

## Special Session Agenda--May 31, 2005

California State Board of Education (SBE) meeting agenda.

---

### SPECIAL SESSION AGENDA

May 31, 2005

#### *State Board Members*

Ruth E. Green, President  
Glee Johnson, Vice President

Alan Bersin  
Ruth Bloom  
Yvonne Chan  
Don Fisher  
Ricky Gill  
Kenneth Noonan  
Joe Nuñez  
Bonnie Reiss  
Johnathan Williams

*Secretary & Executive Officer* Hon. Jack O'Connell

*Executive Director*  
Catherine Barkett

#### SCHEDULE OF MEETING

Tuesday, May 31, 2005  
11:00 a.m. ±

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION  
Closed Session - IF NECESSARY  
(The public may not attend.)

#### LOCATION

California Department of Education  
1430 N Street, Room 1101  
Sacramento, California  
(916) 319-0827

The Closed Session (1) may commence earlier than 11:00 a.m.; (2) may begin at or before 11:00 a.m., be recessed, and then be reconvened later in the day; or (3) may commence later than 11:00 a.m.

#### **CLOSED SESSION AGENDA**

Under *Government Code* section 11126(e)(1), the State Board of Education hereby provides public notice that some or all of the pending litigation which follows will be considered and acted upon, as necessary and appropriate, in closed session:

- *Acevedo, et al. v. State of California, et al.*, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 03CS00827
- *Adkins, et al. v. State of California, et al.*, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 03CS00938
- *Aguayo, et al. v. State of California, et al.*, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 03CS00825
- *Amy v. California Dept. of Education, et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 99CV2644LSP
- *Boyd, et al. v. State of California, et al.*, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 01CS00136
- *Brian Ho, et al., v. San Francisco Unified School District, et al.*, United States District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. C-94-2418 WHO
- *Buckle, et al. v. State of California, et al.*, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 03CS00826
- *California Association of Private Special Education Schools, et al., v. California Department of Education, et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC272983
- *California Department of Education, et al., v. San Francisco Unified School District, et al.*, San Francisco Superior Court,

- Case No. 994049 and cross-complaint and cross-petition for writ of mandate and related actions
- *California State Board of Education v. Delaine Eastin, the Superintendent of Public Instruction for the State of California*, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 97CS02991 and related appeal
  - *Californians for Justice Education Fund, et al. v. State Board of Education*, San Francisco City/County Superior Court, Case No. CPF-03-50227
  - *Campbell Union High School District, et al. v. State Board of Education, et al.*, Sacramento Superior Court, Case No. 99CS00570
  - *Centinela Valley Union High School District v. State Board of Education, et al.*, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BS093054
  - *Centinela Valley Union High School District v. State Board of Education, et al.*, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BS093483
  - *Chapman, et al. v. California Department of Education, et al.*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 2002-049636
  - *Chapman, et al. v. California Department of Education, et al.*, United States District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. C-01-1780 BZ
  - *City Council of the City of Folsom v. State Board of Education*, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 96-CS00954
  - *Coalition for Locally Accountable School Systems v. State Board of Education*, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 96-CS00939
  - *Comité de Padres de Familia v. Honig*, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 281124; 192 Cal.App.3d 528 (1987)
  - *Crawford v. Honig*, United States District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. C-89-0014 DLJ
  - *CTA, et al. v. Wilson*, United States District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 98-9694 ER (CWx) and related appeal
  - *Daniel, et al. v. State of California, et al.*, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BC214156
  - *Donald Urista, et al. v. Torrance Unified School District, et al.*, United States District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 97-6300 ABC
  - *Dutton v. State of California, et al.*, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 03CS01723
  - *Educational Ideas, Inc. v. State of California, et al.*, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 00CS00798
  - *Emma C., et al. v. Delaine Eastin, et al.*, United States District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. C 96 4179
  - *EMS-BP, LLC, Options for Youth Burbank, Inc. et al. v. California Department of Education, et al.*, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 03CS01078 / 03CS01079
  - *Ephorm, et al. v. California Board of Education, et al.*, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. TC013485
  - *Grant Joint Union High School District v. California State Board of Education, et al.*, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 03 CS 01087
  - *Larry P. v. Riles*, 495 F.Supp 926 (N.D. Ca. 1979) aff'd in part, rev'd in part, 793 F.2d 969 (9th Cir. 1986)
  - *Maureen Burch, et al. v. California State Board of Education*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BS034463 and related appeal
  - *McNeil v. State Board of Education*, San Mateo County Superior Court, Case No. 395185
  - *Meinsen, et al. v. Grossmont Unified School District, et al.*, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. C 96 1804 S LSP (pending)
  - *Miller, et al. v. California Department of Education, et al.*, San Diego Superior Court, North District, Case No. GIN036930
  - *Ocean View School District, et al. v SBE, et al.*, Superior Court of San Francisco, Case No. CGC-02-406738
  - *Pazmiño, et al. v. California State Board of Education, et al.*, San Francisco City/County Superior Court, Case No. CPF-03-502554
  - *Porter, et al., v. Manhattan Beach Unified School District, et al.*, United States District Court, Central District, Case No. CV-00-08402
  - *Renaissance Academy Charter School, et al. v. Los Angeles Unified School District, et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BS090869
  - *Roxanne Serna, et al., v. Delaine Eastin, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC174282
  - *San Francisco NAACP v. San Francisco Unified School District, et al.*, United States District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. 78-1445 WHO
  - *San Mateo-Foster City School District, et al., v. State Board of Education*, San Mateo County Superior Court, Case No. 387127
  - *San Rafael Elementary School District v. State Board of Education, et al.*, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 98-CS01503 and related appeal
  - *Shevtsov v. California Department of Education*, United States District Court, Central District of California, Case No. CV 97-6483 IH (CT)
  - *Sonoma County Superintendents of Schools, et. al. v. Special Education Hearing Office, et.al.* Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 04AS0393
  - *Valeria G., et al. v. Wilson, et al.*, United States District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. C-98-2252-CAL;
  - *Angel V. v. Davis*, Ninth Circuit No. 01-15219

*Tinsley v. State of California* , San Mateo County Superior Court, Case No. 206010

- *Wilkins, et al. , v. California Board of Education, et al.*, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. TC014071
- *Williams, et al. v . State of California , et al.*, San Francisco Superior Court, Case No. 312236
- *Wilson , et al. v. State Board of Education, et al.*, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BC254081

Under *Government Code* section 11126(e)(2), the State Board of Education hereby provides public notice that it may meet in closed session to determine whether, based on existing facts and circumstances, any matter presents a significant exposure to litigation [see *Government Code* section 11126(e)(2)(B)(ii)] and, if so, to proceed with closed session consideration and action on that matter, as necessary and appropriate [see *Government Code* section 11126(e)(2)(B)(i)]; or, based on existing facts and circumstances, if it has decided to initiate or is deciding whether to initiate litigation [see *Government Code* section 11126(e)(2)(C)].

Under *Government Code* section 11126(c)(14), the State Board of Education hereby provides public notice that it may meet in closed session to review and discuss the actual content of pupil achievement tests (including, but not limited to, the High School Exit Exam) that have been submitted for State Board approval and/or approved by the State Board.

Under *Government Code* section 11126(a), the State Board of Education hereby provides public notice that it may meet in closed session regarding the appointment, employment, evaluation of performance, or dismissal of employees exempt from civil service under Article VII, Section 4(e) of the California Constitution.

Tuesday, May 21, 2005

11:00 a.m. ± (Upon Adjournment of Closed Session, if held)

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Public Session

California Department of Education

1430 N Street, Room 1101

Sacramento, California

(916) 319-0827

Please see the detailed agenda for more information about the items to be considered and acted upon. The public is welcome.

**Pursuant to *Government Code* section 11123(b) the meeting will be held by teleconference at the following teleconference locations that are accessible to the public:**

150 South Rodeo Drive  
Third Floor Conference Room  
Beverly Hills , CA 90210

2 Folsom Street, 15 th Floor  
North Conference Room  
San Francisco , CA 94105

Kerman Unified School District  
Office of the Superintendent  
151 South First Street  
Kerman, CA 93630

ALL TIMES ARE APPROXIMATE AND ARE PROVIDED FOR CONVENIENCE ONLY  
ALL ITEMS MAY BE RE-ORDERED TO BE HEARD  
ON ANY DAY OF THE NOTICED MEETING  
THE ORDER OF BUSINESS MAY BE CHANGED WITHOUT NOTICE

Persons wishing to address the State Board of Education on a subject to be considered at this meeting, including any matter that may be designated for public hearing, are asked to notify the State Board of Education Office (see telephone/fax numbers below) by noon of the third working day before the scheduled meeting/hearing, stating the subject they wish to address, the organization they represent (if any), and the nature of their testimony. Time is set aside for individuals so desiring to speak on any topic NOT otherwise on the agenda (please see the detailed agenda for the Public Session). In all cases, the presiding officer reserves the right to impose time limits on presentations as may be necessary to ensure that the agenda is completed.

REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION FOR ANY INDIVIDUAL WITH A DISABILITY

Pursuant to the *Rehabilitation Act of 1973* and the *Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990* , any individual with a disability who requires reasonable accommodation to attend or participate in a meeting or function of the California State Board of Education (SBE), may request assistance by contacting the SBE Office, 1430 N Street, Room 5111, Sacramento, CA, 95814; telephone, (916) 319-0827; fax, (916) 319-0175.

**CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

**FULL BOARD  
Public Session**

**Special Session Agenda**

**May 31, 2005**

**Tuesday, May 31, 2005 - 11:00 a.m.± (Upon adjournment of Closed Session if held)**

California Department of Education, 1430 N Street, Room 1101, Sacramento , California

---

- ITEM 1**    *No Child Left Behind ( NCLB ) Act of 2001: Additional Flexibility for NCLB*    INFORMATION  
(DOC; 63KB; Accountability Plan Regarding Students with Disabilities, Growth Models, and    ACTION  
4 pp.)    English Language Learners.
- [Last Minute Memorandum](#) (DOC; 35KB; 2pp.)
  - [Last Minute Memorandum Attachment 1](#) (DOC; 77KB; 5pp.)
  - [Last Minute Memorandum Attachment 2](#) (DOC; 136KB; 10pp.)
  - [Last Minute Memorandum Attachment 3](#) (DOC; 86KB; 7pp.)
- 

- ITEM 2**    PUBLIC COMMENT.    INFORMATION  
(DOC;    Public Comment is invited on any matter not included on the printed agenda.  
56KB;    Depending on the number of individuals wishing to address the State Board, the  
1 p.)    presiding officer may establish specific time limits on presentations.
- 

\*\*\*ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING\*\*\*

For more information concerning this agenda, please contact Catherine Barkett, Executive Director of the California State Board of Education, at 1430 N Street, Room 5111, Sacramento , CA, 95814 ; telephone (916) 319-0827; fax (916) 319-0175. To be added to the speaker's list, please fax or mail your written request to the above-referenced address/fax number. **This agenda is posted on the State Board of Education's Web site:** <http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/>

Questions: State Board of Education | 916-319-0827

Last Reviewed: Thursday, August 04, 2011

---

California Department of Education  
[Mobile site](#) | [Full site](#)



# CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

## MAY 31, 2005 SPECIAL SESSION AGENDA

<b>SUBJECT</b>  No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001: Additional flexibility for NCLB accountability plan regarding students with disabilities, growth models, and English Language Learners.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Action</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Information</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Public Hearing</b>
--	---

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that the State Board of Education (SBE) grant approval to allow the California Department of Education (CDE) to apply for additional flexibility as outlined in the May 10, 2005, guidance from United States Department of Education (ED).

### **SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION DISCUSSION AND ACTION**

On May 10, 2005, United States Secretary of Education, Margaret Spellings, issued a press release and flexibility guidelines regarding accountability under the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act and the assessment of students with disabilities. Those guidelines can be viewed at <http://www.ed.gov/news/pressreleases/2005/05/05102005.html>.

### **SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES**

#### **Proposed Amendments for 2004-05**

By June 1, 2005, ED has asked for a letter of intent from those states interested in taking advantage of the new flexibility opportunities outlined in the May 10, 2005, guidelines. In a follow-up conference call between numerous states and Raymond Simon, Acting Deputy Secretary, United States Department of Education, he made it clear that the June 1 submittal need be nothing more than a letter of intent from states; additional details would need to be provided by June 15, 2005. In order to access this new flexibility, CDE and SBE plan to submit an addendum to ED for California's NCLB workbook. The ED guidelines offered two options. California did not meet the criteria for Transition Option 2, therefore we propose to use the approach that ED has labeled as Transition Option 1 in the May 10, 2005, guidelines:

#### **Transition Option 1**

*Eligible States without modified achievement standards may choose this option, or may propose an alternate approach. Option 1 applies only to schools and districts that did not make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) based solely on the students with disabilities (SWD) subgroup scores. This option allows a State to*

## **SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES**

---

*make a mathematical adjustment to the proficiency rate in order to provide additional credit to schools or districts that missed the AYP target solely based on the achievement of students with disabilities. States must use the same option for all the relevant schools and districts.*

In general, eligible states may calculate a proxy to determine the percentage of special education students (as defined in the Individuals with Disabilities Act) that is equivalent to 2.0 percent of all students assessed. For this year only, this proxy will then be added to the percentage of students with disabilities who are proficient. This adjusted percent proficient is what a State may use to re-examine if the school made AYP for the 2004-05 school year. The following is a step-by-step explanation.

1. Calculate what 2.0 percent of the total number of students assessed within the State equates to solely within the SWD subgroup by dividing 2.0 by the percentage of students who have disabilities. This number, which will be a constant for every school, will be the basis for flexibility in school AYP determinations.
2. Identify all schools that did not make AYP solely on the basis of the SWD subgroup and the proficiency rate of those students in each school.
3. Calculate the adjusted percent proficient for each school's SWD subgroup. This adjustment is equal to the sum of the actual percent of proficient scores of this subgroup plus the proxy percent calculated in Step 1.
4. Compare this adjusted percent proficient for each school identified in Step 2 to the State's annual measurable objective (AMO). This comparison must be conducted without the use of confidence intervals or other statistical treatments.
  - a. If the adjusted proficiency rate for the school's SWD subgroup meets or exceeds the State's AMO, the school may be considered to have made AYP for the 2004-05 school year.
  - b. If the adjusted proficiency rate for the school's SWD subgroup does not meet or exceed the State's AMO, the school did not make AYP for the 2004-05 school year.
5. This process should be followed for reading and mathematics separately and also repeated at the district level, as needed.
6. The actual percent proficient must be reported to parents and the public; the State may also report the adjusted percent proficient.

This approach would be used in calculating the proficiency rates of students with disabilities to determine AYP for 2005. Based on past experience, we anticipate that adoption of this approach will reduce the number of districts and schools that will be newly identified for Program Improvement (PI) in 2005.

## **SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES**

---

In regard to districts and schools already in PI, we cannot apply this approach retroactively to 2004 test results. Therefore, it would not enable us to immediately reverse the PI status of any of these districts and schools. However, we are confident that adoption of this interim approach will enable a number of these districts and schools to make AYP for 2005. This would give them one year of credit that they would not otherwise have towards exiting PI.

In order to use the above proxy calculation, additional information and assurances concerning California's sound educational policies, consistent with the criteria outlined in ED's May 10, 2005, guidelines, will be proposed including our commitment to develop modified achievement standards and high quality alternate assessments to measure them will be submitted by June 15, 2005.

### **Proposed Amendments for 2005-06**

ED's May 10 policies also provide an opportunity for States to request other forms of flexibility in implementing NCLB that would promote the State's efforts to raise student achievement and make accountability more meaningful. California will prospectively seek greater flexibility in two areas:

1. The use of growth models of accountability that hold schools and districts accountable for the annual growth in achievement of individual students and subgroups. We are committed to the goal of having one, unified system of accountability that will bring together our Academic Performance Index (API) – which reflects a growth model -- and AYP under NCLB. Doing so will provide more coherent information to parents and the public on the performance of California schools and school districts and provide a more valid, reliable, and meaningful basis for holding schools and school districts accountable for their success in improving the achievement of all of our students, consistent with both NCLB goals and the expectations of schools and the public in California. Some possible API revisions to meet likely ED concerns were presented to the Board in Item 7 at the May 2005 meeting.
2. Accountability for the performance on reading/language arts and mathematics assessments of English Learners who have been enrolled in United States schools for less than three years. We would like to address alternative means of assessment that may be more valid, reliable, and meaningful for ensuring that the academic needs of these students are effectively addressed by our schools.

We are not at this time requesting flexibility in these two areas for purposes of our 2004-05 assessments. However, we want ED to be aware that we expect to be seeking greater flexibility in these areas in the coming school year.

A draft letter of intent to Raymond Simon requesting this additional flexibility will be discussed at the Special Session of the State Board of Education on May 31, 2005. This draft letter will be posted as a Last-Minute Memorandum prior to the meeting. A more detailed discussion about California's flexibility options and proposals will be discussed

**SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES**

---

in greater detail at the July meeting of the State Board of Education.

**FISCAL ANALYSIS (AS APPROPRIATE)**

---

Changes in the manner in which NCLB is implemented would result in numerous fiscal implications at both the state and local levels. As possible options are explored fully, the fiscal implications will be described in more detail.

**ATTACHMENT (S)**

---

None.

State of California

Department of Education

## LAST MINUTE MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** May 27, 2005

**TO:** MEMBERS, STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

**FROM:** Geno Flores, Deputy Superintendent  
Assessment and Accountability Branch

**RE:** Item No. 1

**SUBJECT:** No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001: Additional flexibility for NCLB accountability plan regarding students with disabilities, growth models, and English Language Learners

On May 10, 2005, United States Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings issued a press release and flexibility guidelines for accountability under the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act and the assessment of students with disabilities, which can be viewed on the CDE Web site at <http://www.ed.gov/news/pressreleases/2005/05/05102005.html>. State Board of Education members received information at the May 12, 2005, meeting about this flexibility, which includes allowing states to develop assessments for up to 2% of students who are unable to demonstrate proficiency on the state's academic content standards and who research indicates would not respond well to interventions for helping them to improve their achievement.

Currently, these students take the *California Standards Tests (CSTs)* and the *California Achievement Tests, Sixth Edition Survey (CAT/6 Survey)* with accommodations and/or modifications. The flexibility being allowed by the United States Department of Education (ED) is to develop alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards for students with disabilities who need to take a modified assessment. The 2% is in addition to up to 1% of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who currently participate in the *Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR)* program by taking the *California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA)*.

ED is providing interim flexibility for determining Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for 2004-05 for states that submit information and a timeline for activities to improve their assessments for the full range of students with disabilities, including alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards and those based on alternate achievement standards. By June 1, 2005, the ED has asked for a letter of intent from those states interested in taking advantage of these new flexibility opportunities. (Detailed background information regarding considerations for the content of this letter was included in the agenda item posted on May 20, 2005.) Additionally, states must submit additional information and planning details to ED by June 15, 2005.

Attached for your review and consideration is a draft of the June 1, 2005, letter of intent to Raymond Simon, United States Acting Deputy Secretary of Education, along with a

set of enclosures that provide the required information regarding the State's assessment system and student data. Also attached is information regarding the content that must be included in the June 15, 2005, letter to ED.

### **Attachments**

Attachment 1: June 1, 2005, DRAFT letter to Raymond Simon

Attachment 2: Enclosures 1 and 2 for June 1, 2005, letter to Raymond Simon

Attachment 3: Proposed Contents of June 15, 2005, letter to Raymond Simon



**CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**  
**JACK O'CONNELL**, State Superintendent of Public Instruction  
(916) 319-0800

1430 N Street Sacramento, CA 95814-5901

**CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**  
**RUTH E. GREEN**, President  
(916) 319-0827

DRAFT June 1, 2005

Raymond Simon, Acting Deputy Secretary  
United States Department of Education  
400 Maryland Avenue, SW  
Washington, DC 20202

Dear Mr. Simon:

The policy documents issued on May 10 provided an opportunity for States to request flexibility in implementing the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 that would promote the State's efforts to raise student achievement and make accountability more meaningful. This letter declares our intent to request immediate flexibility for students with disabilities as well as general flexibility for all students to be addressed in the future.

### **Flexibility for Students with Disabilities**

Pursuant to the policies issued by Secretary Margaret Spellings on May 10, 2005, regarding accountability under NCLB and the assessment of students with disabilities, the California Department of Education (CDE) and State Board of Education (SBE) are submitting the enclosed addendum to our Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) workbook. We hereby request your agreement to our proposed use of the proxy approach that you have labeled as Transition Option #1. That approach would be used in calculating the proficiency rates of students with disabilities to determine AYP for the 2004-05 school year for schools and districts that otherwise would not have made AYP based solely on the subgroup scores for students with disabilities.

We are requesting flexibility in calculating AYP determinations for the 2005-06 school year based on assessments administered to students with disabilities in 2004-05. This

flexibility will impact our current accountability plan with regard to calculating AYP for the students with disabilities subgroup. (Please refer to California's NCLB Accountability Workbook located on the CDE Web site at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/nclb/sr/sa/wb.asp>, Critical Element 5.3.) We believe this flexibility will result in more meaningful accountability and increased student achievement. We request that the United States Department of Education (ED) respond to this request for flexibility by August 1, 2005, so that we can make timely AYP determinations for the 2004-05 school year.

## **I. Core Principles**

We believe that California is meeting all of the core principles related to Title I and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act required to receive the interim flexibility. The information previously submitted to your office, as briefly supplemented below and in the enclosed worksheet addendum, clearly establishes that California meets the core principles criteria outlined in the May 10, 2005, policy documents.

### **1. Participation rate for students with disabilities**

In summary, with specific regard to assessment participation rates for students with disabilities, ninety-seven percent of students with disabilities participated in California's 2003-04 assessments, our most recent, completed test administration. (See Enclosure 1.) Ninety percent of students with disabilities participated in the regular assessment, with or without accommodations, and seven percent participated in the California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA). (See Enclosure 1.) Prior data provided in our Consolidated State Performance Report on these participation rates were in error. They were inadvertently based in part on administration of our Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program in grades that are not included for NCLB accountability purposes. The corrected data reflect participation in assessments in grades that are used for those purposes.

### **2. Availability of alternate assessments**

Currently, California provides an alternate assessment for students with severe cognitive disabilities in the areas of reading/language arts, mathematics, and science. Students with disabilities within the grades tested (second through eighth and tenth) currently participate in California's statewide assessment program by taking either the general assessment with or without accommodations/modifications or the alternate assessment. The vast majority of students with disabilities participate in the general assessment, but those with the most significant cognitive disabilities are eligible to participate in the CAPA. Approximately 7 percent of the state's special education population accesses the assessment system with this exam.

### 3. Reporting of results from alternate assessments

California reports the results of its alternate assessment to Secretary Spellings via California's Consolidated State Performance Report. This information is also made available to the public on the CDE Web site at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/nclb/sr/rt/index.asp>. In addition, we publish school and district reports, letters to parents that include their child's test results, and press releases that summarize statewide results.

### 4. Availability of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities

Students with Individualized Education Program and Section 504 plans may use a wide array of accommodations to allow access to the state assessments. A matrix of these variations, accommodations, and modifications is enclosed. (See Enclosure 2.)

### 5. Minimum group sizes for making AYP decisions

California also ensures that students with disabilities are included in the state's accountability system. In particular, the minimum subgroup size for students with disabilities is consistent with that of other subgroups. For additional information, please refer to California's NCLB Accountability Workbook located on the CDE Web site at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/nclb/sr/sa/wb.asp> in addition to the Consolidated State Performance Report at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/nclb/sr/rt/index.asp>. Enclosure 1 also includes subgroup information for students with disabilities.

## II. Student Achievement

As required by the May 10 announcement for Section II, Student Achievement, points six through nine, California is making significant increases in student achievement for students with disabilities. The chart below demonstrates how California is increasing both the participation and proficiency of students with disabilities on the state's reading/language arts and mathematics assessments.

	2003	2004
Participation rate <b>ELA</b> :	95.0%	97.0%
Percent proficient <b>ELA</b> :	14.0%	14.7%
Participation rate <b>math</b> :	94.2%	97.0%
Percent proficient <b>math</b> :	16.1%	17.2%

For more data demonstrating increased student achievement for students with disabilities, please see California's Consolidated State Performance Report located on the CDE Web site at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/nclb/sr/rt/index.asp>.

### **III. Sound State Education Policies**

We are prepared to submit to the ED by June 15, 2005, additional information and assurances concerning our sound State educational policies, consistent with the criteria outlined in the May 10 policy documents, including our commitment to develop high quality alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards.

#### **General Flexibility**

The May 10 policy documents also provided an opportunity for States to request other forms of flexibility in implementing NCLB that would promote the State's efforts to raise student achievement and make accountability more meaningful. We greatly appreciate that offer and expect prospectively to seek greater flexibility in two areas:

1. *The use of growth models of accountability that hold schools and districts accountable for the annual growth in achievement of individual students and subgroups.* We are committed to the goal of having one unified system of accountability that will bring together our Academic Performance Index (API) – which reflects a growth model – and AYP under NCLB. Doing so will provide more coherent information to parents and the public on the performance of California schools and school districts and provide a more valid, reliable, and meaningful basis for holding schools and school districts accountable for their success in improving the achievement of all of our students, consistent with both NCLB goals and the expectations of schools and the public in California; **and**
2. *Accountability for the performance on Reading/language arts and Mathematics assessments of English Language Learners who have been enrolled in United States schools for less than three years.* We are interested in having discussions with the ED if such flexibility is offered in the future.

Given the needs of both the ED and our own agency to ensure that timely AYP determinations are made in advance of the coming school year, we are not at this time requesting flexibility in these two areas for purposes of our 2004-05 assessments. However, we want you to know that we expect to be seeking greater flexibility in these

areas in the coming school year. We understand that the ED is planning to address these issues in considering further national policies on flexibility. We request an opportunity to be included in that national policy review and also to have an early conversation about California's particular needs for expanded flexibility in these areas. In addition, in the event that your office takes any action to grant expanded flexibility on these issues with regard to AYP determinations for this school year, it is important that California have the opportunity to benefit from any such action. As appropriate, we will be prepared to promptly submit any additional information needed to affect that result.

We appreciate Secretary Spellings' and your responsiveness to the need for greater flexibility for the States in implementing NCLB. These efforts, and our specific current and prospective requests, will assist our efforts in raising the achievement bar for all California students and in better targeting those schools and districts that require interventions. We look forward to working together with you in ensuring that the core principles and student achievement goals of NCLB are effectively realized in California. Please let us know if you have any questions or concerns about this request so that we can constructively resolve them.

Finally, we respectfully request that the United States Department of Education determine California's eligibility as soon as possible so that we can respond by the June 15 deadline to submit the required additional information and assurances.

Sincerely,

JACK O'CONNELL  
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

RUTH E. GREEN, President  
State Board of Education

JO/RG:dl  
Enclosures

## II. CORRECTED PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

### A. Participation of All Students in 2003-04 State Assessments

In the following tables, please provide the total number and percentage for each of the listed subgroups of students who participated in the State's 2003-04 school year academic assessments.

The data provided below for students with disabilities should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA) and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

#### Student Participation in 2003-04 School Year Test Administration

<b>2003-2004 School Year Mathematics Assessment</b>	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Tested</b>
All Students	<b>3,899,484</b>	<b>99</b>
American Indian or Alaska Native	<b>32,590</b>	<b>98</b>
Asian	<b>317,032</b>	<b>99</b>
Black or African American	<b>317,780</b>	<b>98</b>
Hispanic or Latino	<b>1,827,213</b>	<b>99</b>
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	<b>123,955</b>	<b>99</b>
White	<b>1,249,174</b>	<b>99</b>
Students with Disabilities	<b>402,080</b>	<b>97</b>
Limited English Proficient	<b>1,324,309</b>	<b>99</b>
Economically Disadvantaged	<b>2,114,376</b>	<b>99</b>
Migrant	<b>118,869</b>	<b>99</b>
Male	<b>1,996,392</b>	<b>99</b>
Female	<b>1,902,123</b>	<b>99</b>

<b>2003-2004 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment</b>	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Tested</b>
All Students	<b>3,902,303</b>	<b>99</b>
American Indian or Alaska Native	<b>32,736</b>	<b>99</b>
Asian	<b>317,508</b>	<b>99</b>
Black or African American	<b>319,253</b>	<b>99</b>
Hispanic or Latino	<b>1,831,157</b>	<b>99</b>
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	<b>124,206</b>	<b>99</b>
White	<b>1,252,347</b>	<b>99</b>
Students with Disabilities	<b>403,079</b>	<b>97</b>
Limited English Proficient	<b>1,329,402</b>	<b>99</b>
Economically Disadvantaged	<b>2,125,259</b>	<b>99</b>
Migrant	<b>118,964</b>	<b>99</b>
Male	<b>1,998,252</b>	<b>99</b>
Female	<b>1,903,255</b>	<b>99</b>

**B. Corrected Participation of Students with Disabilities in State Assessment System**

Students with disabilities (as defined under IDEA) participate in the State’s assessment system either by taking the regular State assessment, with or without accommodations, by taking an alternate assessment aligned to grade-level standards, or by taking an alternate assessment aligned to alternate achievement standards. In the following table, please provide the total number and percentage of students with disabilities who participated in these various assessments.

The data provided below should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

**Participation of Students with Disabilities in the 2003-04 School Year Test Administration**

<b>2003-2004 School Year Mathematics Assessment</b>	<b>Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested</b>
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	<b>371,574</b>	<b>90</b>
California Alternate Performance Assessment (administered to students with significant cognitive disabilities)	<b>30,506</b>	<b>7</b>
Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	<b>402,080</b>	<b>97</b>

<b>2003-2004 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment</b>	<b>Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested</b>
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	<b>372,607</b>	<b>90</b>
California Alternate Performance Assessment (administered to students with significant cognitive disabilities)	<b>30,472</b>	<b>7</b>
Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	<b>486,388</b>	<b>97</b>

Test Variation (1) Accommodation (2) Modification (3)	STAR			CAHSEE	CELDT	Physical Fitness
	CAT/6	CST	SABE/2			
Test administration directions that are simplified or clarified (does not apply to test questions)	ALL	ALL	ALL	ALL	ALL	ALL
Test individual student separately, provided that a test examiner directly supervises the student	1	1	1	1	1	1
Visual magnifying equipment	1	1	1	1	1	Not applicable
Audio amplification equipment	1	1	1	1	1	1

**Note:** Refer to the *California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Education* for each specific assessment program for more detail.

ALL = These test variations may be provided to all students.

Test Variation (1) = Eligible students may have testing variations if regularly used in the classroom.

Accommodation (2) = Eligible students shall be permitted to take the examination/test with **accommodations** if specified in the eligible student's IEP or Section 504 Plan for use on the examination, standardized testing, or for use during classroom instruction and assessment.

Modification (3) = For the **STAR** Program and **CELDT**, eligible students shall be permitted to take the tests with **modifications** if specified in the eligible student's IEP or Section 504 Plan.

Eligible students shall be permitted to take the **CAHSEE** with **modifications** if specified in the eligible student's IEP or Section 504 Plan for use on the examination, standardized testing, or for use during classroom instruction and assessment.

<i>STAR</i>						
<b>Test Variation (1) Accommodation (2) Modification (3)</b>	<b>CAT/6</b>	<b>CST</b>	<b>SABE/2</b>	<b>CAHSEE</b>	<b>CELDT</b>	<b>Physical Fitness</b>
Noise buffers (e.g. individual carrel or study enclosure)	1	1	1	1	1	Not applicable
Special lighting or acoustics; special or adaptive furniture	1	1	1	1	1	Not applicable
Colored overlay, mask, or other means to maintain visual attention	1	1	1	1	1	Not applicable
Manually Coded English or American Sign Language to present directions for administration (does not apply to test questions)	1	1	1	1	1	1
Student marks in test booklet (other than responses)	2 Grades 4-11 For grades 2, 3 – marks must be erased to avoid scanning interference	All Grades 4-11  1 for grades 2, 3 – marks must be erased to avoid scanning interference	2 Grades 4-11 For grades 2, 3 – marks must be erased to avoid scanning interference	All	All Grades 3-12 K-Grade 2: Red ball point pen only, test booklets may not be used again	Not applicable

	STAR					
<b>Test Variation (1) Accommodation (2) Modification (3)</b>	<b>CAT/6</b>	<b>CST</b>	<b>SABE/2</b>	<b>CAHSEE</b>	<b>CELDT</b>	<b>Physical Fitness</b>
Student marks responses in test booklet and responses are transferred to a scorable answer document by an employee of the school, district, or nonpublic school	2	2	2	2	2	Not applicable
Responses dictated [orally, or in Manually coded English or American Sign Language] to a scribe for selected-response items (multiple-choice questions)	2	2	2	2	2	Not applicable
Word processing software with spell and grammar check tools turned off for the essay responses (writing portion of the test)	Not applicable	2	Not applicable	2	2	Not applicable
Essay responses dictated orally or in Manually Coded English to a scribe, audio recorder, or speech-to-text converter and the student provides all spelling and language conventions.	Not applicable	2	Not applicable	2	2	Not applicable
Assistive device that does not interfere with the independent work of the student on the multiple-choice and/or essay responses (writing portion of the test)	2	2	2	2	2	Not applicable

<b>Test Variation (1) Accommodation (2) Modification (3)</b>	<i>STAR</i>					<b>Physical Fitness</b>
	<b>CAT/6</b>	<b>CST</b>	<b>SABE/2</b>	<b>CAHSEE</b>	<b>CELDT</b>	
Braille transcriptions provided by the test contractor	2	2	Not applicable	2	2	Not applicable
Large print versions Test items enlarged if font larger than required on large print versions	2	2	2	2	2	Not applicable
Extra time on a test within a testing day	2	ALL	2	ALL	ALL	ALL
Test over more than one day for a test or test part to be administered in a single sitting	2	2	2	2	2	Not applicable
Supervised breaks within a section of the test	2	2	2	2	2	Not applicable
Administration of the test at the most beneficial time of day to the student	2	2	2	2	2	2
Test administered at home or in hospital by a test examiner	2	2	2	2	2	2
Dictionary	3	3	3	3	3	Not applicable

<i>STAR</i>						
<b>Test Variation (1) Accommodation (2) Modification (3)</b>	<b>CAT/6</b>	<b>CST</b>	<b>SABE/2</b>	<b>CAHSEE</b>	<b>CELDT</b>	<b>Physical Fitness</b>
Manually Coded English or American Sign Language to present test questions	2 Math, Science	2 Math, Science, History-social Science	2 Math	2 Math	2 Writing	Not applicable
	3 Reading, Language, Spelling	3 ELA	3 Reading, Language, Spelling	3 ELA	3 Reading, Listening, Speaking	
Test questions read aloud to student or audio presentation (CD)	2 Math, Science	2 Math, Science, History-social Science	2 Math	2 Math	2 Writing	Not applicable
	3 Reading, Language, Spelling	3 ELA	3 Reading, Language, Spelling	3 ELA	3 Reading	Not applicable
Calculators on the mathematics or science tests	3	3	3	3	Not applicable	Not applicable
Arithmetic table on the mathematics or science tests	3	3	3	3	Not applicable	Not applicable
Math manipulatives on the mathematics or science tests	3	3	3	3	Not applicable	Not applicable



## Proposed Contents of June 15, 2005, Letter to Raymond Simon

### III. Sound State Education Policies

Once it is determined that California is eligible to take advantage of the interim AYP flexibility with respect to students with disabilities, we must provide ED with information about and a time line for activities to improve our assessments for the full range of students with disabilities, in particular, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards and based on alternate achievement standards. Specifically, California must provide how the State intends to implement steps 10-17 below and provide estimated time lines for when these requirements will be completed. After each step, each proposed response is indicated in bold.

- 10. Document the technical quality of the alternate assessments for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, if not previously completed.**

The 2004 CAPA Technical Report addresses the technical characteristics of the CAPA. This document will be included with the letter to ED.

- 11. Develop criteria and guidance for IEP teams regarding identification of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities and for setting appropriate proficiency expectations for those students.**

The state has provided Individualized Education Program (IEP) teams with nine items to address when determining if students are eligible to take the CAPA. This document is available on the CDE Web site at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/sr/documents/partcrtra.asp> and will be included with this letter. IEP teams also are directed to consider each student's previous year's CAPA results when determining if the student will continue to be assessed with the CAPA.

- 12. Demonstrate that policies are in place to ensure inclusion of all students in the assessment system, as required by IDEA and NCLB.**

California *Education Code* sections 60640 (b) and 60851 (b) require that each school district, charter school, and county office of education assesses each of its pupils in grades 2 to 8, inclusive, and grade 10. The standards-based achievement test (California Standards Tests or CSTs) are used in grades second through eighth, and the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE) is used in grade ten for this purpose. Individuals with exceptional needs are included in the testing with appropriate accommodations in administration where necessary, and those individuals with exceptional needs who are unable to participate in the testing, even with accommodations, are given the California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA). The test coordinator directions for both the CSTs and CAHSEE reinforce these

requirements. IEPs may include only how students will participate in the state's assessments, not if they will participate. IEPs may specify that a student will take the general assessments with no accommodations or with accommodations or modifications or that a student will be assessed with the CAPA.

**13. Provide training to IEP teams on State assessment guidelines and policies, as required under IDEA and NCLB regulations.**

Training on Writing Individualized Education Programs (IEP) Based on State Standards (<http://www.calstat.org/iep/>) is a self-paced Web training module to assist the learner in understanding the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and the components of a performance objective. It provides information on how to write IEP goals tied to standards that are student focused and measurable. The training is designed to guide professionals through the challenge of writing IEP goals and objectives that are based on California's academic content standards including the State assessment guidelines. It provides a pre-test, post-test, and a certificate of completion. The module lists the special education teacher preparation program standards and Education Specialist Credential Program Standards that the module addresses. Over 5,800 individuals accessed this free online training over a nine-month period. The module will be updated soon to the new requirements of the IDEA, as amended in 2004, and the State assessment guidelines and policies as authorized under NCLB and adopted by the State Board of Education. Frequently asked questions will be developed and posted on the CDE Web site during the next year addressing issues on IEP teams and state assessment guidelines and policies, as well as related issues.

The California Department of Education (CDE) won a second State Improvement Grant (SIG) from the federal government in the amount of \$2.079 million dollars a year for three years for professional development activities. The work of the new SIG supports improving special education services in California in numerous areas: the quality and the number of teachers and other personnel who work with students with disabilities; the coordination of services for students with disabilities; the behavioral supports available for students with disabilities; academic outcomes, especially in the area of literacy; the participation of parents and family members; and the collection and dissemination of data. The grant has a significant site-based component that will make use of an entire network of educators who have been trained through the first SIG to assist schools in implementing research-proven behavioral approaches.

CDE has developed an alternate assessment for children with disabilities who cannot take part in general statewide assessment programs with accommodations or medications. This test is the CAPA. CDE provides training to IEP teams on state assessment guidelines and policies for the CAPA, as required under IDEA and NCLB regulations, in part, through Statewide training efforts (DVD distribution, training by DVD, training of trainers, Statewide Web based training). The CDE Web site provides information on the following:

- The set of California Standards appropriate for students with significant cognitive disabilities
- Curriculum for students with significant cognitive disabilities
- Core adaptations allowable to ensure a student's optimal performance
- Participation criteria that provide assistance to IEP teams in determining how a student should participate in state assessments.

**14. Train teachers on instructional interventions, including special education teachers and general education teachers with subject matter expertise, on how to work together, provide access to the general curriculum, and use data to improve student achievement.**

CDE worked with the Sacramento County Office of Education to provide nine live web-based trainings using the high bandwidth California Research & Education Network, (CalREN) that were distributed to 11 county offices representing the 11 California County Superintendents Educational Services Association (CCSESA) service regions. These trainings address English-language arts, mathematics and science curriculum. Additional topics include "Curriculum Access for Students with Disabilities," designed to provide educators with a comprehensive view of standards, assessments and standards-based IEPs. Educators are given strategies and examples needed to understand standards-based education. They are also provided the "Formative Assessment for CAPA," a formative assessment tool developed to measure student progress on the acquisition of skills that will be measured by the CAPA.

**15. Conduct outreach to parents of students with disabilities to explain State testing policies. This outreach may take several forms, such as website documents; brochures for parent centers, schools, and districts; or training for parent liaisons.**

In order to inform parents about the need for an alternate assessment for their children who are unable to participate in STAR Program by taking the CSTs, CDE developed a parent-training video to address the question, "Why provide an alternate assessment and who should participate in CAPA?" This parent training was also provided in the form of an interactive digital versatile disc (DVD). Teams of parent trainers also offered training/information sessions on a regional basis. These sessions were designed to train local representatives from the Parent Training & Information Centers and Family Empowerment Center to provide information to parents at the local level. This information is available for streaming from the CDE Web site at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/sr/capa.asp>

**16. Incorporate appropriately the scores of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities into the State reporting and accountability system.**

Students with disabilities within the grades tested (second through eighth and tenth) currently participate in California's statewide assessment program by taking either the

general assessment with or without accommodations/ modifications or the alternate assessment. The vast majority of students with disabilities participate in the general assessment, but those with the most significant cognitive disabilities are eligible to participate in the CAPA.

California treats the five CAPA performance levels as equal to the five performance levels used for the CSTs and CAHSEE for summarizing LEA and school performance. In other words, a score (performance level) on the alternate assessment holds the same value as a score (performance level) for the general assessments.

Consistent with federal regulations, the State gives any LEA that exceeds the one percent cap on the application of alternate standards and assessments the opportunity to request an exception. The exception is based on criteria similar to those that the U.S. Department of Education uses to evaluate state requests for exception. If the State does not grant the request, it adjusts the results of the LEA by treating the appropriate number of scores as "not proficient" for accountability purposes only. This does not affect the individual student report received by parents.

**17. Submit all alternate assessments for the Department's peer review process for standards and assessments.**

The CAPA will be included in the documents being submitted for ED's peer review process. California's review is being scheduled for February 2006.

**Additional Information Required**

In addition to the above steps, California must provide an assurance that the we will complete the steps bulleted below:

- Develop and formally approve or adopt modified academic achievement descriptors.
- Build a framework, including purpose and scope of alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, that addresses key questions and issues (e.g., portfolio or multiple choice) and is informed by stakeholder and technical advisory committee input.
- Contract for the development of valid alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards for students with disabilities who need to take a modified assessment (as well as students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, if applicable).
- Establish (with diverse stakeholder involvement) and formally approve or adopt modified achievement standards with "cut scores" that differentiate among achievement levels and are aligned with State content standards.
- Document the technical quality of the alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards.

- Demonstrate that policies are in place to ensure inclusion of all students in the assessment system, as required by IDEA and NCLB.

To begin the complex and comprehensive process to improve our assessments for the full range of students with disabilities and address the assurances as stated above, the California Department of Education asked Educational Testing Service (ETS), the current contractor for the state's STAR Program, to assist us in preparing a plan for developing a new alternate assessment for students with moderate cognitive disabilities who have been assessed with the CSTs using modifications. Since these modifications change the constructs being assessed, results for these students have been included in AYP calculations as **not proficient**. An assessment developed for these students will provide information that schools can use in better identifying the students' academic strengths and needs and modifying instructional programs to meet those needs.

### **CAPA**

CAPA is a measurement of the performance of students with severe cognitive disabilities and has performance levels like those produced by the STAR CSTs. CAPA began as a response to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requirements and now needs tight, board-approved blueprints and linkage to California Academic Content Standards by grade level. As a result of this plan, CAPA will be revised as needed to meet NCLB requirements. Blueprints will be revised as necessary. No new item development, assessment reviews, or standard setting will occur for the 2006 administration. Instead, planning activities will focus on linking the standards and revising the blueprints and revising the test and item specifications, which will proceed through several reviews and revisions.

### **Alternate Test Based on Modified Achievement Standards**

ETS will work with CDE to recruit both special education experts and content-specific specialists to share their expertise and give advice on blueprint details for this new assessment. Further, focus groups will assess the viewpoints of parents of the children who are moderately cognitively disabled and their teachers and administrators as well as special education specialists. All this knowledge will help ensure that the final blueprints and standards are appropriate for the students, the NCLB requirements, and California's desire for high standards and appropriate measures of performance. The new assessment will address the standards currently in the STAR CSTs, but with a breadth, depth, and complexity appropriate to the target population.

Depending on availability of funding, the CDE may authorize the contractor to develop items for field-testing both for CAPA and the Alternate for the 2007 administration. Field-test development would require item-writing training and several reviews. Further, the items could be formatted and placed into the CDE item bank, ready for developing stand-alone field tests in 2006 or as part of the 2007 administration. The time line presented below is tentative and represents only the work of our current STAR contractor.

Planned Task

Tasks	Timeline
<b>Create blueprints for Alternate Test</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Link to grade-level standards and draft blueprint (overlaps with CAPA)</li> </ul>	May – August 2005
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Overall standards/strands in three content areas: ELA, Science, Math</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Link of CAPA to grade-level standards</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Link of Alternate test to grade-level standards</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discuss linked version with CDE, SBE liaisons</li> </ul>	July 2005
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two-day meeting on linking to grade-level standards (overlaps with CAPA);</li> <li>• Discuss purpose and scope of alternate “2%” test</li> </ul>	August 8 – 9, 2005
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Recruit Assessment Review Panel members</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	May 16 – May 27, 2005
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Summarize meeting and revise blueprints</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	August 10 – 16
<b>CAPA</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revise test specifications for CAPA</li> </ul>	August – September 2005
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revise item specifications for CAPA</li> </ul>	August – September 2005
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discuss blueprints, specs with CDE, SBE liaisons</li> </ul>	September
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two-day CAPA Assessment Review Panel (ARP) to review revised specs, sample items</li> </ul>	October 4 – 5, 2005
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finalize blueprints, specs with CDE, SBE liaisons</li> </ul>	October 2005
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Present revised CAPA blueprints to SBE</li> </ul>	November 9, 2005
<b>Alternate Test</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft test specifications</li> </ul>	August – September 2005
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft item specifications</li> </ul>	August – September 2005
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discuss blueprints, specs with CDE, SBE liaisons</li> </ul>	September 2005
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two-day Alternate ARP to review blueprints, specs</li> </ul>	October 2005

Tasks	Timeline
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revise blueprints, specs, create sample items</li> </ul>	October – November 2005
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Three two-hour parent and community leaders dinner focus groups in northern, central, and southern California</li> </ul>	November 2005
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Three two-hour teacher, administrator dinner focus groups in northern, central, and southern California</li> </ul>	November 2005
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Share focus group findings with CDE</li> </ul>	November 2005
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CDE provides feedback findings</li> </ul>	December 2005
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revise blueprints, specs</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two-day Alternate ARP meeting to review revised blueprints, specs, and sample items based on stakeholders' feedback.</li> </ul>	January 2006
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revise blueprints, specs</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discuss blueprints, specs with CDE, SBE liaisons</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Present blueprints to SBE</li> </ul>	March 2006
Three-day CAPA Item writer workshop	April 2006
Two-day Alternate Item writer workshop	April 2006
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CAPA ARP to review CAPA items</li> </ul>	May 2006
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alternate item writing</li> </ul>	April – June 2006
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Edit and format Alternate items</li> </ul>	April – June 2006
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Statewide Pupil Assessment Review (SPAR) Panel of CAPA items</li> </ul>	June 2006
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two-day Alternate ARP to review Alternate items</li> </ul>	July 2006
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prepare items for field testing</li> </ul>	August 2006
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enter items in item bank</li> </ul>	August 2006

CDE is currently preparing a Request for Submissions (RFS) for a new contract for the state's STAR Program. Provisions for continuing work on both the CAPA and the new alternate assessment will be included in the RFS that is scheduled for release during July 2005. This new contract is scheduled to begin in January 2006. Therefore, additional time lines and activities will be determined at the time of new contract is granted



# CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

**MAY 31, 2005  
SPECIAL SESSION AGENDA**

<b>SUBJECT</b> PUBLIC COMMENT. Public Comment is invited on any matter <u>not</u> included on the printed agenda. Depending on the number of individuals wishing to address the State Board, the presiding officer may establish specific time limits on presentations.	<input type="checkbox"/> Action <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information <input type="checkbox"/> Public Hearing
---	---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Listen to public comment on matters not included on the agenda.

## **SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION DISCUSSION AND ACTION**

N/A

## **SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES**

N/A

## **FISCAL ANALYSIS (AS APPROPRIATE)**

N/A

## **ATTACHMENT(S)**

None