



College- and Career-Readiness Standards and Assessment Resource List (Winter 2015–16)

Introduction

The Southeast Comprehensive Center (SECC) at SEDL, an affiliate of American Institutes for Research (AIR), publishes this biannual update of college- and career-readiness state standards and assessment resources. It is designed to assist staff in state education agencies (SEAs) and other educators in their curriculum, instruction, and assessment efforts. It includes multiple resources from federal content and comprehensive centers, regional educational laboratories, and other organizations that specialize in education policy, research, and technical assistance.

General Resources

[CCReady: Discover State-Created Tools, Resources and Standard Implementation Success Stories](#)

This website, hosted by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), contains a compilation of resources designed to assist states, districts, and schools in implementing college- and career-readiness standards in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics. The resources, developed by CCSSO, SEAs, and other expert organizations are grouped into six searchable categories: (a) Implementation Tools and Resources; (b) State Spotlights, with examples of promising implementation practices; (c) Case Studies; (d) ELA Resources; (e) Mathematics Resources; and (f) Webinars and Newsletters from the Implementing the CCSS Collaborative. http://www.ccsso.org/CCSS_Forward_State_Resources_and_Success_Stories_to_Implement_the_Common_Core.html

[College- and Career-Ready Standards: Benchmarking Implementation](#)

This guidance document provided by Achieve and The Aspen Institute contains four tools for state education leaders to use in gathering feedback on the implementation of college- and career-readiness (CCR) standards. The tools, which can be adapted to reflect school and district contexts, are (a) School-Level Indicators of Implementation, for determining the current status of CCR standards implementation; (b) Model School-Level Indicators of Implementation Survey, which converts school-level indicators into a survey instrument; (c) Local Education Agency (LEA) Feedback Survey, for obtaining district feedback on the SEA's efforts to support CCR standards implementation; and (d) Survey Guidance, which offers additional advice for designing effective surveys.

<http://www.achieve.org/files/CCRStandardsImplementationIndicators.pdf>

[Deeper Learning: Policies for a 21st Century Education](#)

This report from the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) provides state boards of education and SEAs guidance in adopting policies that support deeper learning as a pathway to student success in college and career readiness and civic life. Deeper learning is defined by its goals for the development of higher levels of content knowledge and cognitive skills along with key interpersonal and intrapersonal competencies such as effective communication, collaboration with diverse groups of colleagues, problem solving, and self-reflection. According to NASBE, five actions state leaders can take to facilitate deeper learning are as follows:

1. Approving standards, curriculums, and materials that support deeper learning
2. Creating high-quality professional development that improves teacher capacity to elicit deeper student learning
3. Designing student assessments that measure deeper learning goals or standards
4. Fostering educational innovations in districts and schools that encourage deeper learning
5. Facilitating systemic change that leads to implementing and sustaining deeper learning initiatives

The report also highlights current state efforts to support deeper learning and contains a link to online worksheets (http://www.nasbe.org/?attachment_id=12772) designed to help state leaders engage in conversations about each of these five actions. An annotated list of additional resources to help states support the implementation of deeper learning is included.

http://www.nasbe.org/wp-content/uploads/Parsi_Deeper-Learning-Ed-Leaders-Report_May-2015.pdf

[Get it Right Podcasts](#)

This webpage from the Learning First Alliance contains a compilation of podcasts highlighting successful state, district, school, and community efforts to implement the Common Core. The podcasts address a variety of topics related to CCSS implementation such as coalition building, professional development, instruction, and the development of standards-based assessments. Podcast presenters include state leaders, educators from K–12 and institutions of higher education, business and parent teacher association leaders, members of other professional organizations, and researchers. A brief summary of the content and an edited transcript are provided for each podcast.

<http://www.learningfirst.org/commoncore/podcast>

[Integrating Earning College Credit in High School into Accountability Systems](#)

This paper by Achieve and Jobs for the Future provides states with a rationale and guidance for adding indicators of earned college credit during high school to their accountability systems as a measure of college and career readiness. The document describes the three most common programs for earning college credit in high school (Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, and dual enrollment) and cites research findings that support the positive relationships between earning college credit in high school and college success. The authors also examine current state policies for incorporating college credit into accountability systems and feature several states' approaches to two key policy issues: public reporting of earned college credit data and inclusion of these data in state accountability formulas. The document concludes with several recommendations to help state policymakers develop accountability systems that support postsecondary education opportunities in high school. Recommendations include (a) ensuring equitable access to postsecondary courses in high school, (b) reporting enrollment and completion rates in postsecondary courses by demographic group, and (c) providing incentives for enrolling in college-level classes and earning college credit in high school.

<http://www.achieve.org/files/EarningCollegeCreditAchieveJFF.pdf>

[Integrating Employability Skills: A Framework for All Educators](#)

Developed by the College and Career Readiness and Success Center (CCRS Center), the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders, and RTI International, this modifiable professional learning module offers regional comprehensive centers, state regional centers, and SEA staff resources for embedding employability skills into instruction and bringing employability skills to the forefront of state and local education efforts. The module defines employability skills as general skills and knowledge that are necessary for job success (e.g., critical thinking skills, problem solving skills, or collaborating with others). The training module includes a facilitator's guide, PowerPoint presentation, workbook, handouts, and sample agenda.

<http://www.ccrscenter.org/technical-assistance-networks/professional-learning-modules/integrating-employability-skills>

[Mapping College-Ready Policies](#)

This interactive web-based tool from ATLAS identifies state-level college- and career-readiness policies that were in effect for the 2014–2015 academic year. The tool provides policymakers, researchers, and other stakeholders with states' current definitions of college and career readiness and a brief review of the academic standards and policies related to assessment, course requirements, admission, financial aid, and course placement. If available, sources are provided for each policy along with a link to the appropriate state website to allow for a more detailed explanation of the college and career policies and practices.

<http://atlas.newamerica.org/mapping-college-readiness#>

[The Role of Strategic Communications in the Transition to New Academic Standards and Assessments: Case Studies of Tennessee and Kentucky](#)

This case study from the Hunt Institute's newsletter describes how two states effectively managed communication during transition to the Common Core. The report includes eight lessons learned about building support for CCSS while minimizing pushback. These eight lessons are (a) tailor communication to various stakeholders, (b) coordinate outgoing information among policymakers and agents, (c) communicate with educators, (d) provide clear and easy-to-understand messages, (e) recruit non-educational organizations to promote your message, (f) plan and prepare for expected and unexpected consequences, (g) focus communication on improved student outcomes and economic growth, and (h) hold frequent public forums to provide information as well as listen to and solicit input from a variety of stakeholders.

http://www.hunt-institute.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/reVISION_TN_KY_CaseStudies_20150602.pdf

[Teacher Leadership: The Pathway to Common Core Success](#)

This report from the Center for American Progress describes the collaborative approach of six school districts to ensure the meaningful involvement of teachers in the Common Core. This document highlights two ways that teacher leadership is used to successfully implement CCSS. Some districts enable teachers to participate in the decision-making process (e.g., participating on the governing board, steering committee, or leadership team). In other districts, teachers provide professional development, collaborate with fellow teachers, and select instructional materials.

<https://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/CCTeacherVoiceFinal.pdf>

[Teaching Academic Content and Literacy to English Learners in Elementary and Middle School](#)

This practice guide from the Institute of Education Sciences is an update of a 2007 guide and provides recommendations for teaching academic content and literacy to English language learners (ELLs). The recommendations focus on acquiring academic vocabulary, writing and oral language development, and small-group interventions. Each recommendation is aligned with the Common Core and is easily adaptable for alignment to other college- and career-readiness standards. Multiple concrete examples illustrate how each recommendation can be implemented in the classroom to support elementary and middle school ELLs.

<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide.aspx?sid=19>

English/Language Arts Resources

[Common Core State Standards Video Series for English Language Arts](#)

These Common Core videos for ELA are designed to support states, schools, and teachers in the implementation of the Common Core. The videos were created in collaboration with states in the SECC's region based on their need for professional development support in the implementation of the standards. Each video focuses on one or more specific standard and includes examples to enhance understanding. Additional videos are being created and added to the website periodically.

http://secc.sedl.org/common_core_videos/index_ela.php

[Instructional Materials Evaluation Tool \(IMET\): ELA/Literacy, Grades K–2](#)

Developed collaboratively by Achieve, CCSSO, and the Council of Great City Schools (CGCS), this tool is housed within the Materials Alignment Toolkit and allows educators to evaluate the degree to which Grade K–2 comprehensive instructional materials are aligned to the Common Core (<http://achievethecore.org/page/285/toolkit-content-list-page>). IMET walks educators through a four-step evidence-based process that includes (1) determining if curricular materials meet nonnegotiable criteria, (2) determining the degree to which they meet other alignment criteria, (3) creating an evaluation summary of the results from the first two steps, and (4) evaluating the materials against a set of indicators that capture additional information about overall quality and/or best practices.

http://achievethecore.org/content/upload/IMET_Version3_ELA_K-2.pdf

[Instructional Materials Evaluation Tool \(IMET\): ELA/Literacy, Grades 3–12](#)

Developed collaboratively by Achieve, CCSSO, and CGCS, this resource tool is housed within the Materials Alignment Toolkit (<http://achievethecore.org/page/285/toolkit-content-list-page>) and allows educators to evaluate the degree to which Grade 3–12 comprehensive instructional materials are aligned to the Common Core. IMET walks educators through a four-step evidence-based process, which is defined above.

http://achievethecore.org/content/upload/IMET_Version2_ELA_3-12.pdf

[Uncommonly Engaging? A Review of the EngageNY English Language Arts Common Core Curriculum](#)

This review of the EngageNY ELA Common Core curriculum by the Thomas B. Fordham Institute provides ELA staff and teachers with an evaluation of the curriculum's strengths and weaknesses. The review is organized by grade bands (Pre-K–2, 3–8, 9–12). The authors provide the organizing principle for each grade band followed by an examination of the strengths and weaknesses of six key areas: (a) Text complexity, quality, and balance; (b) Evidence-based reading; (c) Content knowledge and vocabulary; (d) Writing, language, listening, and speaking; (e) K–3 foundational reading skills; and (f) Instructional coherence, delivery, and assessment. The authors concluded that EngageNY offers high-quality materials and resources for teaching the Common Core.

http://edex.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/publication/pdfs/TBFI-EngageNY-Final_0.pdf

Mathematics Resources

Common Core State Standards Video Series for Mathematics

These Common Core videos for mathematics are designed to support states, schools, and teachers in the implementation of the standards. The videos were created in collaboration with states in the SECC's region based on their need for professional development support in the implementation of the Common Core. Each video focuses on one or more specific standards and includes examples to enhance understanding. Additional videos are added to the website periodically and include connections to other related standards and applications to the Standards of Mathematical Practice.

http://secc.sedl.org/common_core_videos/

Gearing up to Teach the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics in Rural Northeast Region Schools

This report from the Regional Educational Laboratory Northeast & Islands identified needs and challenges state and local educators face as they implement the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics (CCSSM). Although teachers receive a variety of CCSSM resources and professional development from state, district, and school sources, challenges exist for teachers as they implement the CCSSM curriculum. These challenges include (a) lack of time to develop an appropriate level of expertise to teach the curriculum, (b) competing initiatives, (c) lack of collaborative opportunities for implementation, (d) lesson planning, and (e) finding appropriate instructional materials. In addition, state and district administrators often cite funding challenges in attracting qualified math specialists to support implementation and difficulty in finding high-quality curricular materials. The authors recommend educational leaders assist teachers with implementing CCSSM, promote teacher collaboration, and develop a CCSSM resource evaluation system.

<http://www.relnei.org/publications/common-core-math-rural-northeast.html>

Instructional Materials Evaluation Tool (IMET): Mathematics, Grades K–8

Developed collaboratively by Achieve, CCSSO, and CGCS, this tool is housed within the Materials Alignment Toolkit (<http://achievethecore.org/page/285/toolkit-content-list-page>) and allows educators to evaluate the degree to which Grade K–8 comprehensive instructional materials are aligned to the Common Core. IMET walks educators through a four-step evidence-based process that includes (1) determining if curricular materials meet non-negotiable criteria, (2) determining the degree to which they meet other alignment criteria, (3) creating an evaluation summary of the results from the first two steps, and (4) evaluating the materials against a set of indicators that capture additional information about overall quality and/or best practices.

http://achievethecore.org/content/upload/IMET_Version2_Math_K-8.pdf

Instructional Materials Evaluation Tool (IMET): Mathematics, High School

Developed collaboratively by Achieve, CCSSO, and CGCS, this tool is housed within the Materials Alignment Toolkit (<http://achievethecore.org/page/285/toolkit-content-list-page>) and allows educators to evaluate the degree to which Grade K–8 comprehensive instructional materials are aligned to the Common Core. IMET walks educators through a four-step evidence-based process, which is defined above.

http://achievethecore.org/content/upload/IMET_Version2_Math_HS.pdf

Math Standards Implementation Tool

This implementation tool, developed by CCSSO, provides evidence-based research and resources for educators implementing college- and career-ready math standards. The resources are divided into three domains: (a) Content Knowledge for Teachers, (b) Improving Professional Learning Opportunities, and (c) Creating Partnerships. Each domain contains detailed abstracts and full texts of publically available briefs, studies, and practice guides that describe effective instructional practices for supporting the implementation of college- and career-ready math standards. For resources that are not publically available, an abstract and a link to the resource are provided.

<http://mathtool.ccsso.org/>

College- and Career-Readiness Assessment Resources

Communicating Assessment Results to Families and Educators

This website, hosted by Achieve, contains a compilation of resources designed to help state and district leaders communicate assessment results to families and educators. These resources include the following:

- Sample student assessment reports for families, educators, and schools that pertain to selected subjects and grade levels
- Sample communication materials: a parent flyer, parent letter, and frequently asked questions for SEA websites
- Guidance to states on reporting assessment results

Also included is a webinar presentation designed to build state-, district-, and school-level capacity to communicate student assessment results.

<http://www.achieve.org/samplestudentreports>

Comprehensive Statewide Assessment Systems: A Framework for the Role of the State Education Agency in Improving Quality and Reducing Burden

This document from CCSSO provides SEA leaders with a framework for implementing a high-quality comprehensive assessment system. The framework involves six key action steps: (a) Define the goal and determine the state's role, (b) Get the facts, (c) Involve the community, (d) Move from data collection to evaluation, (e) Make recommendations and implement them, and (f) Communicate early and often. Each action step is described in detail, and supporting resources are provided in the appendices.

<http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/Comprehensive%20Statewide%20Assessment%20Systems%20-%20A%20Framework%20Final%206-22.pdf>

CSAI Webinar: Helping SEAs Communicate Effectively Around Shifts in Assessment Scores

In this webinar, Center for Standards and Assessment Implementation (CSAI) staff discuss the reasons for significant decreases in college- and career-readiness assessment scores and how the Regional Comprehensive Center (RCC) network can best support SEAs in effectively addressing the shifts. Two state-level experts share their experiences in addressing communication challenges associated with decreased assessment scores and provide advice based on those experiences. Their advice includes the following strategies: (a) communicate early and often, (b) share effective communication strategies and materials across states, (c) involve the business communities, and (d) have a well-thought-out communication plan. Additional recommendations for RCCs are provided in the accompanying presentation.

<http://csai-online.org/spotlight/csai-webinar-helping-seas-communicate-effectively-around-shifts-assessment-scores>

Examination of Test Construction Materials across Multiple Assessment Programs

This report from CCSSO provides state and district educational leaders with a review and side-by-side comparison of ACT Aspire, Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC), and Smarter Balanced assessments. These assessments are also compared to the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). Areas of review include (a) Test Specifications, (b) Purpose, (c) Content Standards, (d) Performance Level Descriptors, (e) Test Blueprints and Item Specifications, and (f) Score Reports.

<http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/Examination%20of%20Test%20Construction%20Materials.pdf>

How Are States Reporting on College and Career Readiness?

This brief from the CCRS Center reviews the college- and career-readiness measures shared publicly between 2013 and 2014 by all 50 states and the District of Columbia. Information on these measures is organized around four key areas: (a) academic content, (b) pathway knowledge, (c) lifelong learning skills, and (d) postsecondary outcomes. The report concludes with three recommendations:

- Make sure data are understandable and easily accessed.
- Increase the breadth and depth of reporting on existing measures.
- Look for and implement additional ways to measure lifelong learning skills.

http://www.ccrscenter.org/sites/default/files/AskCCRS_Metrics.pdf

Online Professional Learning: Training Modules

This series of online learning modules is being developed by PARCC to help educators understand and use the PARCC assessment system to enhance teaching and learning. A tutorial is available to walk users through the features of the modules. Each module begins with an overview of the key points covered in the training, followed by three sections: (a) In Theory, (b) In Practice, and (c) In Context (which contains the resources referred to in the module). To save time, participants can take a pretest that is designed to identify the topics within the module they should view. The two completed modules are the PARCC Assessments Overview and the PARCC Accessibility System. Three future modules will provide introductions to PARCC's K–2 formative tasks, diagnostic tools, and speaking and listening tools.

<http://www.parcconline.org/professional-learning-modules-parcc-assessments>

[Opt Out Guidance State-by-State Chart](#)

This document from NASBE is a compilation of current guidance and policies for opting out of state testing. It provides policymakers with a brief summary of each state's opt out legislation, policies, and actions. Links to additional resources are provided for readers to access more comprehensive explanations of states' opt out practices.

http://www.nasbe.org/wp-content/uploads/Lorenzo_opt-out-guidance-table.pdf

[PARCC Summative Assessment Resources Collection](#)

This webpage provides access to resources from PARCC to help educators understand the PARCC summative assessments. It provides educators with a link to resources in seven different categories: (a) PARCC Assessment System Overview, (b) Content Specifications, (c) Item and Task Development Specifications, (d) Test Form Blueprints, (e) Practice Tests and Sample Items and Tasks, (f) Accessibility and Accommodations, and (g) Technology Readiness. Selecting a category allows users to access a variety of resources such as guidance documents, model content frameworks, and interactive modules.

<http://csai-online.org/collection/1778>

[PARCC Test Design Changes: Quick Overview](#)

This infographic and accompanying explanatory text from PARCC provides a brief overview of the changes educators can expect in the 2015–2016 PARCC assessments. These changes include (a) identifying a single window for spring testing, (b) reducing the amount of total testing time, (c) reducing the number of units (or sections) of the test students will take, and (d) making the amount of time for each unit more uniform.

<http://www.parcconline.org/assessments/test-design/design-changes>

[Smarter Balanced ELA/Literacy Summative Assessment Blueprint](#)

This document provides an outline of the content included in the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium's (SBAC) summative ELA/literacy assessment and describes how the content is assessed. The blueprint consists of a series of tables, organized by grade or grade bands, that quantify the total number of items in each "claim and content category" (e.g., Reading: Informational) and further delineates the items by type (computer adaptive questions or performance tasks). Additional tables provide information about (a) the assessment targets addressed by the items in each content category, (b) the depth of knowledge required within each target (according to SBAC's 4-level matrix), (c) how each item type is categorized (machine scored; short text; or, in the writing category, as a full write), and (d) score reporting information for the performance tasks.

http://www.smarterbalanced.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/ELA_Blueprint.pdf

[Smarter Balanced Mathematics Summative Assessment Blueprint](#)

This document provides an outline of the content included in the SBAC summative mathematics assessment and describes how the content is assessed. The blueprint consists of a series of tables, organized by grade or grade bands, that quantify the total number of items in each "claim and content category" (e.g., Concepts and Procedures: Supporting Cluster) and further delineates the items by type (computer adaptive questions or performance tasks). Additional tables provide information about the assessment targets addressed by the items in each content category and the depth of knowledge required within each target (according to SBAC's 4-level matrix).

http://www.smarterbalanced.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Mathematics_Blueprint.pdf

Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment Resources

This webpage provides access to resources to help educators understand the Smarter Balanced summative assessment. There are links to resources in nine categories: (a) Smarter Balanced System Overview; (b) Content Specifications; (c) Task and Item Specifications; (d) Test Blueprints; (e) Practice Tests and Sample Items and Tasks; (f) Accessibility, Accommodations; and Sensitivity; (g) Technology Requirements; (h) Professional Development for Item Writers; and (i) District and School Implementation Guidance. Selecting a category allows users to access a variety of resources such as guidance documents, videos, and scoring guides.

<http://csai-online.org/collection/1593>

SEDL/AIR Management

Wesley A. Hoover, Ph.D., AIR Executive Vice President
Vicki Dimock, Ph.D., AIR Managing Director
Beth Howard-Brown, Ed.D., AIR Principal Technical Assistance (TA) Consultant
Tammie Causey-Konaté, Ph.D., AIR Senior TA Consultant

CCRS and Assessment Resources Team

SECC/AIR staff—Beth Howard-Brown, Ed.D., Principal Technical Assistance Consultant; Concepcion Molina, Ed.D., Senior TA Consultant; and Chris Times, M.B.A., Senior Communications Specialist; Partner staff from RMC Research Corporation—Stephen Brown, Office Manager; Joy Eichelberger, Ed.D., Consultant; Archie Hill, Ph.D., Research Associate; Vicki LaRock, M.Ed., Senior Research Associate; Diana Sharp, Ph.D., Research Associate; and Sheryl Turner, M.Ed., Senior Research Associate.

SECC State Liaisons

Alabama State Liaison: Heidi Goertzen, Ph.D. (hgoertzen@air.org)
Georgia State Liaison: Glenda Copeland, M.A. (gcopeland@air.org)
Mississippi State Liaison: Debra Meibaum, M.A.T. (dmeibaum@air.org)
North Carolina State Liaison: Shirley Carraway, Ed.D. (shirleycarraway@suddenlink.net)
South Carolina State Liaison: Don Doggett, M.Ed. (ddoggett@air.org)

The Southeast Comprehensive Center is a project of SEDL, an affiliate of American Institutes for Research

AIR Austin Office	Southeast Comprehensive Center at SEDL
4700 Mueller Blvd.	440 Knox Abbott Drive, Suite 200
Austin, TX 78723	Cayce, SC 29033
800-476-6861	803-936-0750
www.sedl.org	secc.sedl.org

SECC is one of 15 regional centers established by the U.S. Department of Education (ED). The primary goal of the regional centers is to build the capacity of SEAs and statewide systems of support to implement ESEA. Links to the other regional centers, the content centers, and ED may be found on the SECC website (secc.sedl.org). The contents of this publication were developed under a grant from ED. The contents do not, however, necessarily represent the policy of ED, and one should not assume endorsement by the federal government.