Item 1: Developing an Integrated Local, State, and Federal Accountability and Continuous Improvement System

California State Board of Education Meeting

May 10, 2017
State Board of Education: Accountability Related Prior Actions

• **March 2016** – Architecture of Accountability and Continuous Improvement System
• **May 2016** – Determination of a balance of local and state measures and plans for a single, coherent local, state, federal system
• **July 2016** – Standards and performance expectations
• **September 2016** – Approval of Evaluation Rubrics
• **November 2016** – Approval of revised Local Control and Accountability Plan Template
• **January 2017** – Approval of remaining state and local indicators
• **March 2017** – Overview of Alternative Schools
State Board of Education: Accountability Related Future Actions

June 2017

• Information Memorandum on the progress toward a growth model
• Information Memorandum on the emerging state system of support for local educational agencies (LEAs) and schools

July 2017

• Emerging state system of support for LEAs and schools
• Update on inclusion of California Alternate Assessment results in the Academic Indicator
• Revisions to eligibility criteria for alternative schools
• Methodology for identifying schools for support as required under the Every Student Succeeds Act

September 2017

• Review changes to the state and local indicators for the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) evaluation rubrics for inclusion in the 2017 Fall Dashboard Release

November 2017

• Hold for additional changes to the state indicators for the LCFF evaluation rubrics for inclusion in the Fall 2017 Dashboard release
Overview of Item Attachments

Attachment 1: Update on the California School Dashboard
Attachment 2: Application Process for Alternative Schools
Attachment 3: Update on the English Learner Progress Indicator
Attachment 4: Draft Timeline and Outreach with Stakeholders
Attachment 5: Related California *Education Code* sections
Attachment 1: California School Dashboard Overview

https://www.caschooldashboard.org/

California School Dashboard

See how districts and schools are performing on test scores, graduation rates and other measures of student success.

Search for school, district or county office of education

Getting started: Take 2 minutes and learn about what you’ll see.

The Dashboard is being field tested before full implementation in fall 2017. The Dashboard's design and features will be changed over time based on user feedback. Reports included in the field test are based on the latest state data available as of fall 2016. Future versions of the Dashboard will be published annually each fall and will incorporate the most recent available data.

Questions? Send them to lcff@cde.ca.gov.

Copyright 2017 California Department of Education
Spring 2017 Dashboard: Local Educational Agency Support

• Data Reference Tables:
  – Spring 2017 Release
  – Fall 2017 Release

• Links to External Videos/Materials

• Ongoing Stakeholder Input Sessions

• California Collaborative on Education Excellence

• California County Superintendents Educational Services Association
Background

- Legislature provided $20 million in one-time funds for CCEE to establish statewide process to provide professional development training
  - Training must focus on how to use Dashboard and LCAP to support continuous improvement
- CCEE Governing Board approved Professional Development Training Implementation Plan on October 6, 2016
  - Department of Finance approved plan on October 12, 2016
Background

Training must be provided in each region of state, be available to all LEAs, and address:

- How Dashboard may be used for development and implementation of LCAPs
- How Dashboard may be used to improve pupil outcomes, close achievement gap
- How Dashboard may be used to communicate with stakeholders
- How Dashboard and LCAP template may be used to establish system of continuous improvement
### Component I: Workshops
- **Purpose**: Establish common baseline for using Dashboard/LCAP as tools for continuous improvement
- **Depth of Content**: Shallow
- **Breadth of Content**: Broad
- **Interactive**: Partly
- **Individualized**: No

### Component II: Aligned Local Trainings
- **Purpose**: Support aligned local trainings on using Dashboard/LCAP as tools for continuous improvement
- **Depth of Content**: Deep
- **Breadth of Content**: Narrow
- **Interactive**: No
- **Individualized**: Partly

### Component III: Networks
- **Purpose**: Support deep learning for using Dashboard/LCAP as tools for continuous improvement
- **Depth of Content**: Deep
- **Breadth of Content**: Broad
- **Interactive**: Fully
- **Individualized**: Partly
In addition to 3 components, Professional Development work has included customized trainings on request from LEAs

- Opportunity to respond to substantive inquiries on using Dashboard and LCAP as tools for continuous improvement
California County Superintendents Educational Services Association Trainings

- Five-part training series (October, November, and December of 2016, January and February of 2017)

- Purpose was to:
  - build capacity of county office of education (COE) staff to know and lead this work
  - develop greater consistency across the state for COEs related to the state accountability system and new LCAP template

- Every COE that reviews LCAPs participated in the training (Note: Single district COEs submit their LCAP to the CDE for approval)

- A overwhelming majority of COEs that review LCAPs were involved in development/review of materials
California County Superintendents Educational Services Association Training Content

• Overview of accountability system and components and implications for LCAP development
• Focus on the development of a strategic approach to multi-year LCAP Planning
• Nexus between the Dashboard and LCAP
• Stakeholder engagement and how to support districts to increase quality
• Differential Assistance and Intensive Intervention
• Reflection on calibration and ongoing support across COEs
• Work with LEAs toward LCAP Approval
Fall 2017 Dashboard Release:
Work Plan for Functionality Improvements

Data Years
• English Learner Progress and Suspension Rate Indicators will use more up to date information (2016–17 data)
• Four-year graduation cohort report is under development for CALPADS for the 2017–18 collection cycle for inclusion in Fall 2018 Dashboard

Mobile Friendly
• In development

Search/Printing Functionality
• Improve search function (all schools in district) and allow for a comparison across schools in a district
• Adding PDF print option

Note: The California Model Five-by-Five Placement Reports (http://www6.cde.ca.gov/californiamodel/) allow for comparison between all schools in a district on a single indicator.
Attachment 2: Application Process for Alternative Schools

- Alternative schools (as defined by California Education Code and SBE policy) were excluded from the Spring 2017 Dashboard in order to allow the development of indicators specific to alternative schools.
- In preparation for the Fall 2017 Dashboard release, CDE needs to define the universe of schools.
- SBE approval needed to make changes to the application process.
- Alternate Accountability Task Force will meet for the first time in May 2017 and will provide feedback on the expanded eligibility criteria.
Number of Schools by School Type and Grade Span Identified as Alternative Schools in the Spring 2017 Dashboard Release

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligibility Criteria</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>K–12</th>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Defined Alternative Schools EC Section 520529(g)</td>
<td>101 (9.3%)</td>
<td>55 (5.0%)</td>
<td>109 (10%)</td>
<td>825 (75.7%)</td>
<td>1,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Schools (county and district schools)</td>
<td>28 (20.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.5%)</td>
<td>76 (55.9%)</td>
<td>31 (22.8%)</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools of Choice (Meeting the Current SBE Criteria)*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12 (33.3%)</td>
<td>24 (66.6%)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter Schools (Meeting the Current SBE Criteria)*</td>
<td>1 (1.4%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21 (30.4%)</td>
<td>47 (68.1%)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Alternative Schools</td>
<td>130 (9.8%)</td>
<td>56 (4.2%)</td>
<td>218 (16.4%)</td>
<td>927 (69.7%)</td>
<td>1,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Alternative Schools</td>
<td>5,902 (65.8%)</td>
<td>1,358 (15.1%)</td>
<td>317 (3.5%)</td>
<td>1,388 (15.5%)</td>
<td>8,965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These alternative schools were not explicitly identified in EC Section 520529(g) but met the SBE-adopted eligibility criteria of having at least 70 percent of the school’s total enrollment comprised of high-risk groups.
Alternative Schools Definition
Per *Education Code*

- *Education Code* (*EC*) Section 52052(g) requires the Superintendent of Public Instruction, with approval of the SBE, to develop an alternative accountability system for schools that serve a large percentage of high-risk students.

- The *EC* also identifies specific types of schools as alternative (e.g., juvenile court, county community day, etc.) that would automatically be eligible to participate in alternative school accountability.
Alternative Schools Not Included in California *Education Code*

- In 2003, the SBE last updated the definition of alternative schools eligible for inclusion in the alternative schools system.
- This definition includes alternative schools of choice and charter schools in which 70 percent of the school’s total enrollment is composed of the following high-risk groups:
  - Expelled
  - Suspended
  - Wards of the court
  - Pregnant and/or parenting
  - Recovered dropouts
  - Habitually truant or habitually insubordinate and disorderly
  - Retained more than once in kindergarten through grade eight
Changes to the Alternative Schools Application Process

• The alternative school application process should include a process to verify over time that schools continue to serve a large percentage (i.e., 70 percent) of high-risk students, as defined in the SBE eligibility criteria.

• The CDE is recommending that these schools (not explicitly defined as alternative in EC) be required to re-certify before the Fall 2017 Dashboard release, and every three years thereafter, for alternative school status.
Future Considerations for Alternative Schools Eligibility Criteria

• In July, the CDE will bring additional eligibility criteria to the SBE for consideration. This will allow schools that serve a large percentage of high-risk students, that are not currently eligible for alternative school status, the opportunity to be held accountable to alternative indicators that would more fairly evaluate their success and progress.
Item 3: Update on the English Learner Progress Indicator

In June 2016, the SBE recommended that the CDE convene a Work Group of experts to:

1. Explore the use of the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC), Long Term English Learners (LTELs), and Reclassified Fluent English Proficient (RFEP) criteria to capture a fuller picture of student performance; and to

2. Advise on the development of the English Learner Progress Indicator to include in the new accountability system.
Summary of the Group’s Work

The ELPI Work Group first met by phone in October 2016 and convened three subsequent times in person.

October 2016:

• ELPI Work Group asked for simulations to be run using both the California *Education Code* 313.1 LTEL definition and students identified as English learners (EL) for 6+ years in school.
December 2016:

• Provided feedback on presenting information on the EL student group for the Academic Indicator, detailed in the January 2017 SBE Item #2.

• Reviewed whether LTEI data could appropriately and viably be incorporated into the current ELPI.
January 2017:

• Reviewed and provided feedback on draft LTEL reports for posting on the CDE’s DataQuest site that further disaggregates the LTEL student population.

• Reviewed the LTEL data simulations and agreed not to include the data into the existing ELPI formula for status and change due to:
  – difficulty in interpreting the results; and
  – data unfairly penalizes middle and high schools.
March 2017 (cont.):

• The ELPI Work Group recommended a method to provide “extra credit” for LTELs in the ELPI who advance at least one level on the California English Language Development Test (CELDT).

• The ELPI Work Group supported providing additional EL and LTEL data reports in DataQuest and the Dashboard.
Proposal to Include LTELs in the ELPI Formula

Annual CELDT Test Takers Who Increased at least 1 CELDT Level

Plus

Annual CELDT Test Takers Who Maintained Early Advanced/Advanced English Proficient on the CELDT

Plus

ELs Who Were Reclassified in the Prior Year

Plus

*LTEL CELDT Test Takers Who Increased at Least 1 CELDT Level*

Divided by

Total Number of Annual CELDT Test Takers in the Current Year plus

ELs Who Were Reclassified in the Prior Year
Adding Full Weight for LTELs Who Increased 1+ CELDT Level

Results of adding an additional full weight to all LTEL students who increased at least one performance level on the CELDT, using the ELPI data released in the Spring 2017 Dashboard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools with an ELPI Color</th>
<th>Schools with LTEL Students</th>
<th>Schools with at least one LTEL Student that Increased a Performance Level</th>
<th>Schools with an Improved Status Adding Full Weight</th>
<th>Schools with a Change in Color Adding Full Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6,437</td>
<td>4,902</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>63*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: The information presented here is just a simulation and will not change the Spring 2017 Dashboard report.)

* These 63 schools were located in 46 different local educational agencies (LEAs).
Stakeholder Input on Work Group Recommendations

California Practitioners Advisory Group
- Affirmed the ELPI Work Group’s recommendation
- Stated that this would encourage schools to more closely focus on this student group

Technical Design Group
- Affirmed the recommendation provides positive incentives for improving LTELEL students
- Agreed there are no significant technical issues or concerns with the recommendation
Recommended Action

• To allow for changes to the ELPI be made in concert with the other state indicators, the CDE recommends that the SBE consider this as information only and take action, as appropriate, at their September 2017 meeting.

• The CDE recommends that schools not explicitly defined as alternative in EC be required to re-certify before the Fall 2017 Dashboard release, and every three years thereafter, for alternative school status.