
| Did not receive instruction in Spanish in the 2017–18 School Year | 364 | 7.6 |
| Total Students who completed the test | 4,799 | 100.0 |

**Table 20. Program Enrollment for Students Who Received Instruction in Spanish—Grade Six**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Program | Number | Percent  |
| One-Way Immersion program | 94 | 2.0 |
| Dual-Language Immersion program | 4021 | 83.8 |
| Developmental Bilingual Program | 138 | 2.9 |
| Heritage Language or Indigenous Language Program | 23 | 0.5 |
| Spanish as a Foreign Language Program | 29 | 0.6 |
| None of the above | 130 | 2.7 |

**Table 21. Percentage of School-Day Instruction Provided in Spanish—Grade Six**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Percent of School-Day Instruction Provided in Spanish | Number | Percent  |
| 0–25 | 264 | 5.5 |
| 26–50 | 2,868 | 59.8 |
| 51–75 | 937 | 19.5 |
| 76–100 | 365 | 7.6 |

**Table 22. English Language Acquisition Status—Grade Six**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Status | Number | Percent  |
| English only | 1,448 | 30.2 |
| English learner (EL) | 1,316 | 27.4 |
| Initial fluent English proficient | 246 | 5.1 |
| Reclassified fluent English proficient | 1,750 | 36.5 |
| To be determined | 36 | 0.8 |
| English proficiency unknown | 3 | 0.1 |

**Grade Seven Survey Results**

**Table 23. Total Students Receiving Spanish Instruction—Grade Seven**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Students Receiving Spanish Instruction | Number | Percent  |
| Received instruction in Spanish in the 2017–18 School Year—Total | 3,086 | 90.6 |
| Did not receive instruction in Spanish in the 2017–18 School Year | 319 | 9.4 |
| Received instruction in Spanish in the 2017–18 school year—Unknown | 0 | 0.0 |
| Total Students who completed the test | 3,405 | 100.0 |

**Table 24. Program Enrollment for Students Who Received Instruction in Spanish—Grade Seven**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Program | Number | Percent  |
| One-Way Immersion program | 109 | 3.2 |
| Dual-Language Immersion program | 2,690 | 79.0 |
| Developmental Bilingual Program | 89 | 2.6 |
| Heritage Language or Indigenous Language Program | 25 | 0.7 |
| Spanish as a Foreign Language Program | 71 | 2.1 |
| None of the above | 102 | 3.0 |

**Table 25. Percentage of School-Day Instruction Provided in Spanish—Grade Seven**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Percent of School-Day Instruction Provided in Spanish | Number | Percent  |
| 0–25 | 407 | 12.0 |
| 26–50 | 1,784 | 52.4 |
| 51–75 | 523 | 15.4 |
| 76–100 | 371 | 10.9 |

**Table 26. English Language Acquisition Status—Grade Seven**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Status | Number | Percent  |
| English only | 910 | 26.7 |
| English learner (EL) | 947 | 27.8 |
| Initial fluent English proficient | 161 | 4.7 |
| Reclassified fluent English proficient | 1,341 | 39.4 |
| To be determined | 41 | 1.2 |
| English proficiency unknown | 5 | 0.1 |

**Grade Eight Survey Results**

**Table 27. Total Students Receiving Spanish Instruction—Grade Eight**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Students Receiving Spanish Instruction | Number | Percent  |
| Received instruction in Spanish in the 2017–18 School Year—Total | 2,444 | 91.5 |
| Did not receive instruction in Spanish in the 2017–18 School Year | 213 | 8.0 |
| Received instruction in Spanish in the 2017–18 school year—Unknown | 15 | 0.6 |
| Total Students who completed the test | 2,672 | 100.0 |

**Table 28. Program Enrollment for Students Who Received Instruction in Spanish—Grade Eight**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Program | Number | Percent  |
| One-Way Immersion program | 89 | 3.3 |
| Dual-Language Immersion program | 2060 | 77.1 |
| Developmental Bilingual Program | 55 | 2.1 |
| Heritage Language or Indigenous Language Program | 45 | 1.7 |
| Spanish as a Foreign Language Program | 98 | 3.7 |
| None of the above | 88 | 3.3 |

**Table 29. Percentage of School-Day Instruction Provided in Spanish—Grade Eight**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Percent of School-Day Instruction Provided in Spanish | Number | Percent  |
| 0–25 | 496 | 18.6 |
| 26–50 | 1,329 | 49.7 |
| 51–75 | 327 | 12.2 |
| 76–100 | 282 | 10.6 |

**Table 30. English Language Acquisition Status—Grade Eight**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Status | Number | Percent  |
| English only | 653 | 24.4 |
| English learner (EL) | 645 | 24.1 |
| Initial fluent English proficient | 100 | 3.7 |
| Reclassified fluent English proficient | 1,225 | 45.8 |
| To be determined | 46 | 1.7 |
| English proficiency unknown | 3 | 0.1 |

**Grade Nine Survey Results**

**Table 31. Total Students Receiving Spanish Instruction—Grade Nine**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Students Receiving Spanish Instruction | Number | Percent  |
| Received instruction in Spanish in the 2017–18 School Year—Total | 1,095 | 69.7 |
| Did not receive instruction in Spanish in the 2017–18 School Year | 476 | 30.3 |
| Received instruction in Spanish in the 2017–18 school year—Unknown | 0 | 0.0 |
| Total Students who completed the test | 1,571 | 100.0 |

**Table 32. Program Enrollment for Students Who Received Instruction in Spanish—Grade Nine**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Program | Number | Percent  |
| One-Way Immersion program | 222 | 14.1 |
| Dual-Language Immersion program | 336 | 21.4 |
| Developmental Bilingual Program | 86 | 5.5 |
| Heritage Language or Indigenous Language Program | 84 | 5.3 |
| Spanish as a Foreign Language Program | 210 | 13.4 |
| None of the above | 157 | 10.0 |

**Table 33. Percentage of School-Day Instruction Provided in Spanish—Grade Nine**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Percent of School-Day Instruction Provided in Spanish | Number | Percent  |
| 0–25 | 245 | 15.6 |
| 26–50 | 225 | 14.3 |
| 51–75 | 248 | 15.8 |
| 76–100 | 376 | 23.9 |

**Table 34. English Language Acquisition Status—Grade Nine**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Status | Number | Percent  |
| English only | 129 | 8.2 |
| English learner (EL) | 982 | 62.5 |
| Initial fluent English proficient | 33 | 2.1 |
| Reclassified fluent English proficient | 373 | 23.7 |
| To be determined | 51 | 3.2 |
| English proficiency unknown | 3 | 0.2 |

**Grade Ten Survey Results**

**Table 35. Total Students Receiving Spanish Instruction—Grade Ten**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Students Receiving Spanish Instruction | Number | Percent  |
| Received instruction in Spanish in the 2017–18 School Year—Total | 860 | 85.0 |
| Did not receive instruction in Spanish in the 2017–18 School Year | 152 | 15.0 |
| Received instruction in Spanish in the 2017–18 school year—Unknown | 0 | 0.0 |
| Total Students who completed the test | 1,012 | 100.0 |

**Table 36. Program Enrollment for Students Who Received Instruction in Spanish—Grade Ten**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Program | Number | Percent  |
| One-Way Immersion program | 38 | 3.8 |
| Dual-Language Immersion program | 163 | 16.1 |
| Developmental Bilingual Program | 16 | 1.6 |
| Heritage Language or Indigenous Language Program | 145 | 14.3 |
| Spanish as a Foreign Language Program | 449 | 44.4 |
| None of the above | 49 | 4.8 |

**Table 37. Percentage of School-Day Instruction Provided in Spanish—Grade Ten**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Percent of School-Day Instruction Provided in Spanish | Number | Percent  |
| 0–25 | 370 | 36.6 |
| 26–50 | 182 | 18.0 |
| 51–75 | 117 | 11.6 |
| 76–100 | 191 | 18.9 |

**Table 38. English Language Acquisition Status—Grade Ten**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Status | Number | Percent  |
| English only | 193 | 19.1 |
| English learner (EL) | 218 | 21.5 |
| Initial fluent English proficient | 31 | 3.1 |
| Reclassified fluent English proficient | 567 | 56.0 |
| To be determined | 3 | 0.3 |
| English proficiency unknown | 0 | 0.0 |

**Grade Eleven Survey Results**

**Table 39. Total Students Receiving Spanish Instruction—Grade Eleven**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Students Receiving Spanish Instruction | Number | Percent  |
| Received instruction in Spanish in the 2017–18 School Year—Total | 877 | 89.3 |
| Did not receive instruction in Spanish in the 2017–18 School Year | 105 | 10.7 |
| Received instruction in Spanish in the 2017–18 school year–Unknown | 0 | 0.0 |
| Total Students who completed the test | 982 | 100.0 |

**Table 40. Program Enrollment for Students Who Received Instruction in Spanish—Grade Eleven**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Program | Number | Percent  |
| One-Way Immersion program | 22 | 2.2 |
| Dual-Language Immersion program | 74 | 7.5 |
| Developmental Bilingual Program | 12 | 1.2 |
| Heritage Language or Indigenous Language Program | 165 | 16.8 |
| Spanish as a Foreign Language Program | 578 | 58.9 |
| None of the above | 26 | 2.6 |

**Table 41. Percentage of School-Day Instruction Provided in Spanish—Grade Eleven**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Percent of School-Day Instruction Provided in Spanish | Number | Percent  |
| 0–25 | 448 | 45.6 |
| 26–50 | 131 | 13.3 |
| 51–75 | 105 | 10.7 |
| 76–100 | 193 | 19.7 |

**Table 42. English Language Acquisition Status—Grade Eleven**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Status | Number | Percent  |
| English only | 215 | 21.9 |
| English learner (EL) | 156 | 15.9 |
| Initial fluent English proficient | 35 | 3.6 |
| Reclassified fluent English proficient | 575 | 58.6 |
| To be determined | 1 | 0.1 |
| English proficiency unknown | 0 | 0.0 |

**Grade Twelve Survey Results**

**Table 43. Total Students Receiving Spanish Instruction—Grade Twelve**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Students Receiving Spanish Instruction | Number | Percent  |
| Received instruction in Spanish in the 2017–18 School Year—Total | 287 | 76.3 |
| Did not receive instruction in Spanish in the 2017–18 School Year | 89 | 23.7 |
| Received instruction in Spanish in the 2017–18 school year–Unknown | 0 | 0.0 |
| Total Students who completed the test | 376 | 100.0 |

**Table 44. Program Enrollment for Students Who Received Instruction in Spanish—Grade Twelve**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Program | Number | Percent  |
| One-Way Immersion program | 4 | 1.1 |
| Dual-Language Immersion program | 19 | 5.1 |
| Developmental Bilingual Program | 0 | 0.0 |
| Heritage Language or Indigenous Language Program | 90 | 23.9 |
| Enrolled in Spanish as a Foreign Language Program | 164 | 43.6 |
| Enrolled in None of the above | 10 | 2.7 |

**Table 45. Percentage of School-Day Instruction Provided in Spanish—Grade Twelve**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Percent of School-Day Instruction Provided in Spanish | Number | Percent  |
| 0–25 | 146 | 38.8 |
| 26–50 | 37 | 9.8 |
| 51–75 | 21 | 5.6 |
| 76–100 | 83 | 22.1 |

**Table 46. English Language Acquisition Status—Grade Twelve**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Status | Number | Percent  |
| English only | 76 | 20.2 |
| English learner (EL) | 54 | 14.4 |
| Initial fluent English proficient | 16 | 4.3 |
| Reclassified fluent English proficient | 229 | 60.9 |
| To be determined | 1 | 0.3 |
| English proficiency unknown | 0 | 0.0 |

**High School Survey Results**

**Table 47. Total Students Receiving Spanish Instruction—High School**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Students Receiving Spanish Instruction | Number | Percent  |
| Received instruction in Spanish in the 2017–18 School Year—Total | 3,119 | 79.1 |
| Did not receive instruction in Spanish in the 2017–18 School Year | 822 | 20.9 |
| Received instruction in Spanish in the 2017–18 school year—Unknown | 0 | 0.0 |
| Total Students who completed the test | 3,941 | 100.0 |

**Table 48. Program Enrollment for Students Who Received Instruction in Spanish—High School**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Program | Number | Percent  |
| One-Way Immersion program | 286 | 7.3 |
| Dual-Language Immersion program | 592 | 15.0 |
| Developmental Bilingual Program | 114 | 2.9 |
| Heritage Language or Indigenous Language Program | 484 | 12.3 |
| Enrolled in Spanish as a Foreign Language Program | 1,401 | 35.5 |
| Enrolled in None of the above | 242 | 6.1 |

**Table 49. Percentage of School-Day Instruction Provided in Spanish—High School**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Percent of School-Day Instruction Provided in Spanish | Number | Percent  |
| 0–25 | 1,209 | 30.7 |
| 26–50 | 575 | 14.6 |
| 51–75 | 491 | 12.5 |
| 76–100 | 843 | 21.4 |

**Table 50. English Language Acquisition Status—High School**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Status | Number | Percent  |
| English only | 613 | 15.6 |
| English learner (EL) | 1,410 | 35.8 |
| Initial fluent English proficient | 115 | 2.9 |
| Reclassified fluent English proficient | 1,744 | 44.3 |
| To be determined | 56 | 1.4 |
| English proficiency unknown | 3 | 0.1 |

**Table 51. Standard Setting Panel’s Judgments for the Thresholds for the Achievement Levels on the CSA**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Level | Number of Students Completion | Number of Students at Level 1 | Percent of Students at Level 1[[5]](#footnote-6) | Percent of Students at Level 1 or Above[[6]](#footnote-7) | Number of Students on Level 2 | Percent of Students at Level 2 | Threshold Scale Score[[7]](#footnote-8) for Level 2 | Percent of Students at Level 2 or Above | Number of Students on Level 3 | Percent of Students at Level 3 | Threshold Scale Score3 for Level 3 |
| Grade 9 | 1,531 | 1,188 | 77.6 | 100 | 303 | 19.8 | 406 | 22.4 | 40 | 2.6 | 417 |
| Grade 10 | 999 | 653 | 65.4 | 100 | 294 | 29.4 | 406 | 34.6 | 52 | 5.2 | 417 |
| Grade 11 | 950 | 646 | 68.0 | 100 | 259 | 27.3 | 406 | 32.0 | 45 | 4.7 | 417 |
| Grade 12 | 362 | 230 | 63.5 | 100 | 106 | 29.3 | 406 | 36.5 | 26 | 7.2 | 417 |

1. Percentage of students: Estimated percentage of students statewide who would be placed at this achievement level using the results from 2018–19 operational test administration. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Percentage at or above: Estimated percentage of students statewide who would be at and above this achievement level on the basis of the results of the 2018–19 spring operational test administration. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

3 Standard setting threshold scale scores: Minimum scale score needed to achieve this achievement level using results from the 2018–19 operational test administration. These scale scores will be used for standard setting; the official scales will be developed after standard setting for use on the Student Score Report and public reporting. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. 1 Percentage of students: Estimated percentage of students statewide who would be placed at this achievement level using the results from 2018–19 operational test administration. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. 2 Percentage at or above: Estimated percentage of students statewide who would be at and above this achievement level on the basis of the results of the 2018–19 spring operational test administration. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

3 Standard setting threshold scale scores: Minimum scale score needed to achieve this achievement level using results from the 2018–19 operational test administration. These scale scores will be used for standard setting; the official scales will be developed after standard setting for use on the Student Score Report and public reporting. The conditional standard error of measurement for all of the threshold scores was +/- 4 scale score points. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Percentage of students: Estimated percentage of students statewide who would be placed at this achievement level using the results from 2018–19 operational test administration. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Percentage at or above: Estimated percentage of students statewide who would be at or above this achievement level on the basis of the results of the 2018–19 spring operational test administration. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. Standard setting threshold scale scores: Minimum scale score needed to achieve this achievement level using results from the 2018–19 operational test administration. These scale scores were used for standard setting; the official scales will be developed after standard setting for use on the Student Score Report and public reporting. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)