



Update on the Local Performance Indicators Self-Assessment and Menu of Local Measures, School Conditions and Climate Work Group, English Learner Indicator Work Group, and Statements of Model Practices



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Local Performance Indicators

- SBE approved an approach for setting standards for local performance indicators within the LCFF priorities that are not addressed by state indicators:
 - Approach is based on collecting and reporting locally held information, which is likely to enhance local decision making for the relevant LCFF priority.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Local Performance Indicators

- The SBE approved the proposed standards and criteria for the local performance indicators as part of its action to adopt the initial phase of the LCFF evaluation rubrics:
 - *Example Priority 3 Standard:* LEA annually measures its progress in (1) seeking input from parents in decision making and (2) promoting parental participation in programs, and reports the results to its local governing board and to stakeholders and the public through the evaluation rubrics.
 - *Criteria:* LEA would assess its performance on a [Met / Not Met / Not Met for Two or More Years] scale.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Local Performance Indicators

- The SBE will review recommendations to establish a process for Local Educational Agencies to measure performance on the local indicators or provide evidence of progress:
 - *Example Evidence:* LEA determines how it annually measures its progress, which may include use of a self-assessment tool and/or selection from a menu of local measures that will be included in the evaluation rubrics web-based user interface, and report the results to its local governing board and through the local data selection option in the evaluation rubrics.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Small Group Activity-Process to Collect Information

Provide input on ways LEAs can identify self-assessment tools and/or selection of local measures, gather information on these tools and/or measures, and report out on this information in collaboration with stakeholders as part of the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) and local strategic planning process (Attachment 1).



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Discussion-Report Out

Each group will share one important change they made to the draft approach to collect/gather and report out information on local performance indicators.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Small Group Activity-Example Self-Assessment Tools

Provide recommendations on the example self-assessments and/or local measures that LEAs would use to evaluate their progress on the local performance indicators and report that information through the web-based evaluation rubrics system (Attachments 2-5).



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Discussion-Report Out

Each group will have 5 minutes to share the recommendations and/or feedback they want to make.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Item 4

Update on the English Learner Indicator Work Group



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

State Board of Education Decision

- At the May 2016 SBE meeting, the SBE directed California Department of Education (CDE) staff to provide options for incorporating a composite measure for the ELI, including:
 - English learner (EL) proficiency rates
 - Reclassification rates
 - Long-term English learner (LTEL) data



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

CPAG Feedback

- At the June 2016 CPAG meeting, the CDE provided CPAG members with a methodology for incorporating EL proficiency rates and reclassification data in the ELI.
- CPAG members supported the proposed methodology.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

ELI Work Group

- As a result, the CDE prepared a June 2016 SBE Information Memorandum presenting the proposed ELI methodology and indicated that the CDE would convene a Work Group of practitioners and technical experts, to explore the possible inclusion of LTEL data in the ELI.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

ELI Work Group (Cont.)

- The ELI Work Group is comprised of 10 members from throughout California who have both EL program and data expertise and represent county offices of education, school districts, the California Comprehensive Center (CA CC), classroom teachers, and higher education.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

ELI Work Group (Cont.)

- The first ELI Work Group meeting was conducted via Webinar on October 5, 2016.
- ELI Work Group members were provided an overview of the new California Accountability Model, with a focus on the state indicators.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

ELI Work Group (Cont.)

- The ELI Work Group provided feedback on definition of LTEL for data simulation purposes.
- Specifically, they recommended:
 - Using the LTEL definition provided in California *Education Code* 313.1 (See Handout 1)
 - Exploring the incorporation of students who are at “At-Risk” of being identified as LTEL



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

ELI Work Group (Cont.)

- The ELI Work Group will meet in December 2016 and in January and March of 2017.
- The CDE will hold a Webinar in January 2017 to obtain feedback from educational stakeholders on the continued development of the ELI.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

ELI Work Group (Cont.)

- The CDE will continue to update the CPAG on the progress of the ELI Work Group at their February and April 2017 meetings.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Item 4

Update on the School Conditions and Climate Work Group



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Item 4

Update on the

Statements of Model

Practices