

California Practitioners Advisory Group Meeting

Item 02

Feedback on Options for the Methodology to Identify Not Less Than the Lowest-Performing Five Percent of All Schools Receiving Title I, Part A Funds in the State for Comprehensive Support And Improvement.

April 13, 2017



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Background on Requirements for Identifying the Lowest-Performing Five Percent of Title I Schools

Identification of Schools For Assistance

- Under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), the state accountability system must include an approach to identify the bottom five percent of Title I funded schools in need of support based on low overall performance (comprehensive support) or consistent underperformance of student groups (targeted support).

Identification of Schools For Assistance (Cont.)

- Consistently underperforming student groups must include at least any student group in a Title I school that, on its own, would meet the criteria for being in the bottom five percent of Title I schools.

Identification of Schools For Assistance (Cont.)

- ESAA requires that the approach to identify schools for comprehensive and targeted support provide much greater weight, in the aggregate, to academic indicators (e.g., student test scores, progress of English learners, graduation rates, and chronic absence).

Options for Identifying the Lowest-Performing Five Percent

Options for Identifying the Lowest-Performing Five Percent

- Based on feedback from educational stakeholders and the Technical Design Group, four options for identifying the lowest five percent of Title I schools were included in the State Board of Education (SBE) April Information Memoranda and are being presented today.

Options for Identifying the Lowest-Performing Five Percent (Cont.)

Option 1:

Look at the performance levels on all applicable indicators with English language arts (ELA) and mathematics as separate indicators.

Indicator	ELA	Math	Graduation Rate	English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI)	Suspension Rate
Color	RED	ORANGE	YELLOW	RED	GREEN

Options for Identifying the Lowest-Performing Five Percent (Cont.)

Option 2:

Look at the performance levels on all applicable indicators with ELA and mathematics combined into one indicator in a manner consistent with criteria for LEA technical assistance under LCFF.

Indicator	Academic (ELA & Math)	Graduation Rate	ELPI	Suspension Rate
Color	RED	YELLOW	RED	GREEN

For criteria on combining ELA and Math results see Handout 1.

Options for Identifying the Lowest-Performing Five Percent (Cont.)

Option 3:

Look at the performance levels on all applicable indicators but provide more/less weighting to one or more indicators using the same methodology as Options 1 and 2.


Indicator	Academic (ELA & Math) (1)	Graduation Rate (1)	ELPI (1)	Suspension Rate (0.5)
Color	RED	YELLOW	RED	GREEN

Indicator	ELA (2)	Math (2)	Graduation Rate (1)	ELPI (1)	Suspension Rate (1)
Color	RED	ORANGE	YELLOW	RED	GREEN

Options for Identifying the Lowest-Performing Five Percent (Cont.)

Option 4:

Look at the performance levels for one or more indicators to establish a pool of eligible schools, then move to other indicators.



Variability Among Schools

- **Applicable Indicators:** Because schools must have “30 or more” students to receive a performance level (or color), not all schools receive a color for each indicator.
- Schools may have a performance level for up to five indicators:
 - Suspension Rate
 - English Learner Progress
 - Graduation Rate
 - ELA, or
 - Mathematics

Variability Among Schools (Cont.)

- Examples:
 - An **elementary** school may have performance levels (or colors) for only three indicators: suspension rate, ELA, and mathematics
 - A **high** school may have performance colors for only two indicators: suspension and graduation rates (High schools do not receive performance levels (or colors) for the academic indicators. The grade 11 Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment results are included in the College/Career Indicator.)

Variability Among Schools (Cont.)

- The methodology for Options 1, 2, and 3, takes into consideration that different schools receive performance levels on a different number of indicators. Therefore, the performance of a school with only two indicators is treated similarly as the performance of a school with five indicators.

Option Examples

- Example for Options 1 and 2:
 - A school with two indicators, in which both performance levels are “Red,” will be identified for support before a school with three indicators, in which two performance levels are Red and one performance level is Orange.

School	Academic (ELA & Math)	ELPI	Suspension Rate	Percent of Red Indicators
School A	RED	N/A	RED	100%
School B	RED	ORANGE	RED	66.6%

Option Examples (Cont.)

- Example for Option 3:
 - If two schools have the same performance level combination (RRYY), only one school may be identified for support. Assigning more or less weight to select indicators will make a difference in the identification process.

School	ELA (2)	Math (2)	ELPI (1)	Suspension Rate (1)	Number of Weighted Red Indicators
School A	RED	RED	YELLOW	YELLOW	4 out of 6
School B	YELLOW	YELLOW	RED	RED	2 out of 6

Option Examples (Cont.)

- Example Option 4:

- Using a progressive selection process may result in some indicators not contributing to the selection of the five percent.

Indicators for Elementary Schools	Performance Level	Number of Schools	Cumulative Total (5% = 298)
ELA and Math	RED	235	235
ELPI	RED	63	298
Chronic Absenteeism	RED	N/A	
Suspension Rate	RED	N/A	

Other Considerations

- ESSA requires states to develop a single academic indicator. In addition, the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) criteria that will be used to identify LEAs for technical assistance combines ELA and mathematics results.

Discussion

- How would CPAG members rank order the four options?
- What are some of the pros and cons for each methodology?