# Attachment 4: Color Combinations Using Fall 2017 California School Dashboard Data

This attachment details the various options and color combinations under consideration for the identification of the lowest-performing Title I schools and the number of schools that would be identified for support under each option and color combination. Based on current data, 303 schools represents five percent of the total number of schools that received Title I funding in 2016.

None of these schools have Dashboard Alternative School Status (DASS). Please note that the lowest-performing DASS schools will be identified in fall 2018, based on modified methods that are currently under development.

## Background

The school identification and assistance provisions addressed in this attachment are part of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). Developing the ESSA state plan is part of the ongoing efforts by the State Board of Education (SBE) to develop a single public school accountability system based on the priorities reflected in the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), which was enacted in 2013.

Accordingly, the ESSA state plan guiding principles that the SBE considered at the January 2017 meeting continue to apply (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/jan17item04.doc>). The first four of those guiding principles are particularly relevant to this topic:

* **Ensure that state priorities and direction lead the plan with opportunities in the ESSA leveraged to assist in accomplishing goals and objectives.** It makes sense for California to follow the course set through LCFF and use the identified priorities as a means to align federal funding and requirements to the current system.
* **Create a single, coherent system that avoids the complexities of having separate state and federal accountability structures.** The indicators and performance standards approved for the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics should serve state, local, and federal accountability.
* **Refresh applications, plans, and commitments to ensure that local educational agencies (LEAs) are evidencing alignment of federal funds to state and local priorities.** The passage of the ESSA provides an opportunity to direct LEA attention to the state priorities by redesigning federally required applications and plans to align with and reinforce the current state direction.
* **Use the ESSA State Plan to draw further focus to California’s commitment to the implementation of rigorous state standards, equity, local control, performance, and continuous improvement.** Taking such an approach establishes a strong foundation for California’s way forward and clearly distinguishes the work from NCLB-like federal directives.

More recently, the SBE has received updates on the development of California’s system of support for LEAs and schools. The September 2017 SBE Agenda Item 3 on the system of support included a summary of research about past school improvement efforts, including a set of recommendations that remained consistent across at least three evaluations of California’s past school improvement efforts (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/sep17item03.doc>, Attachment 1):

* Balance standardization with customization by allowing differentiation for contextual differences.
* Build district capacity to support schools, rather than focusing exclusively on individual schools.
* Ensure that all stakeholders, including teacher unions, are involved in the school planning and improvement process.
* Support principal capacity for leadership during the school improvement process.
* Tailor support based on readiness, needs, and performance of schools and districts prior to beginning reform effort.
* Think about sustainability and a long-term approach at the beginning of the process.

That summary of research also identified several key findings from the evaluations of California’s past school improvement efforts:

* While recipients of the interventions largely report positive results the impact of the interventions remains unclear since all low-performing schools and districts—both those that did and did not receive state interventions—experienced growth. This growth may be the result of overall pressure on and general support for all low-performing schools and districts, regardless of whether they receive interventions, to make improvement.
* On the other hand, many individual schools and districts participating in these reform efforts show longitudinal growth. Still, results are not statistically significant in the aggregate when compared to those of schools that did not receive the treatment. In addition, any small advantage seen during program participation often dissipates after program completion.

The accountability provisions included in LCFF became operational with the Fall 2017 Dashboard release. Those provisions are consistent with the findings and recommendations summarized above, particularly through their focus of improvement efforts at the LEA rather than school level, with an emphasis on building local capacity (rather than on dictating specific interventions).

When evaluating options for school identification, it is important to consider both the purpose and consequences of the identification process. Under ESSA, the following actions are required when the state identifies the lowest performing Title I schools:

* The LEA in which the school is located must develop and implement a “comprehensive support and improvement plan” for the school that considers all accountability indicators, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies any resource inequities.
* The school, LEA, and State educational agency must approve the plan.
* The State educational agency must monitor and periodically review the plan.

Additionally, under ESSA, Section 1111(d)(1)(B), the state must apply the same criteria used to identify the lowest performing Title I schools to every student group at every school and identify for “targeted support and improvement” any school where at least one student group meets those criteria. Specifically,

* The school must develop and implement a “targeted support and improvement plan” for any identified student group at the school that considers all accountability indicators, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies any resource inequities.
* The LEA must approve the plan.
* The LEA must monitor the plan.

Finally, under ESSA, Section 1111(d)(2)(B) and (C), states must set aside seven percent of their Title I grant for school improvement efforts; at least 95 percent of this amount must be allocated to LEAs to assist schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement or targeted support and improvement. (ESSA, Section 1003.) Based on current estimates, California must set aside approximately $121.6 million for grants to LEAs to support school improvement efforts for identified schools. This equates to roughly $400,000 per school, assuming that all funding goes to schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement (i.e., no funding is provided to schools identified for targeted support and improvement), and using 303 schools as an estimated 5 percent of Title I schools. Based on the ESSA statute, schools would expect to lose this funding within three or four years of identification.

## Baseline Methodology

The Baseline Methodology, which was approved by the SBE in July 2017, includes the following color combinations:

* All Red
* All Red but one Orange

The various color combinations under the Baseline Methodology are shown in Figure 1 below:

Figure 1

| **Color Combinations** |
| --- |
| **Red** |
| **Red, Red** |
| **Red, Orange** |
| **Red, Red, Red** |
| **Red, Red, Orange** |
| **Red, Red, Red, Red** |
| **Red, Red, Red, Orange** |

Table 1 shows the number of schools identified, for each color combination, when the Baseline Methodology is applied. It also shows, by color combination, how many schools are located in districts that have not been identified for Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) support.

Table 1: Title I Schools Identified When Baseline Methodology Is Applied

| **Color Combinations** | **Number of Schools for Each Color Combination** | **Number of Schools Not in LCFF Support District** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Red** | 14 | 6 |
| **Red, Red** | 1 | 0 |
| **Red, Orange** | 6 | 2 |
| **Red, Red, Red** | 12 | 0 |
| **Red, Red, Orange** | 11 | 4 |
| **Red, Red, Red, Red** | 12 | 3 |
| **Red, Red, Red, Orange**  | 24 | 4 |
| **Total: 7** | **80** | **19** |

Please note: of the 80 schools identified above, 14 are charter schools. Additionally, 19 schools are located in a district that has not been identified for LCFF support. However, two pairs of schools are located in the same district (i.e., two schools share one common district, and two additional schools share another common district). Thus, the unduplicated number of non-LCFF districts is 17.

## Schools with Graduation Rates Lower than 67 Percent

ESSA requires states to identify any high school with a graduation rate lower than 67 percent for comprehensive support and improvement, regardless of whether it receives Title I funds. Additionally, ESSA prohibits states from including these schools among the lowest performing five percent of Title I schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement. Accordingly, these schools would be identified separately from (or in addition to) schools identified under the Baseline Methodology.

Tables 2a and 2b shows the number of high schools whose graduation rates were lower than 67 percent for three consecutive years (2013–14, 2014–15, 2015–16) and their color combinations. The table is divided into two parts: Table 2a includes only Title I high schools; Table 2b includes only high schools that do not receive Title I funds.

Table 2a: Title I High Schools with Graduation Rates Below 67 Percent for Three Consecutive Years

| **Color Combinations** | **Number of Schools for Each Color Combination** | **Number of Schools Not in LCFF Support District** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Red, Red** | 1 | 1 |
| **Red, Orange** | 1 | 0 |
| **Red, Yellow** | 1 | 0 |
| **Red, Green** | 2 | 1 |
| **Red, Blue** | 5 | 1 |
| **Red, Red, Red** | 1 | 0 |
| **Red, Red, Green** | 1 | 0 |
| **Red, Red, Blue** | 2 | 0 |
| **Red, Green, Blue** | 2 | 0 |
| **Red, Blue, Blue** | 2 | 0 |
| **Red, Red, Orange, Blue** | 2 | 1 |
| **Red, Orange, Orange, Blue** | 4 | 1 |
| **Red, Orange, Yellow, Blue** | 2 | 0 |
| **Red, Orange, Orange, Yellow, Blue** | 3 | 2 |
| **Red, Yellow, Green, Green, Blue** | 1 | 1 |
| **Total: 15** | **30** | **8** |

Please note that of the 30 Title I high schools in this group:

* 15 are charter schools
* 16 serve students in Kindergarten (K) through grade 12
* 3 are self-identified as alternative schools (i.e., have “alternative” in their title), although they have not applied for Dashboard Alternative School Status (DASS)
* 26 received a Blue or Green performance level for the Suspension Rate Indicator
* 5 received a Blue or Green performance level for the English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI)
* 1 received a Green performance level for English Language Arts/Literacy (ELA)

Table 2b: Non-Title I High Schools with Graduation Rates Below 67 Percent for Three Consecutive Years

| **Color Combinations** | **Total Number of Schools for Each Color Combination** | **Number of Schools Not in LCFF Support District** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Red, Red** | 2 | 1 |
| **Red, Orange** | 2 | 0 |
| **Red, Green** | 5 | 1 |
| **Red, Blue** | 11 | 5 |
| **Red, Red, Blue**  | 1 | 0 |
| **Red, Yellow, Blue** | 1 | 1 |
| **Red, Green, Blue** | 1 | 1 |
| **Red, Orange, Orange, Green** | 2 | 1 |
| **Red, Orange, Orange, Blue** | 1 | 0 |
| **Red, Red, Orange, Blue, Blue** | 1 | 1 |
| **Red, Orange, Orange, Blue, Blue** | 1 | 1 |
| **Total: 13** | **28** | **12** |

Please note that of the 28 non-Title I high schools in this group:

* 8 are charter schools
* 12 serve students in K through grade 12
* 11 are self-identified as alternative schools (although they have not applied for DASS status)
* 24 received a Blue or Green performance level for the Suspension Rate Indicator
* 2 received a Blue or Green performance level for the ELPI

## Expanded Baseline Methodology

Table 3 shows the number of schools to be identified, for each color combination, when the Baseline Methodology is expanded to include the following color combinations

* All but one Red, where the other color is Yellow, Green, or Blue
* Red, Red, Orange, Orange
* Red, Orange, Orange
* Red, Red, Red, Orange, Yellow
* Red, Red, Orange, Yellow

Table 3: Number of Title I Schools Identified When Expanded Baseline Is Applied

| **Color Combinations** | **Total Number of Schools for Each Color Combination** | **Number of Schools Not in LCFF Support District** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Red, Red, Yellow** | 9 | 2 |
| **Red, Orange, Orange** | 51 | 18 |
| **Red, Red, Red, Yellow** | 24 | 4 |
| **Red, Red, Red, Green**  | 11 | 4 |
| **Red, Red, Red, Blue** | 16 | 2 |
| **Red, Red, Orange, Yellow** | 53 | 9 |
| **Red, Red, Orange, Orange** | 51 | 11 |
| **Red, Red, Red, Orange, Yellow** | 1 | 0 |
| **Total: 8** | **216** | **50** |

Of the 216 schools identified through the expanded baseline methodology, 19 are charter schools. In addition, 50 schools are located in districts that have not been identified for LCFF support; the unduplicated number (i.e., adjusting for schools that share a common district) is 47.

## Simulations for the Identification of Title I Schools for Targeted Support

As stated above, ESSA requires states to apply the same set of criteria used to identify the lowest-performing Title I schools to every student group at every school in order to identify schools for targeted support. If these criteria (Baseline plus the Expanded Baseline) were applied at the student group level for Title I schools, a total of 2,649 Title I schools would be identified for targeted support. Table 4 shows the number of schools that qualify for targeted support based on the performance of each student group. The student groups are listed in diminishing order.

Table 4: Student Groups that Meet Expanded Baseline Criteria

| **Student Groups that Meet Expanded Baseline Criteria** | **Number of Schools Qualifying for Targeted Support Based on Student Group Performance** |
| --- | --- |
| Students with Disabilities | 1796 |
| Socio-Economically Disadvantaged |  738 |
| African American |  720 |
| English Learners |  621 |
| Hispanic |  557 |
| White |  397 |
| Homeless |  381 |
| Multi-Racial |  156 |
| Foster |  100 |
| Asian |  47 |
| American Indian |  37 |
| Pacific Islander |  11 |
| Filipino |  11 |

Table 5 shows a breakdown of how many student groups met the criteria for each of the 2,649 schools that would qualify for targeted support under the baseline and expanded baseline methodology.

Table 5: Schools Qualifying for Targeted Support Based on Number of Student Groups that Meet Expanded Baseline Criteria

| **Number of Student Groups That Meet Qualifying Technical Assistance Criteria** | **Number of Schools** |
| --- | --- |
| 1 | 1278 |
| 2 | 619 |
| 3 | 318 |
| 4 | 215 |
| 5 | 125 |
| 6 | 56 |
| 7 | 26 |
| 8 | 9 |
| 9 | 3 |
| Total | 2,649 |

## Summary of Results

1. Using theBaseline Methodology (Table 1), 80 Title I schools are identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI), and an additional 17 districts are identified for LCFF support.
2. Using both the Baseline Methodology and graduation rate criterion (Tables 1, 2a, and 2b), 144 schools (both Title I and non-Title 1 schools) are identified for CSI, and an additional 26 LEAs are identified for LCFF support.
3. Application of the expanded Baseline Methodology (Table 3) results in an additional 216 identified schools. Adding these to the 80 schools identified in Table 1 brings the total to 296 schools and an additional 64 LEAs identified for LCFF support.
4. Application of the Baseline Methodology, the graduation rate criterion, and the expanded Baseline Methodology results in 310 identified schools and an additional total of 73 LEAs identified for LCFF support.
5. Application of the Baseline Methodology and the expanded Baseline Methodology to students groups at schools would result in an additional 2,649 schools identified for Targeted Support and Improvement.
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