Common Core in New York

2010: Board of Regents adopts Common Core State Standards

2013: Common Core Assessments in Grades 3 – 8 ELA and Math are administered

2014: Roll-out of Common Core Regents Exams begins
   • June 2014: ELA and Algebra I
   • June 2015: Geometry and Algebra II

Class of 2017: First cohort of high school graduates required to pass Common Core Regents Exams for graduation

Transition to New York Common Core Assessments is a seven year phase-in.
A New Baseline

- This year’s grades 3-8 ELA and math proficiency percentages should not be compared directly with prior-year results.
  - Unlike prior years, proficiency is now based on the Common Core – a more demanding set of knowledge and skills necessary for 21st century college and careers.

- These results present a new and transparent baseline from which we can measure student progress and preparedness for college and careers.

- School and district leaders are urged to be thoughtful to ensure these proficiency results have no negative impact on students, schools, districts, or teachers.

- No new districts will be identified as Focus Districts and no new schools will be identified as Priority Schools based on 2012-13 assessment results.
State-Provided Growth Scores

New York’s growth scores are based on year-to-year comparisons for similar students, all of whom experienced New York’s Common Core assessments for the first time in 2012-13.

The state-provided growth scores are based on year-to-year comparisons on scale scores, not performance levels. Therefore, the state-provided growth scores resulted in similar percentages of educators earning each rating category* in 2012-13 compared to 2011-12.

*Highly Effective, Effective, Developing, Ineffective
State-Provided Growth Score Comparison - 2012 and 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEDI Rating</th>
<th>2011-12 Percent of Teacher MGPs N=33,129</th>
<th>2012-13 Percent of Teacher MGPs N=37,614</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly Effective</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Growth scores are expected to be released to districts the week of 8/19
Converging Evidence about College Readiness

Whether the measure is national or New York-specific, there is converging evidence about student preparedness for college and careers.
Graduating College and Career Ready

New York's 4-year high school graduation rate is 74% for All Students. However, the percent graduating college and career ready is significantly lower.

**June 2012 Four-Year Graduation Rate (2008 Cohort)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduation under Current Requirements</th>
<th>% Graduating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>81.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learners</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calculated College and Career Ready*</th>
<th>% Graduating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learners</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Students graduating with at least a score of 75 on Regents English and 80 on a Math Regents, which correlates with success in first-year college courses.

Source: NYSED Office of Information and Reporting Services

EngageNY.org
New York 2011 NAEP Reading
Grades 4 and 8
New York 2011 NAEP Math
Grades 4 and 8
SAT and PSAT Benchmarks for New York Students

• College Board and NAEP study determined scores on SAT and PSAT/NMSQT that correspond with college readiness for the nation.

• Criteria were adapted slightly to accommodate New York students’ course-taking patterns.

• The results for all New York students who graduated in 2010 and who took the SAT and PSAT/NMSQT are on the following slide.
SAT and PSAT/NMSQT CCR Benchmark Data: ELA

Percent of Students at or above ELA External Benchmarks

SAT-CR: National 30%, NYS 25%
SAT-W: National 35%, NYS 31%
PSAT-CR: National 27%, NYS 26%
PSAT-W: National 35%, NYS 31%
NAEP Grade 8: National 32%, NYS 35%
NAEP Grade 4: National 32%, NYS 35%
SAT and PSAT/NMSQT CCR Benchmark Data: Math

Percent of Students at or above Math External Benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAT-M</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSAT-M</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAEP Grade 8</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAEP Grade 4</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why Readiness Matters - Underperformance Costs $1 Trillion

- America’s urban school districts underperform compared with their suburban counterparts.
- America’s suburban school districts underperform compared with their international counterparts.
- If American students performed at the same level in math as Canadian students, we would add $1 trillion annually to the economy.

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB100008723963904444223104578041181255713360.html
Why Readiness Matters - Talent Dividend

If New York increased its college attainment rate by just one percent – from 33.8 to 34.8 percent – the State would capture a $17.5 billion Talent Dividend.

Source: CEOs for Cities: http://ceosforcities.org
Regents Reform Agenda

Implementing **Common Core standards** and developing **curriculum and assessments** aligned to these standards to prepare students for success in college and the workplace.

Building **instructional data systems** that measure student success and inform teachers and principals how they can improve their practice in real time.

Recruiting, developing, retaining, and rewarding **effective teachers and principals**

**Turning around the lowest-achieving schools**
SETTING PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR COMMON CORE ASSESSMENTS

Common Core Standards / CCR

Research-based Methodology

NY Educator Judgment

Cut Scores

Standard Setting Determination
Just as New York Educators are Essential to Test Development…

New York educators are represented on the following panels:

- New York State Content Advisory Panels
  - Spans early childhood and P12 through CUNY, SUNY and clcu faculty
- Item Development, Item Review, Final Form Review

These panels are informing:

- College and Career Ready Determinations
- Test specifications, policies, and items
- Policy-level and grade-level performance level descriptions
…New York Educators are Essential to Setting Standards

• 95 New York educators for Days 1 to 4
• 34 stayed for Day 5
• Variety of educators nominated and represented:
  o K-12 ELA and Math Teachers
  o BOCES
  o ELL and SwD specialists
  o Higher Education
  o K-12 Administration
• Panelists represented New York’s geographic and demographic diversity
Days 1 to 4

95 panelists followed a research-based protocol:

• Worked in four groups (ELA 3-5, ELA 6-8, Math 3-5, or Math 6-8).

• Defined expectations based on what students should know and be able to do at each grade according to the demands of the Standards.

• Reviewed the New York tests and external benchmark data (NAEP, SAT, PSAT/NMSQT).

• Viewed test questions in easiest-to-hardest order and made individual panelist judgments on where to place the cut scores for proficiency levels.

• Discussed rationales for their judgments and viewed impact data for each of four rounds of review.
Panelist Evaluation of Standard-Setting Process

Over 90% of panelists at end of Day 4 said they would defend the recommended cut scores. Of those in the minority, none strongly disagreed with the recommended standards (they only moderately disagreed).

“The standards are being set by a group that consists of teachers, K-12, college professors and administrators. It makes sense and it's transparent.”

“The collective experience and knowledge evidenced in discussions and the outcomes of the tasks resulted in fair and unbiased standards. Participants followed directions carefully and judiciously.”
Day 5

- 34 of the 95 panelists remained and worked in two groups (ELA 3-8 or Math 3-8)
- Panelists reviewed the results across all six grade levels to ensure that the results made sense from a broader perspective.
- Panelists were allowed to make small adjustments only (within +/- 4 raw score points).
  - Adjustments were required to be grounded in the expectations of the Common Core standards.
- Commissioner was presented with both sets of recommendations – those from Day 4 and from Day 5.
- The results of Day 4 and Day 5 differed minimally.
“In observing the training for the NY State Grades 3-8 ELA and Math Common Core Tests Standard Setting on June 29, 2013, we were comfortable that the facilitators were following best practices in implementing research-based procedures. After observing a full standard-setting session, we are confident that the recommended cut scores were derived using a well-implemented process that followed the plan presented to the NY technical advisory committee (TAC).”

Marianne Perie, Co-Director at the Center For Educational Testing and Evaluation, University of Kansas

Michael Rodriguez, Campbell Leadership Chair in Education and Human Development, University of Minnesota

New York State TAC
The Commissioner accepted Day 5 performance standard recommendations with no changes.

The Board of Regents approved the Commissioner’s recommendation on July 22, 2013
New Standards, New Tests, New Scale

New performance standards

**NYS Level 4**: Student *exceeds* in CCLS for this grade level

**NYS Level 3**: Student is *proficient* in CCLS for this grade level

**NYS Level 2**: Student is below proficient in CCLS for this grade level (*partial* but insufficient)

**NYS Level 1**: Student is well below proficient in standards for this grade level
2013 Grades 3-8
English Language Arts Results
In **ELA**, 31.1 percent of students in grades 3-8 across the State met or exceeded the proficiency standard (NYS Levels 3 or 4), reflecting a new baseline relative to the Common Core Standards.

The vertical lines indicate years where changes were implemented. In 2010, cut scores changed, but the standards and scale remained the same. In 2013, the standards, scale, and cut scores changed to measure the Common Core.
In each grade level statewide, the majority of students performed at NYS Levels 1 or 2 in ELA.
3.2 percent of English language learners met or exceeded the ELA proficiency standard (NYS Levels 3 or 4) in grades 3-8

Beginning in 2013-14, data will be available for students who received ELL services at any time prior to test administration.
5 percent of students with disabilities met or exceeded the ELA proficiency standard (NYS Levels 3 or 4) in grades 3-8.
The ELA proficiency results (NYS Levels 3 or 4) for race/ethnicity groups across grades 3-8 reveal the persistence of the achievement gap.
Across all race/ethnicity groups in grades 3-8, girls performed better than boys on the ELA proficiency standard (NYS Levels 3 or 4)
Across grades 3-8, lower-need communities continued to outperform other areas of the State in ELA proficiency (NYS Levels 3 or 4)
A smaller percentage of students in grades 3-8 met or exceeded the ELA proficiency standard (NYS Levels 3 or 4) in the Big 5 cities than statewide.
English Language Arts 2009-2013
Charter Schools Comparisons
Grades 3-8 Combined
Percentage of Students Scoring at Levels 3 and 4

Charter Schools Total Public

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Charter Schools</th>
<th>Total Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2013 Grades 3-8 Math Results
In **math**, 31 percent of grades 3-8 students across the State met or exceeded the proficiency standard (NYS Levels 3 or 4) in math, reflecting a new baseline relative to the Common Core Standards.

The vertical lines indicate years where changes were implemented. In 2010, cut scores changed, but the standards and scale remained the same. In 2013, the standards, scale, and cut scores changed to measure the Common Core.
In each grade level statewide, the majority of students performed at NYS Levels 1 or 2 in math.
9.8 percent of English language learners met or exceeded the math proficiency standard (NYS Levels 3 or 4) in grades 3-8

Beginning in 2013-14, data will be available for students who received ELL services at any time prior to test administration.
7 percent of students with disabilities met or exceeded the math proficiency standard (NYS Levels 3 or 4) in grades 3-8
The math proficiency results (NYS Levels 3 or 4) for race/ethnicity groups across grades 3-8 reveal the persistence of the achievement gap.
Results on the math proficiency standard (NYS Levels 3 or 4) in grades 3-8 were relatively comparable for girls and boys across race/ethnicity groups.
Across grades 3-8, lower-need communities continued to outperform other areas of the State in math proficiency (NYS Levels 3 or 4)
A smaller percentage of students in grades 3-8 met or exceeded the math proficiency standard (NYS Levels 3 or 4) in the Big 5 cities than statewide.
Mathematics 2009-2013
Charter School Comparisons
Grades 3-8 Combined
Percentage of Students Scoring at Levels 3 and 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Charter Schools</th>
<th>Total Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- **2009**: Green
- **2010**: Purple
- **2011**: Blue
- **2012**: Light blue
- **2013**: Turquoise
Materials to Support Score Interpretation and Use

Available on EngageNY.org upon release of scores
What is the Work?
Implementing the Common Core

Instructional Shifts Demanded by the Core

6 Shifts in ELA/Literacy
Balancing Informational and Literary Text
Building Knowledge in the Disciplines
Staircase of Complexity
Text-based Answers
Writing from Sources
Academic Vocabulary

6 Shifts in Mathematics
Focus
Coherence
Fluency
Deep Understanding
Applications
Dual Intensity
EngageNY.org
Resources for Professional Development

Parent and Family Resources

Most relevant and current information, and newest materials highlighted for easy access.

One-stop location for resources and materials to support implementation of the Regents Reform Agenda.
Curriculum Modules

- Exemplary, comprehensive, optional, free
- High-quality, rigorous, deeply aligned to the Common Core
- Address needs of students performing above and below grade level, students with disabilities, and English language learners
- Include performance tasks and other assessments that measure student growth – daily, weekly, at the end of each unit/module
- Ensure diversity of voices and perspectives in text selection
- Contain notes for teachers, templates, handouts, homework, problem sets, overviews
- Innovative creative commons license approach
Instructional Videos on EngageNY.org

A Portrait of a District Getting Smarter about the Core: Webster Central School District

Teaching is the Core

Common Core Instruction: Making a Claim Using Two Texts with Similar Themes

Common Core Instruction: Use Modeling and Tools to Solve Three Digit Subtraction Problems
Other Educator Resources

- Professional development videos developed with authors of Common Core and PBS
- Tri-State / EQUiP rubrics to evaluate curricular materials against the Common Core
- Curricular exemplars (sample lessons and instructional materials) developed with feedback from the authors of Common Core
- Grade- and subject-specific test guides and assessment design information
- Sample assessment questions developed with feedback from the authors of Common Core
- Network Team Institutes / Teacher & Principal Common Core Ambassadors Program
**Bilingual Common Core Progressions**

- Analysis of the main academic demand of each standard
- Performance indicators that demonstrate how students at each level of language progression meet the standard using grade-level text
- Analysis of the linguistic demand of each standard
- Scaffolds and supports that guide teachers for each proficiency level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Language Progression</th>
<th>Entering</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Transitioning</th>
<th>Expanding</th>
<th>Commanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common Core Anchor Standard (SL.2): Integrate and evaluate information presented in diverse media and formats, including visually, quantitatively, and orally.</td>
<td>L. Able to compare and contrast two or more sources of information by organizing pre-identified key words into a Venn Diagram that targets similarities and differences, as sources are read aloud in class, or in partnership and/or teacher-led small group discussions, in new and/or home language. (See CCSS RI. 3.7)</td>
<td>L. Able to compare and contrast two or more sources of information by organizing pre-identified key words and short sentences into a Venn Diagram that targets similarities and differences, as sources are read aloud in class, or in partnership and/or small group discussions, in new and/or home language. (See CCSS RI. 3.7)</td>
<td>L. Able to compare and contrast multiple sources of information by independently organizing similarities and differences into an evaluative graphic organizer as sources are read aloud in class, or in partnership, small group, and/or whole class discussions, in new and/or home language. (See CCSS RI. 3.7)</td>
<td>L. Able to compare and contrast multiple sources of information by independently organizing similarities and differences into a note taking guide or taking notes independently, as sources are read aloud in class, or in partnership, small group, and/or whole class discussions, in new language. (See CCSS RI. 3.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Core Grade 9-10 Standard (SL.9-10.2): Integrate multiple sources of information presented in diverse media or formats (e.g., visually, quantitatively, orally) evaluating the credibility and accuracy of each source.</td>
<td>R. Able to evaluate the credibility of two or more sources by rating each source (authority, currency, and/or completeness) in a provided scoring rubric and justifying the ratings, by choosing from a pre-identified list of phrases and short sentences, when reading sources in new and/or home language. (See CCSS RI. 3.7)</td>
<td>R. Able to evaluate the credibility of two or more sources by rating each source (authority, currency, and/or completeness) in a provided scoring rubric, and justifying the ratings by choosing from a pre-identified list of phrases and short sentences, when reading sources in new and/or home language. (See CCSS RI. 3.7)</td>
<td>R. Able to evaluate the credibility of multiple sources by rating each source (authority, currency, and/or objectivity) in a provided scoring rubric and justifying the ratings, after observing a teacher modeling when reading sources in new language. (See CCSS RI. 3.7)</td>
<td>R. Able to evaluate the credibility of multiple sources by rating each source (authority, currency, and/or objectivity) in a provided scoring rubric and justifying the ratings independently, when reading sources in new language. (See CCSS RI. 3.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A New Baseline: Measuring Student Progress on the Common Core Learning Standards

August 2013