# **Attachment 2: Summary of Proposed Revisions to the Every Student Succeeds Act State Plan and Impact on California’s Existing State Accountability System**

The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plan revisions negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education (ED) do not fundamentally change California’s accountability system developed under the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF). Elements that remain intact include:

* California will continue to use the California School Dashboard (Dashboard) for state, local – and now federal – accountability purposes, accomplishing the goal of creating one integrated system.
* The Dashboard will continue to include multiple measures of school and district performance, moving beyond just test scores.
* California will continue to calculate the Dashboard indicators using both status and change.
* California will continue to use the Dashboard to identify districts for targeted assistance through the Statewide of System of Support.
* California will use the color-coded performance levels that schools receive on the Dashboard indicators to identify the lowest performing Title I schools for additional support.

While California worked hard to ensure the primacy of the state system, some changes are necessary to gain ED approval. Without approval, California risks losing about $2.4 billion annually in federal ESSA funds—money that districts and schools use to support their neediest students. Most changes are minor and do not impact the system. Two substantive changes include:

* Grade 11 assessment results will be included in the academic indicators for English language arts (ELA) and mathematics for federal purposes, including school identification under ESSA. If the State Board of Education (SBE) elects to incorporate these changes into the 2018 Dashboard, the Academic Indicators for ELA and mathematics for unified school districts and K-12 schools would include Grade 11 assessment results in addition to grades 3-8, and high school districts and high schools will receive two additional color-coded ratings for Grade 11 assessment results. The Grade 11 assessment results are also included in the College/Career Indicator, which CDE expects to implement in the fall.
* The English learner proficiency indicator will not include data on students reclassified the prior year or an additional weighting factor for progress made by long-term English learners for federal purposes, including school identification under ESSA. Unless California receives a waiver on this issue and/or the SBE elects not to incorporate this change for state accountability purposes, the English Learner Progress Indicator on the Dashboard would have to be modified for future Dashboard releases.

This Attachment is aimed at building understanding of the proposed revisions to the State Plan. It includes:

* **Pages 3-4:** **Summary by Issue Area and Impact on State Accountability System** – Easy-to-read chart summarizing of the proposed revisions to the ESSA Title I accountability sections and their impact on the Dashboard and our overall approach to accountability under LCFF.
* **Page 5-6: Status and Change (Long-Term Goals and Indicators)** – Example of how the use of status and change to create the 5x5 grids that are the basis for performance reporting are unchanged.
* **Page 7-8: School Identification** – Breakdown of how California is proposing to use the Dashboard to identify low-performing schools for extra support and federal funding.
* **Page 9-10: Measurements of Interim Progress** – Example of calculations based on existing data that will be reported to the federal government.

The table below summarizes the impact that the proposed revisions to the Title I accountability sections of the ESSA State Plan will have on the existing approach to school accountability approved by the SBE under the LCFF.

## **Table 1: Summary by Issue Area and Impact on State Accountability System**

| **Issue** | **Impact on Accountability System** |
| --- | --- |
| ***Status and Change (Long-Term Goals and Indicators) – See page 5 for additional information***  For the Academic Achievement, Graduation Rate, and English Learner Progress indicators, report Status and Change as distinct indicators and set the long-term goals based on Status for federal reporting purposes. | None |
| ***Grade 11 Assessments and College/Career Indicator***  Include Grade 11 Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) results in the Academic Achievement indicator for English language arts (ELA) and mathematics (which currently includes only grades 3–8). Retain the College/Career Indicator (CCI), which includes Grade 11 SBAC results, as an additional indicator. | Grade 11 SBAC results would be included in the Academic indicator for ELA and mathematics for the 2018 California School Dashboard (Dashboard), unless the SBE elects to use this indicator only for school identification under ESSA. |
| ***English Language Proficiency Indicator***  Modify how the English Language Progress Indicator (ELPI) is calculated so it is based solely on progress on the annual assessments (i.e., remove reclassified students and weighting factor for long-term English learners [LTELs] from the calculation). | If California does not obtain a waiver on this issue, the ELPI would be calculated differently in the Dashboard, unless the SBE elects to use the modified calculation only for school identification under ESSA. |
| ***Weighting of indicators***  For federal reporting purposes, update language to reflect reporting of Status and Change as distinct indicators and inclusion of Grade 11 SBAC results. | None |

| **Issue** | **Impact on Accountability System** |
| --- | --- |
| ***School identification –See page 7 for additional information***   * Establish performance criteria based on Dashboard colors using both Status and Change to identify at least the lowest performing 5 percent of Title I schools for comprehensive support. * Identify high schools with an average graduation rate below 67 percent over three years for comprehensive support. * Identify schools for targeted support if they have a student group that meets criteria for lowest performing Title I schools for *three out of four* consecutive years. | None |
| ***Exit Criteria***  Clarify that schools meet the exit criteria from federal identification only if their Status has improved on the relevant indicators. | None |
| ***Measurements of interim progress – See page 9 for additional information***  For Academic Achievement, Graduation Rate, and ELPI, report for all students and student groups the average annual progress needed to meet the long-term goal and approximate Status on the indicator at the mid-point if on track to meet the goal. | None |
| ***N-size***   * Describe the support and programmatic oversight that the CDE will provide to small schools with student populations too small to calculate a color-coded performance levels for any indicators on the Dashboard. * Remove reference to the alternative school model, which is under development and subject to final SBE action. | None |

***Status and Change (Long-Term Goals and Indicators).*** Table 2 shows the five-by-five placement grid for Graduation Rate to illustrate why the proposed revisions to these sections of the State Plan do not materially impact our accountability system or require any modifications to the Dashboard.

## **Table 2: High School Graduation Rate Indicator**

| Levels | Change Declined Significantly  Declined by greater than 5% | Change Declined  Declined by 1% to 5% | Change Maintained  Declined or increased by less than 1% | Change Increased  Increased by 1%  to 5% | Change Increased Significantly  Increased by 5% or greater |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Status Very High  95% or more | N/A | 39  (2.9%)  Blue | 203  (14.9%)  Blue | 224  (16.4%)  Blue | 54  (4.0%)  Blue |
| Status High  90% to less than 95% | 5  (0.4%)  Orange | 65  (4.8%)  Yellow | 71 (5.2%) Green | 142  (10.4%)  Green | 71  (5.2%) Blue |
| Status Medium  85% to less than 90% | 6  (0.4%) Orange | 29  (2.1%) Orange | 28  (2.1%) Yellow | 55  (4.0%) Green | 46  (3.4%) Green |
| Status Low  67% to less than 85% | 28  (2.1%)  Red | 33  (2.4%)  Orange | 21  (1.5%) Orange | 52  (3.8%) Yellow | 70  (5.1%) Yellow |
| Status Very Low  Less than 67% | 34  (2.5%) Red | 24  (1.8%) Red | 10  (0.7%)  Red | 20  (1.5%) Red | 34  (2.5%) Red |

The five-by-five placement grid has identical cut-scores for Status and Change and identical colors for the cells as the five-by-five placement grid approved by the SBE as part of the Dashboard. The five-by-five placement grid is still the basis for reporting school performance under the proposed revisions to the ESSA plan:

* Under the proposed revisions to the ESSA plan, the Status axis (vertical axis) is the required graduation rate indicator for federal reporting purposes.
* The Change axis (horizontal axis) is an additional indicator, in this example a measure of student success.
* The cut scores for Status and Change are unaltered.
* The two “indicators” combine to yield a color-coded performance level within the five-by-five placement grid, which is reported on the Dashboard along with the specific data for Status and Change.
* The color-coded performance level produced by combining Status and Change is used to differentiate performance in the school identification process.
* Identification of schools is **not** based on Status only.
* Under the prior versions of the State Plan, the goal was to reach the cell for High (Status)/Maintained (Change). To meet ED’s reading of the statute, the long-term goal must be set based on status only. In practice, the goal is to reach the High status level or a graduation rate of at least 90 percent. Under prior versions of the State Plan, it was not possible to reach the goal of High (Status)/Maintained (Change) without being in the High or Very High status levels.

***School identification.*** Under the proposed revisions, California will use performance on the Dashboard (i.e., the color-coded performance levels on Dashboard indicators that include Status and Change) to determine which schools receive additional support.

* **Comprehensive Support.** Prior SBE discussions centered on how to align school-level identification under the ESSA with local educational agency (LEA) assistance under the LCFF.
  + Some SBE members had argued that our LEA identification, which encompasses nearly 50 percent of Title I school statewide, meets the ESSA’s school identification requirements.
* ED, however, interpreted the relevant statutory provision to require states to identify individual schools based on specific performance criteria.
  + As a result, identification of LEAs for support cannot itself address these requirements.
* To meet ED’s interpretation of the provisions, the revised State Plan proposes to use the color-coded performance levels on Dashboard indicators to identify at least the lowest performing 5 percent of Title I schools statewide.
* The proposed selection process is a criterion-based approach (specified performance levels lead to selection).
  + This criterion-based approach is similar to the approach under LCFF, where LEAs are identified for assistance if they meet SBE-adopted criteria based on Dashboard indicators.
  + One critique of these ESSA provisions is the “arbitrary” 5 percent number. The proposed criteria will likely lead to slight over-selection (data simulations show roughly 6.2 percent of Title I schools would be selected).
* This can be implemented in a meaningful manner within the existing Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) process by pointing LEAs to schools that require extra support *from the LEA* based on objective performance criteria, rather than some arbitrary ranking of performance.
  + It will allow California to maintain the LEA as the locus of responsibility for improvement in implementing the ESSA’s school improvement provisions.
  + It will also ensure that the school planning process is not a burdensome compliance exercise; LEAs should already be considering the needs of very low performing schools within the LCAP process.
* **Targeted Support.** The proposed revisions also include modifying the criteria for targeted support (student groups) so that a school is not identified unless the student group meets the specified criteria in three out of four consecutive years.
  + At the January 2018 meeting, SBE members were concerned about data simulations showing more than 3000 schools would meet the criteria that were initially proposed.
  + The revisions will help focus this identification only on schools with persistent student group performance challenges.
  + The three-out-of-four-year timeline aligns with existing timelines under LCFF for LEA assistance and/or intervention.

***Measurements of interim progress.*** Table 3 uses the Graduation Rate Indicator to illustrate how the proposed revisions to these sections of the State Plan do not materially impact California’s state accountability system or require any modifications to the Dashboard. It includes the same information as the table included in Attachment 2 of the March 2018 ESSA item on pages 40-41 (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/mar18item04a2.docx>), plus the two new columns added by the proposed revisions.

## **Table 3: State Level Graduation Rate by Student Group**

| Student Group | Grade Rate (Status) | Change | Color | *New Column:* Average Annual Improvement to Meet Goal | *New Column:* Approximate Status After Year 3 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All Students | 88.4 | 1.7 | Green | 0.2% | 89.0 |
| American Indian | 82.9 | 0.6 | Orange | 1.0% | 85.9 |
| Asian | 94.1 | 0.6 | Green | Increased from Baseline | 94.2 |
| Black or African American | 81.5 | 3.1 | Yellow | 1.2% | 85.1 |
| Filipino | 94.7 | 1.2 | Green | Increased from Baseline | 94.8 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 86.3 | 2.6 | Green | 0.5% | 87.8 |
| Pacific Islander | 88.8 | 2.9 | Green | 0.2% | 89.4 |
| Two or More Races | 90.6 | 0.6 | Green | Increased from Baseline | 90.7 |
| White | 92.0 | 0.5 | Green | Increased from Baseline | 92.1 |
| English Learner | 77.7 | 5.5 | Yellow | 1.8% | 83.1 |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 85.3 | 2.5 | Green | 0.7% | 87.4 |
| Students with Disabilities | 69.0 | 2.3 | Yellow | 3.0% | 78.0 |

Table 3 displays statewide baseline data for all students and each student group, the approximate annual improvement necessary over the seven-year period for each student group to meet the long-term goal, and an estimated status at the mid-way point if on track to reach the goal (which is 90 percent for graduation rate).

* The two columns marked as “*New Column*” are the only new information included in the proposed revisions, compared to the revised plan that the SBE approved for resubmission at its January 2018 meeting (see Attachment 3 of the January 2018 ESSA item on page 39: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/jan18item05a3.docx>).
* Those two new columns reflect arithmetic using information already included in the State Plan: for the first, subtracting the Status column from the long-term goal (in this case 90 percent for graduation rate) and dividing by 7; for the second, multiplying the first new column by 3 and adding it to the Status.
* The measurements of interim progress are **not** relevant to whether a school is in the overall lowest 5 percent of performance statewide.
* Since its enactment, ESSA has required states to ensure that LEAs produce annual LEA report cards that show specified information, including the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for all students and student groups. (ESSA, Section 1111(h)(2).)
* The LEA report card is simply a reporting requirement: it must be posted on a Web site. The measurements of interim progress can be reported using the same arithmetic used to create the table above.
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