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## Subject

The California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress System and the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California: Request for Approval of the Proposed Addendum to the High-Level Test Design for the California Spanish Assessment, Proposed California Spanish Assessment Revised Blueprint, Proposed Revised California Spanish Assessment General Achievement Level Descriptors, and Proposed Score Reporting Structure; 2021–22 Results for the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress System and the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California; and an Update on Assessment Program Activities.

## Type of Action

Action, Information

## Summary of the Issue(s)

The California Department of Education (CDE) seeks approval of the proposed addendum to the high-level test design (HLTD) for the California Spanish Assessment (CSA), proposed CSA revised blueprint, proposed revised CSA general achievement level descriptors (ALDs), and proposed CSA score reporting structure.

In addition, this item provides an update on the 2021–22 results for the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) and the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) as well as recent events and developments related to the CAASPP and the ELPAC. Attachment 1 provides the CAASPP and ELPAC outreach and professional development activities from September through October 2022.

## Recommendation

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

* Proposed Addendum to the HLTD for the CSA, including the proposed revised CSA general ALDs (Attachment 2)
* Proposed CSA Revised Blueprint (Attachment 3)
* Proposed CSA Score Reporting Structure

## Brief History of Key Issues

The following sections of this item detail the CDE’s recommendations to the SBE and provide a summary of developments and activities related to the CAASPP and the ELPAC.

### California Spanish Assessment

The CSA is aligned with the Common Core State Standards en Español, which are a translated and linguistically augmented version of the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy. The CSA is an optional assessment administered to students in grades three through eight and high school who are seeking a measure of their Spanish skills in reading, writing mechanics, and listening. This assessment is part of the CAASPP system.

The HLTD for the CSA was approved by the SBE in September 2016, pursuant to California *Education Code* (*EC*) Section 60640(b)(5)(C). The approval of the HLTD allowed for the development of the CSA. In March 2017, the SBE approved the proposed blueprints and general ALDs. In spring 2019, the CSA became an operational test.

Per *EC* Section 60640(5)(C), the Superintendent is to consider the appropriate purpose for a stand-alone language arts summative assessment in a primary language other than English, including support for the State Seal of Biliteracy. Further, *EC* Section 51461 specifies that one of the three criteria for attaining the State Seal of Biliteracy is to pass an examination that, at a minimum, assesses speaking, reading, and writing in a language test for one or more languages in addition to English. When the development of the CSA began, funds were limited and speaking and writing constructed-response items were not developed. Therefore, local educational agencies (LEAs) were unable to administer the CSA for the purpose of students attaining the State Seal of Biliteracy.

In November 2021, the SBE approved a new contract with test contractor ETS for the administration of the CAASPP and the ELPAC for California. The work associated with this contract commenced on July 1, 2022. The expansion of the CSA afforded by this contract includes the assessment of speaking and written items. Once the expanded CSA becomes operational, the CDE will recommend to the Legislature that the CSA be included as one of the options to meet, in part, the requirements for the State Seal of Biliteracy.

The expansion of the CSA requires an addendum to the HLTD and revisions to the blueprint and general ALDs. In August 2022, the revisions to the ALDs and blueprints, along with key details from the high-level test design addendum, were presented to the California Association of Bilingual Education, Californian’s Together, and the Technical Advisory Group and later presented to the Assessment Interest Holders in September 2022.

#### Proposed Addendum to the CSA High-Level Test Design

The purpose of the *High-Level Test Design Addendum* (Attachment 2) is to articulate how the test design presented in the 2016 HLTD for the CSA has been updated to include the addition of a speaking domain and the expansion of the writing domain. This addendum was developed with input from the CAASPP Technical Advisory Group; the Assessment Interest Holder Group; and nationally recognized experts in the areas of linguistics and language development, including Dr. Kenji Hakuta, Professor Emeritus, and Dr. Guadalupe Valdés, Professor at Stanford University. The CDE will continue meeting and working with interest holders in the development of the CSA test items, blueprints, and general ALDs.

#### Proposed CSA Revised Blueprint

The proposed revised test blueprint for the CSA (Attachment 3) provides the proposed numbers of items and points to be included in an operational assessment for each of the four language arts domains assessed in grades three through eight and high school. The numbers of items and points, however, are subject to revision in response to statistical analyses of the new Writing and Speaking constructed-response item types, after these items are field tested and undergo their first operational use.

All items are aligned with the *California Common Core State Standards en Español* (<https://commoncore-espanol.sdcoe.net/CaCCSS-en-Espanol/SLA-Literacy>), which is a translated and linguistically augmented version of the *California Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy*.

#### Proposed Revised CSA General Achievement Level Descriptors

The purpose of the revised CSA general ALDs (included in Attachment 2) is to provide generic descriptions of student performance level expectations across three levels. The general ALDs will be used to set grade-level or grade-span specific ALDs and will be used to develop reporting ALDs that describe levels of performance to educators, students, and parents.

With the expansion of the CSA, speaking will be added to the descriptors. In addition, the word “mechanics,” a qualifier in the writing domain’s current ALD text, will be removed because the writing domain will be fully assessed after the expansion is implemented operationally.

#### Proposed CSA Score Reporting Structure

The draft CSA student score reporting structure shown in figure 1 below includes an overall scale score with three achievement levels. Additionally, the student score reporting structure includes the domains of Reading, Writing Mechanics, and Listening. Data from the first operational administration of the CSA expansion will be used to evaluate the reliability of the score reporting structure. Additional analyses will be conducted to determine if four achievement levels can be supported and changes, if necessary, will be brought to the SBE following that analysis.

Figure 1. CSA Score Reporting Hierarchy

#### Next Steps

The CDE, in collaboration with ETS, continues the development of the CSA as shown in table 1.

Our validity evaluation work in this area is ongoing. If the CDE determines, through additional analyses, that any other levels appear to be appropriate for reclassification, we will recommend this to the SBE for approval and will update our guidance and communicate this to the field.

Once approved by the SBE, the proposed addendum to the HLTD for the CSA, the proposed CSA revised blueprint, and revised ALDs will play a large role in moving the development of speaking and writing constructed-response items to an operational administration in 2024–25.

Table 1. Timeline of New CSA Development

| **Development Activity** | **Date** |
| --- | --- |
| SBE action on the addendum to the HLTD for the CSA, revised test blueprints, and general ALDs | November 2022 |
| New item development | 2022–23 |
| Administration of the embedded field test | 2023–24 |
| Dimensionality study and development of range ALDs to support constructed-response items | Spring and summer 2024 |
| Administration of the new, expanded operational CSA | 2024–25 |
| Standard setting | Summer 2025 |
| SBE action on the threshold scores and reporting ALDs | Summer 2025 |

### Updates on Assessment Program Activities

The following updates are on the science resources in Tools for Teachers, the Alternate Assessment 1.0 Percent Justification Survey, the Assessment and Accountability Information Meeting Series, and the Student Score Report redesign process and timeline.

Science Resources in Tools for Teachers

In July 2022, the CDE completed its fifth workshop with California educators to develop kindergarten through high school science resources for inclusion on the Tools for Teachers website, which is located at [https://www.smartertoolsforteachers.org/.](https://www.smartertoolsforteachers.org/) These resources span all three science domains (i.e., Earth and Space Sciences, Life Sciences, and Physical Sciences) and include Engineering, Technology, and Applications of Science.

For the workshop, four educators with experience in developing science resources served as team leads, and 11 other educators worked as developers. Staff from the CDE Assessment Development and Administration Division worked as trainers and coaches to assist the educators in the process. The workshop included the same peer review process as was used in previous workshops to ensure the inclusion of the formative and accessibility strategies and alignment with the California Next Generation Science Standards. The CDE has posted these additional resources on the website, and a total of 70 science formative assessment resources are now available for teachers to use in the classroom.

Alternate Assessment 1.0 Percent Justification Survey

Title 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (ESSA) (ESEA Section111[b][2][D] and *Code of Federal Regulations*, Title 34 [*34 CFR*], sections 200.6[c] and [d]), modifies the provision that eligible students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may participate in alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS). ESSA places a 1.0 percent cap on the number of eligible students who may participate in alternate assessments. States that anticipate exceeding the 1.0 percent cap must submit a waiver request to the U.S. Department of Education (ED). The California Alternate Assessments (CAAs) are California’s AA-AAAS.

Requirement 3 of 34 *CFR* Section 200.6(c)(4)(iii) requires that states provide assurances that they have verified that each of the LEAs they anticipate will assess more than 1.0 percent of their assessed students in a subject using the AA-AAAS followed the state's guidelines for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

Although California continues to narrowly exceed the 1.0 percent threshold set by the ED, California believes that the students who take the CAAs are tested appropriately and in compliance with federal law as determined by each student’s individual education program (IEP) team. That decision takes place at the local level and considers the individual student’s needs, as required by the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. While there is a cap on the percentage of students statewide who may take the CAAs, LEAs are not subject to formal repercussions for having exceeded the threshold. The CDE Special Education Division is working with the Assessment Development and Administration Division on procedures for monitoring and oversight of LEAs that exceed the 1.0 percent cap.

To support California’s request of a waiver of the 1.0 percent threshold set by the ED, all LEAs submit an annual online survey—the One Percent Justification Survey—to the CDE. This survey includes assurances that the LEA has ensured that its educators have been trained on the state guidelines and that IEP teams are adhering to the state’s identified criteria of eligibility in making decisions for students who participate in the AA-AAAS.

By submitting the justification form, the LEA certifies that eligible students identified to take the CAAs have met the criteria below (34 *CFR* Section 200.6) for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities enrolled in the LEA:

* All students identified for alternate assessment have been determined to be the most significantly cognitively impaired, including factors related to cognitive functioning and adaptive behavior, within the LEA.
* All students identified for alternate assessment have been shown to require extensive, direct individualized instruction and substantial supports to achieve measurable gains on the challenging state alternate academic achievement content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled.
* Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are not identified solely on the basis of the student’s previous low academic achievement, or the student’s previous need for accommodations to participate in general state or districtwide assessments.

The CDE notified all LEAs of the 2022–23 1.0 Percent Justification Survey in September and plans to close the survey on October 28. The survey results will be posted later this year on the CDE 1.0 Percent Threshold on Alternate Assessments web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ca/caaonepercent.asp>.

Assessment and Accountability Information Meeting Series

This meeting series was held virtually in August 2022 for CAASPP and ELPAC coordinators and accountability coordinators. Organized into three two-hour sessions, the annual meeting series is designed to equip coordinators with up-to-date information on California’s assessment and accountability systems. Table 2 provides the session dates and the topics covered.

Table 2. Assessment and Accountability Information Meeting Session Dates and Topics

| **Session Date** | **Topics** |
| --- | --- |
| August 4 | General assessment updates, national and international tests, ELPAC, Physical Fitness Test (PFT), and high school equivalency |
| August 11 | English language arts/literacy and mathematics summative assessments, California Science Test, the California Alternate Assessment (CAA) for Science, the CSA, interim and formative assessments |
| August 18 | California Educator Reporting System, Accountability and the California School Dashboard |

In all, 1,479 unique viewers attended these meetings. Details of the meetings are provided in the *2022 Assessment and Accountability Information Meeting Series Report* (Attachment 4).

Student Score Report Redesign Process and Timeline

The CDE and assessment contractor ETS have begun work to redesign the Student Score Reports (SSRs) for the CAASPP and ELPAC now that the initial and summative assessments are fully operational.

The goals of the redesign effort are to:

* Improve the reporting of test results provided to students, parents, and guardians and include actionable information.
* Provide students, parents, and guardians with timely access to test results while minimizing distribution efforts for LEAs.

The redesign activities will include:

* Focus groups with parents and guardians
* Feedback opportunities from California assessment interest holders
* Input from the CDE and the SBE

Input can consist of the utility of including:

* Composite claim scores on the SSR to parents or guardians by 2023–24 if the state continues to provide the adjusted form blueprints
* Two-year state and school scale score averages on the 2023–24 SSRs and three-year averages on the 2024–25 SSRs

The high-level timeline of ETS activities for the redesign effort is presented in Table 3.

Table 3. ETS SSR Redesign Timeline for 2023–24

| Date | Activity |
| --- | --- |
| September–November 2022 | Develop concept design options |
| December 2022–January 2023 | Conduct formal focus groups with the concept design options |
| February 2023 | Provide the CDE with feedback on the concept design options |
| February 2023 | Smarter Balanced staff to discuss progress composite claims with SBE assessment liaisons |
| February–May 2023 | Prepare and review mock-ups with CDE and SBE, as appropriate |
| April 2023 | Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium to discuss the proposed composite claims for ELA and mathematics |
| May 2023 | Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium to vote on composite claims for ELA and mathematics |
| June 2023 | Review and obtain CDE and SBE final feedback on the mock-ups |
| July 2023 | Finalize SBE item for September 2023 meeting |
| September 2023 | Present the recommended revisions to the SSRs at the September SBE board meeting for approval |
| October 2023–April 2024 | Program the system with the new SSRs and translate into the required languages other than English |
| Spring 2024 | Release SSRs for the 2023–24 summative assessments |
| Summer 2023 | Begin the SSR redesign for the Initial ELPAC and the Initial Alternate ELPAC (for reporting beginning with the 2024–25 administration) |

#### Public Release of the 2021–22 CAASPP and ELPAC Test Results

It is anticipated that the CDE will be releasing the 2021–22 CAASPP and ELPAC test results by the end of October 2022. Once the results are released publicly, the CDE will attach an Item Addendum, along with the press release and an interpretation guide for the SBE’s reference.

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

In December 2021, the CDE provided the SBE with information on the Assessment and Accountability Meeting Series and Outreach (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/dec21memoadad02.docx>).

In November 2021, the SBE approved the contract with ETS for the administration of the CAASPP and ELPAC, which included the CSA expansion (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr21/documents/nov21item04.docx>).

In November 2017, the SBE approved the CSA general ALDs and the blueprint (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/nov17item07.doc>) (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/nov17item07a1.pdf>) (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/nov17item07a3.pdf>) (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/nov17item07a4.pdf>).

In September 2016, the SBE approved the CSA HLTD, including the purpose of the test (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr16/documents/sep16item04.doc>).

## Fiscal Analysis

The fiscal year 2022–23 Budget Act provides a total of $67,806,000 for CAASPP contract activities and $25,855,000 for ELPAC contract activities. Funding for 2023–24 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 (10 Pages)
* Attachment 2: Proposed Addendum to the High-Level Test Design for the California Spanish Assessment (11 Pages)
* Attachment 3: Proposed California Spanish Assessment Revised Test Blueprint (12 Pages)
* Attachment 4: Assessment and Accountability Information Meeting Series Report (8 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, ETS and the Sacramento County Office of Education (SCOE), have provided a variety of virtual outreach activities, including workshops, focus group meetings, and presentations, to prepare local educational agencies (LEAs) for the administration of the CAASPP System and the 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 these virtual outreach and professional development activities during September and October 2022.

**Table 1. Trainings**

| **Date(s)** | **Location** | **Estimated Number of Attendees** | **Description** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 9/2022 | 12 local trainings throughout CA, held by COE partners | 290 | New CAASPP Coordinator TrainingThis training was hosted by 11 county offices of education for CAASPP coordinators in their county regions. The training was designed for CAASPP coordinators who were new to their role or wanted a refresher. It familiarized new coordinators with assessment processes, explained the responsibilities of the CAASPP coordinator, offered suggested time frames for completing activities, and explored procedures and practices to support a successful CAASPP administration. |
| 9/6 | Virtual | 150 | Matching Accessibility Resources to Students’ Needs—Virtual Training, Session OneThis virtual training focused on providing participants with an understanding of the purpose and importance of accessibility resources, the different accessibility resource categories, the process for matching students with the appropriate accessibility resources for classroom instruction and assessments, and a research-based framework (Universal Design for Learning) and the connection it has to accessibility resources. |
| 9/8 | Virtual | 800 | Pretest Virtual Training Series—Preparing for TestingThe 2022–23 Pretest Virtual Training Series provided coordinators with the information needed to successfully prepare for and administer the CAASPP and the ELPAC. By request from the field, the content had been modified to be presented over the course of several sessions to provide LEAs with timely information, training, and support throughout the year. |
| 9/13 | Virtual | 150 | Matching Accessibility Resources to Students’ Needs—Virtual Training, Session TwoThis virtual training focused on providing participants with an understanding of the purpose and importance of accessibility resources, the different accessibility resource categories, the process for matching students with the appropriate accessibility resources for classroom instruction and assessments, and a research-based framework (Universal Design for Learning) and the connection it has to accessibility resources. |
| 9/13 | Virtual | 275 | CAASPP and ELPAC Coffee SessionHosted by the CDE and ETS, this virtual Coffee Session offered LEA staff an opportunity to ask questions and receive answers about assessments, trainings, resources, and assessment-related developments. |
| 9/20 | Virtual | 300 | Interim and Formative Assessment Training Series—Module 1: Using the Formative Assessment Process and Tools for Teachers Website to Boost InstructionThis asynchronous series provided direct training on leveraging the interim and formative components of the Smarter Balanced comprehensive system of assessments to inform teaching and learning. It was designed for teachers, instructional coaches, and educators on special assignment. LEA CAASPP and ELPAC coordinators and administrators also were welcome.Module 1 delved into formative assessment practices and resources and included an exploration of the Tools for Teachers website. |
| 9/21 | Virtual | 200 | Interim and Formative Assessment Training Series—Module 2: Gauging Student Progress with the Smarter Balanced Interim Assessments and Related Online SystemsModule 2 delved into the Smarter Balanced Interim Assessments and associated online systems and how to use them.  |
| 9/22 | Virtual | 168 | New Coordinator Webinar #2This webinar, hosted by SCOE, provided the following:A review of upcoming coordinator checklist tasksThe details of accessibility resources and the coordinator’s role in relation to accessibilityA question and Answer session with experienced coordinators |
| 9/27 | Virtual | 200 | Interim and Formative Assessment Training Series—Module 1: Using the Formative Assessment Process and Tools for Teachers Website to Boost InstructionModule 1 delved into formative assessment practices and resources and included an exploration of the Tools for Teachers website. |
| 9/28 | Virtual | 200 | Interim and Formative Assessment Training Series—Module 2: Gauging Student Progress with the Smarter Balanced Interim Assessments and Related Online SystemsModule 2 delved into the Smarter Balanced Interim Assessments and associated online systems and how to use them.  |
| 9/29 | Virtual | 300 | Supporting Teaching and Learning with the Tools for Teachers Website This webinar series is intended for all LEA staff, including administrators and classroom educators. This webinar featured California educators sharing how they use Tools for Teachers and related resources to support teaching and learning in the classroom. It included a question and answer session. |
| 10/4 | Virtual | 100 | Interim and Formative Assessment Training Series—Module 3A: Interim Assessment Hand Scoring for ELAModule 3A provided in-depth instruction and practice in hand scoring for Smarter Balanced English language arts/literacy (ELA) or Smarter Balanced mathematics performance tasks and constructed-response items, including reflection on implications for teaching and learning. |
| 10/5 | Virtual | 100 | Interim and Formative Assessment Training Series—Module 3B: Interim Assessment Hand Scoring for MathematicsModule 3B provided in-depth instruction and practice in hand scoring for Smarter Balanced ELA or Smarter Balanced mathematics performance tasks and constructed-response items, including reflection on implications for teaching and learning. |
| 10/11 | Virtual | 100 | Interim and Formative Assessment Training Series—Module 3A: Interim Assessment Hand Scoring for ELAModule 3A provided in-depth instruction and practice in hand scoring for Smarter Balanced ELA or Smarter Balanced mathematics performance tasks and constructed-response items, including reflection on implications for teaching and learning. |
| 10/11 | Virtual | 375 | CAASPP and ELPAC Coffee SessionHosted by the CDE and ETS, this virtual Coffee Session offered LEA staff an opportunity to ask questions and receive answers about assessments, trainings, resources, and assessment-related developments. |
| 10/12 | Virtual | 100 | Interim and Formative Assessment Training Series—Module 3B: Interim Assessment Hand Scoring for MathematicsModule 3B provided in-depth instruction and practice in hand scoring for Smarter Balanced ELA or Smarter Balanced mathematics performance tasks and constructed-response items, including reflection on implications for teaching and learning. |
| 10/12 | Virtual | 185 | Data Driven Decisions—Module 1: Starting with Summative ResultsThis module covered data available from summative assessments and how that can be used as a jumping-off point to find areas of opportunity and connections to classroom teaching and learning. |
| 10/13 | Virtual | 200 | Introduction to CERS for TeachersThis two-hour training on the California Educator Reporting System (CERS) covered the following topics:* Overview of CERS features and assessment results
* Accessing individual and group results from CAASPP and ELPAC summative assessment results
* Features of the Smarter Balanced Interim Assessment Results, including:
	+ Key distractor analysis
	+ Item level analysis
	+ Rubric and exemplar information
* Resources to support classroom instruction, including links to lesson plans in Tools for Teachers based on CERS results
 |
| 10/18–20 | Riverside | 900 | California Assessment ConferenceThe learning goal of this year’s conference was, “Partners in Progress: Harnessing the Power of Student Assessment.” Attendees customized their learning by selecting from over 80 sessions presented by educators from across California. They heard from outstanding keynote presenters, participated in Q&A sessions with the CDE, and received valuable updates on California's assessments. A condensed virtual conference was also offered for those who could not attend in person. |
| 10/26 | Virtual | 300 | Introduction to CERS for Coordinators and AdministratorsThis three-hour online training supported the implementation of CERS and included opportunities for attendees to practice using its various features. Topics included:* Overview of CERS features for viewing assessment results
* Accessing individual and group results from CAASPP and ELPAC summative assessment results
* Options for viewing Smarter Balanced Interim Assessment Results
* How to manage CERS users
* Available resources to support staff
* Assigning students to teachers
 |
| 10/26 | Virtual | 185 | Data Driven Decisions—Module1: Starting with Summative ResultsThis module covered data available from summative assessments and how that can be used as a jumping-off point to find areas of opportunity and connections to classroom teaching and learning. |
| 10/27 | Virtual | 194 | New Coordinator Webinar #3This webinar, hosted by SCOE, provided information about the following:* A review of upcoming coordinator checklist tasks
* Details on resources for student practice, (e.g., practice tests, interim assessments)
* A question and answer session with experienced coordinators
 |

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

| **Date(s)** | **Location** | **Estimated Number of Attendees** | **Description** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 9/28 | Virtual | 35 | ELPAC Technical Advisory Group (TAG) MeetingThe ELPAC TAG met to review psychometric topics related to ELPAC. |
| 9/29 | Virtual | 40 | CAASPP TAG MeetingThe CAASPP TAG met to review psychometric topics related to CAASPP. |
| 9/27–29, 10/4–6 | Virtual | 30 | ELPAC Item Writer WorkshopsParticipants received training on how to write assessment items and learned about opportunities to write items for use in future versions of the ELPAC. |
| 10/11–13, 10/18–20 | Virtual | 12 | California Alternate Assessments (CAAs) for ELA and Math Item Writer WorkshopsEducator participants received training on how to write items, and then wrote items that may be used in future versions of the CAAs for ELA and math. |
| 10/25–26 | Virtual | 12 | CAA for Science Item Writer WorkshopEducator participants received training on how to write performance task items, and then wrote items that may be used in future versions of the CAA for Science. |

**Table 3. Presentations by CDE Staff**

| **Date(s)** | **Location** | **Estimated Number of Attendees** | **Description** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 9/15 | Virtual | 25 | Assessment Interest Holder MeetingProvided an update on action items from the SBE meeting and the current student completion percentage for CAASPP and ELPAC. |
| 9/21 | Virtual | 25 | Regional Assessment Network MeetingThe Assessment Development and Administration Division (ADAD) provided updates on activities and test developments. |
| 10/1 | Anaheim | 50 | Deconstructing the Design and Expectations of the California Science Test (CAST) at the Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, and Mathematics (STEAM) SymposiumParticipants learned about the organization of the CAST and investigated how the CAST Item Specifications are used by the CDE to verify test item standard-alignment can also be used by educators to design 3-dimensional learning opportunities. |
| 10/1 | Anaheim | 2 | Design and Expectations of the CAA for Science at the STEAM SymposiumParticipants learned about the alternate science standards, analyzed assessment targets for the CAA for Science, and learned about practical tools to support assessment for this student population. |
| 10/14 |  |  | Supporting Equitable Science Education Through Well-Designed Assessment at the California Science Education Conference (CASE) workshopEducators reviewed a released item set that meets the rigors of multi-dimensional science standards and requires little to no adaptation for use by test takers who employ assistive technology for visual impairments. |
| 10/19–20 | Virtual | 25 | Advisory Commission on Special EducationIn conjunction with the Special Education Division, the ADAD provided updates on assessment and test development.  |
| 10/20 | Virtual | 25 | Assessment Interest Holder MeetingProvided an update on action items from the SBE meeting and the current student completion percentage for CAASPP and ELPAC. |
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## Overview

### Background

California is a state with great linguistic diversity. More than 40 percent of students in California speak a language other than English.[[1]](#footnote-2) Of these students, over 1.2 million speak Spanish.[[2]](#footnote-3) The student population in California includes students who are native speakers of Spanish and students who are learning Spanish as an additional language. California’s educational system includes instruction in Spanish in various forms. Thus, the California Spanish Assessment (CSA) was first designed and created in 2016 as a new computer-based assessment for students in grades three through eight and high school to measure students’ competency in Spanish in reading, writing mechanics, and listening. Currently, the CSA is part of the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress System of assessments.

The purpose of this addendum is to articulate how the test design presented in the [*High-Level Test Design for the California Spanish Assessment*](https://www.caaspp.org/rsc/pdfs/CSA.high-level-test-design.pdf)(hereafter referred to as the “*CSA High-Level Test Design*”), which was approved by the State Board of Education (SBE) in September 2016, has been updated to include the expansion of the writing domain and addition of a speaking domain, as approved in the *California Assessment System Scope of Work* for the 2022–27 school years. The expansion of the writing domain and addition of a speaking domain will allow the CSA to be used, in part, to achieve the State Seal of Biliteracy, as originally intended (pursuant to California *Education Code* Section **60640[j]**).

### Key Assumptions for the Expansion

For planning and development purposes, ETS makes the following assumptions about expanding the CSA:

1. The assessment was originally developed with a focus on reading, writing mechanics, and listening. The updated assessment will include an additional writing component as well as speaking.
2. Field testing of the additional writing and speaking components will be handled by embedding field test items into the 2023–24 operational forms.
3. General achievement level descriptors (ALDs) will be updated as specified in [section 2](#_Revised_Achievement_Level).
4. The first operational administration of the expanded assessment will occur in the school year 2024–25.
5. A standard setting process will be designed, and an educator workshop will occur after the first operational administration of the expanded assessment.
6. Interest holders’ input will be a critical component of the development process; there will be a number of opportunities to provide input on test design by interest holders throughout the test development process.

## Revised General Achievement Level Descriptors

The general ALDs are generic descriptors of student performance expectations that provide the range expected in each performance level. The descriptors provide a snapshot of student achievement in the current school year.

With the expansion of the CSA, speaking will be added to the descriptors. Additionally, the word “mechanics,” a qualifier in the writing domain’s current ALD text, will be removed because the writing domain will be fully assessed after the expansion is implemented operationally.

* **Level 3:** Students at Level 3 demonstrate a **high degree** of grade-appropriate Spanish literacy in reading, writing, listening, and speaking, and *are on track* for being literate in Spanish by high school graduation.
* **Level 2:** Students at Level 2 demonstrate a **moderate degree** of grade-appropriate Spanish literacy in reading, writing, listening, and speaking, but *require further development to be on track* for being literate in Spanish by high school graduation.
* **Level 1:** Students at Level 1 demonstrate a **limited degree** of grade-appropriate Spanish literacy in reading, writing, listening, and speaking, and *require substantial development* *before being considered on track* for being literate in Spanish by high school graduation.

## Standards and Claims

The CSA is aligned to the *California Common Core State Standards (CCSS) en Español*, which are a translated and linguistically augmented version of the *California* *CCSS for English Language Arts & Literacy*.

The *California CCSS en Español* are organized into the following domains:

* Reading standards
* Writing standards
* Speaking and listening standards
* Language standards

Using the domains as a guide for the test design, the SBE adopted the following claims for the CSA in September 2016:

* Claim for grades three through eight: Students can demonstrate progress toward a high level of competency in attaining reading/language arts skills and practices through Spanish.
* Claim for high school: Students can demonstrate a high level of competency in attaining reading/language arts skills and practices through Spanish.

The SBE also adopted the following Spanish language arts competency claims for all grade levels and the high school grade band:

* Reading: Students can read, analyze, and interpret a variety of texts and genres through Spanish.
* Writing: Students can write texts for a range of purposes and audiences to accurately and convincingly present, describe, and explain ideas through Spanish.
* Listening: Students can comprehend spoken Spanish in a range of contexts.

With the expansion of the CSA into the speaking domain, ETS recommends the addition of the following claim for all grade levels and the high school grade band:

* Speaking: Students can speak Spanish to accurately and convincingly present, describe, and explain ideas for a range of purposes and audiences.

## Item Development

### New Item Development

ETS assessment specialists will develop samples of new item types for speaking and writing for the California Department of Education’s (CDE’s) review and approval. These samples will be used to update the item specifications and training materials in collaboration with the CDE. The new item specifications will be used when ETS begins development work on items for all domains in the assessment.

All items will be aligned with the *California CCSS* *en Español* and consistent with the goals of California’s testing program. Items will be written by ETS assessment developers and trained item writers familiar with assessment development in Spanish and specifically trained for the CSA as well as California educators who have received item writer training, including updated training on new item types for speaking and writing. All items will be reviewed by ETS content and editorial staff, the CDE, and a review panel composed of California educators. ETS will leverage the current best practices developed on other California assessments that feature constructed-responses (CRs) when designing CSA speaking and writing items.

### Item Types

ETS will develop machine-scorable and human-scorable item types for computer-based administration by leveraging the most current assessment innovations conducive to assessing reading/language arts skills.

The assessment includes both stand-alone items and passage-based items; all items may contain a stimulus (e.g., a passage, video, or image). Some of the items have technology-enhanced interactions. These interactions include having a student respond by typing an answer, completing a table, selecting from a drop-down list, etc.

The expansion of the CSA will include the administration of human-scorable items for writing and speaking, which will necessitate the development of scoring rubrics. The use of artificial intelligence to score written responses will be explored, as advances in this field are well underway.

## Test Design

### Test Format

The expanded CSA will continue to be a linear test delivered online under untimed testing conditions. It will be untimed to allow students sufficient time to complete the test. Testing time estimates will be reviewed and adjusted if necessary and provided to local educational agencies (LEAs) for scheduling purposes. In view of California’s desire for a Spanish reading/language arts assessment that measures a high level of competency demonstrated by students who are on track for exiting public instruction as biliterate graduates, the high school CSA will continue to feature complex passages and tasks that can aid local decisions about eligibility for the State Seal of Biliteracy.

### Test Development Stages

To support the 2024–25 operational launch of the expanded CSA, several activities will take place over a three-year time span:

* 2022–23: Test design, blueprint development, and item and task development
* 2023–24: Field testing of full-write and speaking items and prompts
* 2024–25: First operational administration of full-write and speaking prompts; standard setting

### Field Test Design

Forms with embedded field test items, including the new speaking and writing items, will be administered for grades three, four, five, six, seven, and eight, and for high school, during the 2023–24 school year. Table 1 shows a tentative embedded field test design for grades three through eight.

Table 1. Embedded Field Test Design, Grades Three Through Eight

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Item Type | # of Items Taken by Each Student | Estimated Testing Time for Each Student |
| Speaking CR items (human-scored) | 8 items | 60–90 minutes |
| Full-write CR items (human-scored) | 1 item | 45–60 minutes |
| Writing non-CR items (machine-scored) | 1 item | 1–2 minutes |
| **Estimated Total:** | **10 items** | **105–150 minutes** |

Table 2 shows a tentative embedded field test design for high school.

Table 2. Embedded Field Test Design, High School

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Item Type | # of Items Taken by Each Student | Estimated Testing Time for Each Student |
| Speaking CR items (human-scored) | 12 items | 60–90 minutes |
| Full-write CR items (human-scored) | 2 items | 60–80 minutes |
| Writing non-CR items (machine-scored) | 2 items | 1–2 minutes |
| **Estimated Total:** | **16 items** | **120–170 minutes** |

The field testing of CR items entails an average increase in overall testing time of two hours for grades three through eight and two and one half hours for high school, based on the estimates in table 1 and table 2. Therefore, if the CSA before the expansion took one and one half to two hours, with the expansion, the overall field testing time would potentially range from four to four and one half hours.

ETS is committed to field-testing the number of items shown in table 3.

Table 3. Number of Embedded Field Test Items

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Item Type | # of Items Field-Tested per Grade, Grades 3–8 | # of Items Field-Tested, High School |
| Speaking CR items (human-scored) | 24 items | 36 items |
| Full-write CR items (human-scored) | 3 items | 6 items |
| Writing non-CR items (machine-scored) | 3 items | 6 items |
| **Estimated Total:** | **30 items** | **48 items** |

## Psychometric Considerations

### Embedded Field Test

As noted in [section 5C](#_Field_Test_Design), the 2023–24 operational CSA operational forms will include an embedded field test design for the field testing of the new writing and speaking CR items. Under this design, the newly developed writing and speaking CR items are embedded in an operational form and are analyzed with other operational items in the form. Therefore, the new CR items will be linked to the operational base scale through psychometric analysis of calibration and linking. Logistically, the embedded field test is a cost-efficient way to collect data for the field test items, which does not require an additional off-season test for students and test administrators.

The spring 2024 embedded field test will feel like the operational 2025 year (window is the same, form breakdown will be similar to operational, effort will be there, good testing experience for students with new item type). ETS will have the same test-taking population. In addition, the embedded field testing of items can occur on an ongoing basis for each operational test administration to support a mutually agreed upon refresh rate. All newly developed writing and speaking CR items can be placed and spiraled at the student level to achieve random samples for analysis.

Psychometric analysis and linking procedures can be accomplished with an embedded field test design. Item response theory (IRT) calibration and linking procedures can be used to calibrate, link, and scale the new CR items to the operational base scale.

### Field Testing Sample Size and Threshold

As an optional assessment, the key challenge for a CSA field test administration at the various grade levels and the high school grade band is the small sample size. In general, larger test samples occur in the lower grades three through five. As enrollment in Spanish instruction attenuates at the middle and upper grades, the test-taking sample size decreases as the grade level increases. In the embedded field test model, the psychometric threshold of the testing sample for item analysis is the same for each grade level and the high school grade band, (e.g., a minimum of 200 students per item and desirable 300 students per item per form, excluding the accommodated form). To receive reliable analysis results, ETS would adhere to this threshold of the sample size for item analysis for the field tests of new writing and speaking CR items.

As this threshold can be met easily in the lower grades and might be challenging in higher grades, especially in the high school grade band, it is possible to increase the number of field test items in each version of the regular forms and reduce the number of versions in high school to support the goal that items that are field-tested have sufficient student responses to be analyzed as the minimum and desirable student counts mentioned previously. For example, three versions of a regular form may be appropriate in grades three through eight, each containing one CR item for writing and speaking. In the high school grade band, two versions of a regular form could be administered, each containing two CR items in each domain.

### Psychometric Analyses

#### Classical Item Analysis and Differential Item Functioning

Classical item analysis will be conducted to evaluate the performance of all newly developed writing and speaking CR items with respect to item difficulty and item discrimination. The following flagging rules for these statistics will be used to identify items that are not performing as expected:

* A *p*-value (or mean of item score) less than 0.2 or greater than 0.95
* An item with a polyserial correlation less than 0.20
* An item with nonresponse rates greater than 5 percent
* An item that has less than 3 percent of the students at any score level (e.g., 0, 1, 2)

Differential item functioning (DIF) analyses will be performed on the newly developed writing CR items and speaking CR items. Because of the CSA sample size, only gender DIF will be analyzed and C-DIF will be flagged. If fewer than 200 students respond to a CR field test item, item analysis and DIF analysis may not be conducted.

#### Interrater Reliability Analysis

The new writing and speaking CR items will be scored by a single rater with 10 percent back-reading, which means 10 percent of the responses to CR items will be scored independently by a second rater. Data from items with two raters will be used to evaluate interrater reliability of scoring. The statistics for interrater reliability include the percentage of perfect agreement and adjacent agreement between the two raters, and the quadratic weighted kappa statistic (QWK). QWK is a statistic used to measure the degree of association between two ratings with values ranging from 0.0 (indicating no agreement) to 1.0 (indicating perfect agreement).

CR items will be flagged if any of the following conditions occur:

* Adjacent plus exact agreement < 0.80
* QWK < 0.70

#### Dimensionality Analysis

When writing and speaking CR items are included in the test form, it is unknown whether the unidimensional assumption can be held. Thus, ETS will conduct a dimensionality analysis to examine whether the CSA is unidimensional or multidimensional. Results of the study will inform how the items should be calibrated and scores be reported.

#### Item Response Model Analysis

IRT models will be continuously used to analyze writing and speaking CR items and the CSA forms. The selection of the specific IRT models will be based on the results of the aforementioned dimensionality analysis. Furthermore, even if the dimensionality analysis confirms unidimensional features of the CSA scale, the continuity of the current scale established in the 2019 will be investigated carefully. Scale scores and achievement levels will be produced and reported.

## Appendix A: High-Level Test Development Timeline

Table 4. High-Level Test Development Timeline

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Activity | Date |
| SBE action on the *Addendum to the* *High-Level Test Design for the California Spanish Assessment*, revised test blueprints, and general ALDs | September 2022 |
| Administration of the embedded field test | 2023–24 administration |
| Dimensionality study | Spring and summer 2024 |
| Administration of the operational test of the newly expanded CSA | 2024–25 administration |
| Standard setting | Summer 2025 |
| SBE action on the threshold scores and reporting ALDs | September 2025 |
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**Introduction to the Revised Test Blueprint for the California Spanish Assessment**

The revised test blueprint for the California Spanish Assessment (CSA) updates the CSA test blueprint that was approved in November 2017. This revised test blueprint for the CSA provides the proposed numbers of items and points to be included in an operational assessment for each of the four language-arts domains assessed in grades three through eight and high school. Note, however, that the numbers of items and points are subject to revision in response to statistical analyses of the new writing and speaking constructed-response (CR) item types after their first field test and first operational uses.

All items are aligned with the [*California Common Core State Standards en Español*](https://commoncore-espanol.sdcoe.net/CaCCSS-en-Espanol/SLA-Literacy)*,* which is a translated and linguistically augmented version of the *Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy*.

The revised test blueprint is represented in the tables presented in this document. [Table 1](#Table_1) provides an overview to clarify the proportions of the blueprint assigned to each domain. After this overview table, [table 2](#Table_2) through [table 4](#Table_4) provide specifics enumerating further content categories and subcategories of the domains.

Table 1 is organized by the four domains assessed: Reading, Writing, Listening, and Speaking. For each domain, a corresponding claim is provided in the first column. Other columns in the overview table are as follows:

* Second column: *Total Items by Claim*
* Third column: *Percent of Items by Claim*
* Fourth column: *Total Score Points by Claim*
* Fifth column: *Percent of Score Points by Claim*

[Table 2](#Table_2) through [table 4](#Table_4) of the revised test blueprint take the same information to a granular level, providing the proportions of testing standards that cover the content categories and subcategories on an operational assessment. The columns in [table 2](#Table_2) through [table 4](#Table_4) are as follows:

* First column: *Claim and Content Categories*
* Second column: *Total Items by Content Category* (*Subcategory for* [table 4](#Table_4))
* Third column: *Selected Response (SR) or CR*
* Fourth column: *Total Score Points by Content Category* (*Subcategory for* [table 4](#Table_4))

Note that SR items are machine-scored and CR items elicit student responses, which are human-scored.

Each grade level test has more than 50 testable standards at its disposal, so [table 5](#Table_5) through [table 7](#Table_7) delineate specific groups of testing standards to be used for each content category and subcategory. Each table summarizes a different grade span. Keep in mind that the CSA tests high school grade levels together in one test. The high school CSA uses two sets of the *California Common Core State Standards en Español*: the standards designated as “9–10,” for grades nine and ten, as well as the standards designated “11–12,” for grades eleven and twelve. Both sets of standards are eligible for use on the high school CSA. The columns in the testing standards tables are as follows:

* First column: *Claim and Content Categories and Subcategories*
* Other columns: Grade levels or grade band tested

**Revised Blueprint for the CSA**

**Blueprint Overview**

Note that the original wording of the writing claim was amended to acknowledge that the CSA test blueprint did not feature constructed-response items. With the recent addition of full-writes to the test blueprint, the interim wording—“**Writing Mechanics Claim: Students can revise** writing products…”—has reverted to its original text and is restored in table 1.

**Table 1. Proposed Blueprint Overview, CSA, Operational Forms, 2024–25**

| **Claim and Domain** | **Total Items by Claim** | **Percent of Items by Claim** | **Total Score Points by Claim** | **Percent of Score Points by Claim** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Reading Claim:** Students can read, analyze, and interpret a variety of texts and genres through Spanish. | 24 | 42.9% | 27–35 | 36–43% |
| **Writing Claim:** Students can write texts for a range of purposes and audiences in order to accurately and convincingly present, describe, and explain ideas through Spanish. | 12 | 21.4% | 19–22 | 25–27% |
| **Listening Claim:** Students can comprehend spoken Spanish in a range of contexts. | 12 | 21.4% | 15–17 | 20–21% |
| **Speaking Claim:** Students can speak Spanish to accurately and convincingly present, describe, and explain ideas for a range of purposes and audiences. | 8 | 14.3% | 15–16 | 20% |
| **TOTAL:** | **56** | **100%** | **76–82** | **100%** |

**Grade Span: Three Through Five**

Note the following about [table 2](#Table_2):

* SR items are machine-scored.
* CR items elicit student responses and are human-scored.

**Table 2. Proposed Blueprint Table—Content Categories, CSA, Grade Span Three Through Five, Operational Forms, 2024–25**

| **Claim and Content Categories** | **Total Items by Content Category** | **SR or CR** | **Total Score Points by Content Category** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading: Literary (subcategories in [table 4](#Table_4)) | 6–9 | SR | 7–11 |
| Reading: Informational (subcategories in [table 4](#Table_4)) | 6–9 | SR | 7–11 |
| Reading: Vocabulary and Meaning | 8–10 | SR | 10–13 |
| Writing: Foundational Mechanics and Conventions | 6–8 | SR | 7–10 |
| Writing: Revising and Editing | 3–5 | SR | 4–8 |
| Writing: Written Expression | 1 | CR | 4 |
| Listening: Listening Comprehension | 12 | SR | 15–17 |
| Speaking: Spoken Expression | 8 | CR | 15–16 |
| **TOTAL:** | **56** | **47 SRs + 9 CRs** | **76–82** |

**Grade Spans: Six Through Eight and High School**

Note the following about [table 3](#Table_3):

* SR items are machine-scored.
* CR items elicit student responses and are human-scored.

**Table 3. Proposed Blueprint Table—Content Categories, CSA, Grade Span Six Through Eight and High School, Operational Forms, 2024–25**

| **Claim and Content Categories** | **Total Items by Content Category** | **SR or CR** | **Total Score Points by Content Category** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading: Literary (subcategories in [table 4](#Table_4)) | 6–9 | SR | 7–11 |
| Reading: Informational (subcategories in [table 4](#Table_4)) | 6–9 | SR | 7–11 |
| Reading: Vocabulary and Meaning | 8–10 | SR | 10–13 |
| Writing: Mechanics and Conventions | 4–7 | SR | 5–9 |
| Writing: Revising and Editing | 4–7 | SR | 5–9 |
| Writing: Written Expression | 1 | CR | 4 |
| Listening: Listening Comprehension | 12 | SR | 15–17 |
| Speaking: Spoken Expression | 8 | CR | 15–16 |
| **TOTAL:** | **56** | **47 SRs + 9 CRs** | **76–82** |

**Reading Subcategories**

For [table 4](#Table_4),note that SR items are machine-scored.

**Table 4. Proposed Blueprint Table—Reading Subcategories, CSA, All Grade Levels, Operational Forms, 2024–25**

| **Claim and Content Subcategories** | **Total Items by Content Subcategory** | **SR or CR** | **Total Score Points by Content Subcategory** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading: Literary—Key Ideas and Details | 4–6 | SR | 5–7 |
| Reading: Literary—Craft and Structure | 1–2 | SR | 1–3 |
| Reading: Literary—Integration of Knowledge and Ideas | 1–2 | SR | 1–3 |
| Reading: Informational—Key Ideas and Details | 4–6 | SR | 5–7 |
| Reading: Informational—Craft and Structure | 1–2 | SR | 1–3 |
| Reading: Informational—Integration of Knowledge and Ideas | 1–2 | SR | 1–3 |
| Reading: Vocabulary and Meaning | 8–10 | SR | 10–13 |
| **TOTAL:** | 24 | **24 SRs** | 27–35 |

**California Common Core State Standards en Español Sampling**

**Grade Span: Three Through Five**

Note that many standards have contributory standards. For instance, in grade four, Language Standard 4.L.2 deals with conventions and Standard 4.L.2a deals specifically with capitalization. While Standard 4.L.2a is not mentioned in [table 5](#Table_5), it is incorporated under 4.L.2.

**Table 5. *California Common Core State Standards en Español* Sampling by Content Categories and Subcategories, CSA, Grade Span Three Through Five**

| **Claim and Content Categories and Subcategories** | **Grade Three** | **Grade Four** | **Grade Five** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading: Literary—Key Ideas and Details | 3.RL.1, 3.RL.2, 3.RL.3 | 4.RL.1, 4.RL.2, 4.RL.3 | 5.RL.1, 5.RL.2, 5.RL.3 |
| Reading: Literary—Craft and Structure | 3.RL.5, 3.RL.6 | 4.RL.5, 4.RL.6 | 5.RL.5, 5.RL.6 |
| Reading: Literary—Integration of Knowledge and Ideas | 3.RL.7, 3.RL.9 | 4.RL.7, 4.RL.9 | 5.RL.7, 5.RL.9 |
| Reading: Informational—Key Ideas and Details | 3.RI.1, 3.RI.2, 3.RI.3 | 4.RI.1, 4.RI.2, 4.RI.3 | 5.RI.1, 5.RI.2, 5.RI.3 |
| Reading: Informational—Craft and Structure | 3.RI.5, 3.RI.6 | 4.RI.5, 4.RI.6 | 5.RI.5, 5.RI.6 |
| Reading: Informational—Integration of Knowledge and Ideas | 3.RI.7, 3.RI.8, 3.RI.9 | 4.RI.7, 4.RI.8, 4.RI.9 | 5.RI.7, 5.RI.8, 5.RI.9 |
| Reading: Vocabulary and Meaning | 3.RL.4, 3.RI.43.L.4, 3.L.5, 3.L.6  | 4.RL.4, 4.RI.44.L.4, 4.L.5, 4.L.6  | 5.RL.4, 5.RI.45.L.4, 5.L.5, 5.L.6  |
| Writing: Foundational Mechanics and Conventions | 3.RF.33.L.1, 3.L.2, 3.L.3 | 4.RF.3 4.L.1, 4.L.2, 4.L.3 | 5.RF.35.L.1, 5.L.2, 5.L.3 |
| Writing: Revising and Editing | 3.W.1, 3.W.2, 3.W.3 | 4.W.1, 4.W.2, 4.W.3 | 5.W.1, 5.W.2, 5.W.3 |
| Writing: Written Expression | 3.W standards | 4.W standards | 5.W standards |
| Listening: Listening Comprehension | 3.SL.2, 3.SL.3 | 4.SL.2, 4.SL.3 | 5.SL.2, 5.SL.3 |
| Speaking: Spoken Expression | 3.SL standards | 4.SL standards | 5.SL standards |

**Grade Span: Six Through Eight**

Note that many standards have contributory standards. For instance, in grade eight, Language Standard 8.L.2 deals with conventions and Standard 8.L.2a deals specifically with punctuation indicating a pause or break. While Standard 8.L.2a is not mentioned in [table 6](#Table_6), it is incorporated under 8.L.2.

**Table 6. *California Common Core State Standards en Español* Sampling by Content Categories and Subcategories, CSA, Grade Span Six Through Eight**

| **Claim and Content Categories and Subcategories** | **Grade Six** | **Grade Seven** | **Grade Eight** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading: Literary—Key Ideas and Details | 6.RL.1, 6.RL.2, 6.RL.3 | 7.RL.1, 7.RL.2, 7.RL.3 | 8.RL.1, 8.RL.2, 8.RL.3 |
| Reading: Literary—Craft and Structure | 6.RL.5, 6.RL.6 | 7.RL.5, 7.RL.6 | 8.RL.5, 8.RL.6 |
| Reading: Literary—Integration of Knowledge and Ideas | 6.RL.7, 6.RL.9 | 7.RL.7, 7.RL.9 | 8.RL.7, 8.RL.9 |
| Reading: Informational—Key Ideas and Details | 6.RI.1, 6.RI.2, 6.RI.3 | 7.RI.1, 7.RI.2, 7.RI.3 | 8.RI.1, 8.RI.2, 8.RI.3 |
| Reading: Informational—Craft and Structure | 6.RI.5, 6.RI.5a, 6.RI.6 | 7.RI.5, 7.RI.5a, 7.RI.6 | 8.RI.5, 8.RI.5a, 8.RI.6 |
| Reading: Informational—Integration of Knowledge and Ideas | 6.RI.7, 6.RI.8, 6.RI.9 | 7.RI.7, 7.RI.8, 7.RI.9 | 8.RI.7, 8.RI.8, 8.RI.9 |
| Reading: Vocabulary and Meaning | 6.RL.4, 6.RI.46.L.4, 6.L.5, 6.L.6  | 7.RL.4, 7.RI.47.L.4, 7.L.5, 7.L.6  | 8.RL.4, 8.RI.48.L.4, 8.L.5, 8.L.6  |
| Writing: Mechanics and Conventions | 6.L.1, 6.L.2, 6.L.3 | 7.L.1, 7.L.2, 7.L.3 | 8.L.1, 8.L.2, 8.L.3 |
| Writing: Revising and Editing | 6.W.1, 6.W.2, 6.W.3 | 7.W.1, 7.W.2, 7.W.3 | 8.W.1, 8.W.2, 8.W.3 |
| Writing: Written Expression | 6.W standards | 7.W standards | 8.W standards |
| Listening: Listening Comprehension | 6.SL.2, 6.SL.3 | 7.SL.2, 7.SL.3 | 8.SL.2, 8.SL.3 |
| Speaking: Spoken Expression | 6.SL standards | 7.SL standards | 8.SL standards |

**Grade Band: High School**

Note that many standards have contributory standards. For instance, Language Standard 9–10.L.2 deals with conventions and Standard 9–10.L.2a deals specifically with parallel structure. While Standard 9–10.L.2a is not mentioned in [table 7](#Table_7), it is incorporated under 9–10.L.2.

**Table 7. *California Common Core State Standards en Español* Sampling by Content Categories and Subcategories, CSA, High School**

| **Claim and Content Categories and Subcategories** | **High School** |
| --- | --- |
| Reading: Literary—Key Ideas and Details | 9–10.RL.1, 9–10.RL.2, 9–10.RL.3 11–12.RL.1, 11–12.RL.2, 11–12.RL.3 |
| Reading: Literary—Craft and Structure | 9–10.RL.5, 9–10.RL.611–12.RL.5, 11–12.RL.6 |
| Reading: Literary—Integration of Knowledge and Ideas | 9–10.RL.7, 9–10.RL.9 11–12.RL.7, 11–12.RL.9 |
| Reading: Informational—Key Ideas and Details | 9–10.RI.1, 9–10.RI.2, 9–10.RI.311–12.RI.1, 11–12.RI.2, 11–12.RI.3 |
| Reading: Informational—Craft and Structure | 9–10.RI.5, 9–10.RI.5a, 9–10.RI.6 11–12.RI.5, 11–12.RI.5a, 11–12.RI.6 |
| Reading: Informational—Integration of Knowledge and Ideas | 9–10.RI.7, 9–10.RI.8, 9–10.RI.9 11–12.RI.7, 11–12.RI.8, 11–12.RI.9 |
| Reading: Vocabulary and Meaning | 9–10.RL.4, 9–10.RI.4, 9–10.L.4, 9–10.L.5, 9–10.L.611–12.RL.4, 11–12.RI.4, 11–12.L.4, 11–12.L.5, 11–12.L.6  |

Table 7 *(continuation)*

| **Claim and Content Categories and Subcategories** | **High School** |
| --- | --- |
| Writing: Mechanics and Conventions | 9–10.L.1, 9–10.L.2, 9–10.L.3 11–12.L.1, 11–12.L.2, 11–12.L.3 |
| Writing: Revising and Editing | 9–10.W.1, 9–10.W.2, 9–10.W.3  11–12.W.1, 11–12.W.2, 11–12.W.3 |
| Writing: Written Expression | 9–10.W standards 11–12.W standards |
| Listening: Listening Comprehension | 9–10.SL.2, 9–10.SL.3 11–12.SL.2, 11–12.SL.3 |
| Speaking: Spoken Expression | 9–10.SL standards 11–12.SL standards |
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Introduction and Background

The Sacramento County Office of Education (SCOE) hosted the 2022 Assessment and Accountability Information Meeting (AAIM) under contract with the California Department of Education (CDE) Assessment Development and Administration Division. This annual meeting was designed and delivered to provide California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP), English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC), and accountability coordinators with updates and information on California’s assessment and accountability systems.

Prior to 2020, this meeting was held in person twice each year as well as via live webcast. This meeting is now in its third year using a virtual platform.

In response to coordinator and CDE participant feedback from 2021, the structure of this meeting was changed slightly from the previous year. The changes included, but were not limited to

* changing from 90-minute sessions across six days to two-hour sessions across three days;
* using a Google Form to collect questions in advance that were answered live; and
* training presenters on accessible and effective presentation best practices.

**AAIM Schedule**

The table below lists the 2022 AAIM sessions schedule.

Table 1. 2022 AAIM Sessions by Date and Topic

| **Date** | **Topic** |
| --- | --- |
| August 4, 2022 | * Director’s Message
* National and International Assessments
* Updates Across Assessments
* ELPAC
* High School Equivalency (HSE) and Physical Fitness Test (PFT)
 |
| August 11, 2022 | * CAASPP English Language Arts/Literacy (ELA) and Mathematics
* Science
* California Spanish Assessment (CSA)
* Interim Assessments and Tools for Teachers
 |
| August 18, 2022 | * California Educator Reporting System (CERS)
* Accountability
 |

Summary of Participants

**Attendance**

On average, about half of all registrants attended the sessions for which they had registered. The attendance rate for this free information session was as expected, provided the availability of multiple avenues to access the content—attending the live webinar, viewing the recording, or only accessing the materials. This is consistent with the 2021 attendance rate. The total registration and attendance increased by approximately 30 percent from 2021 to 2022.

**August 4, 2022**

* 1,621 registrants
* 962 attendees
* 59 percent attendance rate

**August 11, 2022**

* 1,600 registrants
* 846 attendees
* 53 percent attendance rate

**August 18, 2022**

* 1,695 registrants
* 859 attendees
* 51 percent attendance rate

**Survey Responses**

 Attendees received a post-meeting survey request through Zoom after each session but were only able to respond one time for the entire series; although attendees may have attended multiple sessions, they were only able to respond once to the survey. Refer to [Appendix A](#_Appendix_A) for a complete list of survey questions. The survey response rate of nine percent was an increase from last year’s response rate of seven percent.

* 1,479 total unique attendees
* 140 survey respondents

Given the industry standard of approximately ten to twenty percent post-training survey response rate, the response rate obtained for the AAIM webinars is only one percent lower than desired. However, the rate may be insufficient to draw general conclusions about the population or the program.

**Demographic Information**

Respondents were asked about their role in the assessment process. As shown in figure 1, **more than half** of all registrants said that they **were local educational agency (LEA) level CAASPP or ELPAC coordinators.** Responses in the “Other” category included teachers, district or site administrators, county office or state education staff, and accountability coordinators. Registrants were able to choose more than one answer to this question, resulting in a total that exceeds 100 percent.

Figure 1. Respondents’ Roles in the Assessment Process

****

Findings and Considerations

The respondents were asked if the information that was provided during the AAIM sessions was helpful. The responses included feedback for all three sessions.

**99 percent of attendees** said the information presented was helpful.

***Just wanted to take a minute to share that this presentation had a different feel from the typical webinar. Your team is trying hard to support schools and it shows. Keep up the great work.***

**Anonymous Attendee**

**Changes for Future Meetings**

After reviewing the feedback from meeting participants and the experiences of CDE and SCOE teams, SCOE proposes the implementation of several changes for the 2023 meeting.

SCOE proposes the following changes to be considered for future Assessment and Accountability Information Meetings:

* Use only high-quality, professional, and accessible images in all PowerPoint presentations.
* Encourage “watch parties” at county offices of education so attendees can share information and best practices with their peers.
* Increase survey response rate by offering a raffle prize drawing of a free California Assessment Conference registration for those who participate.

**Continued Practices**

SCOE proposes the continuation of the following practices for future Assessment and Accountability Information Meetings:

* Use data visualization best practices when creating PowerPoint presentations and notes.
* Conduct the meeting virtually in two-hour sessions across three dates in August.
* Use an electronic question submission system before and during the meeting. Only twelve questions were submitted before the meetings and five hundred questions were submitted during the meetings.
* Hold question and answer sessions after each presentation.
* Provide a Frequently Asked Questions sheet that will include popular questions and answers from the presentations. Questions will be selected by program managers from the questions submitted through the electronic system and will be compiled by SCOE into a document to be posted after the meeting.
* Provide registrants with electronic copies of the notetaking guide before the meeting.
* Provide the PowerPoint slide decks to participants after the meeting.
* Post a recording of each presentation on the CAASPP and ELPAC Upcoming Training Opportunities web pages.

**Proposed 2023 Meeting Dates and Times**

SCOE proposes the following schedule of webinars throughout August 2023. Although final dates, times, and topics are flexible, scheduling will be determined by the CDE during the 2023 planning process.

Table 2. Sample 2023 Assessment and Accountability Information Meeting Schedule

| Date | Time | Topics |
| --- | --- | --- |
| August 3, 2023 | 2 to 4 p.m. | * Director’s Message
* National and International Tests
* Accessibility
* HSE and PFT
* ELPAC
 |
| August 10, 2023 | 2 to 4 p.m. | * ELA and Mathematics
* Science
* CSA
* Interim Assessments and Tools for Teachers
 |
| August 17, 2023 | 2 to 4 p.m. | * CERS
* Accountability
 |

Appendix A

1. Which of the following best describes your Local Educational Agency (LEA)?
	* County Office of Education
	* Unified School District
	* High School District
	* Elementary School District
	* Charter
	* Other (please specify)
2. How long have you been in your current position?
	* 0 years
	* 1–3 years
	* 3–5 years
	* Over 5 years
3. Attendee Category (Check all that apply.)
	* LEA CAASPP Coordinator
	* LEA ELPAC Coordinator
	* Site Level CAASPP Coordinator
	* Site Level ELPAC Coordinator
	* Test Administrator
	* The California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) Coordinator
	* Other (please specify)
4. Which of the following are you responsible for? (Check all that apply.)
	* Assessment
	* Accountability
	* CALPADS / Data Management
	* Technology
	* Other (please specify)
5. Was the information provided today helpful?
	* Extremely helpful
	* Very helpful
	* Somewhat helpful
	* Not so helpful
	* Not at all helpful
6. List any additional comments or suggestions regarding the meeting.
1. California Department of Education, DataQuest, Language Census Data for 2012–13 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. EDFacts/California Consolidated State Performance Report, 2012–13 and 2013–14 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)