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Brief Context

• March SBE Meeting – Architecture of Accountability and Continuous Improvement System
• May SBE Meeting – Determination of a balance of local and state measures and plans for a single, coherent local, state, federal system
• July SBE Meeting – Standards and performance expectations
• September SBE Meeting –
A set of state indicators;

A methodology for calculating performance as a combination of status (outcome) and change (improvement) for the state indicators in order to differentiate performance at the LEA and school levels, and for student subgroups;

A component that supports the use of local data; and

Concepts for a top-level display.

The SBE also directed staff to prepare a recommendation for establishing standards for the LCFF priorities that are not addressed by the state indicators and options for incorporating college and career readiness, local climate surveys, and an English learner composite measure into the overall LCFF evaluation rubrics design.
### Proposed Design Features for Top-Level Summary Data Display.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LCFF Priority</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>All Student Performance</th>
<th>Equity Report</th>
<th>Narrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ELA Assessment (K-8)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Improved Significantly</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Math Assessment (K-8)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>English Learner Proficiency</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Maintained</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Graduation Rate (9-12)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chronic Absenteeism (K-8)</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Maintained</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Suspension Rate &amp; Local Climate Survey</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Maintained</td>
<td>^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 8</td>
<td>College &amp; Career Readiness (9-12)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Improved Significantly</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Basics (Teachers, Instructional Materials, Facilities)</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Implementation of Academic Standards</td>
<td>Not Met for One Year</td>
<td>^</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Parent Engagement</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The following symbols correspond to the Performance Category noted in parentheses for All Student Performance and within the Equity Report: # (Blue); + (Green); - (Yellow); ^ (Orange); ~ (Red).

---

1 The Equity Report identifies any student subgroup, with valid n-size, that is in the Red or Orange level of performance on the indicator. Users can generate more detailed reports showing performance for all student subgroups. The Equity Report would include the specific student subgroups listed in Education Code 52052: Socioeconomically disadvantaged pupils; English learners; Foster youth; Pupils with disabilities; Homeless youth; and racial/ethnic student subgroups currently reflected in standard reporting (American Indian/Native Alaskan; Asian; Black/African-American; Filipino; Hispanic/Latino; Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander; Two or more races; and White). This mock-up identifies student subgroups by number for illustrative purposes only.
1. Proposed Standards for Graduation Rate, scores on the CASPP, Suspension Rates, Progress of English learners Toward English Proficiency, and College and Career Readiness

2. Proposed Standards for the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) Priority Areas not Addressed by the Approved State Indicators


4. Additional Components of the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics – Top-Level Summary Data Display

5. Relevant CA Education Codes
Recommendations for Action

- Attachments lay the foundation for action today and final approval of the evaluation rubrics in September.
- Item recommends methodology for determining standards for each state priority as required by statute (EC 52064.5).
- Use of the rubrics supports local planning and determines levels of tiered technical assistance by County Superintendents, State Superintendent, and CA Collaborative for Educational Excellence (CCEE).
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Topics

• Overview of the California Model
• Methodology for the California Model
• Indicators—Setting the Distributions
• The College and Career Standards Model
Overview of the California Model
Overview of the California Model

• The California Model uses percentiles to create a 5 by 5 grid (giving 25 results) that combine “Status” and “Change” that are equally weighted to make an overall determination for a “Performance Category” (represented by a color) for each indicator.
Overview of the California Model (Cont.)

- **Status** is based on the *current* year performance.
- **Change** is the difference between performance from the *prior* year and *current* year, or between the current year and a multi-year average—if available.
Overview of the California Model (Cont.)

• The model will be applied to all local educational agencies (LEAs), traditional schools, and student groups with 30 or more students.

• The model is aligned with the Local Control and Accountability Plans (LCAPs) and will support local improvement efforts.

(Note: Because a separate accountability system is being developed for alternative schools, their data were excluded from the process.)
Example:
An LEA or school with a “High” Status and an “Increased” in Change will receive an overall performance of Green for most indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Declined</th>
<th>Declined</th>
<th>Maintained</th>
<th>Increased</th>
<th>Increased Significantly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methodology for the California Model
Methodology

• To determine the performance category, the percentile distributions for Status and Change were examined and cut points were selected separately for each indicator (i.e., each indicator has their own unique set of cut points)
Methodology (Cont.)

– For Status, LEAs and/or schools were ordered from highest to lowest and four cut points were selected based on the distribution of all LEAs and/or schools. These cut points created five “Status Levels.”
Methodology (Cont.)

- For Change, LEAs and/or schools were ordered separately from highest to lowest for positive change and lowest to highest for negative change. Cut points were determined separately for positive and negative change. A total of four cuts were selected which created five “Change Levels.”
Methodology (Cont.)

• Cut points will remain in place for a select number of years (e.g., 3 to 5 years), as determined by the State Board of Education (SBE).
Indicators Based on Local Educational Agency Distributions
Graduation Rate Indicator

• The Graduation Rate Indicator uses the four-year cohort graduation rate.

• Cut points were set using the LEA distribution data, which were applied to both LEAs and traditional schools.
Graduation Rate Indicator (Cont.)

• Change was determined by comparing the most recent four-year cohort graduation rate data (2014–15) to a three-year average generated by using prior four-year cohort graduation rates (2011–12, 2012–13, and 2013–14).
Graduation Rate Indicator (Cont.)

• The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) allows for the use of a five-year cohort graduation rate for accountability. Staff will work with the Technical Design Group (TDG) to determine the best methodology for incorporating a five-year cohort rate into the California Model, for inclusion in the State’s Consolidated Plan.
College and Career Indicator

• The College and Career Indicator (CCI) methodology is applied to all students in the four-year graduation cohort.

• Cut points were set using the LEA distribution data, which were applied to all LEAs and traditional schools.
College and Career Indicator (Cont.)

• Change was determined by comparing the results of the current four-year cohort graduation class (2014–15) to the results of the prior four-year cohort graduation class (2013–14).
English Learner Indicator

• The English Language Indicator (ELI) combines performance on the English language test (i.e., currently the California English Language Proficiency Assessment [CELDT]) with reclassified student data.
English Learner Indicator (Cont.)

• Cut points were set using the LEA distribution, which were applied to all LEAs and traditional schools
• Change was determined by comparing the current year CELDT data (2014–15) to the prior year CELDT data (2013–14)
• Reclassification data are from the prior school year (2013–14)
Long-Term English Learners

• In 2015, SB 750 was signed into law which redefines the definition of Long-term English learners (LTELs). Therefore, 2015–16 LTEL data will not be comparable to the prior two years of LTEL data (Note: the 2015–16 LTEL data, using the revised definition, will be available in mid-August.)
Long-Term English Learners (Cont.)

• In addition, using LTEL data for school level accountability may not be appropriate. However, LTEL data may be more relevant at the LEA level.

• Department staff will convene a work group to explore methodologies for incorporating LTEL data into the ELI as outlined in the June Information Memorandum to the SBE.
Indicators Based on School Distributions
Academic Indicator

- Only one year of data is currently available (2015 Smarter Balanced Assessments). Therefore, for this indicator only, Performance Categories (i.e., colors) were based on “Status” using the Smarter Balanced Assessment levels of ‘standards met or exceeded’.
Academic Indicator (Cont.)

• Cut points were set separately for:
  – ELA and mathematics
  – LEAs and schools

• Cut points for schools were set using assessment results for grades 3 through 8

• LEA cut points were set using all assessment results (i.e., grades 3 through 8 and grade 11)
Academic Indicator (Cont.)

- The Department expects to receive the 2016 California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) results in August. Having two years of assessment data will allow staff to pursue options for replacing ‘standard met or exceeded’ as the measure for this indicator.

- In addition, the TDG will continue to explore student-level growth models.
School Suspension Rate Indicator

• Cut points were set separately for each school type (elementary, middle, and high).

• Change was determined by comparing the current year data (2013–14) to prior year data (2014–15).
District Suspension Rate Indicator

• Staff will work with the TDG to develop the LEA Suspension Rate Indicator for the SBE to consider at the September meeting.
The College and Career Standards Model
College and Career Standards Model

• Staff recommend that the SBE approve:
  – The methodology for the College and Career Standards Model
  – The inclusion of the CCI as a state indicator
  – Modifying the Academic Indicator (ELA and mathematics) to remove grade 11 assessment scores to avoid “double counting”
College and Career Standards Model (Cont.)

• The Department will conduct two stakeholder webinars (July 20\textsuperscript{th} and 22\textsuperscript{nd}) to obtain input on the different measures and their placement across the four performance levels (i.e., well prepared, prepared, approaching prepared, and not prepared) identified on the chart in Attachment 1.
College and Career Standards Model (Cont.)

• The information from these sessions will be shared with the TDG for consideration in setting the final placement of measures across the four performance levels.

• TDG recommendations will be brought to the SBE in September for final approval.
College and Career Standards Model (Cont.)

• The initial CCI simulations combined students who are “well prepared” and students who are “prepared” to determine performance levels. The department will explore other methodologies for consideration in 2017-18.
College and Career Standards Model (Cont.)

• However, LEA and school-level reports will be generated to reflect their performance on all four CCI performance levels.
Questions
This attachment summarizes the recommended approach for establishing standards for the following LCFF priorities without state-level data:

- **Priority 1** ( Appropriately Assigned Teachers, Access to Curriculum-Aligned Instructional Materials, and Safe, Clean and Functional School Facilities)
- **Priority 2** (Implementation of State Academic Standards)
- **Priority 3** (Parent Engagement)
- **Priority 7** (Access to a Broad Course of Study)
- **Priority 8** (Outcomes in a Broad Course of Study)
- **Priority 9** (Coordination of Services for Expelled Students)
- **Priority 10** (Coordination of Services for Foster Youth)
The staff proposed standards for each remaining LCFF priority on prior slide are described in the attachment using the following structure:

- the proposed statement of the **standard**;
- the **evidence** for assessing progress relative to the standard; and
- **criteria** that LEAs would use to assess progress toward meeting the standard (*i.e.*, [**Met / Not Met / Not Met for Two or More Years**]).

This approach emphasizes the importance of these LCFF priorities, also begins to establish a baseline of locally reported information to inform future policymaking.

Staff also propose including a standard for Priority 6 (School Climate) related to the use of local climate surveys to complement the suspension rate state indicator.
Priority 2: Implementation of State Academic Standards

Standard: LEA completes a self-assessment* included within LCFF evaluation rubrics and reports the results in the evaluation rubrics.

Evidence: LEAs would determine whether they completed the self-assessment and reported the results, including ratings on each prompt and the overall rating, through the local data selection option in the evaluation rubrics.

Criteria: LEAs would assess their performance on a [Met / Not Met / Not Met for Two or More Years] scale.

*Note: The self-assessment instrument would address the LEA's implementation of adopted state academic standards. LEAs would rate their performance (e.g., using a 1- to 5-point scale) on distinct aspects of implementation. Staff will present the proposed self-assessment at the September 2016 SBE meeting, after further consultation with stakeholders.
LCFF Evaluation Rubrics Design
- Top-Level Summary Data Display
- Data Analysis Tool
- Statements of Model Practices
- Links to External Resources

DRAFT Statements of Model Practices
- June 2016 information memorandum (http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-sbe-jun16item02.doc)
- Descriptions of research-supported and evidence-based practices organized to correspond to the indicators from the data analysis tool for optional use by LEAs as a complementary component
Top-Level Summary Data Display

• Three statutory (EC 52064.5) purposes for the LCFF evaluation rubrics:
  – to support LEAs in identifying strengths, weaknesses and areas for improvement;
  – to assist in determining whether LEAs are eligible for technical assistance;
  – to assist the Superintendent of Public Instruction in determining whether LEAs are eligible for more intensive state support/intervention.

• Primary users of the evaluation rubrics

• Importance of ensuring that students, parents, and other stakeholders and the public can access information on LEA- or school-levels of performance.
### Proposed Design Features for Top-Level Summary Data Display.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA/SCHOOL INFO HERE (could include basic demographic info)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LCFF Priority</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Basics (Teachers, Instructional Materials, Facilities)</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>(Summarize Self-Assessment Results)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Implementation of Academic Standards</td>
<td>Not Met for One Year</td>
<td>^</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Parent Engagement</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The following symbols correspond to the Performance Category noted in parentheses for All Student Performance and within the Equity Report: # (Blue); + (Green); - (Yellow); ^ (Orange); ~ (Red).

\(^1\) The Equity Report identifies any student subgroup, with valid n-size, that is in the Red or Orange level of performance on the indicator. Users can generate more detailed reports showing performance for all student subgroups. The Equity Report would include the specific student subgroups listed in Education Code 52052: Socioeconomically disadvantaged pupils; English learners; Foster youth; Pupils with disabilities; Homeless youth; and racial/ethnic student subgroups currently reflected in standard reporting (American Indian/Native Alaskan; Asian; Black/African-American; Filipino; Hispanic/Latino; Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander; Two or more races; and White). This mock-up identifies student subgroups by number for illustrative purposes only.
Recommendations for Action

1. Approve a measure of college and career readiness, as specified in Attachment 1, including:
   
a. Adopting the College and Career Indicator (CCI), which combines Grade 11 test scores on English Language Arts (ELA) and Math and other measures of college and career readiness, as a state indicator (formerly called “key indicators”)

b. Using the CCI to establish standards for Priority 7 (Access to Broad Course of Study) and Priority 8 (Outcomes in a Broad Course of Study) based on the approved methodology
Recommendations for Action

c. Modifying the state indicator for student test scores on ELA and Math (Priority 4 – Pupil Achievement), approved at the May 2016 Board meeting, to remove the Grade 11 scores, in order to avoid double-counting those test scores in two state indicators; and

d. Directing staff to prepare a recommendation for the September 2016 Board meeting on the final technical specifications for the CCI.
Recommendations for Action

2. Approve a methodology for establishing standards, as specified in Attachment 2 for:
   b. Priority 2 (Implementation of State Academic Standards),
   c. Priority 3 (Parent Engagement),
   d. County Office of Education (COE) Priority 9 (Coordination of Services for Expelled Students), and
   e. COE Priority 10 (Coordination of Services for Foster Youth).
Recommendations for Action

3. Approve inclusion of a standard for the use of local climate surveys to support a broader assessment of performance on Priority 6 (School Climate), as specified in Attachment 2.

4. Approve inclusion of an Equity Report, which identifies instances where any student subgroup is in the two lowest performance categories (currently Red or Orange) on a state indicator, within the top-level summary data display, as specified in Attachment 4.
Questions?