



California State Board of Education March 2018 Agenda Item #01

Subject

Developing an Integrated Local, State, and Federal Accountability and Continuous Improvement System: Updates and Recommended Action Regarding Local Indicators; and Update on the Continuing Development Work and Revisions Under Consideration for the 2018 California School Dashboard.

Type of Action

Action, Information

Summary of the Issue(s)

With the approval of a new accountability system in May 2016, the State Board of Education (SBE) established an annual review process of the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) evaluation rubrics, which is reported through the online California School Dashboard (Dashboard). This process includes the review of state and local indicators and performance standards to consider necessary changes or improvements based on newly available data, recent research, and/or stakeholder feedback. Under this process, the California Department of Education (CDE) includes state and local indicators that need revisions or updates in the work plan presented annually at each March SBE meeting. This process allows for a gradual and deliberate approach to improving the state and local indicators and incorporating changes prior to the annual release of the Dashboard each fall. This item will provide an extensive update on activities and recommendations for the 2018 Dashboard release; recommendation for action on Priority 6: School Climate and Priority 7: Access to a Broad Course of Study as a local indicator; and an update on the outreach activities completed to date on the Dashboard.

Recommendation

The CDE recommends that the SBE approve: (1) the proposed revision to the self-reflection tool for Priority 6: School Climate, and (2) the proposed standard and self-assessment tool for LEAs to determine progress on the local performance indicator for Priority 7: Access to a Broad Course of Study. The CDE also recommends that the SBE provide guidance on recommended changes to the state indicators and take additional action as deemed necessary and appropriate.

Brief History of Key Issues

Since the SBE adopted the initial phase of the LCFF evaluation rubrics at its September 2016 meeting, extensive feedback from numerous stakeholder input sessions and work groups continues to inform the state and local indicators and Dashboard displays and reports. The Spring 2017 Dashboard release was designed as a field test of the system. Accordingly, the system was intended to be flexible and further evolve based on user experiences and stakeholder feedback in anticipation of the first operational release of the Dashboard in fall 2017.

The Fall 2017 Dashboard was released on December 7, 2017, and is available on the CDE Dashboard Web site at <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/>. Prior to the release, the CDE hosted a six-part Webinar series that provided a general introduction of the Dashboard and the Local Indicators; informed on the general business rules used to calculate each state indicator; and concluded with a final Webinar on how to use the new data in the Local Control and Accountability Plan process.

The CDE also developed several new resources to support the release of the Fall 2017 Dashboard, which are posted on the CDE California Accountability Model & School Dashboard Web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/cm/>. These include videos, a parent guide, in-depth modules on each of the state indicators, communication tools for LEAs, and several new flyers. Additionally, many of these resources have been translated to accommodate non-English speaking users.

The Fall 2017 Dashboard itself included several new features to improve functionality, as detailed in the January 2018 SBE Agenda Item 1 (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/jan18item01.docx>). In addition, the CDE also released two reports: (1) the California Model Five-by-Five Placement Report and (2) the College/Career Indicator Report and Data to better inform the public, LEAs, and schools about the data presented in the Dashboard.

Summary of Previous State Board of Education Discussion and Action

In February 2018, the SBE received the following Information Memoranda:

- Developing a New State Accountability System: Update on the Implementation of the College/Career Indicator; Including the Expansion of Career Measures and Performance Comparisons for Academic Measures
(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-feb18item02.docx>)
- Developing a New State Accountability System: Update on the Development of a Student-Level Growth Model
(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-feb18item01.docx>)
- Update on the Development of a Revised Self-Reflection Tool for the Local Performance Indicator for Local Control Funding Formula Priority 6: School Climate (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-exec-ocd-feb18item01.docx>)

In January 2018, the SBE received an update on the outreach activities related to the Fall 2017 Dashboard release and two presentations from local educational agencies on their work with the Dashboard.

(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/jan18item01.docx>)

In November 2017, the SBE adopted new Status cut scores for the Academic Indicator (for both ELA and mathematics) and the Change cut scores for mathematics only. In addition, the SBE adopted new five-by-five colored grids for the Academic Indicator.

(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/nov17item03.doc>)

Additionally, the SBE received a summary report of the work of the School Conditions and Climate Work Group (CCWG). The report included a synopsis of the framework recommendations including state level and local educational agency (LEA) level recommendations. The CCWG's recommendations comprise both those that can be acted on with existing resources and authority and those for which additional resources and authority will be necessary to implement.

(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/nov17item03rev.doc>)

In June 2017, the SBE received the following Information Memoranda:

- Smarter Balanced Assessment Growth Model Simulations to Inform Local Educational Agency and School Accountability
(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-asb-adad-jun17item03.doc>)

- Developing an Integrated Statewide System of Support
(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-exec-ocd-jun17item02.doc>)
- Update on the School Conditions and Climate Workgroup
(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-exec-ocd-jun17item01.doc>)

In May 2017, the SBE heard an update on the Dashboard, and received an overview of the recommendations of the English Learner Progress Indicator Workgroup. The SBE took action to approve the development of an application process to require alternative schools of choice and charter schools to re-certify—every three years—that at least 70 percent of their enrollment is comprised of high-risk students (as defined in the SBE-approved eligibility criteria) in order to continue participating as an alternative school in the accountability system.

(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/may17item01.doc>)

In March 2017, the SBE heard an update on the development of the new accountability system; an overview of alternative schools in preparation for the development of applicable indicators; a work plan for state indicator development; and an update on the local indicators—specifically, the work by the School Conditions and Climate Work Group. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/mar17item02.doc>)

In February 2017, the SBE received the following Information Memoranda:

- Updated Summary of SBE Actions Related to Adopting the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-sbe-feb17item01v2.doc>)
- Update on the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics Components: Statements of Model Practices (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-exe-jan17item02.doc>)

In January 2017, the SBE approved the Academic Indicator, based on student test scores on English language arts/literacy (ELA) and mathematics for grades three through eight that includes results from the second year of Smarter Balanced tests, as well as the definition of the English learner (EL) student group for the Academic Indicator. Additionally, the SBE approved the self-reflection tools for LEAs to determine progress on the local performance indicators for Priority 2: Implementation of State Academic Standards and Priority 3: Parent Engagement.

(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/jan17item02.doc>)

Furthermore, the SBE received the following Information Memorandum:

- Update on School Conditions and Climate Workgroup
(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-exe-jan17item01.doc>)

In September 2016, the SBE approved the performance standards for all local indicators and the state indicators (except for the Academic Indicator), and the annual process for the SBE to review the rubrics to determine if updates or revisions are necessary. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr16/documents/sep16item01.doc>)

In May 2016, the SBE adopted Chronic Absenteeism as a state indicator. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr16/documents/may16item02revised.doc>)

In November 2014, the SBE adopted the LCFF template, which included the formula for calculating the Chronic Absenteeism rate. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr14/documents/nov14item14.doc>)

Fiscal Analysis (as appropriate)

The 2017–18 state budget funds the Proposition 98 Minimum Guarantee at \$74.5 billion. This includes an increase of more than \$1.4 million to support the continued implementation of LCFF and builds upon the investment of more than \$15.7 billion provided over the last four years. This increase brings the formula to 97 percent of full implementation.

Attachment(s)

- Attachment 1: Proposed Revisions to the 2018 California School Dashboard (9 Pages)
- Attachment 2: Proposed Revision to the Self-Reflection Tool for Priority 6: School Climate (3 Pages)
- Attachment 3: Local Performance Indicator for Priority 7: Access to a Broad Course of Study (4 Pages)
- Attachment 4: Update on the California School Dashboard (1 Page)
- Attachment 5: California School Dashboard Educational Outreach Activities (4 Pages)

Attachment 1: Proposed Revisions to the 2018 California School Dashboard

The State Board of Education (SBE) annually reviews the California School Dashboard (Dashboard) indicators and performance standards to consider whether changes or improvements are needed based on newly available data, recent research, and feedback from stakeholders. The annual review process requires that the California Department of Education (CDE) update the SBE annually at their March meeting on which indicators are under consideration for review and/or revisions for action at the September SBE meeting. The CDE is considering the following revisions to the 2018 Dashboard:

- Chronic Absenteeism Indicator
- College/Career Indicator (CCI)
- Modified Methods for Dashboard Alternative School Status (DASS)
- Graduation Rate Indicator
- Application of Safety Net Methodology (Three-by-Five) for Student Groups
- Student-Level Growth Model
- English Learner Progress Indicator
- Reporting Participation Rate
- Automatic Assignment of a Red Performance Level
- Producing a State-Level Dashboard Report

CDE staff will provide updates to the SBE on the above proposed revisions throughout the spring and summer based on further technical review and feedback received from advisory groups and stakeholders. As part of the annual review process, approval of revisions to the 2018 Dashboard will be taken under consideration by the SBE at the September and November 2018 SBE meetings.

Chronic Absenteeism Indicator

At the November 2017 SBE meeting, the CDE indicated that a recommendation for Status cut scores for the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator would be made at the March 2018 meeting. Due to technical issues, the CDE recommends that both Status and Change cut scores be brought for consideration at the September 2018 meeting. Once these cut scores have been approved, these data, along with performance levels (colors) will be reported in the 2018 Dashboard. Currently, the Dashboard links users to the CDE's data reporting portal, DataQuest, to view this data. The CDE is reviewing the data and will run simulations for the Technical Design Group (TDG) and stakeholder input and review, after which point the simulations will be shared in an Information Memorandum.

College/Career Indicator

The SBE received a February 2018 SBE Information Memorandum (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-feb18item02.docx>) on the implementation of the CCI, including the development of new career measures in consultation with the CCI Work Group and Alternative Schools Task Force, and performance comparisons on the academic measures in the CCI.

The Fall 2017 Dashboard includes one year of CCI results utilizing the first year of grade eleven Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments results (i.e., 2015 Smarter Balanced Assessments) and Status only. To assist local educational agencies (LEAs) and schools with accessing the new data and understanding how well they are preparing students for college and career based on the indicator measures, the following CCI resources were prepared (as discussed in the February 2018 Information Memorandum) and released in conjunction with the Fall 2017 Dashboard release:

- A **one-page CCI flyer**, which provides the measures used to determine whether LEAs and schools are preparing students for success after high school.
- The **Dashboard Detailed Report**, which displays in a graph three years of grade eleven Smarter Balanced results for English language arts/literacy and mathematics by LEA and school.
- The **Dashboard Detailed Report tab**, which provides a bar chart that displays the percentage of students for each of the three CCI preparedness levels: “Prepared”, “Approaching Prepared”, and “Not Prepared.”
- The **CCI Indicator Reports and Data**, which are linked from the Dashboard CCI single indicator report and hosted on the CDE California Accountability Model & School Dashboard Web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/cm/>. These reports provide the number and percentage of students, by student group, who met each of the measures in the “Prepared” and “Approaching Prepared” levels.

In preparation for the 2018 Dashboard release, the CDE is developing a four-year graduation cohort report in the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS). As a result, the CDE will be able to use the **most current** years of graduation cohort data in the calculation of the CCI and Graduation Rate Indicator. Following the SBE approval of the Change cut scores for the CCI in fall 2018, the 2018 Dashboard will report Status (Class of 2018) and Change, which will be the difference between the Class of 2018 and Class of 2017. It will also report performance levels (colors) for the first time.

The 2018 Dashboard will report on three new career measures for the Class of 2017:

- Articulated Career Technical Education Courses
- State Seal of Biliteracy

- Golden State Seal Merit Diploma

The CDE will run simulations on these measures and present them to the CCI Work Group for review prior to SBE action.

Modified Methods for Dashboard Alternative School Status

In July 2017, the SBE approved criteria for schools to apply for Dashboard Alternative School Status (DASS). While DASS schools did not receive a Dashboard in the spring and fall of 2017, they will receive a Dashboard report beginning in 2018. DASS schools will be held accountable for meeting all of the same state indicators that are currently reported in the Dashboard, although modified methods will be used (when appropriate) to more fairly evaluate the success of alternative schools that serve high-risk students. Additionally, LEAs will be held accountable for DASS schools in their Dashboard report.

In preparation for the 2018 Dashboard, the CDE presented, at the SBE July 2017 meeting, its work with the Alternative Schools Task Force, a joint project with the John W. Gardner Center at Stanford University supported with a grant from the Stuart Foundation, on identifying modified measures for DASS schools. To date, the Alternative Schools Task Force has explored the use of the following modified measures:

- **One-Year Graduation Rate for the Graduation Rate Indicator:** Currently, the Graduation Rate Indicator uses the four-year cohort graduation rate for non-alternative schools. The Alternative Schools Task Force is considering the use of a one-year graduation rate as a modified method that could be applicable to DASS schools. The Alternative Schools Task Force reviewed a number of simulations using the one-year graduation rate and will likely make a recommendation on the methodology at its March 2018 meeting. The proposed methodology will be reviewed by the TDG and presented to stakeholders for input.
- **Modified Career Measures for the College/Career Indicator:** Because DASS schools offer students unique programs that are not available at non-alternative schools, the Alternative Schools Task Force is reviewing career measures currently collected in the CALPADS for potential inclusion in the 2018 Dashboard. In addition, the Alternative Schools Task Force is exploring new career measures for collection in CALPADS in future years. Any measures recommended for inclusion by the Alternative Schools Task Force in the 2018 Dashboard will be brought for consideration at the September 2018 SBE meeting.

Graduation Rate Indicator

Recommended Revision to the Calculation of Change

For all state indicators, Change is determined by taking the difference between current and prior year data. The Graduation Rate Indicator is the only state indicator that uses a three-year average rate to calculate Change. The prior three-year (weighted) average rate is subtracted from the current four-year graduation cohort rate.

The initial goal of using a three-year average for the Graduation Rate Indicator was to create stability and to account for any year-to-year dramatic increases or decreases in the results. For example, using a three-year average would reduce the volatility for a school that achieves a high rate in two of the last three years and achieves a low rate in one of those three years.

After reviewing the Change results, including performance levels (colors) which are derived by combining both Status and Change, the TDG recommended the use of a one-year rate to determine change for the Graduation Rate Indicator and raised the following technical issues regarding the use of a three-year average:

1. Under the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), districts and schools strive to meet the requirement for stakeholder engagement, particularly with parents/guardians. To allow for more meaningful parent involvement, the data and information in the Dashboard must be understandable and easy to communicate. Therefore, using a three-year average to determine Change for one indicator, but not others, can be confusing and difficult to explain.
2. The definition of "Change" is the difference from one year to the next, whereas a three-year average is more reflective of "trend" data and does not necessarily represent actual change. A school may have an increase in their prior year performance, but overall, their "three-year trend" may reflect a decrease. Conversely, you may have two years of growth and a decrease in the third year, but the overall average may reflect positive performance and a positive trend. If the Dashboard does not reflect what occurred in the prior year, there may be a tendency for the public and LEAs to disregard the indicator because it does not measure actual change.
3. Prior year data may be more essential data to districts, schools, and the public, whereas the three-year average information may be considered less relevant.
4. Reporting prior year data on the Dashboard is more transparent and easier to use by local staff and the community. Districts and schools are also more familiar with the prior year data, and they can easily compare it against their own data, rather than going through the process of validating an average of prior year data.

5. As charter schools open and close, the ability to accurately roll up data to the LEA level and to track which students are counted in the LEA's graduating cohort becomes more challenging.

The Five-Year Graduation Rate

Currently, the Graduation Rate Indicator only includes the four-year cohort graduation rate. It does not capture the progress of students who take five years to graduate from high school. The SBE previously expressed an interest in using the five-year cohort graduation rate as part of the Dashboard, as it could provide an opportunity for schools to demonstrate success with students who may need additional time to earn a regular high school diploma (e.g., students with disabilities and English learners [ELs]).

While the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) does allow states to include a five-year graduation rate in the accountability system, states are required to set a more rigorous long-term goal for an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate (or five-year rate), as compared to the long-term goal set for the four-year cohort graduation rate. Therefore, it may not be possible to incorporate the five-year cohort rate into the current Graduation Rate Indicator, as initially planned.

The CDE is seeking guidance from the SBE on whether they want the CDE to explore other options for including a five-year graduation rate in the Dashboard.

Application of Safety Net Methodology (Three-by-Five) for Student Groups

The "Safety Net" methodology prevents large swings in data that are triggered by the results of a few students, which can lead to an over-identification of schools in the Red and Blue performance levels when the overall size of a school or LEA is small. This methodology was approved by the SBE at the September 2017 SBE meeting (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/sep17item02.doc>).

Currently, this methodology is applied at the school level for two indicators only, based on the number of students included in the indicator:

- Graduate Rate Indicator: Applied if fewer than 150 students are in the graduating cohort
- Suspension Rate Indicator: Applied if fewer than 150 students are cumulatively enrolled.

Application of the safety net methodology results in a refiguring of the performance level tables—from a five-by-five grid to a three-by-five grid—by removing two Change levels (Increased Significantly and Decreased Significantly) and thus limiting extreme changes in small student populations.

Because large swings in performance levels also occurs for student groups, the CDE is proposing that the safety net methodology be applied at the student group level, beginning with the 2018 Dashboard.

Student-Level Growth Model

As discussed in the February 2018 SBE Information Memorandum on the update of the development of the student-level growth model, the CDE's testing vendor, Educational Testing Service (ETS), conducted an statistical analysis of three proposed growth models selected based on the desired characteristics reviewed and discussed at the January 2017 SBE meeting:

1. "Change-in-distance-to-met" measures absolute growth of each student from the prior year to the current year using Distance from Level 3 as the measurement threshold.
2. "Conditional percentile rank of the gain" ranks the growth of students who are grouped together, as a result of having the same prior year test scores, in the same subject and grade.
3. "Residual gain" is the difference between a students predicted test score and actual test score. Note: the predicted test score is based on both prior ELA and mathematics test scores, as well as the scores of all other students in the same grade.

ETS presented their analysis to the TDG, the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress Technical Advisory Group, and the LCFF and assessment stakeholders. The CDE anticipates scheduling future meetings, as needed, to obtain additional feedback to inform the SBE's decision on selecting a growth model. Specifically, at the May 2018 SBE meeting, the CDE plans to share the stakeholder feedback, discuss the options for incorporating the growth model in the 2018 Dashboard, and request action from the SBE to select one of three growth models for possible inclusion in the 2018 Dashboard.

English Learner Progress Indicator

Beginning in 2017–18, California will be transitioning from the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) to the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC). As a result, the CDE must revisit the methodology used to determine EL progress toward proficiency for state and federal accountability purposes.

The summative ELPAC was field tested in spring 2017 to determine test reliability and validity. The ELPAC field test was administered to a sample of ELs (N=41,498) and English Only (EO) students (N=4,568) by grade span.

Because the ELPAC is substantially different from the CELDT, ELPAC results will serve as a baseline from which future progress for accountability purposes will be measured and should not be compared to results from the state's previous assessment, the CELDT. Therefore, future releases of the English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) will not include CELDT results in the calculation. The next ELPI to be released will instead utilize operational ELPAC summative assessment results from the spring 2018 administration. Although the next Dashboard release is planned for fall 2018, the release of the ELPI likely will be delayed until April 2019. The ELPI will be released after other indicators because the final ELPAC cut scores must first be approved by the SBE in November 2018 and the ELPI cut scores are anticipated to be approved by the SBE in March 2019.

Moving from the CELDT to the ELPAC for EL progress measurement represents a fundamental change for the following reasons:

1. The ELPAC is aligned with the 2012 California English Language Development (ELD) Standards, whereas the CELDT is aligned with the 1999 California ELD Standards.
2. The ELPAC consists of two separate tests: the initial assessment (IA), administered throughout the school year, and summative assessment (SA), administered in the spring of each year. The CELDT, however, was one test that served to assess both initial and annual test takers.
3. The ELPAC has four performance levels, whereas the CELDT had five.
4. For the upcoming Dashboard release, only one year of summative ELPAC data from the spring 2018 administration will be available.
5. The prior ELPI Status determinations for schools and districts were based upon improvement in individual student performance on the CELDT year over year. Therefore, in order to calculate Status using the prior ELPI methodology, at least two years of summative ELPAC results (spring 2018 and spring 2019) would be needed before Status could be reported.

The prior ELPI school and district Change determinations were based on the difference between current year Status and prior year Status. Therefore, at least three years of summative ELPAC results (spring 2018, spring 2019, and spring 2020) would be needed before Change could be reported. As such, no color could be assigned until the 2020 Dashboard release.

While the CDE may decide to recommend to the SBE the same formula for ELPI as was recommended using the CELDT data, staff are consulting with the TDG, ELPI Work Group, and stakeholders on other possible methods that would allow for Status and Change to be determined using fewer years of data. Currently, only the spring 2017 summative ELPAC field test results are available to conduct simulations. It is important

to note, however, that the field test sample is representative of student performance by grade span. The sample was not taken to be representative of school or district performance, limiting the utility of these data for conducting simulations to inform comprehensive EL accountability decisions.

In addition to testing results, the prior ELPI included long-term English learners (LTELs) and reclassified fluent English-proficient (RFEP) students. CDE staff will consult with the ELPI Work Group, the TDG, and other stakeholders over the next several months to determine if and how to include LTELs and RFEPs into the ELPI.

Some key dates for the ELPI in the 2018 Dashboard include:

- March 2018: The CDE provides the SBE with an annual update on the inclusion of the ELPI in the Dashboard.
- August 2018: Spring 2018 Summative ELPAC results available.
- November 2018: ELPAC cut scores recommended for approval by the SBE.
- February 2019: The CDE provides SBE an Information Memorandum on proposed revisions to the ELPI.
- March 2019: The CDE recommends new ELPI Status cut scores approved by the SBE.
- April 2019: New ELPI Status cut scores included in the Dashboard.

Reporting Participation Rate

The ESSA requires states to report and factor the 95 percent participation rate in their accountability systems. At the July 2017 meeting, the SBE approved the use of multiple icons to report on the Dashboard indicating whether schools met the 95 percent participation rate requirement.

Four icons will be displayed to distinguish when:

- Both the school **and** each student group met the 95 percent requirement.
- The school met the 95 participation rate, but at least one student group did not meet the participation rate.
- The schoolwide participation rate is at least 85 percent, but less than 95 percent.
- The schoolwide participation rate is below 85 percent.

Once these icons have been developed, the CDE will create mock reports to obtain feedback from stakeholder groups.

Stakeholder and TDG recommendations will be brought forth to the SBE for review before the September 2018 meeting.

Automatic Assignment of a Red Performance Level

Currently, for both the Suspension Rate Indicator and the ELPI, LEAs and schools are automatically assigned an Orange performance level if they did not meet certain conditions:

- **Suspension Rate Indicator:** If LEAs and charter schools did not certify their suspension (or discipline) data in the CALPADS in the current year or prior year.
- **ELPI:** LEAs and schools that did not test at least 50 percent of their EL population on the CELDT, in grades three through eight and eleven, are assigned an Orange performance level. The 50 percent determination is based on the number of ELs (i.e., does not include RFEP students) who took the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments in mathematics in grades three through eight and grade eleven.

It is critical for LEAs and schools to report accurate data and to administer the language assessments to all EL students. Therefore, the CDE is proposing that, beginning with the 2018 Dashboard, failure to certify suspension and chronic absence data, or to test at least 50 percent of the EL population in mathematics, will result in an automatic assignment of a Red performance level.

Producing a State-Level Dashboard Report

The CDE is proposing to produce a state-level Dashboard report for all state indicators. Based on feedback from various stakeholders, there is an interest in being able to access how the state is performing as a whole on each state indicator.

Attachment 2: Proposed Revision to the Self-Reflection Tool for Priority 6: School Climate

Brief Summary of Key Issues

This attachment proposes an update to the self-reflection tool for LCFF Priority 6: School Climate. The proposed revisions are based on the work of the School Conditions and Climate Work Group (CCWG). The CCWG was formed by the California Department of Education (CDE) in partnership with the California Comprehensive Center at WestEd following May 2016 SBE guidance (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-dsib-amard-jun16item02.doc>). The CCWG's primary scope was to explore options to advise the State Superintendent of Public Instruction (SSPI) on the further development of school conditions and climate measures in California's accountability and continuous improvement system. The CCWG was comprised of a broad range of stakeholders including practitioners (teachers and administrators), researchers, parents, and advocates.

The CCWG worked diligently to synthesize their own thinking while incorporating State Board of Education (SBE), California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG), and a year's worth of extensive stakeholder feedback to draft a comprehensive set of recommendations to the CDE and SSPI (see the October 2017 SBE Information Memorandum at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-ocd-oct17item01.doc>). CCWG members presented the SBE with a summary report of their work, including a synopsis of their comprehensive recommendations framework at the November 2017 SBE meeting (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/nov17item03rev.doc>).

Implementing guidance received at the November 2017 SBE meeting, CDE staff, in partnership with the California Comprehensive Center, worked diligently to gather input on the proposed revisions to the self-reflection tool. Extensive stakeholder engagement was conducted to further refine the tool. The information received was very thoughtful, helpful, and supportive. A comprehensive report of stakeholder feedback and data results, including a detailed timeline, is available in the February 2018 SBE Information Memorandum entitled, "Update on the Development of a Revised Self-Reflection Tool for the Local Performance Indicator for Local Control Funding Formula Priority 6, School Climate" (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-exec-ocd-feb18item01.docx>).

The full text of the minor revisions for the self-reflection tool for LCFF Priority 6 is presented below. The standard and evidence sections are remaining unchanged.

Recommendation

Staff recommend that the SBE approve the proposed revision to the self-reflection tool for local educational agencies (LEAs) to utilize for the local indicator for LCFF Priority 6: School Climate.

Proposed 2018 Revision to the Self-Reflection Tool for Priority 6

Standard: The LEA administers a local climate survey at least every other year that provides a valid measure of perceptions of school safety and connectedness, such as the California Healthy Kids Survey, to students in at least one grade within the grade span(s) that the LEA serves (e.g., K–5, 6–8, 9–12), and reports the results to its local governing board at a regularly scheduled meeting of the local governing board and to stakeholders and the public through the California School Dashboard.

Evidence: The LEA administers a survey, as specified, and reports the results to its local governing board and through the local data selection option in the Dashboard.

Updated Self-reflection tool language*

Local educational agencies (LEAs) will provide a narrative summary of the local administration and analysis of a local climate survey that captures a valid measure of student perceptions¹ of school safety and connectedness in at least one grade within the grade span (e.g., K–5, 6–8, 9–12) in a text box provided in the California School Dashboard. LEAs will have an opportunity to include differences among student groups,² and for surveys that provide an overall score, such as the California Healthy Kids Survey, report the overall score for all students and student groups. This summary may also include an analysis of a subset of specific items on a local survey and *additional data collection tools* that are particularly relevant to school conditions and climate. The following are suggested guiding questions to help frame the narrative summary:

1. **DATA:** Reflect on the key learnings from the survey results and share what the LEA learned.

¹ California *Education Code* Section 52060(d)(6)(C) states, “Other local measures, including surveys of pupils, parents, and teachers on the sense of safety and school connectedness.”

² As a recommended best practice, LEAs should report the results of their school conditions and climate tools on the Dashboard, by including a URL to a district Web site that shows the school conditions and climate survey results, disaggregated by student groups, with a minimum n-size, for each school site, if applicable.

2. **MEANING:** What do the disaggregated results (*if applicable*) of the survey and other data collection methods reveal about schools in the LEA, such as areas of strength or growth, challenges, and barriers?
3. **USE:** What revisions, decisions, or actions has, or will, the LEA implement in response to the results for continuous improvement purposes? Why? If you have already implemented actions, did you see the results you were seeking?

Enter text for self-reflection tool response.

*The proposed revision to the self-reflection tool for Priority 6 maintains the basis of the current SBE-adopted self-reflection tool, making minor modifications that include guiding questions, adding the words *additional data collection tools* especially to support school districts in providing context, and a reference to data disaggregation as a best practice, if applicable.

Attachment 3: Local Performance Indicator for Priority 7: Access to a Broad Course of Study

Summary of Key Issue(s)

At their July 2016 meeting, the State Board of Education (SBE) approved the College/Career Indicator (CCI) as a state indicator to address standards for Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) Priority 7: Access to a Broad Course of Study and Priority 8: Outcomes in Access to a Broad Course of Study. These measures, however, do not provide sufficient information to determine a local educational agency's (LEA's) progress toward addressing the extent to which students have access to, and are enrolled in, Access to a Broad Course of Study (Priority 7). In September 2017, the California Department of Education (CDE) indicated to the SBE that they would develop a local indicator for Priority 7 using the standards adopted by the SBE for the current local indicators; the SBE considered the proposed local indicator at its November 2017 meeting (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/nov17item03rev.doc>).

Recommendation

Staff recommend that the SBE approve the standard and proposed self-assessment tool for LEAs to determine progress on the local performance indicator for Priority 7: Access to a Broad Course of Study.

Brief History of Key Issues

The LCFF statute requires that the evaluation rubrics include standards for all LCFF priorities. An LEA's performance, as assessed by the evaluation rubrics, is determined by state and local performance indicators and is reported through the California School Dashboard (Dashboard). State indicators meet the criteria of: (1) being valid and reliable measures, (2) having comparable state-level data, and (3) being disaggregated by student groups. These criteria ensure a common and comparable way of measuring performance on the indicators across the state, including for student groups. The SBE adopted state indicators for Priority 4: Student Achievement, Priority 5: Student Engagement, and Priority 6: School Climate.

At its July 2016 meeting, the SBE approved the methodology for establishing local performance indicators (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr16/documents/jul16item02.doc>). The methodology identified, for each LCFF priority with a local performance indicator, the proposed standard, the evidence that LEAs would use to demonstrate progress in meeting the standard, and the criteria for assessing progress based on that evidence (i.e., Met, Not Met, Not Met for Two or More Years).

At its September 2016 meeting, the SBE approved standards and the scale by which an LEA will assess its performance of meeting the standards for each of these local performance indicators

(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr16/documents/sep16item01.doc>). For each local indicator, the standard involves measuring LEA progress on the local performance indicator based on locally available information, and reporting the results to the LEA's local governing board and to stakeholders and the public via the appropriate self-reflection tool of the local indicator within the Dashboard. Based on evidence that it has annually measured its progress and reported the results to its local governing board and reported the results within the Dashboard, the LEA report its status of meeting the SBE approved standards using a (Met, Not Met, or Not Met for Two or More Years) reporting scale.

At its November 2016 meeting, the SBE approved tools for LEAs to determine progress on the local performance indicators for the LCFF Priority 1: Basics, Priority 6: School Climate, Priority 9: Coordination of Services for Expelled Students, and Priority 10: Coordination of Services for Foster Youth

(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr16/documents/nov16item03.doc>). In addition, the SBE approved a revision to the standard for each local performance indicator that clarified the reporting of information to the local governing board shall occur at a regularly scheduled meeting of the local governing board.

At its January 2017 meeting, the SBE approved tools for LEAs to determine progress on the local performance indicators for LCFF Priority 2: State Academic Standards and Priority 3: Parent Engagement

(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/jan17item02.doc>). LEAs used these self-reflection tools to evaluate and report their progress on the Dashboard in the local performance indicators as part of the Fall 2017 Dashboard.

DRAFT Self-Reflection Tool for Priority 7: Access to Access to a Broad Course of Study

Standard: Local educational agencies (LEAs) annually measure their progress in the extent to which students have access to, and are enrolled in, a broad course of study that includes the adopted courses of study specified in the California *Education Code* for Grades 1-6³ and Grades 7-12⁴, as applicable, including the programs and services developed and provided to unduplicated students and individuals with exceptional needs, and report the results to their local governing board at regularly scheduled meetings of the local governing board and to stakeholders and the public through the Dashboard.

Evidence: The LEA responds to the self-reflection tools as specified and reports the results to its local governing board and through the local data selection option in the Dashboard.

Approach for Self-Reflection Tool to Use as Evidence

LEAs provide a narrative summary of the extent to which all students have access to and are enrolled in a broad course of study by addressing, at a minimum, the following four prompts:

1. Briefly identify the locally selected measures or tools that the LEA is using to track the extent to which all students have access to, and are enrolled in, a broad course of study, based on grade spans, unduplicated student groups, and individuals with exceptional needs served⁵.

[Insert text here]

2. Using the locally selected measures or tools, summarize the extent to which all students have access to, and are enrolled in, a broad course of study. The summary should identify any differences across school sites and student groups in access to, and enrollment in, a broad course of study, and may describe

³ The adopted course of study for grades 1 to 6, inclusive, shall include instruction, beginning in grade 1 and continuing through grade 6, in the following areas of study: English; mathematics; social sciences; science; visual and performing arts; health; physical education; other studies that may be prescribed by the governing board.

⁴ The adopted course of study for grades 7 to 12, inclusive, shall offer courses in the following areas of study: English; social sciences; foreign language or languages; physical education; science; mathematics; visual and performing arts; applied arts; Career Technical Education.

⁵ Nothing precludes LEAs from identifying barriers of access to a broad course of study for any student group enrolled in an LEA.

progress over time in the extent to which all students have access to, and are enrolled in, a broad course of study.

[Insert text here]

3. Given the results of the tool or locally selected measures, identify the barriers preventing the LEA from providing access to a broad course of study for all students.

[Insert text here]

4. In response to the results of the tool or locally selected measures, what revisions, decisions, or new actions will the LEA implement, or has the LEA implemented, to ensure access to a broad course of study for all students?

[Insert text here]

Additional information about enrollment in courses and the number of courses offered in different subjects at schools is available on the California Department of Education DataQuest Web page at

<https://data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/page2.asp?Level=District&subject=Course>.

Attachment 4: Update on the California School Dashboard

As detailed in the January 2018 State Board of Education (SBE) Item 1, several changes were made to the Fall 2017 California School Dashboard (Dashboard) in order to improve the functionality and usability based on user feedback provided during the field test (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/jan18item01.docx>).

The following is an update on these improvements:

- **PDF Capability:** The ability to print Dashboard reports using a PDF functionality is now operational. Users have the option to print a single report or all reports for a local educational agency or school. This functionality will make it easier for educators to share reports with stakeholders and insert critical information into their Local Control and Accountability Plans.
- **Improved Dashboard Home Page:** The 2018–19 State Budget proposes \$300,000 to update the Dashboard's user interface. In the current year, the California Department of Education (CDE) is working with its contractor, the San Joaquin Office of Education, to develop a more visually engaging, user friendly, and intuitive landing page. The design changes will be shared with stakeholders for feedback this spring.
- **Revisions to the Dashboard Reports:** The CDE also plans to review other options for displaying the reports within the Dashboard to make them less text-heavy and more intuitive for all users. The CDE will engage with stakeholder and parent groups to obtain their feedback throughout the revision and redesign process.
- **Spanish Translations:** Currently, the online translation tool "Google Translate" allows users to translate the Dashboard reports into multiple languages. In response to parent and SBE member concerns, the CDE has reviewed the option of translating the Dashboard into Spanish. However, with the design changes detailed above, this work is pending until the new home page and report design are completed.

Attachment 5: California School Dashboard Educational Outreach Activities

Table 1. California Department of Education Policy Work Group Meetings

Date	Title	Estimated Number of Attendees	Description
January 5, 2018	Alternative Schools Task Force: State Indicator Subcommittee	12	Provided an update on the one-year graduation rate and modified College/Career Indicator (CCI) measures for schools with California School Dashboard (Dashboard) Alternative School Status (DASS).
February 27, 2018	Alternative Schools Task Force: State Indicator Subcommittee	8	Reviewed and obtained feedback on potential modified career measures to collect in the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) and the criteria to determine the “Prepared” and “Approaching Prepared” levels of career preparedness.
March 2, 2018	CCI Work-Based Learning Subcommittee	12	Reviewed new career measures for collection in CALPADS and further inclusion in the CCI.
March 2, 2018	Alternative Schools Task Force: Local Indicator Subcommittee	12	Discussed the further development of proposed local accountability measures and practices for continuous learning and improvement relative to DASS-eligible alternative schools.

Table 2. In-person Meetings/Conferences

Date	Location	Title	Estimated Number of Attendees	Description
January 17, 2018	Sacramento	Curriculum and Instruction Steering Committee (CISC): Mathematics Sub-Committee	40	Provided an update on changes to the Academic Indicator that were adopted by the State Board of Education (SBE) in November 2017 and how these changes impacted results reported in the Fall 2017 Dashboard.
January 24, 2018	Sacramento	Regional Assessment Network (RAN)	20	Provided an update on new features and reports in the Fall 2017 Dashboard; actions taken by the SBE in January 2018, regarding the revisions to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plan and criteria used to identify the lowest performing schools; anticipated changes for the 2018 Dashboard; and modified methods for DASS schools (specifically relating to the Graduation Rate Indicator and the CCI).
January 24, 2018	Sacramento	CISC: Accountability Sub-Committee	12	Provided an update on actions taken by the SBE in January 2018 and discussed Dashboard work plan for 2018.
January 25, 2018	Sacramento	CISC	40	Provided information on the collection and reporting of foster and homeless students. Provided the definition of both student groups for accountability.

Date	Location	Title	Estimated Number of Attendees	Description
January 26, 2018	Sacramento	Legislative Dashboard Briefing	30	Provided an overview of California's new accountability system and the components that make up the Dashboard. The presentation also provided an overview of the data used to identify local educational agencies for assistance under the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF).
February 15, 2018	California Department of Education (CDE), Sacramento	California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG)	25	Provided an update on criteria for identifying the lowest performing schools and obtained feedback on performance categories for color combinations.
February 21, 2018	CDE, Sacramento	Advisory Commission on Special Education (ACSE)	25	Provided an update on modified methods for the one-year graduation rate and alternative career measures; and provided statewide student group data. Obtained feedback on career measures for students with disabilities.
February 21, 2018	CDE, Sacramento	LCFF Stakeholder Meeting	15	Provided an update and obtained feedback on: (a) The self-reflection tool for Priority 7: Access to a Broad Course of Study, (b) Local Control and Accountability Plan Federal Addendum, (c) the self-reflection tool for Priority 6: School Climate, (d) Guidance for Stakeholder Engagement within Differentiated Assistance, and (e) Identification of the Lowest Performing Schools Under the ESSA.

Date	Location	Title	Estimated Number of Attendees	Description
February 22, 2018	Monterey	CISC Leadership Symposium	97	Conducted a session on “Understanding, Utilizing, and Leveraging Data in the California School Dashboard.”
February 26, 2018	CDE, Sacramento	LCFF and California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) Stakeholder Group Joint Meeting	48	Shared the results from the Educational Testing Service (ETS) statistical study of three growth models that the CDE is considering for use in the accountability system. Representatives from ETS presented their results based on an analysis conducted using data from the 2014–15 and 2015–16 CAASPP administrations.
March 1, 2018	Sacramento	Bilingual Coordinators Meeting	80	Provided an update on the approach to the English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) with the new English Language Proficiency Assessments for California data, including a general timeline and plan. The CDE solicited feedback on the possible incorporation of long-term English learner and reclassified fluent-English proficient data into the ELPI.
March 17, 2018	San Francisco	Migrant Parent Conference	75	Provided a workshop on the Dashboard.