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# **California State Board of Education** September 2022 Agenda Item #02

## Subject

Update on the Implementation of the Integrated Local, State, and Federal Accountability and Continuous Improvement System: Eligibility Criteria for Differentiated Assistance, Connecting the Dashboard to the Teacher Assignment Data and Science Test Results, California School Dashboard Principles, and Information on the English Learner Student Group for the Academic Indicators.

## Type of Action

Action, Information.

## Summary of the Issue(s)

In March 2022, the State Board of Education (SBE) received an annual update from the California Department of Education (CDE) pertaining to planned revisions or updates for the 2022 California School Dashboard (Dashboard). During this meeting, the SBE members were informed that after a two-year absence (due to the 2019 novel coronavirus disease [COVID-19] pandemic), schools and districts would once again receive accountability determinations on the Dashboard and resume eligibility for Differentiated Assistance and school improvement under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) for the 2021–22 school year.

With the return and publication of the Dashboard, California is committed to once again reviewing and revising Dashboard indicators and performance standards (as appropriate), especially given the challenges faced by K–12 communities during the pandemic. In anticipation of the first review of proposed Dashboard updates starting at the September 2022 SBE meeting, the CDE provided a Dashboard 101 study session at the July 2022 meeting to support SBE members in enhancing their understanding of the Dashboard. The study session included the origins of California’s K–12 accountability system and an overview of the Dashboard that SBE members could draw upon as they review and decide on future proposed revisions.

This item reviews specific revisions to the Dashboard for the SBE’s approval. It also includes information on some Dashboard elements in response to questions raised at the July 2022 SBE meeting. The following attachments detail the proposed revisions and information.

Attachment 1 includes an updated set of the Dashboard Principles for the SBE to use as a framework to ensure that decisions made related to the Dashboard are fair, effective, and directly align with policy objectives. The CDE is asking the SBE for feedback on this work and intends to bring these Principals for SBE approval at their November 2022 meeting.

Attachment 2 responds to questions presented by SBE members at the July 2022 meeting and contains information on the definition used to determine which students are included in the English learner (EL) student group for the Academic Indicators and the historic decisions that were made to arrive at the definition. Furthermore, during the September 2022 SBE meeting, Kenji Hakuta, an expert from Stanford University in the field of ELs, will present on the context and intent under the Every Student Succeeds Act to allow for inclusion of reclassified ELs in this indicator.

Attachment 3 includes a proposal to amend the eligibility criteria for Differentiated Assistance for the 2022–23 school year only based on modifications to the Dashboard for 2022 under Assembly Bill (AB) 130 (Chapter 44, Statutes of 2021). Local educational agencies (LEAs) including districts, county offices of education (COEs), and charter schools are eligible for differentiated assistance based on their performance on the state and local indicators in the state priority areas under the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF).

Attachments 4 and 5 include proposals to highlight on the Dashboard: (1) the teacher assignment data on the DataQuest web page and (2) the science results reported on the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) web site.

## Recommendation

The CDE is seeking approval to: (1) use the lowest Status level as a proxy for Red as reported on the 2022 Dashboard to determine county offices of education and districts eligible for Differentiated Assistance, (2) include a link on the Dashboard to the teacher assignment data that is supported through DataQuest, and (3) include a link on the Dashboard to the science results that is supported through the CAASPP web site.

## Brief History of Key Issues

### California School Dashboard Principles

As California transitioned to a new accountability system in 2015, the SBE used a set of guiding principles that clearly laid out a model of governance for the SBE members to use while making decisions about the new system. With the Dashboard now fully implemented and operational since 2017, and as the state considers the possibility of adding new indicators to the Dashboard (e.g., science results and growth model) and modifying existing state indicators (as appropriate), the CDE is bringing an updated set of principles specific to the Dashboard for the SBE’s consideration. These principles can be used as a framework during Dashboard-related discussions and deliberations in the future to ensure that decisions align with then SBE’s policy objectives. Feedback received from the SBE on these principles during the September 2022 meeting will be incorporated and the final set of principles will be brought to the SBE in November 2022 for approval.

### Academic Indicator: English Learner Student Group

As a follow up to a conversation during the July 2022 SBE meeting, the CDE is providing an overview of this topic and the development of this policy decision for information purposes to the SBE. Work on this topic began in November 2016 during the development of the Academic Indicators for the Dashboard. At that time, the SBE requested the CDE to consider various options for defining the EL student group. To meet this request, in January 2017, the CDE brought a proposed definition, which identified the group as: (1) current EL students and (2) EL students who have been reclassified for four years or less. This definition was approved by the SBE in January 2017 and has been used for the Academic Indicators since the first release of the Dashboard in Fall 2017. Subsequently, in August 2019, the SBE was provided an Information Memorandum that also reviewed the history of the topic and provided updated data. Attachment 2 contains a detailed explanation of the EL student group and past performance on the Academic Indicators.

### Eligibility Criteria for Differentiated Assistance

LEAs, including districts, COEs, and charter schools, are eligible under state law for differentiated assistance based on their student group performance on the state and local indicators in the state priority areas.

Under LCFF, there are three methods for LEAs to be eligible for differentiated assistance:

* Method 1: State Indicators
* Method 2: Local Indicators
* Method 3: Combination of State and Local Indicators

Charter schools, both direct funded and locally-funded, are eligible for differentiated assistance using **only** the state indicators.

Table 1 outlies the three different methods for determining LEAs eligible for DA and the number of LEAs eligible by each method.

#### Table 1: 2019 DA Eligibility Methods

| **Method Type** | **Description** | **2019 Districts and COEs Eligible for DA** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Method 1: State Indicators | One student group meets the criteria in at least two priority areas. | 331 |
| Method 2: Local Indicators | “Not Met for Two or More Years” in at least two priority areas (e.g., priority areas 1 and 2). | 2 |
| Method 3: Combination of State and Local Indicators | One or more student group(s) meets(s) the criteria in one priority area, and the LEA or COE meets the “Not Met for Two or More Years” on only one local indicator in a different priority area. | 0 |
| All Methods | N/A | 333 |

Differentiated assistance eligibility determinations were last made in December 2019 using data from the 2019 Dashboard. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the 333 districts and COEs and 23 charter schools identified for eligibility in 2019 have remained in differentiated assistance.

Table 2 provides the SBE approved Method 1 State and Local Indicator differentiated assistance eligibility criteria by LCFF Priority Area.

#### Table 2: 2019 Differentiated Assistance Eligibility Criteria by Priority Area

| **LCFF Priority Area** | **2019 Dashboard State Indicators Criteria** | **2019 Local Indicator Criteria** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Priority 1 – Basics | N/A | * Not met for Two or More Years on Local Performance Indicator |
| Priority 2 – Implementation of State Academic Standards | N/A | * Not Met for Two or More Years on Local Performance Indicator |
| Priority 3 – Parent and Family Engagement | N/A | * Not Met for Two or More Years on Local Performance Indicator |
| Priority 4 – Pupil Achievement | * Red on both English Language Arts (ELA) and Math Academic Indicator; or * Red on ELA or Math Academic Indicator and Orange on the other; or * Status of “Very Low” on the English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI). | N/A |
| Priority 5 - Pupil Engagement | * Red on Graduation Rate Indicator; or * Red on Chronic Absenteeism Indicator | N/A |
| Priority 6 – School Climate | * Red on the Suspension Rate Indicator | * Not Met for Two or More Years on Local Performance Indicator |
| Priority 7 – Access to a Broad Course of Study | N/A | * Not Met for Two or More Years on Local Performance Indicator |
| Priority 8 – Outcomes to a Broad Course of Study | * Red on the College/Career Indicator | N/A |

As outlined in Table 2, only LCFF Priorities 4, 5, 6, and 8 use State indicators reported on the Dashboard for DA eligibility determinations.

The files containing the assistance status for districts and COEs and charter schools are available on the Local Control Funding Formula web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/>.

Due to requirements under AB 130, the CDE can only display the most current year of data (also known as Status) on the 2022 Dashboard. Therefore, compared to prior Dashboards, performance levels will not be reported using colors. Instead, the 2022 Dashboard will report performance levels using one of five Status levels (ranging from Very High, High, Medium, Low, and Very Low) for all state measures based on the 2021–22 school year data. Since the DA criteria relies on colors, the CDE is recommending one-time changes to the eligibility criteria in order to make eligibility determinations for 2022.

### Connecting the Dashboard to the Teacher Assignment Data and **Science Results**

Over the past several years, the CDE has continued to inform the SBE on the progress of the work on teacher assignment data and science assessment results. The first set of data of Teacher Assignment data was released in June 2022, and the CDE has committed to the SBE to provide this first year of data within Priority 1 as we work toward the full implementation of *Education Code* 54064.5 (c) and (e)(2). CDE has convened an ad-hoc workgroup to evaluate the addition of this data to the Dashboard. The first meeting was in August; however, the creation of the objective criteria cannot begin until two years of data are available. In order to meet the request of the SBE to publish the first year of data within the local indicators, CDE recommends the addition of a link to the published DataQuest teacher assignment data reports within the Dashboard. Additionally, at the March 2022 SBE meeting, the SBE requested that the CDE consider reporting science results on the Dashboard for informational purposes without having it be used for accountability (i.e., used to determine differentiated assistance for LEAs or for school support). The CDE is requesting the SBE approve adding a link to the CAASPP web site (which reports science results) within the Dashboard.

### 2022 Dashboard Resources

With the absence of state indicators reported on the Dashboard for the past two years, the SBE recognized a critical need to support LEAs with resources that will help increase the understanding of the release of and limitations on the 2022 Dashboard. To meet this need, the CDE has developed several notable supporting tools that are listed below:

* **2022 Dashboard Communications Toolkit:** In August 2022, the CDE released a 2022 Dashboard Communications Toolkit (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/cm/dashboardtoolkit.asp>) that features one-to-two-page flyers for parents and educators that informs how to navigate the Dashboard and details the indicators reported within it. This toolkit also features talking points; presentation slide decks that LEAs and schools can use as they communicate the 2022 Dashboard results to their communities; and links that will connect viewers to translated materials, and general and technical information about the Dashboard.
* **Redesigned Web Pages:** With the re-start of accountability for the 2021–22 school year, the CDE re-evaluated the structure of the California School Dashboard and System of Support web page (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/cm/>) and completed a redesign to better highlight the wide range of available resources. This new look was launched in July 2022, and the CDE will be monitoring the use of these web pages to assess where further improvements can be made to increase LEA and public engagement.
* **Social Media:** As mentioned in the March 2022 SBE item, we are strengthening our communications to LEAs and the public through social networking and media. The goal is to increase CDE transparency and availability of services and information. This work group is developing a social media strategic plan that considers the targeted audience, resources to be released, media policy, and logistics around informational releases. CDE and SCOE are focusing on an existing media tool, the CDE’s Twitter account, while investigating further venues of media outreach.

The CDE also plans to conduct the following activities up until the public release of the 2022 Dashboard: (1) presenting at conferences to relay current information about the Dashboard; (2) conducting a series of webinars to provide LEAs an opportunity to refresh and re-learn all the Dashboard components; and (3) releasing communication notices to Accountability and Dashboard Coordinators about important deadlines, access to private previews of the Dashboard data, and critical information about the Dashboard.

## Summary of Previous State Board of Education Discussion and Action

### California School Dashboard Principles

In January 2015, the SBE received an update on the LCFF and information on the development of the LCFF evaluation rubrics (i.e., Dashboard), including key principles that would guide the design process of the evaluation rubrics. (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr15/documents/jan15item04.doc>).

In May 2015, the SBE reviewed guiding principles that will be used to frame their future discussions for recommending a framework and implementation plan to align the new accountability system with LCFF (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr15/documents/may15item10.doc>).

In July 2015, the SBE reviewed the guiding principles to ensure their use for accountability planning and to help frame the conversation as the SBE continued to deliberate on the development of the LCFF evaluation rubrics [https:/www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr15/documents/jul15item01.doc](https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr15/documents/jul15item01.doc).

In September 2015, the SBE received an update on the LCFF evaluation rubrics that included a discussion of existing accountability components along with the guiding principles that could be used as a policy framework for the new accountability system (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr15/documents/sep15item14.doc>).

In November 2015, the SBE received an analytical review of whether the components in the accountability system aligned with LCFF and the guiding principles, which included feedback from public input. The review concluded that there was a vast consensus of alignment with the majority of the components but there were areas that conflicted with the guiding principles. With these conflicts, the SBE was provided recommendations on how to modify or eliminate these components.

(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr15/documents/nov15item11.doc>).

### Academic Indicator: English Learner Student Group

In May 2016, the SBE approved the Academic Indicator as a state indicator that will be included as part of the design of the LCFF evaluation rubrics (which is currently reported through the Dashboard). (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr16/documents/may16item02revised.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. This item also included the definition of the English Learner (EL) student group. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/jan17item02.doc>).

In August 2019, the SBE received an information memorandum that detailed the rationale for defining the EL student group for the Academic Indicator as those students who are current EL students and ELs reclassified for four years or less. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-aug19item02.docx>).

### Eligibility Criteria for Differentiated Assistance

In September 2016, the SBE adopts the Local Control Funding Formula Evaluation Rubrics and Update on Local Control and Accountability Plan and Annual Update Template Revisions and Progress on the Every Student Succeeds Act State Plan.

(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr16/documents/sep16item01.doc>)

In November 2016, The SBE further clarified the applicability of the criteria to charter schools

([https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr16/documents/nov16item03.doc)](https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr16/documents/nov16item03.doc)

In August 2016, an information memorandum provided a proposal for how the proposed performance levels on state indicators and local performance indicators will assist in identifying LEAs eligible for differentiated assistance and intensive intervention. (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-sbe-aug16item02.doc>).

In December 2017, the California Department of Education identified, in an Information Memorandum for the SBE, 228 LEAs that were eligible for differentiated assistance based on the Fall 2017 California School Dashboard (Dashboard) release. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-dec17item02rev.docx>)

In November 2018, the SBE approved the use of the ELPI Status for 2019 Local Control Funding Formula differentiated assistance and Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) school assistance eligibility determinations (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/nov18item04.docx>).

In March 2018, the CDE provided an update on the Implementation of the Local, State and Federal Accountability and Continuous Improvement System: Local Control Funding Formula Identification of Local Educational Agencies for Differentiated Assistance.

(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/mar18item01.docx>)

In September 2019, the SBE approved the criteria for determining LEA eligibility for differentiated assistance at its September 2016 meeting. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr16/documents/sep16item01.doc>)

In December 2019, the CDE provided an update regarding LEAs that were eligible for differentiated assistance under Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) in 2019 (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/apr20memoamard01.docx>).

In March 2020, the CDE provided an update on the Implementation of the Local, State and Federal Accountability and Continuous Improvement System: Local Control Funding Formula Eligibility for Differentiated Assistance for Districts, County Offices of Education, and Charter Schools

(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr20/documents/mar20item05.docx>)

In October 2021, the CDE Consistently Low-Performing Student Groups Per California Education Code Section 52064(e)(6)(A) and Consistently Low-Performing Schools Per California Education Code Section 52064(e)(6)(B)

(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/oct21memoamard01.docx>)

### Local Indicators

In November 2016 meeting, the SBE approved tools for LEAs to determine progress on the local performance indicators for specific priorities within the LCFF statute. The self-reflection tools are for: Priority 1—Basic Services and Conditions at schools; Priority 6—School Climate; Priority 9—Coordination of Services for Expelled Students; and Priority 10—Coordination of Services for Foster Youth. (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr16/documents/nov16item03.doc>)

In July 2016, the SBE approved the criteria for assessing evidence. The criteria are the same across all local performance indicators and requires LEAs to assess their progress on these indicators on a *[Met/Not Met/Not Met for Two or More Years]* scale. (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr16/documents/jul16item02.doc>).

At the September 2016 SBE meeting, the SBE approved standards for the local performance indicator. (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr16/documents/sep16item01.doc>).

In September 2016 the California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG) reviewed an initial draft of the local performance indicators at its September meeting. Information on Priority 1 is collected through the School Accountability Report Card (SARC). LEAs would use locally available information to provide evidence of progress on the local performance indicator.

(<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/cc/cp/documents/memo-cpag-sep16item02.doc>).

### Ineffective and Out-of-Field Teachers

In November 2019, the SBE adopted updated teacher equity definitions under Every Student Succeeds Act and state reporting requirements based on feedback from LEAs (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr19/documents/nov19item05rev.docx>).

In August 2020, the SBE received an Information Memorandum which provided background information and an implementation plan for *Education Code* 52064.5 related to the Standards for Local Indicators (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/aug20amard01.docx>).

In September 2020, the CDE presented an update on the implementation of *Education Code* (*EC*) Section 52064.5, related to local indicators. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr20/documents/sep20item02.docx>).

In November 2021, the CDE presented an update on ESSA state plan amendments and proposed changes to data tables related to ineffective teachers. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr21/documents/nov21item06.docx>).

In June 2022, the SBE received an Information Memorandum that announced the release of the Teaching Assignment Monitoring Outcome (AMO) by Full-Time Equivalency (FTE) reports on DataQuest. The memorandum also included background information on the release of the Teacher AMO data from the 2020–21 school year, as well as its use within the School Accountability Report Cards (SARCs), and the Dashboard.

(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/jun22memoamard01.docx>)

### California Science Test Results

In March 2020, the SBE received the annual Dashboard update, which included potential revisions that the CDE was considering for the Dashboard beyond 2020. The CDE noted when the science results could be incorporated. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr20/documents/mar20item05.docx>)

In March 2022, the CDE provided an update on the feasibility of when the science results could be incorporated into the Dashboard given the low participation on the science test during 2020–21, the use of the revised blueprint for the 2021–22 administration of the California Science Test (CAST), and the gaps in implementing the science instructional materials due to the challenges that schools faced because of COVID-19. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr22/documents/mar22item04.docx>).

## Fiscal Analysis (as appropriate)

For the prior fiscal year, California’s total kindergarten through grade twelve funding within the 2022–23 California Budget Act was $127.1 billion:

* State: $78.9 billion (61.4 percent)
* Local: $37.0 billion (28.8 percent)
* Federal: $11.0 billion (8.6 percent)

The Every Student Succeeds Act funds are also typically a portion of the total federal funding amount.

## Attachment(s)

* Attachment 1: California School Dashboard Principles (4 Pages)
* Attachment 2: Academic Indicator: Inclusion of Reclassified Students in the Englisher Learner Student Group (11 Pages)
* Attachment 3: Differentiated Assistance (3 Page)
* Attachment 4: Connecting the California School Dashboard to the Teacher Assignment Data (2 Pages)
* Attachment 5: Connecting the California School Dashboard to the Science Test Results (2 Pages)

# Attachment 1

## California School Dashboard Principles

In 2015, the State Board of Education (SBE) used a set of guiding principles to help frame the conversations and decisions to develop California’s new accountability system. These principles were used to ensure that the new system supported continuous learning and improvement, equity, and transparency. The SBE also ensured that the principles were aligned to the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) state priorities and the core goals of the California School Dashboard (Dashboard).

With the commitment to continually improve upon the components within the Dashboard, the California Department of Education (CDE) is bringing a set of principles specific to the Dashboard for the SBE’s review. The SBE can use these principles to help support the conversations and decisions that will need to be made as changes and additions to Dashboard state and local indicators are presented.

These principles were presented to the California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG) at their August 2022 meeting. Many of CPAG members commented that the principals were useful in understanding the background of the development of the Dashboard, especially as California contemplates future Dashboard changes. Several members also expressed that the Dashboard should be an integral and useful tool for continuous improvement, and that it not be a compliance-based tool but has value to parents, teachers, and school boards. CPAG members also expressed interest in expanding the Dashboard to include the science assessment results and graduation profiles.

To assist with framing this attachment, it is important to note the purpose of the Dashboard:

**Dashboard Purpose:** *The California School Dashboard provides parents and educators with meaningful information on school and district progress so they can participate in decisions to improve student learning.*

**1. Focuses on elements that express the state's priorities for a well-rounded, well-supported education and makes space for what is valued locally.**

California’s accountability system reflects a broad set of indicators that measure student educational opportunities and outcomes. These indicators leverage data in three areas: 1) Academic Performance, 2) Academic Engagement, and 3) Conditions and Climate. The system is designed to adapt as priorities evolve and add new meaningful information to the Dashboard and remove data that may no longer be relevant.

**2. Promotes equity through focus on student group opportunities and performance.**

California’s accountability system focuses on equity through the lens of 13 student groups, whose performance is reported separately if the group has at least 11 students. Each indicator includes an Equity Report that highlights the number of student groups in each performance category. California in turn uses differences in performance to identify districts and schools for support and improvement initiatives on one hand, and for recognition on the other. In particular, identifying student groups needing the most support—and then providing that support—is a foundational driver of an accountability system.

**3. Gives equal weight to each indicator.**

California’s accountability system gives equal weight to all state indicators by reporting results for each indicator separately and in a non-summative manner. Through this approach to reporting, all indicators are equally valued in the system

**4. Values high performance and growth equally.**

California equally weights status (current year) and change (difference from prior year), distinguishing districts, schools, and student groups showing significant growth as well as strong performance. This approach to measuring school performance recognizes and supports continuous improvement to higher performance, as all districts, schools, and student groups are expected to improve. California’s multiple measures accountability system uses percentile distributions based on actual district and school performance to create a five-by-five grid that provides 25 results that combine status and change to make an overall determination for each indicator.

**5. Reports transparently and comprehensively at the state, district, school, and student group levels.**

California’s accountability system produces a comprehensive picture of student group, school, district, and state performance by including, to the greatest extent possible, the performance of all students. Indicators are broadly applicable to all or specific student groups, which allows indicators to be reported for groups, schools, and districts with at least 11 students. The system provides transparency through the reporting of an overall determination for student groups of 30 students or more (15 or more for foster or homeless students).

**6. Promotes effective visualization, clear communication, and thorough documentation.**

The California School Dashboard leverages powerful visual techniques to show performance and progress information quickly, clearly, and with universal accessibility. The California School Dashboard website is purposefully designed to be parent-friendly. Along with the system’s technical manual, the website is translated into the top languages spoken by families in California, to support the public use of the system. With the input of educational partners and community members, California’s system leverages colors and the image of a gauge to communicate how a district, school, or student group is performing. For additional detail, California’s accountability system is documented through an extensive technical manual that provides the system’s technical and policy details, including data definitions, calculation methodology and business rules, classification decisions, and how results lead to actions.

**7. Reflects technical quality through measures that are valid and reliable.**

The indicators and measurement of student outcomes used in California’s accountability system are based on sound methodology and data that have been dual processed, validated, and determined to be reliable. Through a focus on high-quality measures, every school system can see some key areas of strength and areas for growth.

**8. Leverages the expertise and perspectives of a broad set of educational partners and community members.**

Education practitioners, policy specialists, psychometricians, professionals who work with special populations, and education advocates provided extensive input and expertise to build California’s accountability system. Updates and additions to the accountability system are vetted through policy advisory groups, such as the California Practitioners Advisory Group, who advises the State Board of Education on the accountability system. Additionally, the CDE convenes policy and technical committees to advise the CDE on the system’s technical soundness; impacts to the system based on legislative and policy initiatives; consequences of different approaches for districts, schools, and groups of students; implementation; and transparency and communication of the system to the field.

**9. Promotes coherence between data reporting and support/improvement programs.**

The California School Dashboard, Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) process, and system of support all work together to identify and address areas of performance that need to improve, so that all interested parties may understand and work toward consensus on the improvement priorities for a district and its schools. The review of these indicator data is embedded into annual processes that drive setting goals, outcomes, actions, and expenditures in every district in California.

**10. Is subject to continuous revision and improvement.**

The State Board of Education (SBE) annually reviews California’s accountability system to ensure that it is continuously improving. In partnership with CDE staff, the SBE checks to see that indicators are performing as designed. In addition, as new student outcome data becomes available, the SBE evaluates whether the new data has a place in the system. This reflection process ensures that the system continues to be educationally meaningful and technically sound and that the metrics to hold districts and schools accountable for student outcomes remain relevant.

# Attachment 2

## Academic Indicator: Inclusion of Reclassified Students in the Englisher Learner Student Group

At the July 2022 State Board Education (SBE) meeting, SBE members requested information on the English learner (EL) student group on the California School Dashboard (Dashboard) for the Academic Indicator, which reports results on English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics assessments. This attachment provides for information purposes an overview of the EL student group for each state indicator on the California School Dashboard and performance of the EL student group in the Academic Indicator on prior Dashboards.

## Background

In 2016, as each state indicator was being developed for the Dashboard, the SBE reviewed the core goals of the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF). They expressed that the state’s new accountability system should reflect a clear expectation that all local educational agencies (LEAs) and schools can and should improve and emphasize equity by focusing on student group performance. The Dashboard reports on the following student groups:

* English learners
* Socioeconomically disadvantaged pupils
* Foster youth
* Homeless youth
* Students with disabilities
* Racial/ethnic groups, including:
  + African-American
  + American Indian/Native Alaskan
  + Asian
  + Filipino
  + Hispanic/Latino
  + Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
  + Two or more races
  + White

In compliance with state and federal accountability requirements, the data for the EL student group is reported in **all** state indicators on the Dashboard. The EL student group is also the **only** student group with its own indicator, the English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI). The definition of ELs varies by state indicator, which is identified in Table 1. (Note: this table is adapted from the 2019 Dashboard flyer, “Who Is Included in the English Learner Student Group?” which is available at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/cm/documents/whoisenglishlearner.pdf>.)

### Table 1 Who is Included in the EL Student Group for Each State Indicator

| **Indicator** | **Who Counts as an EL?** |
| --- | --- |
| Academic Performance | Students who are reported as EL during the time of testing, including students who were reclassified (or RFEP) within the past four years. |
| Chronic Absenteeism | Students who are reported as an EL at any time during the 2018–19 academic year. |
| College/Career Readiness | Students who are reported as EL at any time during the four-year cohort, or the Dashboard Alternative School Status (DASS) graduation rate, for the Class of 2019. |
| English Learner Progress (ELPI) | Results for students who took the Summative English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC). |
| Graduate Rate | Students who are reported as EL at any time during the four-year cohort, or the DASS graduation rate, for the Class of 2019. |
| Suspension Rate | Students who are reported as an EL at any time during the 2018–19 academic year. |

## English Learners in the Academic Indicator

During the development of the Dashboard, one specific area of focus by the SBE was the reporting of the EL student group in the Academic Indicator. The ESSA permits states to include students who are reclassified as fluent English proficient (RFEP) in the EL student group for up to four years within the academic indicator.

In January 2017, the SBE adopted the EL student group definition for the Academic Indicators, which includes current EL students **and** ELs reclassified for four years or less(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/jan17item02.doc> and <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/jan17item02a1addendum.doc>). The SBE supported this definition in part because it recognizes that school and district performance on the Academic Indicators reflects the effectiveness of the entire EL program—from initial designation through successful reclassification.

In making the decision to include RFEPs, the SBE acknowledged that compared to other student groups, the EL student group is much more fluid because it is expected to change over time to accommodate newly arrived ELs and those students exiting due to reclassification, especially in elementary schools. In addition, the EL student group results needed to align with the core methodology for establishing performance standards for Dashboard state indicators: (1) an appropriate distribution across performance levels, and (2) the ability to improve and move up in performance levels.

While considering the definition of the EL student group for the Academic Indicators the following national EL researchers provided support for the SBE’s decision to include students reclassified in the past four years in the EL student group for the Academic Indicators: Robert Linquanti from WestEd; Pete Goldschmidt from the California State University, Northridge; Kenji Hakuta from Stanford University; and Delia Pompa with the Migration Policy Institute. At the September 2022 SBE meeting, Dr. Hakuta will present on his work in this area.

## Academic Indictor Performance by the English Learner Student Group

In August 2019, in response to a request from the SBE, the CDE conducted an analysis of the performance of the EL student group on the Dashboard based on the 2018 data. Table 2 shows that, among districts and schools that receive a Red performance level for their EL student group in English language arts/literacy (ELA) or mathematics, a significant percent of RFEP students have a negative Distance from Standard (DFS). (Note that the data in Table 2 was initially presented in an August 2019 Information Memorandum [https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-aug19item02.docx ]. Table 2 has been updated to reflect the data reported for the 2019 Dashboard which demonstrate the same pattern of results.)

### Table 2: Districts and Schools with Red Performance Level for ELA and Mathematics Percent of EL and RFEP Students Contributing to the Negative DFS Score

| Content Area | Number of Red Performing Districts/Schools | Percent of Red Performing Districts and Schools that have Negative DFS for both EL Only and RFEP Students |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ELA | 61 Districts | 91.8% |
| ELA | 719 Schools | 89.7% |
| Mathematics | 69 Districts | 100% |
| Mathematics | 797 Schools | 99.7% |

Additionally, Table 2 shows that 61 districts received a red performance level in ELA and 69 districts received a red performance level in Mathematics. As noted in later in this item in Attachment 3, Table 7, a district may be eligible for support under state law for differentiated assistance based on student group performance in **two or more priority areas** in the Local Control Funding Formula. Since Priority 4-Pupil Achievement includes ELA and Mathematics or the English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI), the EL student group for the district must also meet the criteria in one of the other priority areas to be eligible for differentiated assistance. Accordingly, in 2019, approximately 57 districts met the eligibility criteria for their EL student group (see Table 5, December 2019 Information Memorandum to the SBE at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/apr20memoamard01.docx>).

## Additional Considerations for English Learners in the Academic Indicator

The January 2017 SBE agenda item also emphasized two additional reasons for including RFEP students for the last four years in the EL student group:

* First, since most of the reclassification criteria are locally determined by LEAs, the EL and RFEP student populations may have different characteristics across LEAs and schools, making comparability an issue in an accountability system. For example, the EL only students in one district may have more students performing at ELPAC levels 1 and 2, compared to other districts that may have more students who are proficient on the ELPAC in their EL group. This same issue would also apply to the RFEP student group because LEAs have locally adopted criteria for reclassifying students. Therefore, including students who are RFEP for four years stabilizes the group, allowing for better comparison across LEAs and schools.

To date, California does not have a standard statewide definition for reclassifying students who are ELs. Beginning in January 2019, the ELPAC overall score at level 4 criteria is used statewide for the first reclassification criteria, while all other criteria remain locally determined. Specifically, California *Education Code* Section 313(f) states that multiple measures must be used to reclassify ELs and must include, at a minimum, all four of the following criteria:

1. Assessment of English language proficiency
2. Teacher evaluation
3. Parental opinion and consultation
4. Comparison of student performance in basic skills against an empirically established range of performance in basic skills based on the performance of English proficient students of the same age.

Further, Title 5, *California Code of Regulations*, Section 11303 requires LEAs to establish local reclassification policies that allow for “the effective and efficient conduct of the language reclassification process.” Therefore, the decision to reclassify students is ultimately a local decision and there is considerable variation across the state.

However, efforts are currently being made to standardize the reclassification criteria statewide. Assembly Bill 181 (Chapter 52, Statues of 2022) recently extended the Observation Protocol for Teachers of English Learners (OPTEL) timeline to complete the field test and validation study to December 31, 2023, to allow for field testing to occur in alignment with the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California in Spring 2023. After all data analyses are completed and refinements suggested by educational partners have been made, the OPTEL will be brought before the SBE in November 2023 to be considered for approval as the statewide standardized protocol for Criterion 2 (teacher evaluation of EL students) and Criterion 3 (parent opinion and consultation) for the purpose of reclassification.

* The second reason for including RFEP students for the last four years is that it significantly increases the number of schools with a valid N size to receive a color for accountability purposes. The following section reflects the data demonstrates this.

## Data on Inclusion of Reclassified Students into the English Learner Student Group

Tables 3 and 4 provide the most recent data on the number and percent of schools and LEAs identified in each of the performance categories for ELA, based on four different definitions of the EL student group:

1. ELs and students reclassified for up to four years (reclassified from 2016–19): Current definition
2. ELs and students reclassified for up to three years (reclassified from 2017–19)
3. ELs and students reclassified for up to two years (reclassified from 2018–19)
4. Current English Learner Only (ELO) students and no reclassified students

Note: These tables were updated from the August 2019 Information Memorandum to include the performance categories for the English learner only (ELO) students to further identify the impact of redefining the EL student group on the Academic Indicators.

### Table 3 2019 Dashboard Results School Comparison: EL and ELO Student Group Data for ELA

| **EL and RFEP Students** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** | **Total** | **Difference** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| EL + 4 Years RFEP | 719  11.2% | 2,513 39.0% | 2,184 33.9% | 738 11.5% | 283 4.4% | 6,437 | Baseline\* |
| EL + 3 Years RFEP | 929  14.9% | 2,499 40.1% | 1,981  31.8% | 605 9.7% | 224 3.6% | 6,238 | -199 Schools\*\* |
| EL + 2 Years RFEP | 1,282 21.8% | 2,413 41.0% | 1,694 28.8% | 372 6.3% | 124 2.1% | 5,885 | -552 Schools\*\* |
| ELO | 1,800 38.6% | 2,091 44.8% | 734 15.7% | 33  0.7% | 9  0.2% | 4,667 | -1,770 Schools\*\* |

\*Criteria currently applied to the EL student group

\*\*Difference in number of schools receiving a color based on valid N size (30 or more students in the EL student group)

### Table 4 2019 Dashboard Results LEA Comparison: EL and ELO Student Group Data for ELA

| **EL and RFEP Students** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** | **Total** | **Difference** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| EL + 4 Years RFEP | 61 9.2% | 270  40.7% | 255 38.5% | 70  10.6% | 7  1.1% | 663 | Baseline\* |
| EL + 3 Years RFEP | 78 12.0% | 302 46.5% | 210 32.3% | 54  8.3% | 6  0.9% | 650 | -13 Districts\*\* |
| EL + 2 Years RFEP | 132 21.0% | 277 44.1% | 183 29.1% | 31  4.9% | 5  0.8% | 628 | -35 Districts\*\* |
| ELO | 228 38.3% | 273 45.8% | 93 15.6% | 1  0.2% | 1  0.2% | 596 | -67 Districts\*\* |

The data in Tables 3 and 4 show that significantly fewer schools and LEAs would receive a performance level for their EL student groups when the inclusion of reclassified students is reduced from four years to three or two years. The most notable difference is seen with the ELO student group, which removes reclassified students completely from the EL student group, as it would result in over 27 percent fewer schools and over 10 percent fewer districts having a performance level for ELA.

### Table 5 2019 Dashboard Results School Comparison: EL and ELO Student Group Data for Mathematics

| **EL and RFEP Students** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** | **Total** | **Difference** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| EL + 4 Years RFEP | 797 12.4% | 2,308 35.9% | 2,025 31.5% | 930 14.5% | 370 5.8% | 6,430 | Baseline\* |
| EL + 3 Years RFEP | 901 14.4% | 2,323 37.2% | 1,914 30.7% | 784 12.6% | 316 5.1% | 6,238 | -192 Schools\*\* |
| EL + 2 Years RFEP | 1,075 18.3% | 2,255 38.3% | 1,792 30.5% | 558 9.5% | 203 3.5% | 5,883 | -547 Schools\*\* |
| ELO | 1,416 30.4% | 1,919 41.1% | 1,151 24.7% | 137 2.9% | 42  0.9% | 4,665 | -1,765 Schools\*\* |

### Table 6 2019 Dashboard Results LEA Comparison: EL and ELO Student Group Data for Mathematics

| **EL and RFEP Students** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** | **Total** | **Difference** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| EL + 4 Years RFEP | 69 10.4% | 292 44.1% | 219 33.1% | 63  9.5% | 19  2.9% | 662 | Baseline\* |
| EL + 3 Years RFEP | 94 14.5% | 296 45.7% | 183 28.2% | 57  8.8% | 18  2.8% | 648 | -14 Districts\*\* |
| EL + 2 Years RFEP | 142 22.6% | 257 40.9% | 182 29.0% | 38  6.1% | 9  1.4% | 628 | -34 Districts\*\* |
| ELO | 236 39.6% | 231 38.8% | 115 19.3% | 12  2.0% | 2  0.3% | 596 | -66 Districts\*\* |

The data in Tables 5 and 6 shows a significant decrease in the number of schools and districts receiving a performance level for mathematics for their EL students when the inclusion of reclassified students is reduced from four years to three or two years. Similar to the results we saw earlier for ELA, the most notable difference is seen with the ELO student group, which removes reclassified students completely from the EL student group, as it would result in 27 percent fewer schools and over 10 percent fewer districts having a performance level for Mathematics.

## Summary of the Data Analysis

The application of the current definition for the EL student group– ELs and students reclassified for up to four years (2016–19)—**continues to hold more schools and districts accountable for the effectiveness of the entire EL program**—from initial designation through successful reclassification. For example, if the inclusion of RFEP students were reduced to two years, 552 schools (8.6 percent) and 35 LEAs would **not** receive a performance level (color) for the EL student group in ELA. The results are similar for mathematics: 547 schools and 34 LEAs would **not** receive a performance color. In addition, it is important to note the data reflects that the number of RFEP students who reach Level 3 on the Smarter Balanced Assessment increases substantially between students who have been reclassified for two years verses students who have been reclassified for four years (i.e., percentage of schools with an ELA Green performance level is 11.5 percent in the EL +4 Years RFEP category vs. 6.3 percent EL + 2 Years RFEP category).

Additionally, excluding RFEP students may result in an inability for schools to achieve the Green and Blue performance categories if they reclassify their students. This may have the unintended consequence of schools not reclassifying EL students as soon as possible. Analyses found schools that were in the Blue and Green performance category, based on EL only, had EL student groups that were comprised of large numbers of students who scored Met or Exceeded Standard on the statewide assessments. In many other LEAs, these students would have been reclassified.

Finally, identifying a large number of EL student groups in the Red performance category may simply describe the language acquisition status of students, instead of helping districts who are eligible for differentiated assistance to distinguish the strengths and weaknesses as they determine their priorities and allocate resources.

## Additional English Learner Data

### Academic Indicator Additional Reporting Groups

To further ensure transparency of ELs performance on the Academic Indicator, the SBE requested that the Dashboard include disaggregated Distance from Standard scores (for current year and change from the prior year) within the EL student group at the LEA and school level for the following:

* English learners only
* RFEP
* English only

The data for these three additional reporting groups are displayed on the Dashboard for the Academic Indicators. These additional reporting groups are not displayed for other state indicators. These data are reported for informational purposes and are not used to determine LEAs and schools for support. Dashboard users are encouraged to utilize the information to compare how each of these additional reporting groups are performing on the ELA and mathematics indicators and appropriately plan to support the progress of their EL student group.

### California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress English-Language Fluency

In addition to the accountability data on Dashboard for the Academic Indicator, the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) web site. CAASPP web site (<https://www.caaspp.org/>) further disaggregates performance for the following categories under “English-Language Fluency”:

* Initial Fluent English Proficient (IFEP) and English Only (EO)
* IFEP
* RFEP
* ELs enrolled less than 12 months
* ELs enrolled 12 months or more
* EL
* Adult English learner
* EO
* Ever-ELs
* To be determined

LEAs are encouraged to use this additional CAASPP data to inform decisions about what improvements may needed to be implemented to strengthen their EL programs.

### English Learner Progress Indicator

In addition to the Academic Indicator, as previously mentioned in Table 2, ELs are also measured on how they are progressing towards English proficiency based on results of students who took the Summative English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC).

Accordingly, the Academic Indicator and the ELPI measure two different aspects of EL success: (1) making sufficient progress toward language acquisition to increase EL access to the curriculum in all content areas, and (2) evaluating the strength of the entire EL program in academic performance from initial designation through successful reclassification. The ELPI Status is designed to determine whether EL students are making sufficient progress in English acquisition in contrast to the Academic Indicators that measure student’s mastery of academic standards. Therefore, besides reviewing the data within the Academic Indicators, LEAs can also use the ELPI to access another important piece of information on the success of their ELD (English Language Development) programs.

# Attachment 3

## Eligibility Criteria for Differentiated Assistance

California’s public-school accountability system is designed to reinforce the expectation that every school and LEA can improve while also ensuring additional support is provided to LEAs that need it. It also intentionally focused on assisting the receiving LEA to build the necessary capacity to improve student outcomes.

Under the LCFF, LEAs including districts, county offices of education (COEs), and charter schools are eligible for differentiated assistance (DA) based on their performance on the California School Dashboard (Dashboard). The last time LEAs were determined eligible for differentiated assistance was based on results from the 2019 Dashboard. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, LEAs that were determined eligible for based on the 2019 Dashboard have remained in DA due to the lack of state indicators on the 2020 and 2021 Dashboards.

Differentiated assistance is intended not only to help the LEA address the underlying causes that led to its eligibility for assistance, but also to strengthen the LEA’s overall ability to evaluate the effectiveness of strategies and programs and make adjustments as appropriate.

AB 130 requires DA eligibility be based solely on data from the 2021-22 school year. Additionally, per AB 130, prior year Dashboard data (i.e., 2018, 2019) will be used to determine those LEAs eligible for level 3 support in future years. As a result of the limitations in AB 130, the California Department of Education (CDE) is recommending that the SBE make 2022 DA eligibility determinations using only Status levels from the 2022 Dashboard. The TDG (Technical Design Group) agreed that this recommendation is technically sound to use the lowest available Status levels on the State indicators as a proxy for Red.

Eligibility determinations made for 2022 differentiated assistance will only be able to utilize Method 1, also known as State Indicators only, due to only having one year of local indicator data. Methods 2 and 3 of differentiated assistance eligibility determinations are unavailable until the 2023 differentiated assistance eligibility determinations. Additionally, the College/Career indicator will not be available as a State Indicator on the 2022 Dashboard. This is due to limited statewide testing data from the 2020–21 school year.

Therefore, based on the guidelines and restrictions from AB 130, CDE proposes to utilize the following criteria for eligibility determinations for differentiated assistance as described in Table 7:

### Table 7: Proposed 2022 Differentiated Assistance Eligibility Criteria by Priority Area

| **LCFF Priority Area** | **2019 Dashboard State Indicators Criteria** |
| --- | --- |
| Priority 1 – Basics | N/A |
| Priority 2 – Implementation of State Academic Standards | N/A |
| Priority 3 – Parent and Family Engagement | N/A |
| Priority 4 – Pupil Achievement | * Status of “Very Low” on both English Language Arts (ELA) and Math Academic Indicator; or * Status of “Very Low” on the English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI). |
| Priority 5 - Pupil Engagement | * Status of “Very Low” on Graduation Rate Indicator; or * Status of “Very High” on Chronic Absenteeism Indicator |
| Priority 6 – School Climate | * Status of “Very High” on the Suspension Rate Indicator |
| Priority 7 – Access to a Broad Course of Study | N/A |
| Priority 8 – Outcomes to a Broad Course of Study | N/A |

In order to estimate the magnitude of change in eligibility identification due to changes in the criteria, CDE ran simulations using the 2019 Dashboard data. The result, in Table 8, shows an increase in districts and COEs identified for support in comparison to the 2019 identification cycle (see Table 1).

### Table 8: Simulation of Proposed 2022 DA Eligibility Criteria Utilizing 2019 Dashboard Data Compared to Actual 2019 DA Eligibility

| **Method Type** | **Description** | **2019 Districts and COEs Eligible for DA** | **2019 Districts and COEs Eligible for DA** **(removing CCI)** | **2019 Districts and COEs Eligible for DA if Using Proposed 2022 Criteria** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Method 1: State Indicators | One student group meets the criteria in at least two priority areas. | 331 | 297 | 399 |
| Method 2: Local Indicators | “Not Met for Two or More Years” in at least two priority areas (e.g., priority areas 1 and 2). | 2 | 2 | n/a |
| Method 3: Combination of State and Local Indicators | One or more student group(s) meets(s) the criteria in one priority area, and the LEA or COE meets the “Not Met for Two or More Years” on only one local indicator in a different priority area. | 0 | 0 | n/a |
| All Methods | N/A | 333 | 299 | 399 |

The CDE presented this proposal to the California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG) at their August 2022 meeting. CPAG members did not share concerns related to the 2022 proposed methodology changes. They did, however, voice worry around the capacity for COEs to direct the required support necessary to LEAs if the numbers increased dramatically this year as well raise questions around the under identification of EL student groups under this current methodology.

# Attachment 4

## Connecting the California School Dashboard to the Teacher Assignment Data

### Teacher Data

In June 2022, the California Department of Education (CDE), the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) released the first set of 2020-21 statewide Teaching Assignment Monitoring Outcome data for California. The data report is the result of extensive cooperation between the CTC and CDE and can be accessed through the Teacher Assignment Monitoring Outcomes web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/ad/tamo.asp>. Following the State Board of Education’s (SBE) approval of teacher assignment definitions in the federal Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) state plan, the agencies began developing a roadmap to provide the public with meaningful data.

The CDE recommends that the SBE approve the inclusion of a link on the 2022 California School Dashboard (Dashboard) for each local educational agency (LEA) to the Dataquest Teacher Assignment Monitoring Outcomes by Full-Time Equivalency Report. The following provides the background information for this recommendation and educational partner engagement on this topic.

### Overview and Implementation of Senate Bill 75

The SBE adopted local indicators for the California School Dashboard for the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) state priority areas where statewide data is not available. The SBE-adopted local indicators include performance standards for LEAs and self-reflection tools that LEAs use to report progress. LEAs are responsible for annually completing the local indicator self-reflection tools based on an assessment of locally collected data and input from educational partners, reporting progress to the local governing board or body of the LEA and uploading the results to the Dashboard.

Senate Bill (SB) 75 (Chapter 51, Statutes of 2019) requires that “no later than January 31, 2021, local indicators shall reflect school-level data to the extent the department collects or otherwise has access to relevant and reliable school-level data for all schools statewide.” Based on this language, the CDE reviewed the local indicators and one data point from Priority 1, related to the assignment of teachers, met the criteria outlined in SB 75.

Priority 1 includes data on teachers inclusive of basic Services and Conditions – Appropriately Assigned Teachers, Access to Curriculum-Aligned Instructional Materials, and Safe, Clean and Functional School Facilities. An LEA that meets the SBE-adopted performance standards receives a status of Met in the Dashboard; an LEA that does not meet the SBE-adopted performance standards receives a status of Not Met or Not Met for Two or More Years, as applicable.

### Educational Partner Engagement

The CDE recently convened an Ad-Hoc Priority 1 Teacher Assignment Data Workgroup (Workgroup) to solicit feedback on the reporting of the data, including a review of the data elements, and resources to the field to support the 2022 Dashboard. The Workgroup is comprised of representatives from the Association of California School Administrators, California County Superintendents Educational Services Association, charter school practitioners, California Teachers Association, and the Equity Coalition. The Workgroup reviewed and provided feedback on the reporting of these data on the 2022 Dashboard. Specifically, Workgroup members supported the CDE proposal to add a link to the Dashboard to connect users directly to the teaching assignment monitoring outcome data available on DataQuest. The Workgroup further discussed the development of resources that could be translated into different languages to assist the public with reviewing the DataQuest reports.

Additionally, at the August 2022 California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG) meeting, CPAG members noted their appreciation for both the robust data that is now available through DataQuest as well as the linkage to the data via the 2022 Dashboard.

After the release of the second year of data in Spring 2023, the CDE will re-engage the Workgroup and technical experts to develop objective criteria for the SBE to consider pursuant to California *Education Code* Section 52064.5 for use on the 2023 Dashboard and beyond. Additional work will be conducted to determine the inclusion methodology of these criteria considering that teacher assignment data represent only one of the three component pieces included within Priority Area 1 in order to accurately and appropriately report these data in future Dashboards.

# Attachment 5

## Connecting the California School Dashboard to the California Science Test Results

At the March 2022 State Board of Education (SBE) meeting, the California Department of Education (CDE) provided an update on the inclusion of the California Science Test (CAST) results in the California School Dashboard (Dashboard). During the meeting, the CDE presented several factors that need to be considered prior to inclusion:

* There had been a limited number of students completing the CAST due to the impacts of the 2019 novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19) (e.g., 16.4 percent of eligible students taking the test and 35 percent of eligible students taking the California Alternate Assessment for Science in 2020–21), which makes it difficult to fairly set standards based on a small portion of student results.
* Beginning in 2021–22, a revised blueprint of the CAST was administered making this administration the first data point that could potentially be used for accountability.
* There have been difficulties in implementing the science instructional materials, which were adopted by the SBE in November 2018. As a result, full implementation of the California Next Generation Science Standards (CA NGSS) has not yet occurred across the state.
* The inclusion of this as a state indicator requires an amendment to California’s Every Student Succeeds Acts (ESSA) Consolidated State Plan. ED’s approval of the accountability system is contingent on maintaining a balance between academic and non-academic indicators. It is important to ensure that the inclusion of CAST will not generate an imbalance of indicators.

Since the CDE could not predict (at the March 2022 SBE meeting) the projected participation in the science assessments for the 2021–22 administration, it was recommended to the SBE that the CDE will continue to carefully assess when this test may be fully incorporated into the Dashboard. However, to acknowledge the importance of science, the SBE requested that a link be added to the Dashboard to connect users directly to the CAST results.

Based on this request, the CDE proposes two options for the SBE’s consideration:

* Option 1: Include a link through the "More Information" tab at the top of the Dashboard directly to the CAASPP science results, or
* Option 2: Include a specific link to each school/LEA’s CAASPP science results through Additional Reports button

The CDE presented this proposal to the California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG) at their August 2022 meeting. Several of the CPAG members noted that including a link in the Additional Reports button would be helpful. They also noted that communicating the availability of the link is important and that the CDE should provide instructions on how the data should be used or interpreted.