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## Subject

The California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress System and English Language Proficiency Assessments for California: Approval of the 2021–22 Apportionment Rates, Approval of the Proposed Alternate English Language Proficiency Assessments for California Threshold Scores, and Updates on Assessment Program Activities.

## Type of Action

Action, Information.

## Summary of the Issue(s)

The California Department of Education (CDE) seeks approval of the proposed 2021–22 apportionment rates for the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) and the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC). This item also seeks approval of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction’s proposed Alternate ELPAC threshold scores for 2021–22 and beyond.

In addition, this item provides an update on recent events and developments related to the CAASPP, the ELPAC, and an update on national and international assessments. Attachment 1 provides the CAASPP and ELPAC outreach and professional development activities from March through April 2022.

## Recommendation

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

1. Per-pupil apportionment rates for the 2021–22 school year (contingent on the availability of an appropriation for this purpose) for the CAASPP tests administered as part of the CAASPP System, as provided in table 1 of Attachment 2.
2. Per-pupil apportionment rates for the 2021–22 school year (contingent on the availability of an appropriation for this purpose) for the ELPAC tests administered, as provided in table 2 of Attachment 2.
3. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction’s proposed Initial and Summative Alternate ELPAC threshold scores, to be effective beginning with the 2021–22 administration. The proposed threshold scores are shown in tables 1 and 2 of Attachment 4.

## Brief History of Key Issues

The following sections detail the CDE’s proposed recommendations to the SBE and provide a summary of developments and updates related to the California Assessment System, which consists of the CAASPP and the ELPAC.

### Proposed 2021–22 Apportionment Rates

California *Education Code* (*EC*) sections 60640(l)(1) and 60810(a)(3) require that the State Superintendent of Public Instruction apportion funds to local educational agencies (LEAs) for the administration of the CAASPP and the ELPAC. The CDE recommends that the SBE approve the per-pupil apportionment rates listed in tables 1 and 2 of Attachment 2, contingent on the availability of an appropriation for this purpose, for tests administered as part of the CAASPP and the ELPAC during the 2021–22 school year.

Assessment apportionments are not distributed until the following fiscal year, when all testing for the previous year has been completed (i.e., LEAs will be reimbursed in 2022–23 for testing that occurs in 2021–22). Attachment 3 provides the estimated number of pupils tested per grade, by assessment, and the estimated apportionment cost per assessment based on the proposed per-pupil rates. The assessment apportionment funds are unrestricted funds to reimburse LEAs for the following costs:

1. All staffing costs, including the LEA coordinator, the test site coordinators, and staff training and other staff expenses, such as test administration time related to testing
2. All expenses incurred at the LEA level and site level related to testing
3. All transportation costs for delivering and retrieving tests and test materials within the LEA

All covered costs of the collection and submission of student demographic information are associated with the processes necessary to provide the complete and accurate data required for student group reporting per state regulations.

#### California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress per-Pupil Apportionment Rates

The CDE recommends that the SBE approve the following rates for tests administered as part of the CAASPP System during the 2021–22 school year:

* Per pupil administered any portion of the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for English language arts/literacy (ELA) and mathematics—$4.00
* Per pupil administered any portion of the California Science Test—$2.00
* Per pupil administered any portion of the California Alternate Assessments (CAAs) for ELA and mathematics—$5.00
* Per pupil administered any portion of the CAA for Science—$5.00
* Per pupil administered any portion of the California Spanish Assessment who is an English learner whose primary language is Spanish, grades three through eight and high school—$5.00
* Per-pupil apportionment rate for CDE-certified grade two diagnostic tests administered at the option and cost of the LEA per *EC* Section 60644—$2.52
* Per-pupil apportionment rate for not tested due to medical emergency or parent/guardian exemptions—$1.00

#### English Language Proficiency Assessments for California per-Pupil Apportionment Rates

The CDE recommends that the SBE approve the following rates for tests administered as part of the ELPAC during the 2021–22 school year, which are the same as those for the 2020–21 school year except for the addition of the Alternate ELPAC operational field test:

* Per pupil administered any portion of the Initial and Summative ELPAC, kindergarten through grade two (one-on-one administration)—$5.50
* Per pupil administered any portion of the Initial and Summative ELPAC, grades three through twelve—$5.00
* Per pupil in the Initial ELPAC Rotating Score Validation Process (RSVP), kindergarten through grade twelve—$0.50
* Per pupil in the Alternate ELPAC operational field test, kindergarten through grade twelve—$5.50

Regarding the RSVP, approximately 10 percent of LEAs have been identified by the CDE to take part in the process, which helps to produce item statistics for the Initial ELPAC, validate scores, and provide technical assistance for scoring. Apportionment will be provided only to those LEAs designated for the RSVP that submitted the required materials during the period of July 1 through October 31, 2021.

The Alternate ELPAC operational field test was administered as a census field test in the school year 2021–22. The recommended apportionment rate for the computer-based Alternate ELPAC is the same rate as for the one-on-one administration of the kindergarten through grade two Initial and Summative ELPAC.

### The State Superintendent of Public Instruction’s Proposed Threshold Scores for the Alternate ELPAC

The Alternate ELPAC will be the first California state-administered test of English language proficiency for students whose primary language is a language other than English and who have been found eligible for alternate assessments by their individualized education program team.

In May 2019, the SBE approved the Alternate ELPAC high-level test design (HLTD) for the Initial and Summative Alternate ELPAC. In May 2020, the SBE approved the blueprint that will be used to develop test forms for both the Initial Alternate ELPAC and the Summative Alternate ELPAC. National experts, along with the CDE and testing contractor ETS, determined this to be appropriate because both assessments use the same score reporting categories and the same performance level descriptors.

In its April 2022 Information Memorandum to the SBE, the CDE provided an update on the standard setting plan for the 2022 Alternate ELPAC standard setting workshop to establish the proposed threshold scores. At the workshop, educators provided standard setting judgments on all items administered in the operational field test. The final panel-recommended threshold scores for Level 2 (Intermediate English Learner) and Level 3 (Fluent English Proficient) are based on the bank of items used to assemble both the Initial Alternate ELPAC and Summative Alternate ELPAC and can, therefore, be applied to both assessments. The Memorandum can be found at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/apr22memoadad01.docx>.

The standard setting workshop was conducted from February 22 through March 3, 2022. The 44 standard setting panelists were a diverse group of educators, familiar with the 2012 English Language Development Standards, the English Language Development Connectors, and experienced in teaching English learner students with the most significant cognitive disabilities (see Attachment 6). Nine educators participated on more than one grade level panel.

The CDE recommends that the SBE adopt the proposed threshold scores informed by the 2022 Alternate ELPAC standard setting workshop. Table 1 and table 2 in Attachment 4 provides the State Superintendent of Public Instruction’s recommended threshold scores for the specific grade level and grade span by overall scale score based on the general performance level descriptors approved by the SBE in May 2019. Table 1 and table 2 in Attachment 5 provide the standard setting panel’s recommended judgments that were reviewed by CDE staff and ELPAC Technical Advisory Group (TAG) members, for the specific grade levels and grade spans by overall scale score. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction’s recommendations in Attachment 4 were based on the standard setting panel’s recommended judgments, as described in the April 2022 Memorandum. To maintain fidelity with the work of the standard setting panel, the thresholds presented in Attachment 4 are within two conditional standard error of measurement of the panel’s recommendations. That is, all adjustments are within the natural error variance of the panel’s recommended thresholds and, therefore, reflect only slight modifications of the panel’s judgments.

In addition, the ELPAC TAG was provided with a briefing on these recommended scores. The Statewide Assessment Interest Holder members, representing California educational associations, also were provided a briefing on the recommended scores. If approved, the proposed threshold scores will be applied beginning with the 2021–22 administration of the Alternate ELPAC operational field test and used in the production of the Summative Alternate ELPAC Student Score Reports (SSRs) and the aggregate reports found on the Test Results for California's Assessments website at <https://caaspp-elpac.cde.ca.gov/elpac/Default>.

#### Next Steps

Contingent on the SBE’s approval of the Alternate ELPAC threshold scores, the CDE will notify LEA superintendents and charter school administrators of the approved threshold scores for the 2021–22 school year. Prior to the release of the Summative Alternate ELPAC SSRs, ETS and the CDE will perform an internal quality control process to verify that the SSRs are error free. The quality control process will include evaluating Alternate ELPAC student score data at both the individual and aggregate levels and producing a small sample of SSRs to ensure that all information reported is accurate for each performance level and student. The SSRs are anticipated to be generated and delivered to LEAs to share with parents and guardians in July 2022. Two separate validation studies will be conducted in 2022–23 for the Initial and Summative Alternate ELPAC. More information will be brought to the SBE when it becomes available.

### Updates on Assessment Program Activities

The following sections detail assessment program updates about the Smarter Balanced Demonstration of Concept Study, the California Educator Reporting System (CERS) training, interim and formative assessment trainings, Science instructional resources, Tools for Teachers summer workshops, and national and international assessments.

#### Smarter Balanced Demonstration of Concept Study

In January and March 2022, the CDE provided the SBE with information about a study being conducted by the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium in partnership with the New Teacher Center (NTC). The study is (1) examining how Smarter Balanced Interim Assessment performance tasks can be incorporated into classroom instruction; and (2) building collective knowledge on how Smarter Balanced performance tasks may be embedded during instruction as part of the summative assessment process.

Since March, the two LEAs participating in the study—Upper Lake Unified and Val Verde Unified, both from California—have completed the following activities:

* Professional learning sessions
* Implementation of the interim assessment performance task support activity
* Administration of the interim assessment performance task
* Collaborative scoring of the performance tasks
* Planning for instruction and adaptations to curriculum based on data gathered from the performance tasks

Throughout the professional learning sessions, Smarter Balanced and the NTC asked participants to share information, including students’ responses from the classroom activities and feedback from teachers regarding students’ progress in order to draft a preliminary analysis for the study. A preliminary report, including the benefits and challenges of embedding performance tasks into classroom instruction, is expected later this year.

#### 2022–23 California Educator Reporting System Training

The CERS provides LEA staff the earliest access to individual and aggregate student results from CAASPP and ELPAC summative assessments as well as from Smarter Balanced Interim Assessments. On behalf of the CDE, the Sacramento County Office of Education is developing new online CERS training sessions that will be offered throughout 2022–23. The first sessions, which will begin in July 2022, are designed for assessment coordinators and administrators to gain familiarity with CERS features, including features specifically for CERS users with administrator-level roles. In addition, participants will learn ways to promote and support educator access and use of the system locally. These three-hour training sessions for coordinators and administrators will include an optional lab session for participants to practice and learn more about managing rosters in CERS.

Subsequent training sessions designed for all users of CERS, including teachers, will begin in August 2022. These two-hour introductory training sessions will be offered to familiarize LEA staff with CERS features and provide guidance on viewing summative and interim assessment results within the system. Further information about the 2022–23 CERS training, including available session dates, can be found on the CAASPP Upcoming Training Opportunities web page at [https://www.caaspp.org/training/training-opportunities.html and on the ELPAC Upcoming Training and Opportunities web page at](https://www.caaspp.org/training/training-opportunities.html) <https://www.elpac.org/training/training-opportunities/>.

A recording of the CERS training sessions, along with the PowerPoint presentations, will be posted on the CAASPP Past Training Opportunities and Materials web page at <https://www.caaspp.org/training/training-opportunities-archive.html> and on the ELPAC Past Training Opportunities and Materials web page at <https://www.elpac.org/training/training-opportunities-archive/>.

#### Interim and Formative Assessment Training Series for Teachers and LEA Staff

On behalf of the CDE, ETS and WestEd will develop and offer the Interim and Formative Assessment Training Series, which will include three modules of live online trainings for teachers and other LEA staff who work directly with students. This series will begin in summer 2022 and continue through the fall. As with last year’s training series, each module will have a unique focus:

* Module One will focus on the purposes of different types of assessment, including formative assessment and such resources as Tools for Teachers and how they work together to support learning.
* Module Two will focus on how the Smarter Balanced Interim Assessments and results from them can be used for classroom application.
* Module Three will focus on using hand scoring to analyze interim assessment written responses, understand expectations, and determine next steps to support learning.

All three modules are approximately three hours in length. Module Three will consist of separate sessions for ELA and mathematics. Each module is designed to be independent of the other modules; therefore, the understanding of content from one module is not dependent on participation in another. Educators can customize their participation on the basis of the area(s) in which they want further professional development.

All modules will be offered multiple times via live online trainings. Fall sessions will include asynchronous options for educators who cannot attend the live offerings. In addition, training materials and recordings will be made available on the CAASPP Past Training Opportunities and Materials web page. Training dates will be announced and registration will open in May 2022.

#### Science Instructional Resources in Tools for Teachers

The CDE continues to work with California science educators to develop science instructional resources to be added to the Tools for Teachers website, which is located at <https://www.smartertoolsforteachers.org/>. The CDE has completed four workshops with California science educators to develop kindergarten through high school science resources for Tools for Teachers. Currently, 59 science resources are available on the website. These resources span all three science domains (i.e., Earth and Space Sciences, Life Sciences, and Physical Sciences) and include Engineering, Technology, and Applications of Science.

In July 2022, the CDE will conduct an in-person workshop in Sacramento with California science educators to develop 15 additional science instructional resources for inclusion in Tools for Teachers. The workshop will include 5 educators with experience in developing these science resources, who will work as team leads, and 15 educators who will work as developers. In addition, staff from the CDE Assessment Development and Administration Division will work as trainers and coaches to assist the educators. The workshop will include the same peer review process as was used in previous workshops to ensure the inclusion of the formative and accessibility strategies and alignment with the California Next Generation Science Standards. The CDE anticipates that the resources developed in this workshop will be posted in Tools for Teachers in fall 2022.

#### Smarter Balanced Tools for Teachers Summer Workshops

Smarter Balanced will conduct two workshops in July 2022 for members of the State Network of Educators (SNE) to develop ELA and mathematics instructional resources for inclusion in the Tools for Teachers website. SNE members consist of a team of educators from Smarter Balanced member states who are trained to develop ELA and mathematics instructional resources and vet those of their peers during the SNE workshops.

Smarter Balanced plans to host approximately 80 educators as resource authors for both workshops, including 23 educators from California. In addition, three staff members from CDE’s Assessment Development and Administration Division will attend as State Leadership Team members to provide guidance to participating SNE members. The goal will be to develop over 150 instructional resources for ELA and mathematics for use by educators to supplement instruction. This year, development will expand to include ELA resources for kindergarten through grade two.

All resources developed during these workshops will support teachers in implementing formative assessment practices during classroom instruction and are part of the consortium’s ongoing efforts to provide teachers with grade-level resources aligned with the Common Core State Standards.

#### National and International Assessments Update

California public schools participate in several national and international assessments annually. For the 2021–22 school year, a sample of California public schools participated in the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), a field test for the International Computer and Information Literacy Study (ICILS), a field test for the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), the Progress in International Reading Literacy Survey (PIRLS), and a field test for the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS). These assessments are conducted by field staff under contract with the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), within the U.S. Department of Education’s Institute of Education Sciences.

##### National Assessment of Educational Progress

NAEP, which also is known as “The Nation’s Report Card,” is a congressionally mandated project of the NCES since 1969. It is the largest nationally representative and continuing assessment of what students in the United States know and can do, providing a common measure of student achievement in mathematics, reading, science, and other subjects.

Depending on the assessment, NAEP report cards provide national, state, and some district-level results—in California, for Los Angeles and San Diego Unified School Districts—as well as results for different demographic student groups. NAEP data also is used in special studies conducted by the NCES, including comparisons of proficiency standards across state assessments; insights from high school transcripts, including courses taken and credits earned; and in-depth studies of how different demographic groups perform across different types of schools.

NAEP 2022 included the following assessments: grade four mathematics and reading; grade eight mathematics, reading, civics, and U.S. history; and age nine long-term trend (LTT) mathematics and reading. A representative sample of schools—in California, approximately 520 schools—were selected by NAEP on the basis of location, size, demographics, and achievement. Approximately 50 students were randomly selected from each school. Each student took a portion of the assessment in a single subject. NAEP testing takes students approximately two hours to complete.

The assessment window for regular NAEP testing was January 25 through March 31, 2022, and the LTT assessment window was January 10 through March 18, 2022. NAEP 2022 results are expected by spring 2023.

Participation in NAEP grades four and eight mathematics and reading is required for district Title I compliance. All other NAEP assessments (including LTT) are voluntary. Additional information about NAEP can be found on the Nation’s Report Card website at <https://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/>.

##### International Computer and Information Literacy Study

ICILS is an international assessment and research project designed to measure computer and information literacy achievement at the eighth grade as well as school and teacher practices related to instruction. It is coordinated by the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA), managed in the United States by the NCES, and administered every five years since 2013. The next operational round of ICILS, planned for spring 2023, will draw students from approximately 30 countries and education systems around the world.

In spring 2022, ICILS plans to conduct a field test (a small-scale, trial run of the assessment) to determine whether any of the test questions are biased because of national, social, or cultural differences and whether field operations work as intended. Approximately five California public schools have volunteered to represent the United States in the ICILS field test, and up to two classes of grade eight students will be assessed from each school. Participation in ICILS is voluntary. Additional information about ICILS can be found on the NCES ICILS web page at <https://nces.ed.gov/surveys/icils/>.

##### Program for International Student Assessment

PISA is an international assessment of fifteen-year-old students that measures how well these students apply their knowledge and skills in reading, mathematics, science, and financial literacy to problems set in real-life contexts. It is coordinated by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, managed in the United States by the NCES, and administered every three years since 2000. The next operational round of PISA, planned for October 2022, will draw students from more than 80 countries and education systems around the world.

In fall 2021, PISA conducted a field test in every participating country to determine whether any of the test questions are biased because of national, social, or cultural differences and whether field operations work as intended. Approximately ten California public schools were selected to represent the United States in the PISA field test, and up to 60 fifteen-year-old students were assessed from each school. PISA testing takes students approximately four hours, including breaks. Participation in PISA is voluntary. Additional information about PISA can be found on the NCES PISA web page at <https://nces.ed.gov/surveys/pisa/>.

##### Progress in International Reading Literacy Survey

PIRLS documents worldwide trends in the reading knowledge of grade four students as well as school and teacher practices related to instruction. It is coordinated by the IEA, managed in the United States by the NCES, and administered every five years since 2001. The most recent round of PIRLS, administered in fall 2021, drew students from more than 50 countries and education systems around the world. Results from that round are expected in December 2022.

PIRLS 2021 was the first large-scale international assessment since the novel coronavirus 2019 pandemic began. Approximately 30 California public schools were selected to represent the United States by participating in PIRLS 2021; up to two classrooms per school were assessed. PIRLS testing takes students approximately three hours, including breaks. Participation in PIRLS is voluntary. Additional information about PIRLS can be found on the NCES PIRLS web page at <https://nces.ed.gov/surveys/pirls/index.asp>.

##### Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study

TIMSS is an international assessment and research project designed to measure trends in the mathematics and science achievement of students in grades four and eight as well as school and teacher practices related to instruction. It is coordinated by the IEA, managed in the United States by the NCES, and administered every four years since 1995. The next operational round of TIMSS, planned for spring 2023, will involve students from approximately 65 countries and educational systems throughout the world.

In spring 2022, TIMSS plans to conduct a field test to allow assessment developers to try out new test items to determine how well they perform when administered to students internationally. The results of the field test administered to students in the United States will help inform the assessment development process. The field test also will provide an opportunity for the United States to fine tune operational procedures in preparation for the 2023 assessment. Approximately 10 California public schools have been selected to represent the United States for the field test, and students from up to two classrooms from each of those schools will be administered the field test.

The TIMSS assessment takes students approximately three hours, including breaks, to complete. Participation in TIMSS is voluntary. Additional information about TIMSS can be found on the NCES TIMSS web page at <https://nces.ed.gov/timss/>.

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

In April 2022, the CDE provided the SBE with an Information Memorandum that gave an update on the Alternate ELPAC Standard Setting Plan (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/apr22memoadad01.docx>).

In September 2021, the CDE provided the SBE with a national and international assessments update (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr21/documents/sep21item02.docx>).

In May 2021, the CDE presented for approval the proposed 2020–2021 apportionment rates for the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) and the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr21/documents/may21item03.docx>).

In May 2020, the CDE provided the SBE with the proposed test blueprints for the Initial Alternate and Summative Alternate ELPAC (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr20/documents/may20item01.docx>).

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

## Fiscal Analysis (as appropriate)

The 2021–22 Budget Act includes the funding necessary for 2021–22 CAASPP and ELPAC administration contract activities. Funding for 2022–23 and beyond will be contingent on an annual appropriation being made available from the Legislature for future fiscal years.

For fiscal year 2021–22, $25.3 million was appropriated for assessment apportionments for 2020–21 testing. The CDE provided the Department of Finance with estimated costs per test for statewide assessment apportionments to be administered in 2021–22, including approximately $16.2 million for the CAASPP System, $6.9 million for the ELPAC, and $1.1 million for the grade two diagnostics, totaling $24.2 million for the development of the proposed 2022–23 Governor’s Budget. Attachment 3 provides the estimated number of pupils tested per grade, by assessment, and the estimated apportionment cost.

The 2021–22 Budget Act provides a total of $86,977,000 in multiple CAASPP System contract costs, which includes $76,896,000 in funding for the ETS CAASPP contract activities and $531,000 for the University of California, Santa Cruz (UCSC) CERS contract activities.

The 2021–22 Budget provides a total of $23,205,000 in funding for ELPAC contract costs, which includes $22,919,000 for the ETS ELPAC contract activities and $286,000 for the UCSC CERS contract activities.

## Attachment(s)

* Attachment 1: Outreach and Professional Development Activities (3 Pages)
* Attachment 2: Proposed per-Pupil Apportionment Rates (2 Pages)
* Attachment 3: Estimated Apportionment Costs (2 Pages)
* Attachment 4: State Superintendent of Public Instruction’s Alternate ELPAC Threshold Score Recommendations (2 Pages)
* Attachment 5: Standard Setting Panel’s Recommended Judgments for the Alternate ELPAC (2 Pages)
* Attachment 6: Alternate ELPAC Standard Setting Panelist Composition (3 Pages)

## Outreach and Professional Development Activities

The California Department of Education (CDE), in coordination with California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) and English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) contractors ETS and the Sacramento County Office of Education (SCOE), has provided a variety of virtual outreach activities, including workshops, focus group meetings, and presentations to prepare local educational agencies (LEAs) for the administration of the CAASPP System and the ELPAC. In addition, the CDE continues to release information regarding assessment program updates, including weekly updates, on its website and through listserv email. The following tables provide descriptions of these virtual outreach and professional development activities during March and April 2022.

**Table 1. Trainings**

| **Date(s)** | **Location** | **Estimated Number of Attendees** | **Description** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3/1 | Virtual | 700 | A Teacher’s Best Kept Secret: Interim Assessments and Tools for TeachersHosted by the CDE and SCOE, this webinar was offered for educators and other LEA staff as the fifth webinar in the Tools for Teachers Shared Practices Webinar Series. LEA representatives shared specific ways they use Smarter Balanced Interim Assessments and Tools for Teachers resources in their classrooms. |
| 3/11 | Virtual | 420 | CAASPP and ELPAC Coffee SessionHosted by the CDE and ETS, this virtual Coffee Session offered LEA staff an opportunity to ask questions and receive answers about assessments, trainings, resources, and assessment-related developments. |
| 4/8 | Virtual | 425 | CAASPP and ELPAC Coffee SessionHosted by the CDE and ETS, this virtual Coffee Session offered LEA staff an opportunity to ask questions and receive answers about assessments, trainings, resources, and assessment-related developments. |
| 4/21 | Virtual | 250 | New Coordinator Webinar #5This webinar, hosted by the SCOE, provided the following:* A review of upcoming coordinator checklist tasks
* The details of preparing for summative assessment results
* Question and answer session with experienced coordinators
 |

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

| **Date(s)** | **Location** | **Estimated Number of Attendees** | **Description** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3/1–3/3 | Virtual | 31 | Alternate ELPAC Standard Setting Workshop (Upper Grades)Educators collaborated to develop recommended threshold scores to be approved by the California State Board of Education (SBE). |
| 3/3 | Virtual | 25 | Alternate ELPAC Standard Setting Workshop (Vertical Articulation) Educators collaborated to develop recommended threshold scores to be approved by the SBE. |
| 3/15 | Virtual | 40 | ELPAC Technical Advisory Group (TAG) MeetingThe ELPAC TAG met to review psychometric topics related to the ELPAC. |
| 3/16 | Virtual | 50 | CAASPP TAG MeetingThe CAASPP TAG met to review psychometric topics related to CAASPP. |
| 3/17–3/18 | Virtual | 22 | Alternate ELPAC Data Review Meeting (2 days)California educators met virtually to review ELPAC test items for content, bias, and sensitivity. |

**Table 3. Presentations by CDE Staff**

| **Date(s)** | **Location** | **Estimated Number of Attendees** | **Description** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3/16 | Virtual | 25 | March Regional Assessment Network MeetingThe Assessment Development and Administration Division (ADAD) provided updates on activities and test developments. |
| 3/17 | Virtual | 15 | March Statewide Assessment Stakeholders MeetingThe ADAD provided updates on activities and test development. |
| 4/30 | Virtual | 200 | 2022 California Science Educators (CASE) Environmental Literacy Committee Poster SessionThis presentation will highlight the environmental science instructional resources, aligned with California’s Environmental Principles and Concepts, that are designed to teach environmental literacy in tandem with three-dimensional science content. These resources are available now for educators to use in Tools for Teachers. |

## Proposed per-Pupil Apportionment Rates

The California Department of Education recommends that the California State Board of Education approve the proposed 2021–22 per-pupil apportionment rates, contingent on the availability of an appropriation for this purpose, for the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP), as shown in table 1, and the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC), as shown in table 2.

**Table 1. Proposed 2021–22 CAASPP per-Pupil Apportionment Rates**

| **Assessment** | **Proposed****per-Pupil Apportionment Rate** |
| --- | --- |
| Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for English Language Arts/Literacy (ELA) and/or Mathematics | $4.00 |
| California Science Test | $2.00 |
| California Spanish Assessment | $5.00 |
| California Alternate Assessments (CAAs) for ELA and/or Mathematics | $5.00 |
| CAA for Science | $5.00 |
| Grade two diagnostic assessments for ELA and/or mathematics | $2.52 |
| Students not tested due to medical emergency or parent/guardian exemptions | $1.00 |

**Table 2. Proposed 2021–22 ELPAC per-Pupil Apportionment Rates**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ELPAC Assessments** | **Proposed****per-Pupil Apportionment Rate** |
| Initial, kindergarten through grade two (one-on-one administration) | $5.50 |
| Initial, grades three through twelve | $5.00 |
| Initial Rotating Score Validation Process, kindergarten through grade twelve | $0.50 |
| Summative, kindergarten through grade two (one-on-one administration) | $5.50 |
| Summative, grades three through twelve | $5.00 |
| Alternate ELPAC operational field test, kindergarten through grade twelve (one-on-one administration) | $5.50 |

## Estimated Apportionment Costs

Tables 1 and 2 provide estimated 2021–22 apportionment costs for the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) and the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC), respectively, if the California State Board of Education elects to approve the California Department of Education’s recommended per-pupil apportionment rates.

**Table 1. Proposed 2021–22 CAASPP per-Pupil Apportionment Rates, Estimated Pupil Population, and Estimated Apportionment Costs**

| **Assessment** | **Proposed per-Pupil Rate** | **Estimated 2021–22 Pupil Population** | **Estimated Apportionment Cost** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for English Language Arts/Literacy (ELA) and/or Mathematics | $4.00 | 3,190,100 | $12,760,400 |
| California Science Test | $2.00 | 1,504,000 | $3,008,000 |
| California Spanish Assessment | $5.00 | 30,000 | $150,000 |
| California Alternate Assessments (CAAs) for ELA and/or Mathematics | $5.00 | 32,000 | $160,000 |
| CAA for Science | $5.00 | 15,500 | $77,500 |
| Grade two diagnostic assessments for ELA and/or mathematics | $2.52 | 423,000 | $1,065,960 |
| Students not tested due to medical emergency or parent/guardian exemptions | $1.00 | 24,000 | $24,000 |
| **Total:** | – | – | **$17,245,860** |

**Table 2. Proposed 2021–22 ELPAC per-Pupil Apportionment Rates, Estimated Pupil Population, and Estimated Apportionment Costs**

| **ELPAC Assessments** | **Proposed per-Pupil Rate** | **Estimated2021–22 Pupil Population** | **Estimated Apportionment Cost** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Initial, kindergarten through grade two (one-on-one administration) | $5.50 | 152,000 | $836,000 |
| Initial, grades three through twelve | $5.00 | 50,000 | $250,000 |
| Initial Rotating Score Validation Process, kindergarten through grade twelve | $0.50 | 23,000 | $11,500 |
| Summative, kindergarten through grade two (one-on-one administration) | $5.50 | 350,000 | $1,925,000 |
| Summative, grades three through twelve | $5.00 | 750,000 | $3,750,000 |
| Alternate ELPAC operational field test, kindergarten through grade twelve (one-on-one administration) | $5.50 | 20,000 | 110,000 |
| **Total:** | – | – | **$6,882,500** |

## State Superintendent of Public Instruction’s Alternate ELPACThreshold Score Recommendations

Table 1. State Superintendent of Public Instruction’s Recommendations for the Proposed Performance Levels on the Overall Score for the Initial Alternate English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC)

| **Grade** | **Level 1** **Percentage of Students** | **Level 1****Percentage at or above** | **Level 2****Percentage of Students** | **Level 2****Standard-Setting Scale Threshold Score** | **Level 2** **Percentage at or above** | **Level 3****Percentage of Students** | **Level 3****Standard-Setting Scale Threshold Score** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| K | 39.6 | 100 | 45.0 | 254 | 60.4 | 15.4 | 275 |
| 1 | 33.3 | 100 | 49.0 | 250 | 66.7 | 17.8 | 271 |
| 2 | 40.5 | 100 | 41.8 | 252 | 59.5 | 17.7 | 272 |
| 3–5 | 27.6 | 100 | 44.8 | 244 | 72.4 | 27.7 | 268 |
| 6–8 | 22.7 | 100 | 36.7 | 237 | 77.3 | 40.6 | 261 |
| 9–12 | 28.0 | 100 | 37.8 | 239 | 72.0 | 34.3 | 267 |

**Key**

| Percentage of Students | Percent of students statewide who would be placed at this performance level on the basis of the results of the 2021–22 operational field test administration. |
| --- | --- |
| Standard-Setting Scale Threshold Score | Minimum standard-setting scale score needed to achieve this performance level on the basis of the results of the 2021–22 operational field test administration. See note below. |
| Percentage at or above | Percent of students statewide who would be at and above this performance level on the basis of the results of the 2021–22 operational field test administration. |

Notes:

1. Threshold scores are presented on a score scale generated solely for the standard-setting process. Reporting scales will be developed to report scores on the Student Score Report and public reporting.
2. Each level percentages may not sum to 100, due to rounding.

Table 2. State Superintendent of Public Instruction’s Recommendations for the Proposed Performance Levels on the Overall Score for the Summative Alternate English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC)

| **Grade** | **Level 1** **Percentage of Students** | **Level 1****Percentage at or above** | **Level 2****Percentage of Students** | **Level 2****Standard-Setting Scale Threshold Score** | **Level 2** **Percentage at or above** | **Level 3****Percentage of Students** | **Level 3****Standard-Setting Scale Threshold Score** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| K | 39.6 | 100 | 45.0 | 254 | 60.4 | 15.4 | 275 |
| 1 | 33.3 | 100 | 49.0 | 250 | 66.7 | 17.8 | 271 |
| 2 | 40.5 | 100 | 41.8 | 252 | 59.5 | 17.7 | 272 |
| 3–5 | 27.6 | 100 | 44.8 | 244 | 72.4 | 27.7 | 268 |
| 6–8 | 22.7 | 100 | 36.7 | 237 | 77.3 | 40.6 | 261 |
| 9–10 | 27.7 | 100 | 39.5 | 239 | 72.3 | 32.7 | 267 |
| 11–12 | 28.1 | 100 | 36.9 | 239 | 71.9 | 35.1 | 267 |

**Key**

| Percentage of Students | Percent of students statewide who would be placed at this performance level on the basis of the results of the 2021–22 operational field test administration. |
| --- | --- |
| Standard-Setting Scale Threshold Score | Minimum standard-setting scale score needed to achieve this performance level on the basis of the results of the 2021–22 operational field test administration. See note below. |
| Percentage at or above | Percent of students statewide who would be at and above this performance level on the basis of the results of the 2021–22 operational field test administration. |

Notes:

1. Threshold scores are presented on a score scale generated solely for the standard-setting process. Reporting scales will be developed to report scores on the Student Score Report and public reporting.
2. Each level percentages may not sum to 100, due to rounding.

## Standard Setting Panel’s Recommended Judgments for the Alternate ELPAC

Table 1. Standard Setting Panel Recommendations for the Proposed Performance Levels on the Overall Score for the Initial Alternate English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC)

| **Grade** | **Level 1** **Percentage of Students** | **Level 1****Percentage at or above** | **Level 2****Percentage of Students** | **Level 2****Standard-Setting Scale Threshold Score** | **Level 2** **Percentage at or above** | **Level 3****Percentage of Students** | **Level 3****Standard-Setting Scale Threshold Score** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| K | 39.6 | 100 | 44.0 | 254 | 60.4 | 16.4 | 273 |
| 1 | 30.1 | 100 | 49.9 | 249 | 69.9 | 19.9 | 269 |
| 2 | 43.3 | 100 | 36.4 | 253 | 56.7 | 20.3 | 270 |
| 3–5 | 21.4 | 100 | 40.5 | 240 | 78.6 | 38.0 | 260 |
| 6–8 | 18.1 | 100 | 28.6 | 234 | 81.9 | 53.4 | 253 |
| 9–12 | 30.0 | 100 | 24.6 | 240 | 70.0 | 45.5 | 258 |

**Key**

| Percentage of Students | Percent of students statewide who would be placed at this performance level on the basis of the results of the 2021–22 operational field test administration. |
| --- | --- |
| Standard-Setting Scale Threshold Score | Minimum standard-setting scale score needed to achieve this performance level on the basis of the results of the 2021–22 operational field test administration. See note below. |
| Percentage at or above | Percent of students statewide who would be at and above this performance level on the basis of the results of the 2021–22 operational field test administration. |

Notes:

1. Threshold scores are presented on a score scale generated solely for the standard-setting process. Reporting scales will be developed to report scores on the Student Score Report and public reporting.
2. Each level percentages may not sum to 100, due to rounding.

Table 2. Standard Setting Panel Recommendations for the Proposed Performance Levels on the Overall Score for the Summative Alternate English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC)

| **Grade** | **Level 1** **Percentage of Students** | **Level 1****Percentage at or above** | **Level 2****Percentage of Students** | **Level 2****Standard-Setting Scale Threshold Score** | **Level 2** **Percentage at or above** | **Level 3****Percentage of Students** | **Level 3****Standard-Setting Scale Threshold Score** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| K | 39.6 | 100 | 44.0 | 254 | 60.4 | 16.4 | 273 |
| 1 | 30.1 | 100 | 49.9 | 249 | 69.9 | 19.9 | 269 |
| 2 | 43.3 | 100 | 36.4 | 253 | 56.7 | 20.3 | 270 |
| 3–5 | 21.4 | 100 | 40.5 | 240 | 78.6 | 38.0 | 260 |
| 6–8 | 18.1 | 100 | 28.6 | 234 | 81.9 | 53.4 | 253 |
| 9–10 | 30.0 | 100 | 26.5 | 240 | 70.0 | 43.5 | 258 |
| 11–12 | 29.9 | 100 | 23.6 | 240 | 70.1 | 46.5 | 258 |

**Key**

| Percentage of Students | Percent of students statewide who would be placed at this performance level on the basis of the results of the 2021–22 operational field test administration. |
| --- | --- |
| Standard-Setting Scale Threshold Score | Minimum standard-setting scale score needed to achieve this performance level on the basis of the results of the 2021–22 operational field test administration. See note below. |
| Percentage at or above | Percent of students statewide who would be at and above this performance level on the basis of the results of the 2021–22 operational field test administration. |

Notes:

1. Threshold scores are presented on a score scale generated solely for the standard-setting process. Reporting scales will be developed to report scores on the Student Score Report and public reporting.
2. Each level percentages may not sum to 100, due to rounding.

## Alternate English Language Proficiency Assessments for California Standard Setting Panelist Composition

The following tables provide information on the panelist composition of the February and March Alternate English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) Standard Setting Workshop.

### Description of 2022 Standard Setting Panelists

The Alternate ELPAC Standard Setting Workshop educator panelists provided information to the California Department of Education about their experience and background prior to the workshop. As indicated in table 1 through table 8, the 44 educator panelists were a diverse group and representative of the state of California. Nine educators participated on more than one grade-level panel. Panelists represented the three main regions of the state, had varied ethnicities, and included perspectives of special education teachers, English learner (EL) teachers and coaches, classroom teachers, and local educational agency or county office employees. Additionally, these panelists brought their familiarity with the breadth and depth of the [2012 California English Language Development (ELD) Standards](https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/documents/eldstndspublication14.pdf), and experience in teaching students eligible to take the Alternate ELPAC, to the work conducted during the standard setting workshop.

Table 1. Number and Percent of Panelists by Gender

| **Gender** | **Number of Panelists** | **Percent of Panelists** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Female | 39 | 89 |
| Male | 5 | 11 |
| **Total** | **44** | **100** |

Table 2. Number and Percent of Panelists by Race or Ethnicity

| **Race or Ethnicity** | **Number of Panelists** | **Percent of Panelists** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| America Indian or Alaska Native | 4 | 7 |
| Black or African American | 6 | 10 |
| Cambodian | 1 | 2 |
| Filipino | 4 | 7 |
| Hispanic  | 13 | 22 |
| White | 30 | 51 |
| Decline to state | 1 | 2 |
| **Total** | **59** | **100** |

**Note:** Panelists were instructed to select all that apply; therefore, the total is more than the number of panelists who participated in the standard setting. Percent may be more than 100 due to rounding.

Table 3. Number and Percent of Panelists by Region of California

| **Region** | **Number of Panelists** | **Percent of Panelists** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Central | 2 | 5 |
| Northern | 8 | 18 |
| Southern | 34 | 77 |
| **Total** | **44** | **100** |

Table 4. Number and Percent of Panelists by Primary Position

| **Primary Position** | **Number of Panelists** | **Percent of Panelists** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Special education teacher | 22 | 50 |
| EL or literacy coach | 3 | 7 |
| General education classroom teacher | 8 | 18 |
| Teacher on special assignment | 6 | 14 |
| Administrator | 5 | 11 |
| **Total** | **44** | **100** |

Table 5. Number and Percent of Panelists by Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (K–‍12) Credential

| **K–12 Credential** | **Number of Panelists** | **Percent of Panelists** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Special Education | 33 | 40 |
| EL (Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development; Bilingual, Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development) | 18 | 22 |
| Elementary Teaching (multiple subjects) | 13 | 16 |
| Secondary Teaching (single subject) | 6 | 7 |
| Administrative | 10 | 12 |
| Other | 3 | 4 |
| **Total** | **83** | **100** |

**Note:** Panelists were instructed to select all that apply; therefore, the total is more than the number of panelists who participated in the standard setting. Percent may be more than 100 due to rounding.

Table 6. Number of Panelists by Grade Level or Grade Span

| **Grade Level or Grade Span** | **Number of Panelists** |
| --- | --- |
| Kindergarten | 8 |
| 1 | 8 |
| 2 | 6 |
| 3–5 | 9 |
| 6–8 | 11 |
| 9–12 | 11 |
| **Total** | **53** |

**Note:** Nine panelists served on more than one panel.

Table 7. Number and Percent of Panelists by Familiarity with ELD Standards

| **Familiarity with ELD Standards** | **Number of Panelists** | **Percent of Panelists** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Very familiar | 28 | 64 |
| Somewhat familiar | 12 | 27 |
| Not at all familiar | 4 | 9 |
| **Total** | **44** | **100** |

**Note:** Panelists self-reported experience with ELD Standards.

Table 8. Number and Percent of Panelists by Experience Supporting Students Using Special Education Services

| **Special Education Service** | **Number of Panelists** | **Percent of Panelists** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Vision impairment | 16 | 15 |
| Hearing impairment | 17 | 15 |
| Significant cognitive disabilities | 31 | 28 |
| Assistive technology | 26 | 24 |
| Speech-language pathology | 20 | 18 |
| **Total** | **110** | **100** |

**Note:** Panelists self-reported experience with special education services and were instructed to select all that apply; therefore, the total is more than the number of panelists who participated in the standard setting.