CODESP NEWS

VOLUME 31, ISSUE 10

JUNE, 2003

ELECTION RESULTS

Effective July 1, 2003, CODESP will have two new directors on our Board. These vacancies were created by an additional spot added to the Board for community colleges and by the completion of Board Member Glenn Siegel's term. He was not able to run for re-election. We would like to thank Glenn for his service on the Board. Traveling from the San Mateo Office of Education to our meetings in Orange County wasn't always easy, but we appreciate all the time, effort, and guidance he provided during his term. We hope to have another Bay Area representative on the Board in the future.

Glenn's spot was filled by Don McCann, Director-Personnel Commission for Torrance USD. He has over 30 years of experience as a human resource professional in a civil service testing environment. Don has also been a member of the California Bar Association for over 25 years. His education includes a Bachelor's Degree in Human Resources, a Masters of Science Degree in Business Management, a Ph.D. in School Administration, and a Juris Doctorate.

Jeff Josserand returns to our Board as the Community College Representative. The Board decided that the unique nature of community colleges required a board member spot reserved exclusively Jeff is the Director at State Center for them. Community College District in Fresno. Prior to becoming director at State Center, Jeff worked for Cutler-Orosi Joint Unified School District. He also has 20 years experience as an officer with the Marine Corps in civil service management and is concluding his Ed.D from USC. Jeff is also active with the California State Personnel Commissioner's Association.

We are pleased to have directors with such impressive resumes and with varied backgrounds. Three members of the Board of Directors are up for re-election each year and interested members are encouraged to run for office.

NCLB UPDATE

A decision has been made by the State Board of Education regarding the NCLB Liaison Team recommendations and will be posted soon.

Based on requests for clarification and guidance from school districts and (California Department of Education) CDE staff analysis, the following issues have been identified and include some of the Liaison team recommendations prepared for the State Board of Education, June 2003.

The definition of two years of study has been interpreted as 48 semester units and it is recommended that the State be allowed local flexibility in the coursework required for "two years of college".

It is recommended that the California Department of Education explore the use of a structured observation process for determining paraprofessional knowledge and skills. The federal Title 1 regulations make it clear that states and local agencies have considerable flexibility in how they design and administer the paraprofessional assessments. The assessment, therefore, could be a written exam, but also could be a demonstration, performance, observation, or oral exam. However, there must be evidence that the assessment is valid and reliable. The assessment results must be documented, i.e., there needs to be a record of the assessment and the individual's performance on it.

Discussions are currently underway regarding the use of an observation/review process for determining veteran teachers' status in meeting the NCLB "highly qualified teacher" definition. A similar process could be developed or adopted for paraprofessionals, particularly for those who have already passed a written exam (if that exam meets the standard of rigor required by the law) that documents their knowledge and skills in the subject areas of reading, mathematics, and writing. If a local proficiency test were determined by the LEA

Cont'd on page 3

CALIFORNIA HIGH SCHOOL EXIT EXAM

Jack O'Connell, State Superintendent of Schools, in correspondence to the County and District Superintendents dated June 13, 2003, stated that he will be recommending to the State Board of Education (SBE) to delay the graduation requirement to pass the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) until 2006; to recognize those students who have passed both parts of the CAHSEE; and to reduce both the length of the test and the number of days it is administered.

The California Department of Education states that the primary purpose of the exam is to significantly improve pupil achievement in public high school and to ensure that pupils who graduate from public high schools can demonstrate grade level competency in reading, writing, and mathematics.

The CAHSEE has two parts: English-language arts (ELA) and mathematics. The ELA section addresses state content standards through grade 10. In the reading section this includes vocabulary, decoding, comprehension, and analysis information and literary texts. In writing, the test covers writing strategies, applications, and the conventions of English (e.g. grammar, spelling, and punctuation). The ELA includes 82 multiple- choice items and two writing tasks. The math section includes 80 multiple-choice questions and addresses state standards in grades 6 and 7 and Algebra I. The exam includes statistics, data analysis and probability, number sense, measurement and geometry, mathematical reasoning, and algebra. Students are also asked to demonstrate a strong foundation in computation and arithmetic, including working with decimals, fractions, and percents.

The CAHSEE was developed after the determination was made that local proficiency standards established pursuant to Education Code Section 51215 (repealed January 1, 2000) were generally below a high school level and were not consistent with the state's content standards (*this is true of most district's old proficiency tests*). The Legislature indicated its intent to set higher standards for high school graduation. *This was the first clue that the proficiency exams used for Instructional Aides needed to be reevaluated and upgraded.*

State Superintendent O'Connell also stated that he is recommending that the SBE delay the graduation requirement for the classes of 2004 and 2005 because (1) the Assembly Bill 1609 Study Report has indicated "...many factors suggest that the effectiveness of standards-based instruction will improve for each succeeding class" (after the class of 2004); and (2) he wants to maintain the positive momentum created by the CAHSEE by requiring students in the class of 2006 to take it as 10th graders beginning in January 2004.

The Assembly Bill 1609 Study Report also found that those schools that have closely aligned their curriculum to the content standards, reported passing grades of 75 percent or greater more frequently than schools without early implementation of the standards. *Another indication that preparing for a test, such as using a tutorial or providing prep classes, will raise test scores.*

The percent of first-time test takers achieving passing scores in the Class of 2005 (March 2003-Grade 10) was 79% in the English-Language Arts section and 60% in the Mathematics section. These results were an improvement from the class of 2004.

As classified employee test developers, it is important for us to follow the trends in state testing. We have seen over the last five years an increased emphasis on student testing and changes in curriculum. Reading, writing and math standards have been raised, and science will soon follow. These changes not only affect the Instructional Aide test, they will also effect the type of candidates we'll see in the future. The next generation may not be more capable, but will possess more test-taking skills as they have spent much of their instructional time devoted to test preparation. We will continue to monitor state testing trends so that test materials provided to members for the Instructional Aide test will remain aligned to the California State Content Standards and will also meet the "rigor" required by the federal government.

UPCOMING CONFERENCE

WRIPAC

Fish Camp/Yosemite Area Western Regional Intergovernmental Personnel Assessment Council Preconference Training: Sept. 2 - 3 Conference: Sept. 4 - 5

There will be a choice of two training workshops during the preconference training:

Job Analysis is a 2 day program and will be presented by Mike Willihnganz, Ph.D., and Karen Coffee. This interactive workshop will focus on the WRIPAC Job Analysis Method. This comprehensive method is designed to identify the essential job tasks and associated knowledge, skills and abilities required to perform the tasks in a satisfactory manner. This method is flexible enough to be used in any jurisdiction and for a variety of classifications. It is compliant with the 1978 Federal Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures and the ADA.

Assessment Center is a one day workshop and will be presented by Aaron Morgan and Julie Paholke. Well-designed assessment centers can provide one of the most direct and accurate measurements of a candidate's particular work products. They generally have a high candidate acceptance and typically result in significantly less adverse impact than most paper and pencil tests. This workshop is designed to provide concepts, methodologies, techniques and practical examples.

The cost of each workshop is \$100/WRIPAC members and \$120/Non-Members.

Hotel accommodations can be made at the Tenaya Lodge at Yosemite. (888) 514-2167. To register for the training contact: Julie Paholke at jpaholke@mail.co.washoe.nv.us. There are no registration fees to attend the conference.

NEW MEMBERS

Dry Creek ESD Hanford Joint Union HSD Salinas City SD Sunnyvale SD Westside Union SD to meet the rigor, reliability, and validity required under the NCLB, those paraprofessionals who had previously passed the exam ("veteran paraprofessionals") may be in no need of further assessment. If a local proficiency test met the standard for knowledge of the subject areas, but not the ability to "assist in instruction", a successful rating through a structured observation process could complete the requirement for those veteran employees.

Incorporating the NCLB and the California Education Code requirements for paraprofessionals, the following options could be considered for assessing the qualifications of instructional aides for employment in Title 1 programs:

Written Assessment: (1) Commercial tests -There are a variety of commercially available exams that appear to meet the criteria set forth by the USDE for assessing the skills and knowledge of paraprofessionals. (2) Locally developed tests - An LEA may choose to use locally developed tests if the test has been determined by the LEA to meet the rigor, reliability, and validity required.

Structured Interview: Some LEAs in California are choosing this option for determining the skills and knowledge of paraprofessionals, and when used in combination with a written exam (such as a proficiency exam given prior to NCLB that meets the standards of rigor required by the federal law), this process could adequately meet NCLB requirements. The structured interview could cover both content (core subject knowledge) and the ability to assist in instruction (learning strategies, behavior mgt., etc.) without the addition of a written exam, if the LEA has determined that it meets the federal requirements.

Structured Observation: This is another option being considered by LEAs to assess the skills and knowledge of currently employed paraprofessionals, in addition to a written exam (such as the proficiency exam given prior to NCLB that meets the standard of rigor required by the federal law). It should be designed to provide consistent, reliable data that demonstrates both content knowledge (reading, mathematics, and writing) and skills in assisting in instruction. The determination of who performs and documents the observation is a local decision.

These are options that are being considered, the CDE will offer a final opinion soon.

INSTRUCTIONAL AIDE SURVEY

On June 17, we conducted an email survey (if you didn't receive it, we may have an incorrect email address for you, give us a call). The California Department of Education will post the recent decision by the State Board of Education that should clarify local options. The results below offer a glimpse of what 52 members are currently doing and what they anticipate doing.

| | | YES | NO | |
|---|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|--|
| h | Do you offer a prep class for IA candidates prior to testing? | 8 | 43 | |
| ľ | Do you offer the CODESP Tutorial? | 26 | 25 | |
| h | Are you currently testing incumbent Instructional Aides? | 18 | 34 | |
| 1 | If yes, are you providing them with the CODESP Tutorial? | 13 | 6 | |
| Ì | If yes, are you providing them with an alternate prep course? | 8 | 11 | |
| ľ | If given a choice, which type of test would your district offer to incumbent Instructional Aides? | | | |
| | Multiple-Choice. 20 | | | |
| | Observation/Evaluation. 10 | | | |
| | A Choice Between the Two. 18 | | | |

CODESP 17210 Oak Street Fountain Valley, CA 92708

Phone: 714 - 847-8203 Fax: 714 - 848-2963 email: tests@codesp.com Internet: www.codesp.com