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# **MEMORANDUM**

**DATE:** February 9, 2024

**TO:** MEMBERS, State Board of Education

**FROM:** TONY THURMOND, State Superintendent of Public Instruction

**SUBJECT:** Summary of the 2023 Coordinator Survey Report and the 2023 California Assessment Conference Post-Conference Report.

## Summary of Key Issues

The California Department of Education (CDE) is committed to providing resources and professional development support to assist local educational agencies (LEAs) in the successful implementation of the California Assessment System, which includes the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) and the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC). The CDE has a contract with the Sacramento County Office of Education (SCOE) through which SCOE gathers feedback and recommendations from attendees at meetings, trainings, structured feedback sessions, and surveys, and then provides the CDE with reports that include an analysis of any feedback and recommendations based on attendees’ input and any other related information gathered. These reports provide information and recommendations for the CDE to consider in determining future training and outreach efforts to meet the needs identified by LEAs and other interest holders.

Two such reports are provided as attachments to this information memorandum. They are as follows:

* 2023 Assessment Coordinator Survey Report
* 2023 California Assessment Conference Post-Conference Report

### **2023 Assessment Coordinator Survey Report**

The 2023 Assessment Coordinator Survey Report represents the culmination of a large-scale campaign aimed at identifying helpful resources to assist LEA assessment coordinators in successfully implementing the necessary activities for administering the CAASPP and ELPAC tests. After surveying coordinators, the SCOE analyzed the survey responses and compiled a report of the findings for the CDE. This report provides information and

recommendations for the CDE to consider in determining future outreach efforts. Highlights of the recommendations include the following:

* Continue to update and maintain the number of resources so assessment coordinators feel well supported.
* Implement additional avenues for advertising the Charter School Assessment Coordinator Network to increase awareness among the network’s target population.
* Continue to expand upon current California Educator Reporting System (CERS) training and publicizing efforts. As more respondents continue to use the system and the CERS Sandbox, the CDE and SCOE can continue to support them with intermediate trainings or additional webinars about summative results.
* Continue to promote interim assessments on social media to increase educator awareness.

The full report can be found in Attachment 1.

### **2023 California Assessment Conference Post-Conference Report**

The fifth annual California Assessment Conference (CAC), hosted by the SCOE on behalf of the CDE Assessment Development and Administration Division, was held October 9–10, 2023, at the SAFE Credit Union Convention Center in Sacramento, California.

The 2023 CAC was a training opportunity for educators directly involved in classroom instruction, such as teachers, teachers on special assignments, teacher coaches, and site administrators. While registration was open to all educators at any level and in any role, the content of the conference sessions aimed to enrich classroom instruction. Highlights of the recommendations include the following:

* **Three-Day Conference:** A three-day conference offers significant advantages over a two-day event, primarily due to the more relaxed and less hectic pace it allows. The extra day not only provides attendees with additional time to absorb the wealth of information and insights presented, but also fosters deeper connections and networking opportunities.
* **Venue Space:** The 2023 CAC venue had limited space and did not adequately accommodate attendees during the breaks between sessions. SCOE recognizes the importance of providing a comfortable learning environment for CAC attendees and recommends securing a more spacious and accommodating venue for future events.
* **Keynote Speaker:** For the 2024 CAC, SCOE recommends featuring only one keynote speaker and refraining from using the keynote as a way to “keep attendees until the end of the conference.” It was proven in 2022 and 2023 that this approach did not work, as attendees left the CAC at times that worked for them, and not everyone stayed for the ending session. Having one keynote will also increase cost savings, which will help keep registration fees low.
* **CDE Information Table:** The SCOE strongly recommends the reinstatement of the CDE information table for the conference next year. Having CDE staff available for attendees to interact with is a valuable resource that enhances the event's educational and informative aspects. Attendees can ask questions, seek guidance, and gain insights directly from CDE experts.
* **Live 101 Sessions:** Optional 101 videos were available to attendees on the CAC website, and an overview of the CAASPP and ELPAC was provided. Instead of having optional 101 videos available asynchronously before the CAC, SCOE recommends bringing up to five 101 sessions to the 2024 CAC and offering them as optional sessions the morning of day one as a pre-conference offering.

The full report can be found in Attachment 2.

## Attachment(s)

* Attachment 1: 2023 Assessment Coordinator Survey Report (18 pages)
* Attachment 2: 2023 California Assessment Conference Post-Conference Report (14 pages)

**2023 Assessment Coordinator Survey Report**
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**Introduction**

In August 2023, the California Department of Education (CDE) Assessment Development and Administration Division launched the sixth annual Assessment Coordinator Survey. This work was undertaken by the Sacramento County Office of Education (SCOE) under the Assessment Validity and Outreach contract with the CDE. The survey, which was sent via email to all primary local educational agency (LEA) California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) and English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) coordinators in the state, was designed to gather feedback and input on currently available assessment-related resources, training opportunities, and the California Educator Reporting System (CERS).

This report provides a detailed summary of the feedback received from the survey respondents as well as a set of recommendations for improving the type and quality of support the CDE provides for LEA assessment coordinators.

**Survey Distribution**

The 2023 Assessment Coordinator Survey was emailed directly to primary LEA CAASPP and ELPAC coordinators on August 3, 2023. Attendees of the Assessment and Accountability Information Meetings were reminded to complete the survey, and coordinators received a follow-up email before the closing of the survey window, reminding them to submit their responses.

**Survey Responses**

Out of the 2,213 unique primary LEA coordinators who were contacted (note that coordinators holding both CAASPP and ELPAC coordinator roles were counted only once), 562 responded to the survey.

**562 survey respondents**

**25 percent response rate**

Thirty-one respondents (5 percent) were screened out because they indicated they were not in an LEA coordinator role, and 34 additional LEA coordinators (6 percent) were screened out for incomplete surveys (not answering anything beyond the demographic questions). Answers from the remaining 497 respondents are shown in this report.

**Respondents’ Demographic Information**

**Staff from LEAs with an enrollment of 1,000–5,999 students were the single most highly represented group among survey respondents.** Staff from LEAs with fewer than 1,000 students cumulatively represented 42 percent of respondents, whereas staff from LEAs with 6,000 students or more cumulatively represented 22 percent of respondents. Figure 1 illustrates the LEA size representation.

Figure 1. LEA Size Representation, Based on Student Enrollment

**When asked what grade levels the LEA served**

* 88.13 percent of coordinators were from LEAs that served students in Transitional Kindergarten through grade five;
* 88.51 percent of coordinators were from LEAs that served students in grades six through eight; and
* 52.82 percent of coordinators were from LEAs that served students in grades nine through twelve.

Respondents were able to select all response options that applied, so the total percentage was greater than 100 percent.

**When asked about charter school status**

* 71.98 percent of coordinators were from a non-charter school; and
* 28.02 percent of coordinators were from a charter school.

**Of the 28.02 percent of coordinators from a charter school**

* 72.66 percent were funded directly; and
* 27.34 percent were funded locally.

**When asked about their specific coordinator role**

* 59.96 percent of coordinators served as both CAASPP and ELPAC coordinators;
* 22.33 percent of coordinators served only as the CAASPP coordinator; and
* 17.71 percent of coordinators served only as the ELPAC coordinator.

**When asked how long the CAASPP coordinators served in their role**

* 14.22 percent were in the role for less than one year;
* 39.71 percent were in the role for one to three years;
* 23.28 percent were in the role for four to six years;
* 15.44 percent were in the role for seven to ten years; and
* 7.35 percent were in the role for more than ten years.

**When asked how long the ELPAC coordinators served in their role**

* 14.81 percent were in the role for less than one year;
* 39.48 percent were in the role for one to three years;
* 23.38 percent were in the role for four to six years;
* 14.29 percent were in the role for seven to ten years; and
* 8.05 percent were in the role for more than ten years.

**Findings**

The findings in this report are organized into four sections based on the structure of the survey:

* Resources
* Charter School Assessment Coordinator Network
* CERS
* California Science Test (CAST) Interim Assessments and ELPAC Interim Assessments

A complete list of survey questions can be found in the [Survey Questions](#_Survey_Questions) section.

**Resources**

This section analyzes respondents’ overall satisfaction with existing resources (including documents and videos). This feedback was gathered to help the CDE and SCOE to update existing resources and to inform the development of future deliverables. The results in this section include data from the LEA assessment coordinator surveys conducted from 2018 to 2023.

**Existing Resources**

**When asked if they were satisfied with the *amount* of existing resources, 90 percent of CAASPP coordinators and 91 percent of ELPAC coordinators agreed**. Coordinators’ overall satisfaction with the amount of resources has increased over time, as illustrated in figure 2.

Figure 2. Satisfaction with the Amount of Current Resources

**Respondents’ overall satisfaction with the *quality* of existing CAASPP and ELPAC resources has increased over time as well**, as illustrated in figure 3.

Figure 3. Satisfaction with the Quality of Current Resources

Coordinators were asked to rate the ease of finding information or resources when a question or issue arises, with 1 being “difficult” and 5 being “easy”. The average response for CAASPP coordinators was 3.43 and the average response for ELPAC coordinators was 3.37. No coordinators answered with a 1 nor a 5.

**Charter School Assessment Coordinator Network**

Coordinators who indicated being from a charter school were given additional questions about the new CDE Charter School Assessment Coordinator Network. The responses in this section are from the 139 respondents who stated they were from a charter school.

**When asked if they were aware of the network**

* 64.03 percent were aware; and
* 35.97 percent were not aware.

**When asked if they had attended the network meetings**

* 39.57 percent had attended; and
* 60.43 percent had not attended.

When asked why they had not attended, the most common answers were not being aware or having a schedule conflict. When asked if the meetings were a valuable use of their time, 87 percent of those who attended agreed that they were.

**When asked if they were aware of the monthly Charter School Assessment Coordinator Newsletter**

* 45.32 percent were aware; and
* 54.68 percent were not aware.

Of the 45.32 percent that were aware of the newsletter, 87 percent agreed that it contained useful information.

**California Educator Reporting System**

CERS provides teachers and schools with access to assessment results to help guide instruction. This section analyzes respondents’ awareness of the Quarterly CERS Update emails, CERS itself, and the CERS Sandbox tool.

**Update Emails**

**When asked if they were aware of the Quarterly CERS Update emails**

* 65.13 percent were aware; and
* 34.87 percent were not aware.

**Of the 65.13 percent who were aware of the emails**

* 96.52 percent found them useful; and
* 3.48 percent found them not useful.

**Use of the California Educator Reporting System**

**When asked if they had used CERS**

* 80.46 percent had used the system; and
* 19.54 percent had not used the system.

**Of the 80.46 percent who had used CERS**

* 19.06 percent used it rarely;
* 54.31 percent used it occasionally; and
* 26.63 percent used it frequently.

**California Educator Reporting System Sandbox**

The CERS Sandbox is a nonsecure training and demonstration environment that uses fictitious computer-generated data. It can be accessed on the CAASPP CERS Resources web page at <https://www.caaspp.org/ta-resources/cers.html>.

**When asked if they had used the CERS Sandbox**

* 44.12 percent of respondents had used it; and
* 55.88 percent of respondents had not used it.

**Interim Assessments**

Interim assessments are one component of the California assessment system. The CAST Interim Assessments and ELPAC Interim Assessments will join the Smarter Balanced Interim Assessments for English language arts/literacy and mathematics as optional tests available from the CDE to measure what students know and can do.

**When asked if they were aware of the new ELPAC Interim Assessments**

* 82.93 percent were aware; and
* 17.07 percent were not aware.

**Of the 82.93 percent of respondents who were aware of the new ELPAC Interim Assessments**

* 60.58 percent planned to use them; and
* 32.42 percent did not plan to use them.

**When asked which groups they had shared information with about the new ELPAC Interim Assessments**

* 46.17 percent had shared information with district curriculum staff;
* 45.73 percent had shared information with site administrators;
* 37.42 percent had shared information with teachers and teachers on special assignment (TOSAs);
* 3.94 percent had shared information with parents; and
* 5.25 had shared information with other groups.

Respondents were able to select all response options that applied, so the total percentage was greater than 100 percent. When asked who else they had shared information with, the most common answer was English language development coordinators and staff.

**When asked if they were aware of the new CAST Interim Assessments**

* 76.37 percent were aware; and
* 23.63 percent were not aware.

**Of the 76.37 percent of respondents who were aware of the new CAASPP Interim Assessments**

* 65.33 percent planned to use them; and
* 34.67 percent did not plan to use them.

**When asked which groups they had shared information with about the new CAST Interim Assessments**

* 42.45 percent had shared information with district curriculum staff;
* 44.42 percent had shared information with site administrators;
* 35.89 percent had shared information with teachers and TOSAs;
* 4.16 percent had shared information with parents; and
* 3.28 had shared information with other groups.

Respondents were able to select all response options that applied, so the total percentage was greater than 100 percent. When asked who else they had shared information with, the most common answer was curriculum staff and site administrators.

**When asked if they were planning to attend the upcoming Introducing the CAST and ELPAC Interim Assessments webinars**

* 69.59 percent of respondents were; and
* 30.42 percent of respondents were not.

**Future Considerations**

The future considerations set forth by SCOE in this section are the direct result of feedback and data collected in the Assessment Coordinator Survey. The recommendations are organized into four sections based on the structure of the survey. The survey responses will also inform the development of the Training Plan and Educator Engagement Plan for the 2024–25 school year.

**Consideration 1:** Continue to update and maintain the number of resources so assessment coordinators feel well supported.

**Consideration 2:** Implement additional avenues for advertising the Charter School Assessment Coordinator Network to increase awareness among the network’s target population.

Some examples might include, but not be limited to

* including an article quarterly in the weekly *Assessment Spotlight*;
* posting network information on the [Regional Assessment Network](https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ai/caregionalranmap.asp) web page on the CDE website; and
* partnering with charter-specific associations, such as the California Charter Schools Association or the Charter Schools Development Center, to spread the word about the network.

**Consideration 3:** Continue to expand upon current CERS training and publicizing efforts. As more respondents continue to use the system and the CERS Sandbox, the CDE and SCOE can continue to support them with intermediate trainings or additional webinars about summative results.

**Consideration 4**: Continue to promote interim assessments on social media to increase educator awareness.

**Survey Questions**

The logic that was programmed into the survey (e.g., skipping questions based on responses) is shown beside questions and response options where applicable.

**2023 Assessment Coordinator Survey**

The purpose of this survey is to gather information from LEA CAASPP and ELPAC coordinators about communication materials, training, and other resources needed to support them in the successful administration of the CAASPP and ELPAC assessment programs.

**District Demographics**

1. Are you an LEA level assessment coordinator?
   1. Yes
   2. No (Skip to end of survey.)
2. How many students are enrolled in your LEA?
   1. 249 or fewer
   2. 250–499
   3. 500–999
   4. 1,000–5,999
   5. 6,000–14,999
   6. 15,000 or more
3. What grade levels does your LEA serve? *(Select all that apply.)*
   1. Elementary (TK–5)
   2. Middle (6–8)
   3. High (9–12)
4. Is your LEA:
   1. Rural
   2. Suburban
   3. Urban
5. What percentage of students in your LEA are English learner students?
   1. Less than 10%
   2. 10–25%
   3. 26–50%
   4. 51–75%
   5. More than 75%
6. Is your LEA a charter school/organization?
   1. Yes
   2. No (Skip charter school section.)

**Charter Schools**

*(This section appears only to respondents who answered ‘Yes’ to previous question 6.)*

1. How is your charter school funded?
   1. Directly
   2. Locally
2. Are you aware that the CDE maintains a Charter School Assessment Coordinator Network to support assessment coordinators at charter schools in California?
   1. Yes
   2. No
3. Have you attended any of the quarterly meetings of the Charter School Assessment Coordinator Network?
   1. Yes.
   2. No. If not, why not?
4. Did you find the meeting(s) to be a good use of your time?
   1. Yes.
   2. No. If not, why not
   3. N/A. I have not attended
5. Do you recall receiving a monthly Charter School Assessment Coordinator Newsletter email in the 2022–23 school year?
   1. Yes
   2. No
6. Does the newsletter contain information that is useful for you as a charter school assessment coordinator?
   1. Yes. If yes, please explain what you appreciate most about the newsletter
   2. No. If no, please explain why
   3. N/A. I have not received a newsletter

**California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress Coordinator**

1. Are you the LEA CAASPP coordinator?
   1. Yes
   2. No *(Skip to ELPAC Coordinator section.)*
2. How long have you served in this role?
   1. Less than 1 year
   2. 1–3 years
   3. 4–6 years
   4. 7–10 years
   5. More than 10 years
3. How satisfied are you with the **amount** of resources (documents and videos) available to support you with the CAASPP System?
   1. Very satisfied
   2. Satisfied
   3. Somewhat satisfied
   4. Not at all satisfied
4. How satisfied are you with the **quality** of resources (documents and videos) available to support you with the CAASPP System?
   1. Very satisfied
   2. Satisfied
   3. Somewhat satisfied
   4. Not at all satisfied
5. What additional resources or supports are needed to help you be more successful in your role as the LEA CAASPP coordinator? *(Open-ended response.)*

**California Educator Reporting System**

The CDE’s CERS is a free and powerful tool available to all California LEAs to access their students' individual and aggregate test results from state summative and interim assessments. Information about CERS can be found on the CAASPP California Educator Reporting System Resources web page at <https://www.caaspp.org/ta-resources/cers.html>.

1. Quarterly CERS Update emails are distributed to LEA coordinators to provide timely CERS updates.
2. Did you read the Quarterly CERS Update for LEA Coordinators?
   1. Yes
   2. No
3. Did you find the Quarterly CERS Update for LEA Coordinators useful?
   1. Yes
   2. No
4. What topic(s) would you like to learn about in future Quarterly CERS Updates for LEA Coordinators? *(Open-ended response.)*
5. Have you used CERS?
   1. Yes
   2. No *(Skip to Question 7.)*
6. How often do you access CERS? (Skip to the next section after response submission.)
   1. Frequently
   2. Occasionally
   3. Rarely
7. Is there a reason you have not used CERS in the past?
   1. I was not aware of it
   2. I do not know how to use it
   3. My district uses another data system to view student results from state assessments
   4. Other, please specify *(Open-ended response.)*

**California Educator Reporting System Sandbox**

The CERS Sandbox is a non-secure training and demonstration environment that uses fictitious computer-generated data. The CERS Sandbox can be accessed on the Smarter Balanced CERS Sandbox web page at <http://cerssandbox.smarterreporting.org/>.

1. Have you used the CERS Sandbox training tool to get familiar with the features of CERS?
   1. Yes
   2. No *(Skip to Question 3.)*
2. How did you learn about the CERS Sandbox? *(Select all that apply.)*
   1. CAASPP website
   2. ELPAC website
   3. CDE Assessment Spotlight email
   4. CDE website
   5. At a conference, training, or workshop
   6. Word of mouth/colleague
   7. Other, please specify *(Open-ended response.)*
   8. Not sure
3. Is there a reason you have not used the CERS Sandbox in the past?
   1. I was not aware of it
   2. I do not know how to use it
   3. Other, please specify *(Open-ended response.)*

**Interim Assessments**

1. Are you aware of the new ELPAC Interim Assessments?
   1. Yes
   2. No
2. Is your LEA planning on using the ELPAC Interim Assessments?
   1. Yes
   2. No
3. With which groups have you shared information about the new ELPAC Interim Assessments?
   1. District curriculum staff
   2. Site administrators
   3. Teachers/TOSAs/teacher coaches
   4. Parents
   5. Other, please specify *(Open-ended response.)*
4. Are you aware of the new CAST Interim Assessments?
   1. Yes
   2. No
5. Is your LEA planning on using the CAST Interim Assessments?
   1. Yes
   2. No
6. With which groups have you shared information about the new CAST Interim Assessments?
   1. District curriculum staff
   2. Site administrators
   3. Teachers/TOSAs/teacher coaches
   4. Parents
   5. Other, please specify *(Open-ended response.)*
7. Are you planning to attend the upcoming CAST and ELPAC Interim Assessment trainings?
   1. Yes
   2. No

**2023 California Assessment Conference Post-Conference Report**
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**Introduction**

The fifth annual California Assessment Conference (CAC), hosted by the Sacramento County Office of Education (SCOE) on behalf of the California Department of Education (CDE) Assessment Development and Administration Division, was held October 9–10, 2023, at the SAFE Credit Union Convention Center in Sacramento, California. Pre-recorded Assessment 101 videos were offered as optional conference pre-work via the conference website for any attendees who wanted a refresher. The full schedule for the 2023 CAC is available in [Appendix A](#_Appendix_A:_Conference)*.*

The 2023 CAC was billed as a training opportunity for educators with a connection to classroom instruction—classroom teachers, teachers on special assignment (TOSAs), teacher coaches, and site administrators. While registration was open to all educators at any level and in any role, the content of the conference sessions was intended to inform classroom instruction.

**Registrant Demographics**

The 2023 CAC drew 750 registrants along with 27 CDE staff, 10 SCOE staff, 18 CAC trainers, and 31 local educational agency (LEA) presenters who did not attend the CAC but only presented, for a total of 836 attendees.

The 2022 CAC drew 872 registrants: 536 for the in-person conference and 336 for the condensed virtual option. Please note that in 2022 the CAC was a hybrid model, so registrant rates are not comparable.

Registrants were asked to select their role during the registration process. The percentage of registrants by roles as compared to 2022 are listed in table 1 below.

Table 1. Percentage of Registrants by Role in 2022 and 2023

| Role | 2022 | 2023 |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Teacher | 14% | 24% |
| District or county level curriculum staff | 12% | 20% |
| LEA assessment coordinator | 16% | 16% |
| Site administrator | 11% | 14% |
| TOSA | 11% | 11% |
| Coach or lead teacher | 4% | 7% |
| Site assessment coordinator | 7% | 6% |
| Superintendent | 1% | 2% |
| Other district or county staff | 16% | n/a |
| Other | 8% | n/a |

**Conference Attendance**

Of the 750 registrants, 690 attended the conference, which was an **attendance rate of 92 percent.**

**Survey Respondents**

The post-conference survey was delivered to all conference registrants via direct email. Registrants received a follow-up email one week prior to the closing of the survey. The full survey instrument can be found in [Appendix B](#_Appendix_B:_Post-Conference).

There was a total of 272 survey responses collected—a 39 percent response rate.

Please note that SCOE attempted to collect data via in-app surveys; however, due to an unexpected error in the system, the data cannot be considered valid and is therefore excluded from this analysis.

**Post-Conference Survey Responses**

All findings in this section are based on feedback obtained from 272 survey respondents unless otherwise noted.

**Overall Experience**

Attendees were asked four questions about their overall conference experience. For the overall survey questions

* 95 percent of respondents agreed that they could immediately apply the things they learned at the CAC to their work;
* 95 percent of respondents agreed that attending the CAC helped them better meet the needs of their students;
* 93 percent of respondents agreed that the conference was a productive use of their time; and
* 93 percent of respondents would recommend the CAC to their colleagues.

**Training Team and Materials**

Attendees were asked three questions about the trainers and materials. For these questions

* 98 percent of respondents agreed that the presenters were knowledgeable;
* 97 percent of respondents agreed that the presenters shared real-life examples and experiences; and
* 97 percent of respondents agreed that the presenters were able to address their questions.

**Opening and Closing Keynote**

The conference was opened by Cheryl Cotton, Deputy Superintendent of the CDE’s Instruction, Measurement, and Administration Branch and Dr. Mao Vang, Director for the CDE’s Assessment Development and Administration Division, followed by opening remarks by State Superintendent of Public Instruction Tony Thurmond.

Dr. Andrew Ho gave the opening keynote address. Dr. Ho is a Charles William Eliot Professor of Education, Harvard Graduate School of Education. He is a psychometrician whose research aims to improve the design, use, and interpretation of test scores in educational policy and practice.

Of the 272 respondents, 42 did not attend the opening keynote. Of the 230 respondents who did

* 90 percent agreed the opening keynote by Dr. Ho was relevant to their work; and
* 88 percent agreed the opening keynote by Dr. Ho was inspiring.

The closing keynote speaker was Dr. Alfredo Quiñones-Hinojosa. Dr. Quiñones-Hinojosa was an impoverished teenager living in a rural Mexican village before arriving in California. He attended San Joaquin Delta College, then UC Berkeley, and Harvard before becoming a Professor of Neurosurgery and Oncology, Neuroscience and Cellular and Molecular Medicine at The Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore. Dr. Quiñones-Hinojosa credits California public education for his professional success.

Of the 272 respondents, 159 did not attend the closing keynote. Of the 113 respondents who did

* 87 percent agreed the closing keynote by Dr. Quiñones-Hinojosa was relevant to their work; and
* 99 percent agreed the closing keynote by Dr. Quiñones-Hinojosa was inspiring.

**Networking and Engagement**

A networking and social hour was held on the first night where attendees could interact with each other as well as with staff from the CDE and ETS. Of the 272 respondents, 107 attended the networking and social hour.

**Conference App**

A custom CAC app was developed for both the iOS app store and the Google Play store. The app provided attendees with immediate access to the schedule, presenter information, venue maps, and a game where they could collect points and join the leaderboard.

Of the 272 respondents

* 83 percent downloaded the conference app;
* 67 percent downloaded the conference app *before* arriving in Sacramento; and
* 74 percent created a personal conference schedule within the app.

**Future Considerations and Practices to Continue**

SCOE has reviewed the 2023 conference costs as well as the feedback obtained from CDE and SCOE staff, trainers, and survey respondents. For the 2024 CAC, SCOE proposes continuing some practices from previous years and implementing some changes.

**Proposed Changes to the Setup**

Below are proposed changes to be incorporated into the 2024 CAC.

**Three-Day Conference**

After feedback from attendees, trainers, and CDE staff, SCOE recommends returning to a three-day conference format. A three-day conference offers significant advantages over a two-day event, primarily due to the more relaxed and less hectic pace it allows. The extra day not only provides attendees with additional time to absorb the wealth of information and insights presented, but also fosters deeper connections and networking opportunities. This extended duration encourages more meaningful discussions and interactions, facilitating a more enriching experience for all participants.

**Venue Space**

The 2023 CAC venue had limited space and did not adequately accommodate attendees during the breaks between sessions. The limited space meant that participants had to navigate crowded areas, struggling to find available seating. This not only impeded their ability to relax and recharge between sessions but also hindered spontaneous networking opportunities, which are a valuable part of any conference experience. SCOE recognizes the importance of providing a comfortable learning environment for CAC attendees and recommends securing a more spacious and accommodating venue for future events.

**Keynote Speakers**

For the 2024 CAC, SCOE recommends having only one keynote speaker and not using the keynote as a way to “keep attendees until the end of the conference.” It was proven in 2022 and 2023 that this approach did not work, as attendees left the CAC at times that worked for them and not everyone stayed for the ending session. Having one keynote will also increase cost savings, which will help keep registration fees low.

**Information Table**

SCOE strongly recommends the reinstatement of the CDE information table for the 2024 conference. Having CDE staff available for attendees to interact with is a valuable resource that enhances the event's educational and informative aspects. Attendees can ask questions, seek guidance, and gain insights directly from CDE experts outside of their question-and-answer session, creating a more enriching experience and allowing CDE staff to forge important connections with the attendees.

**Live 101 Sessions**

In 2023, attendees had the option to watch introductory videos on varying assessment topics prior to the conference. These optional 101 videos were available on the CAC website and provided an overview of the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) and English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC).

Instead of having optional 101 videos available asynchronously before the CAC, SCOE recommends bringing up to five 101 sessions to the 2024 CAC and offering them as optional sessions the morning of day one as a pre-conference offering. This will allow attendees to gain foundational knowledge in areas of their choosing before engaging in three days of deeper learning, without adding many 101-level sessions to the CAC schedule. This recommendation is due to the importance of foundational content as evidenced by a high number of 2023 CAC participants who were new to the world of student assessment.

**Practices to Continue**

Below are SCOE recommendations for continued practices.

**Audience**

To keep consistent with 2023, the 2024 CAC primary audience will be listed as teachers and site administrators who will be encouraged to attend the conference with LEA teams. Marketing materials will also list that sessions will be available for both assessment coordinators as well as site-level and district-level curriculum staff.

**Shared Practice Sessions**

SCOE recommends that the 2024 CAC continues providing a large number of shared practice sessions. Attendees value the opportunity to hear from other LEA staff and educators from throughout the state. SCOE also recommends continuing efforts to ensure the diversity of the shared practice sessions to include presenters who work with various age groups, students with disabilities, and other student groups.

**Multiple Content Area Options in Each Time Slot**

SCOE recommends continuing to ensure that each time slot for breakout sessions includes options for multiple content areas, so no attendees feel as though their preferred content areas are not available during any breakout strand.

**Processing Time Between Sessions**

In 2022, SCOE provided attendees with 30 minutes between breakout sessions and in 2023, the time between sessions was either 15 or 30 minutes. This was done to allow time for attendees to check their emails or finish processing what they had just learned in order to fully engage when attending sessions. Based on survey respondents’ open-ended comments and their feedback shared with SCOE staff at the conference, the flexible time between sessions was very popular with attendees, and SCOE will continue to offer 15- to 30-minute breaks between sessions.

**Appendices**

**Appendix A: Conference Schedule**

Appendix A contains the full conference schedule listed in tables 1 and 2.

**Day 1 | October 9, 2023**

Table 2. Schedule for Day 1

| Time | Schedule Item |
| --- | --- |
| 7 a.m. to 4 p.m. | Registration is open |
| 9 to 10:15 a.m. | Session 1 breakouts |
| 10:15 to 10:45 a.m. | Attendee processing time |
| 10:45 to noon | Session 2 breakouts |
| Noon to 1:30 p.m. | Lunch and opening keynote |
| 1:30 to 2:45 p.m. | Session 3 breakouts |
| 2:45 to 3:15 p.m. | Attendee processing time |
| 3:15 to 4:30 p.m. | Session 4 breakouts |
| 4:30 to 6 p.m. | Social hour |

**Day 2 | October 10, 2023**

Table 3. Schedule for Day 2

| Time | Schedule Item |
| --- | --- |
| 7 a.m. to 3 p.m. | Registration is open |
| 8:30 to 9:45 a.m. | Session 5 breakouts |
| 9:45 to 10:15 a.m. | Attendee processing time |
| 10:15 to 11:30 a.m. | Session 6 breakouts |
| 11:30 a.m. to 12:15 p.m. | Lunch |
| 12:15 to 1:30 p.m. | Session 7 breakouts |
| 1:30 to 1:45 p.m. | Attendee processing time |
| 1:45 to 3 p.m. | Session 8 breakouts |
| 3 to 4:30 p.m. | Closing keynote and snack |

**Appendix B: Post-Conference Survey**

Appendix B contains the survey instrument. The logic that was programmed into the survey (e.g., skipping questions based on responses) is shown beside questions and response options, where applicable.

**Trainers, Training Materials, and Overall Impression of the Conference**

1. The presenters were knowledgeable.
   1. Strongly agree
   2. Agree
   3. Disagree
   4. Strongly disagree
2. The presenters shared real-life examples and experiences.
   1. Strongly agree
   2. Agree
   3. Disagree
   4. Strongly disagree
3. The presenters were able to address my questions.
   1. Strongly agree
   2. Agree
   3. Disagree
   4. Strongly disagree
4. I learned things at the conference that I can immediately apply in my classroom, school, or district.
   1. Strongly agree
   2. Agree
   3. Disagree
   4. Strongly disagree
5. Attendance at this conference will help me better meet the needs of my students.
   1. Strongly agree
   2. Agree
   3. Disagree
   4. Strongly disagree
6. The conference was a productive use of my time.
   1. Strongly agree
   2. Agree
   3. Disagree
   4. Strongly disagree
7. I would recommend this conference to my colleagues.
   1. Strongly agree
   2. Agree
   3. Disagree
   4. Strongly disagree

**Conference Plenary Sessions and Other Key Features**

Please tell us about your experience with the keynote sessions.

1. The keynote session by Professor Andrew Ho was:
   1. Very relevant to my work
   2. Somewhat relevant to my work
   3. Not relevant at all to my work
   4. Not applicable. I did not attend this session.
2. The keynote session by Professor Andrew Ho was:
   1. Very inspiring
   2. Somewhat inspiring
   3. Not inspiring at all
   4. Not applicable. I did not attend this session.
3. The keynote session by Dr. Alfredo Quiñones-Hinojosa was:
   1. Very relevant to my work
   2. Somewhat relevant to my work
   3. Not relevant at all to my work
   4. Not applicable. I did not attend this session.
4. The keynote session by Dr. Alfredo Quiñones-Hinojosa was:
   1. Very inspiring
   2. Somewhat inspiring
   3. Not inspiring at all
   4. Not applicable. I did not attend this session.

**Networking Social Hour**

1. Did you attend the Networking Social Hour on Day 1? (If not, it will skip the rest of the questions in this section.)
   1. Yes
   2. No
2. What suggestions do you have for improving the Networking Social Hour? *(**Open-ended comment box)*

**Conference App**

1. Did you download the conference app? (If not, it will skip the rest of the questions in this section.)
   1. Yes
   2. No
2. Did you access the conference app before arriving on site in Sacramento?
   1. Yes
   2. No
3. Did you create a personal conference schedule for yourself using the app?
   1. Yes
   2. No
4. Did you complete any of the in-app post session surveys?
   1. Yes
   2. No
5. What suggestions do you have for improving the conference app?

**Suggestions**

1. Tell us what worked for you at the conference? (Open-ended comment box)
2. What suggestions do you have for future conferences? (Open-ended comment box)