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DATE: July 9, 2012

TO: MEMBERS, State Board of Education

FROM: TOM TORLAKSON, State Superintendent of Public Instruction

SUBJECT: Item 04 – Update on the Activities of the California Department of Education Regarding the Development of the Superintendent’s Recommendations on the Future Assessment System in California, Including, but Not Limited to, the Specific Categories of Measurement and Content and Design.

Summary of Key Issues

California Education Code (EC) Section 60604.5 requires the State Superintendent of Public Instruction (SSPI) to develop recommendations, including a plan to transition to a new system, for the reauthorization of the statewide pupil assessment system. EC Section 60604.5 also requires that the SSPI consult with the State Board of Education (SBE) as well as specific stakeholders in developing the SSPI recommendations and requires that the recommendations consider 16 specific areas outlined in statute. To that end, the California Department of Education (CDE) has included the summary of discussions from the May and June 2012 Work Group meetings and the regional public meetings. See Attachment 4 for the summary of discussions.

Attachment(s)

Attachment 4: Summary of discussions from the May and June 2012 Work Group meetings and the regional public meetings (3 pages)
Summary of discussions from the May and June 2012 Work Group meetings and the regional public meetings

Purpose
California Education Code Section 60604.5 requires the State Superintendent of Public Instruction (SSPI) to consult with specific stakeholder groups in developing recommendations for the reauthorization of the statewide pupil assessment system. The recommendations are due to the fiscal and appropriate policy committees of the Legislature by November 1, 2012. To facilitate this process, a Statewide Assessment Reauthorization Work Group was formed to provide input and suggestions to the SSPI. The Work Group includes representatives from the State Board of Education, the Public Schools Accountability Act committee, measurement experts, experts with experience in assessing students with disabilities (SWDs) and English learners (ELs), teachers, administrators, local governing board members, and parents.

The purpose of the third and fourth meetings was to have Work Group members provide input and suggestions based on the areas of consideration outlined in statute in the “Content and Design” and “Efficiency” categories.

Organization
CDE staff presented Work Group members information on the following topics: Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC), types of assessments, types of assessment items, formative assessment practices and tools, the SSPI’s Education Technology Task Force assessment considerations, and test administration and scoring technologies. Members were also provided comments from the San Diego, Orange County, and Contra Costa regional public meetings.

Content and Design Outcomes
Some of the input and suggestions offered by the members included the following:
• Incorporate a variety of item types to better assess student thinking, application of skills and knowledge, and the formation of oral argument
• Include statewide assessments in science and history-social science in grades three through eight and end-of-course assessments in grades nine through twelve
• Consider providing formative assessment practices and tools and interim assessments in English-language arts, mathematics, science, and history-social science in grades two through twelve
• Include diagnostic assessment for all grade two students and as needed for students in grades three through twelve.

Efficiency Outcomes
Some of the input and suggestions offered by the members included the following:
• Use an assessment for multiple purposes to reduce redundancies
• Consider end-of-course or SBAC grade eleven assessments to be submitted to colleges/universities in place of SAT or ACT. These might also be used to fulfill the high school graduation requirement
• Explore using matrix sampling to streamline testing
• Integrate technology into instruction to encourage early exposure to technology
• Utilize computer-based delivery methods for non-SBAC assessments
• Explore using a blended scoring model with automated scoring for mechanics and other such qualities and human scoring for depth of knowledge, expression, and other complex skills.

Summary of Public Comment
Following each presentation and Work Group discussion, time for public comment was offered. The following comments were offered during the two Work Group meetings:

• SBAC is scheduled to deliver new assessments by 2015; however, CDE should consider an alternative or back-up plan should the SBAC timeline not be realized as intended.

• Care should be taken to ensure that assessments intended for diagnostic or interim monitoring of student progress are not used for purposes for which they were not designed.

• Assessments designed to inform instruction (i.e., formative, interim, diagnostic) should be locally controlled and not state mandated. Summative assessments need to have state control for standardization and comparability.

• Rather than designing summative assessments to be administered at a given grade, consider designing assessments to be administered by the end of a given grade. This ensures that assessments follow instruction and not vice versa, but will also require rethinking accountability and how such summative assessments are factored into the system.

• Formative, interim, and summative assessments serve distinct purposes. Care should be taken to ensure that these purposes do not get combined and that formative and interim assessments do not become a tool for teaching to the test.

• Science and history–social science should be assessed on par with English–language arts and mathematics.

• Consideration should be given to the ideas on reducing the number of standardized tests from the Governor’s 2012 State of the State address.

• Recent publications and competitions (e.g., Hewlett Foundation) suggest automated scoring engines are promising, especially for instructional testing, but may not be quite ready for summative, high-stakes applications.
• There is a need to have the appropriate summative mathematics assessments (e.g., algebra, algebra readiness) for students in grades seven or eight, depending on the course enrolled. Assessments should follow instruction and not vice-versa and federal law supports this practice.

Other public meetings

Purpose
The purpose of the Regional Public Meetings was to seek public input on the reauthorization of the statewide pupil assessment system. These were the final three of five such meetings scheduled throughout the state.

Public Comment
After receiving an overview on the reauthorization of the statewide pupil assessment system, the following public input was provided:
• Maintain the concept of the Standards-based Tests in Spanish (STS). Assessing students in their own language allows educators to truly see what students know.
• Consider assessing students in grades nine and ten, whether with formative, summative, or interim assessments.
• Include diagnostic assessment for grade two students and consider inclusion in kindergarten and grade one.
• Use matrix sampling to streamline testing.
• Include item types that evaluate critical thinking and problem solving, communication, collaboration, and creativity and innovation.
• Consider using results from the future assessment system to satisfy the high school graduation requirement.

Suggestions were made to involve classroom teachers in the scoring process because of the value it provides to teachers in helping them improve instruction. Additionally, suggestions were made to strengthen the articulation between assessment and curriculum programs and California’s post-secondary institutions. Further, it was suggested that California pursue consistency in assessment practices and curriculum between K–12 and post-secondary institutions (i.e., perhaps utilizing K–12 assessment results for entrance and placement assessment).
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Summary of Key Issues

California Education Code (EC) Section 60640 (g) requires pupils identified as English learners (ELs) who are enrolled in grades two through eleven to test in his or her primary language in addition to their grade-level California Standards Tests and/or California Modified Assessment.

The Standards-based Tests in Spanish is the designated primary language test and is required for ELs in grades two through eleven who either receive instruction in Spanish or have been enrolled in a school in the United States for less than 12 months.

Also, EC Section 60605 requires the SBE to adopt statewide performance standards in the core curriculum areas of reading, writing, mathematics, history–social science, and science and to conduct regional public hearings prior to the adoption of the performance levels. See Attachment 3 for the summary of discussions.

Attachment(s)

Report of the Video Conferenced Regional Public Hearings for the Proposed Performance Standards (Levels) for the Standards-based Tests in Spanish for Reading Language Arts in Grades Eight, Nine, Ten, Eleven and for Algebra 1 and Geometry

On July 9, 2012, the State Board of Education (SBE) and California Department of Education (CDE) staff conducted regional public hearings via video conference at the Santa Clara County Office of Education and the San Diego County Office of Education. The announcement for the Standards-based Tests in Spanish (STS) regional public hearings can be found on the SBE Public Notices Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/pn/starpublichearings.asp.

The public hearings were opened by Patricia de Cos, Deputy Executive Director, SBE, at the times specified in the hearing announcement. After a brief explanation of the hearing process, Ms. de Cos opened the hearings to public comment.

No individuals from the public attended the public hearings at the Santa Clara and San Diego County Offices of Education.

No written comments were submitted to the CDE or the SBE.