

California Department of Education

Executive Office

SBE-003 (REV. 11/2017)

pptb-amard-jul18item01

# California State Board of EducationJuly 2018 AgendaItem #01

## Subject

Developing an Integrated Local, State, and Federal Accountability and Continuous Improvement System: Recommended Action on the Student Growth Model, the Application of the Safety Net Methodology at the Student Group Level, and the Three-Year Transition Plan for the English Learner Progress Indicator; and an Update on the California School Dashboard.

## Type of Action

Action, Information

## Summary of the Issue(s)

This is a standing item for the State Board of Education (SBE) to receive updates on the ongoing development of the California School Dashboard (Dashboard). The California Department of Education (CDE) is proposing changes to prepare for the release of the 2018 Dashboard. In April and May 2018, the CDE provided an Information Memorandum and Agenda Item, respectively, to the SBE that included a detailed work plan up to the release of the 2018 Dashboard. Consistent with the Fall 2017 Dashboard release, in which the CDE presented proposed changes to the Dashboard throughout the spring and summer, the CDE will be requesting that the SBE adopt changes to the state indicators on the Dashboard at the September and November 2018 SBE meetings. However, prior to the adoption of the final components of the state indicators, there are a number of items that are technical and require incremental decisions to be made at the July meeting.

This item provides requested information on the growth model selected for further exploration by the SBE at the May 2018 SBE meeting, recommends the use of the Safety Net methodology—an alternative methodology for assigning performance levels (colors) to small population sizes—specifically to student groups, and requests the approval of a three-year plan for the English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI), as we transition to a new assessment of English proficiency.

## Recommendation

The CDE recommends that the SBE approve: (1) further study of the Residual Gain (RG) growth model to examine volatility in the model using additional years of assessment data as it becomes available (2) the recommended proposal to apply the Safety Net methodology to student groups, and (3) the three-year plan for the ELPI**.**

## Brief History of Key Issues

Since the SBE adopted the initial phase of the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) evaluation rubrics at its September 2016 meeting, extensive feedback from numerous stakeholder input sessions and policy work groups continues to inform the state and local indicators and Dashboard displays and reports.

The Fall 2017 Dashboard was released on December 7, 2017, and is available on the California School Dashboard Web site at <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/>. Since the release of the Fall 2017 Dashboard, the CDE has been conducting in-person and virtual outreach activities to garner user feedback to improve the functionality and usability of the Dashboard for the 2018 release.

In May 2018, the CDE provided information on the analyses of three student-level growth models conducted by Educational Testing Service (ETS). An update on the outreach activities for the Dashboard was also included.

In March 2018, the CDE provided a plan for the annual proposed changes to the Dashboard to the SBE. Although extensive work on the Dashboard has been completed over the last year, the addition of new indicators, modified methods for Dashboard Alternative School Status (DASS) schools, a potential student-level growth model, and the transition to a new English language proficiency assessment, will result in substantial revisions to the 2018 Dashboard. As a result, the CDE developed a work plan (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-mar18item01.docx>) to provide the SBE with a timeline for when specific SBE Agendas and Information Memoranda would be provided to the SBE through November 2018. This timeline outlines when decisions on specific indicators will be required.

### Student-Level Growth Model

A February 2018 Memorandum provided the SBE with the results of the ETS Growth Study that provided an statistical analysis of three proposed growth models selected based on the desired characteristics reviewed and discussed at the January 2017 SBE meeting:

1. “Change-in-distance-to-met” measures absolute growth of each student from the prior year to the current year using Distance from Level 3 as the measurement threshold.
2. “Conditional percentile rank of the gain” ranks the growth of students who are grouped together, as a result of having the same prior year test scores, in the same subject and grade.
3. “Residual gain” is the difference between a student’s predicted test score and actual test score. Note: the predicted test score is based on both prior English Language Arts/Literature (ELA) and mathematics test scores, as well as the scores of all other students in the same grade.

At the May 2018 SBE meeting, the SBE directed CDE staff to further explore the RG model for possible inclusion in the Dashboard. The results of this further investigation are provided in Attachment 1.

### Application of the Safety Net Methodology (Three-by-Five) for Student Groups

In March 2018, the CDE informed the SBE of its forthcoming proposal to apply the “Safety Net” methodology to the student group level. This methodology, approved by the SBE in September 2017, prevents large swings in data that are triggered by the results of a few students, which can lead to an over-identification of schools in the Red and Blue performance levels when the overall size of a school or local educational agency (LEA) is small. (September 2017 SBE meeting <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/sep17item02.doc>).

Application of the Safety Net methodology results in a refiguring of the performance level tables—from a five-by-five grid to a three-by-five grid—by removing two Change levels (Increased Significantly and Decreased Significantly) and thus limiting extreme changes in small student populations.

Currently, this methodology is applied at the LEA and school levels for two indicators only, based on the number of students included in the indicator:

* Graduation Rate Indicator: Applied if fewer than 150 students are in the graduating cohort
* Suspension Rate Indicator: Applied if fewer than 150 students are cumulatively enrolled

Because large swings in performance levels also occurs for student groups, the CDE is proposing that the Safety Net methodology be applied at the student group level, beginning with the 2018 Dashboard. The recommended methodology is detailed in Attachment 2.

### English Learner Progress Indicator

In September 2016, the SBE adopted the methodology for the ELPI using the results of the California English Language Development Test (CELDT). In the spring of 2018, California transitioned to a new English language proficiency (ELP) assessment, the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC). This new assessment is substantially different from the CELDT because the ELPAC is aligned to the more recently adopted 2012 California English language development standards making it inappropriate to compare the ELPAC results to the CELDT results. Consequently, the 2018 ELPAC results will serve as a baseline from which future EL progress for accountability purposes will be measured.

The ELPI is the only indicator that measures **progress** **towards proficiency** rather than the end goal of proficiency itself. To measure progress toward ELP (Status), two years of ELPAC Summative results are required. To determine if schools and LEAs are improving their rate of moving students toward ELP (Change), three years of ELPAC Summative results are required. Based on this data limitation, the earliest that the CDE will be able to report Status, using the current methodology, is in the 2019 Dashboard when two years of ELPAC Summative results are available. The CDE therefore anticipates reporting both Status and Change in the 2020 Dashboard when three years of ELPAC Summative results are available. The proposed three-year timeline is detailed in Attachment 3.

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

In May 2018, the SBE received information on the analyses of three student-level growth models conducted by ETS and proposed methodology for calculating and incorporating the one-year graduation rate for DASS schools. The SBE approved: (1) the “Residual gain” student growth model for further exploration and modeling to be considered for possible inclusion in the 2018 Dashboard; and (2) the recommended methodology for the one-year graduation rate for DASS schools.

In April 2018, the SBE received the following Information Memoranda:

* An overview of the research that was conducted and incorporated in the development of the College/Career Indicator (CCI) and the rigorous vetting criteria and processes that were applied to select CCI measures (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-apr18item02.docx>).
* A timeline for specific SBE Items and Information Memoranda that will be provided to the SBE from April 2018 through November 2018 for the proposed revisions to the 2018 Dashboard
([https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/ memo-pptb-amard-mar18item01](https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/%20memo-pptb-amard-mar18item01)).

In March 2018, the SBE received the annual update on the proposed revisions to the 2018 Dashboard. The SBE approved: (1) the proposed revision to the self-reflection tool for Priority 6: School Climate, and (2) the proposed standard and self-assessment tool for LEAs to determine progress on the local performance indicator for Priority 7: Access to a Broad Course of Study (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/mar18item01.docx>).

In January 2018, the SBE received an update on the outreach activities related to the Fall 2017 Dashboard release and two presentations from LEAs on their work with the Dashboard (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/jan18item01.docx>).

In November 2017, the SBE adopted new Status cut scores for the Academic Indicator (for both ELA and mathematics) and the Change cut scores for mathematics only. In addition, the SBE adopted new five-by-five colored grids for the Academic Indicator (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/nov17item03.doc>).

Additionally, the SBE received a summary report of the work of the School Conditions and Climate Work Group (CCWG). The report included a synopsis of the framework recommendations including state level and LEA level recommendations. The CCWG’s recommendations comprise both those that can be acted on with existing resources and authority and those for which additional resources and authority will be necessary to implement (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/nov17item03rev.doc>).

### Student-Level Growth Model

In May 2018, the SBE reviewed analyses of three student-level growth models conducted by ETS (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/may18item02.docx>).

In March 2018, the SBE reviewed proposed revisions for the 2018 Dashboard, including the inclusion of a student-level growth model (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/mar18item01.docx>).

In February 2018, the SBE received simulation results, conducted by ETS, for three potential student-level growth models (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-feb18item01.docx>).

In June 2017, the SBE received an update on the continued work toward a growth model, including three potential student growth models to be considered for simulations (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-asb-adad-jun17item03.doc>).

In January 2017, the SBE discussed criteria for selecting a growth model to be used for school and district accountability (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/jan17item02.doc>).

In December 2017, the SBE received an update on the ongoing development of the growth model
(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-dec17item03.docx>).

In June 2016, the CDE provided a progress update and clarified key issues related to the design of a school- and district-level accountability model, as opposed to reporting individual student-level growth and performance (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-dsib-amard-jun16item01.doc>).

In February 2016, the SBE received an overview of student-level growth models that could be used to communicate Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment results (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-dsib-amard-feb16item01.doc>).

### Application of the Safety Net

In March 2018, the SBE reviewed proposed revisions for the 2018 Dashboard, including the application of the Safety Net methodology for student groups (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/mar18item01.docx>).

In September 2017, the SBE approved criteria for state indicators released in the Fall 2017 Dashboard, including the application of the Safety Net methodology for LEAs and schools (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/sep17item02.doc>).

## Fiscal Analysis (as appropriate)

The 2017–18 state budget funds the Proposition 98 Minimum Guarantee at $74.5 billion. This includes an increase of more than $1.4 million to support the continued implementation of the LCFF and builds upon the investment of more than $15.7 billion provided over the last four years. This increase brings the formula to 97 percent of full implementation.

## Attachment(s)

* Attachment 1: Incorporating a Growth Model into the Dashboard (2 Pages)
* Attachment 2: Application of Safety Net Methodology (Three-by-Five) for Student Groups (8 Pages)
* Attachment 3: English Learner Progress Indicator (9 Pages)
* Attachment 4: Update on the California School Dashboard (1 Page)
* Attachment 5: California School Dashboard Educational Outreach Activities
(5 Pages)

# Attachment 1

## Incorporating a Growth Model into the Dashboard

In 2016, the State Board of Education (SBE) and the California Department of Education (CDE) began work on the possible inclusion of a student-level growth model in California’s new accountability system and the California School Dashboard (Dashboard). Working closely with the Technical Design Group (TDG) and staff at the Educational Testing Service (ETS), the CDE explored three different student growth models:

1. Change in Distance to Met (CDTM)
2. Conditional Percentile Rank of Gain (CPR), and
3. Residual Gain (RG).

Based on the data simulations conducted on all three models, the SBE directed the CDE, at the May 2018 SBE meeting, to focus on the RG model to address the following questions:

1. What information does the RG model provide compared to the information that the current District from Level 3 (DF3) provides?
2. How would the RG model fit into the current accountability five-by-five structure?

In June 2018, a CDE memorandum provided a detailed response to the questions above (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-jun18item01.docx>). To summarize, the RG model does provide information on the number of students who met their predicted test scores, as well as the difference (i.e., number of points above or below) between their actual and predicted test scores. However, it does not indicate how much improvement is needed to bring the average student up to the Standard Met Level (Level 3) on the Smarter Balanced Assessment, whether achievement gaps are closing, or if students are on track to reach proficiency.

In addition, application of the RG model to the existing change axis may result in movements along the five-by-five performance grid that are inconsistent with those yielded through the Distance from Level 3 (DF3) methodology. For example, under DF3, schools can only increase their Status level, if they make positive Change from the prior- to current-year. However, with the RG model, a school can increase their Status while having negative Growth, which is counterintuitive to the continuous improvement model that the SBE adopted and difficult for practitioners to understand.

The June 2018 SBE Memorandum also included the ETS report, “Updated Analysis of the Residual Gain Model 2017–18 Plan.” This update provides analyses of the RG model using the most recent 2017 Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment results, which the SBE requested. The report found that, while the RG model performed statistically similar in both years, there was low year-to-year stability within the outcomes. The report states: “Such high volatility can make it difficult for local educational agencies to use the growth data for driving decisions, as decisions made one year might be contradicted with the next year’s growth data. It may be more advisable to look for patterns in these scores over several years than to act on their values in a given year.”

Similar results in the year-to-year stability were found for the two other growth models considered in the *California Growth Study* (CDTM and CPR). Moreover, this finding is not unique to California assessments—an analysis of a dataset from a large urban school district in a different state found similar magnitudes of year-to year correlations.

The CDE has engaged several stakeholder groups in discussions on the RG model and sought their feedback on the usefulness of the model and its incorporation in the Dashboard. Stakeholders indicated that, although they wanted a growth model, they did not believe that the RG model produced actionable data. Stakeholders expressed concerns that, since the RG model is a relative measure, it does not provide them with the specific year-to-year growth that students should be making to be on grade level.

At the June 2018 TDG meeting, the CDE shared the ETS finding, along with stakeholder feedback on the RG model. After reviewing the ETS report, the TDG unanimously recommended to delay the inclusion of the RG model into the accountability system. They indicated that more years of data are needed to determine how to reduce the volatility of growth over time and suggested that CDE staff explore whether other growth models can provide the information that schools and districts are requesting. In addition, the TDG strongly recommended against providing RG growth data for informational purposes.

## Recommendation

Based on the ETS report, stakeholder feedback, and the TDG recommendation, the CDE is recommending that the SBE approve the further study of the RG growth model using additional years of assessment data as it becomes available. The additional data will allow the CDE to determine whether volatility in the model decreases over time; if not, it may be appropriate to explore other growth models. The CDE is also recommending not producing the RG results for informational purposes because of the likelihood for confusion given the volatility in the model.

# Attachment 2

## Application of Safety Net Methodology (Three-by-Five) for Student Groups

After the release of the Spring 2017 California School Dashboard (Dashboard), the California Department of Education (CDE) received feedback from stakeholders that schools with small populations were overrepresented in the Red performance level. After conducting its own analysis, the CDE confirmed that two specific indicators—the Graduate and Suspension Rate Indicators—were particularly susceptible to dramatic data fluctuations in schools and local educational agencies (LEAs) with small student populations, where large swings could be triggered by the results of a few students. The CDE found that schools with small populations were not only overly identified in the Red performance level, but that they were overly identified in the Blue performance level. To resolve this issue, the CDE, in collaboration with multiple stakeholders, reviewed multiple methodologies that could help stabilize results for LEAs and schools with small populations.

In September 2017, the State Board of Education (SBE) approved the “Safety Net” methodology—an alternative methodology for assigning performance levels (colors) to LEAs and schools with small populations. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/sep17item02.doc>).

Currently, this approved methodology is applied at the LEA and school levels for two state indicators only, based on the number of students included in the indicator:

1. Graduate Rate Indicator: Applied if fewer than 150 students are in the graduating cohort
2. Suspension Rate Indicator: Applied if fewer than 150 students are cumulatively enrolled

Application of the Safety Net methodology results in a refiguring of the performance level tables—from a five-by-five grid to a three-by-five grid—by removing two Change levels (Increased Significantly and Decreased Significantly) and thus limiting extreme changes in small student populations.

Because large swings in performance levels also occur for student groups, the CDE proposed, at the March 2018 SBE meeting, that the Safety Net methodology be applied at the student group level, beginning with the 2018 Dashboard (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/mar18item01.docx>). Specifically, the CDE recommends that the methodology be applied to student groups that have:

* 30 to 149 students in the graduating cohort for the Graduation Rate Indicator, and
* 30 to 149 students cumulatively enrolled for the Suspension Rate Indicator.

The impact of the methodology on student group results are shown below.

### Graduation Rate Indicator

Figure 1 is the three-by-five colored table for the Graduation Rate Indicator. As referenced above, the five-by-five colored table—used to identify the performance levels (colors) for the Graduation Rate Indicator—is reduced to a three-by-five colored table when the Safety Net methodology is applied.

Specifically, the two Change columns “Declined Significantly” and “Increased Significantly” are removed, resulting in a table that has three Change columns (i.e., Declined, Maintained, and Increased) and five Status rows (i.e., Very High, High, Medium, Low, and Very Low). As reflected in Figure 1, there are still five possible performance levels (colors) that student groups can receive if their graduating cohort size is 30 to 149 students.

**Figure 1: Three-by-Five Colored Table for the Graduation Rate Indicator**



Table 1 shows the change in performance levels (colors) for the Fall 2017 Dashboard that would occur as a result of applying the Safety Net methodology to student groups. Table 2 provides the breakdown of results by race and ethnicity.**Table 1: Impact of Safety Net Methodology on the Fall 2017 Dashboard Graduation Indicator for Student Groups: Using a Three-by-Five Grid**

| **Performance Level Changes** | **Number of Student Groups Impacted** |
| --- | --- |
| From Red to Orange | 243 (3.1%) |
| From Orange to Yellow | 42 (0.5%) |
| From Blue to Green | 325 (4.2%) |
| No Changes | 7,157 (92.1%) |

N=7,767 (The sum of race and ethnic student groups, including program participation [e.g., Homeless, English learner, students with disabilities, socioeconomically disadvantaged, etc.], that received a color for the Graduation Rate Indicator on the Fall 2017 Dashboard).

**Table 2: Impact of Safety Net Methodology on the Fall 2017 Dashboard Graduation Rate Indicator at Student Group Level by Race and Ethnicity**

| **Student Groups** | **Lower Performance Level (Color)** | **No Change in Performance Level (Color)** | **Higher Performance Level (Color)** | **Total** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| African American | 24 (6.6%) | 324 (88.8%) | 17 (4.7%) | 365 |
| American Indian | 0 (0.0%) | 8 (80.0%) | 2 (20.0%) | 10 |
| Asian | 5 (1.1%) | 460 (96.6%) | 11 (2.3%) | 476 |
| English Learner (EL) | 90 (9.1%) | 861 (86.9%) | 40 (4.0%) | 991 |
| Filipino | 2 (0.9%) | 211 (96.8%) | 5 (2.3%) | 218 |
| Foster | 1 (2.8%) | 35 (97.2%) | 0 (0.0%) | 36 |
| Hispanic | 54 (3.8%) | 1,354 (94.6%) | 23 (1.6%) | 1,431 |
| Homeless | 35 (7.6%) | 379 (82.2%) | 47 (10.2%) | 461 |
| Multiple Race | 2 (1.3%) | 141 (93.4%) | 8 (5.3%) | 151 |
| Pacific Islander | 0 (0.0%) | 13 (92.9%) | 1 (7.1%) | 14 |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED) | 47 (2.9%) | 1,532(95.2%) | 31 (1.9%) | 1,610 |
| Students with Disabilities (SWD) | 45 (4.9%) | 796 (87.2%) | 72 (7.9%) | 913 |
| White | 21 (1.9%) | 1043 (95.6%) | 27 (2.5%) | 1,091 |

The results for Tables 1 and 2 show that the application of the Safety Net methodology has a minimal impact on the performance level at the student-group level. The impact varies by student group, as shown in Table 2:

* More African Americans and EL student groups moved from Blue to Green
* More Homeless and students with disabilities student groups moved from a Red to Orange and from Orange to Yellow

### Suspension Rate Indicator

Figure 2 is the three-by-five colored table for the Suspension Rate Indicator. Similar to the Graduation Rate Indicator, the five-by-five colored table, used to identify performance levels (colors) for the Suspension Rate Indicator, is reduced to a three-by-five colored table when the Safety Net methodology is applied. The two Change columns “Declined Significantly” and “Increased Significantly” are removed, resulting in a table that has three Change columns (i.e., Declined, Maintained, and Increased) and five Status rows (i.e., Very High, High, Medium, Low, and Very Low). As reflected in Figure 2, there are still five possible performance levels (colors) that student groups can receive if their graduating cohort size is 30 to 149 students.

**Figure 2: Three-by-Five Colored Table for the Suspension Rate Indicator**



Table 3 shows the change in performance levels (colors) that occur as a result of applying the Safety Net methodology to student groups. Table 4 provides the breakdown of results by race and ethnicity.**Table 3: Impact of Safety Net Methodology on the Fall 2017 Dashboard Suspension Rate Indicator for Student Groups: Using a Three-by-Five Grid**

| **Performance Level Changes** | **Number of Student Groups Impacted** |
| --- | --- |
| From Red to Orange | 1,600 (2.8%) |
| From Orange to Yellow | 12 (0.02%) |
| From Yellow to Orange | 1,212 (2.1%) |
| From Blue to Green | 439 (0.8%) |
| No Changes | 53,657 (94.3%) |

N= 56,920 (The sum of race and ethnic student groups, including program participation [e.g., Homeless, EL, SWD, SED, etc.] groups that received a color for the Suspension Rate Indicator on the 2017 Dashboard).

**Table 4: Impact of Safety Net Methodology on the Fall 2017 Dashboard Suspension Rate Indicator at Student Group Level by Race and Ethnicity**

| **Student Groups** | **Lower Performance Level (Color)** | **No Change in Performance Level (Color)** | **Higher Performance Level (Color)** | **Total** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| African American | 296 (8.8%) | 2,906 (86.2%) | 170 (5.0%) | 3,372 |
| American Indian | 29 (7.6%) | 325 (85.1%) | 28 (7.3%) | 382 |
| Asian | 32 (0.9%) | 3,594 (97.1%) | 75 (2.0%) | 3,701 |
| EL | 112 (1.4%) | 7,674 (96.3%) | 183 (2.3%) | 7,969 |
| Filipino | 15 (0.9%) | 1,584 (97.1%) | 33 (2.0%) | 1,632 |
| Foster | 111 (15.8%) | 575 (81.8%) | 17 (2.4%) | 703 |
| Hispanic | 53 (0.6%) | 8,926 (97.9%) | 138 (1.5%) | 9,117 |
| Homeless | 154 (6.2%) | 2,183 (87.6%) | 154 (6.2%) | 2,491 |
| Multiple Race | 85 (3.1%) | 2,544 (93.0%) | 108 (4.0%) | 2,737 |
| Pacific Islander | 16 (5.9%) | 227 (84.1%) | 27 (10.0%) | 270 |
| SED | 57 (0.6%) | 9,136 (98.0%) | 132 (1.4%) | 9,325 |
| SWD | 539 (6.6%) | 7,250 (88.9%) | 365 (4.5%) | 8,154 |
| White | 152 (2.2%) | 6,733 (95.3%) | 182 (2.6%) | 7,067 |

The results for Tables 3 and 4 show that the application of the Safety Net methodology has a minimal impact on the performance level at the student-group level. As shown in Table 3, the biggest impact can be seen at the lower performance levels:

* From Red to Orange (2.8%)
* From Yellow to Orange (2.1%)

The impact also varies by student group, as shown in Table 4:

* Foster youth had the largest negative impact on performance levels

### Impact on LEAs Eligible for Local Control Funding Formula Support

Under the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), LEAs are eligible for support based on **student group** performance in ten LCFF state priority areas. The ten LCFF state priority areas are based on local and state indicator data. Table 5 shows the ten criteria used to identify LEAs for LCFF support (i.e., technical assistance and intensive intervention).

**Table 5: Criteria to Identify LEAs Eligible for LCFF Support**

| **LCFF State Priority Area** | **Eligibility Criteria** |
| --- | --- |
| Basics (Priority 1) | * *Not Met for Two or More Years* on Local Performance Indicator
 |
| Implementation of State Academic Standards (Priority 2) | * *Not Met for Two or More Years* on Local Performance Indicator
 |
| Parent Engagement (Priority 3) | * *Not Met for Two or More Years* on Local Performance Indicator
 |
| Pupil Achievement (Priority 4) | * *Red* on both English language arts and math tests, **or**
* *Red* on English language arts or math test **and** *Orange* on the other test, **or**
* *Red* on the English Learner Progress Indicator (EL student group only)
 |
| Pupil Engagement (Priority 5) | * *Red* on Graduation Rate Indicator, **or**
* *Red* on Chronic Absence Indicator
 |
| School Climate (Priority 6) | * *Red* on Suspension Rate Indicator, **or**
* *Not Met for Two or More Years* on Local Performance Indicator
 |
| Access to a Broad Course of Study (Priority 7) | * *Not Met for Two or More Years on Local Performance Indicator*
 |
| Outcomes in a Broad Course of Study (Priority 8) | * *Red* on College/Career Indicator
 |
| Coordination of Services for Expelled Pupils – County Offices of Education (COE) Only (Priority 9) | * *Not Met for Two or More Years* on Local Performance Indicator
 |
| Coordination of Services for Foster Youth – COEs Only (Priority 10) | * *Not Met for Two or More Years* on Local Performance Indicator
 |

Because LCFF support eligibility criteria is based on **student group** performance, the impact of the Safety Net methodology on the identification of LEAs for differentiated support was examined using the Fall 2017 Dashboard results. Table 6 shows the number of student groups that meet the LCFF criteria with and without the Safety Net methodology applied. Table 7 show the impact of the Safety Net methodology on the number of LEAs identified for LCFF support.

**Table 6: Comparison of the Number of LEAs Identified for LCFF Support, Based on Student Group Performance**

| **Student Group** | **# of Student Groups that met the LCFF criteria for Support, w/out Safety Net Applied** | **# of Student Groups in LEAs Identified for LCFF Support that met the criteria, with Safety Net Applied** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| African American | 27\* | 26 |
| American Indian | 8 | 7 |
| Asian | 1 | 1 |
| EL | 19 | 15 |
| Foster Youth | 41 | 41 |
| Hispanic | 5 | 5 |
| Homeless | 45 | 32 |
| Multiple Races | 2 | 2+ |
| Pacific Islander | 1 | 0 |
| SED | 12 | 10 |
| SWD | 163 | 154 |
| White | 4 | 3 |
| **TOTAL** | **328** | **296** |

\*Note: The African American student group met the LCFF criteria for support in 27 of the LEAs identified for assistance.

**Table 7: Comparison of Number of LEAs Identified for LCFF Support with and without the Safety Net Methodology**

| **Number of Student Groups that Met LCFF Support Criteria** | **# of LEAs Eligiblew/outSafety Net Applied** | **# of LEAs EligiblewithSafety Net Applied** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 5 Student Groups | 1 | 1 |
| 4 Student Groups | 8 | 8 |
| 3 Student Groups | 19 | 16 |
| 2 Student Groups | 34 | 30 |
| 1 Student Group | 166 | 151 |
| **TOTAL** | **228** | **206** |

Overall, the impact of using the Safety Net methodology for student groups is minimal. However, the number of LEAs that would be identified for LCFF support does decrease if the Safety Net for student groups is applied.

## Recommendation

The CDE recommends that the SBE approve the application of the Safety Net methodology at the student group level in the 2018 Dashboard for the Graduation Rate Indicator and the Suspension Rate Indicator.

# Attachment 3

## English Learner Progress Indicator

## Background

California has transitioned to a new assessment of English language proficiency (ELP), the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC). This new assessment is used to measure the progress of English learners (EL) in acquiring ELP. The ELPAC is substantially different from the state’s previous assessment, the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) because the ELPAC is aligned to the more recently adopted 2012 California English language development standards. The 2018 ELPAC results will serve as a baseline from which future EL progress for accountability purposes will be measured and should not be compared to results from the state's previous assessment, the CELDT.

The ELPAC consists of two separate ELP assessments: one for the initial identification of students as English learners (ELs), and a second for the annual summative assessment to measure a student’s progress in learning English and to identify the student's level of ELP. Future California School Dashboard (Dashboard) releases of the English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) will only use ELPAC Summative results. As noted, this is because the CELDT is no longer administered and results from the two different assessments cannot be compared for accountability purposes. Because research indicates English language acquisition takes approximately five to seven years, it is important that the ELPI measure progress toward proficiency rather than the end goal of proficiency in itself. Accordingly, the ELPI is the only indicator required under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) to measure **progress** **towards proficiency** rather than the end goal of proficiency itself. To measure progress toward ELP, two years of ELPAC Summative results are required. To determine if schools and local educational agencies (LEAs) are improving the rate of their progress in moving students toward ELP, three years of ELPAC Summative results are required. Based on this data limitation, the earliest that the California Department of Education (CDE) will be able to report Status is the 2019 Dashboard when two years of ELPAC Summative results are available. The CDE therefore anticipates reporting both Status and Change in the 2020 Dashboard when three years of ELPAC Summative results are available.

The State Board of Education (SBE) adopted the original methodology for the ELPI at their September 2016 meeting. At the September 2017 SBE meeting, the SBE approved adding a full count to the ELPI Status numerator for each long-term English learner (LTEL) student who advanced at least one level on the annual CELDT. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/sep17item02.doc>)

After the release of the Fall 2017 Dashboard, the U.S. Department of Education (ED) rejected the CDE’s inclusion of reclassified fluent English proficient (RFEP) students in the calculation of ELPI. At the April 2018 SBE meeting, the SBE approved the CDE’s recommendation to pursue a waiver on the ESSA statute for the EL progress towards proficiency indicator to maintain the current ELPI formula that includes RFEPs and an extra weighting method for LTELs. On May 16, 2018, the CDE and the SBE submitted the ESSA waiver (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/memo-pptb-amard-apr18item01a1.asp>) to the ED requesting a four-year waiver which will allow California to include RFEP students in measuring the progress of ELs to achieve ELP and to provide additional weight for LTEL students making progress toward proficiency. The ED has 120 days from the submission of the waiver to provide initial approval or disapproval. The CDE will provide the SBE an update on the status of the ESSA waiver at the September 2018 SBE meeting.

## Methodology for Measuring Language Progress towards Proficiency for the Fall 2017 Dashboard

The ELPI is distinguished from other measures included in the Dashboard because it is the only indicator required under the ESSA to measure **progress towards proficiency**, which required an initial two years of data, rather than the end goal of proficiency itself. In June 2016, the CDE considered several options to create a progress measure that both addresses federal statute and is technically sound for the EL student group. The CDE, with extensive feedback from the Technical Design Group (TDG) and stakeholders, concluded that ELPI Status should measure EL student growth toward ELP. For the EL student group, it was suggested that the growth measure should accurately capture the impact of the school’s and/or local educational agency’s (LEA’s) EL program. Accordingly, for the EL student group, any measure of progress must set annual student-level growth expectations based on the student’s prior year ELP assessment performance to determine adequate progress toward proficiency. Based on analysis of student growth trajectories using CELDT results, it was determined that the Intermediate level of the CELDT needed to be split to create six performance levels for accountability purposes. Table 1 provides the annual growth expectations.

**Table 1: Annual Growth Expectations on the CELDT**

| Previous CELDT Overall Level | Current CELDT Overall Level |
| --- | --- |
| Beginning | Early Intermediate |
| Early Intermediate | Low Intermediate |
| Low Intermediate | High Intermediate |
| High Intermediate | Early Advanced |
| Early Advanced or Advanced Not Proficient | Early Advanced or Advanced **Proficient** |
| Early Advanced or Advanced Proficient | Early Advanced or Advanced **Proficient** |

To determine Status for the ELPI, the student level growth results were then aggregated to the school and LEA levels to calculate the percent of students who moved up at least one performance level from the prior year. The CDE concluded that the Status calculation provides schools and LEAs with invaluable information on the proportion of their students who are on-track in making progress toward the goal of ELP.

The CDE determined that ELPI Change should measure the year-to-year change in the rate schools and LEAs move EL students toward proficiency. The Change calculation allows schools and LEAs to determine if they are improving upon their ability to keep EL students on-track toward the goal of ELP.

The CDE recommendations were adopted by the SBE and formed the basis for measuring progress towards ELP in the Fall 2017 Dashboard ELPI Status and Change calculations.

**Current Year Status** tracks the CELDT performance of a cohort of EL students at two points in time. **Prior Year Status** tracks the CELDT performance of a **separate** cohort of EL students at two points in time. For example, in the Fall 2017 Dashboard, current year Status consisted of the 2016–17 cohort of EL students who took the 2016–17 CELDT and had a 2015–16 CELDT result (or a most recent prior year CELDT score if not one year prior) and tracked the change in student performance between the two years. Prior year Status consisted of a separate cohort (i.e., 2015–16) of EL students who took the 2015–16 CELDT and had a 2014–15 CELDT result (or a most recent prior year CELDT score if not one year prior) and tracked the change in student performance between the two years.

**Change** is the percentage point difference betweenthe **Current Year Status** andthe **Prior Year Status**. Therefore, at least three years of CELDT results (2016–17, 2015–16, and 2014–15 CELDT results) were needed to report Status and Change on the Fall 2017 Dashboard.

Table 2 below illustrates an example of how status and change are calculated:

* The percent of EL students who made progress between the current and prior scores reported on the 2015–16 CELDT was 87.1% (i.e., Prior Year Status).
* The percent of EL students who made progress between the current and prior scores reported on the 2016–17 CELDT was 88.2% (i.e., Current Year Status).
* The difference between the Current Year Status of 88.2% and the Prior Year Status of 87.1% results in a Change of 1.1 (i.e., 88.2 minus 87.1 = 1.1).

**Table 2 Example: Gemstone High School**

| **CELDT File Year** | **Total Number of Annual CELDT Takers** | **Number of ELs who Advanced at Least One Level from Prior Year or Maintained Early Advanced or Advanced Proficient** | **Percent of ELs Who made Progress** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2015–16 (Calculation of Prior Year Status)\* | 155 | 135 | 87.1%(i.e., result of 135/155) |
| 2016–17 (Calculation of Current Year Status)\*\* | 170 | 150 | 88.2%(i.e., result of 150/170) |

\*The calculation of prior year status in this example is based on the 2015–16 CELDT file which includes both current and prior year data. The prior year data on the file usually represents data from the immediate prior year (i.e., 2014–15) but in some cases may be data from the most recent prior year available for the student.

\*\*The calculation of current year status in this example is based on the 2016–17 CELDT file which includes both current and prior year data. The prior year data on the file usually represents data from the immediate prior year (i.e., 2015–16) but in some cases may be data from the most recent prior year available for the student.

## ELPI Report for the 2018, 2019, and 2020 Dashboard

For the 2018 Dashboard, the CDE will only have one year of ELPAC Summative results from the spring 2018 test administration. The CDE is unable to determine Status with only one year of data. As noted above, the ELPI is the only ESSA indicator that requires capturing progress towards proficiency, and thus by definition a minimum of two data points are required in order to measure student progress, which is presented as a Status measure in the Dashboard. The CDE has reviewed various options for providing information to the field in the absence of being able to calculate a performance level or color on the 2018 Dashboard. After extensive review and stakeholder input, the CDE will recommend at the September 2018 SBE meeting that the SBE approve a report on the percentage of students in each of the ELPAC’s four performance levels (i.e., minimally developed, somewhat developed, moderately developed, well developed) at the school and LEA level.

For the 2019 Dashboard, the CDE will have two years of ELPAC Summative results, including information from both the spring 2018 and spring 2019 test administrations. With two years of ELPAC data, the CDE will only be able to report Status for the ELPI, as noted above.

It should be noted that reporting just the Status indicator does meet ESSA reporting requirements because Status in the California accountability model measures progress toward proficiency using the state ELP assessment as required under federal statute.

For the 2020 Dashboard, the CDE will have three years of ELPAC Summative results, including information from the spring 2018, spring 2019, and spring 2020 test administrations. With three years of ELPAC data, the CDE will be able to calculate Change for the ELPI.

## Calculating Status and Change Using Two Years of Data

Other Dashboard indicators, such as the Academic Indicator, use only two years of assessment results to calculate Status and Change. Accordingly, there has been some interest in exploring the possibility of calculating Status with one year of data and Change with two years of data for the ELPI. Because two years of ELPAC data are not currently available, the CDE conducted data simulations using CELDT data as a proxy to determine the feasibility of using only two years of ELP assessment results to calculate Status and Change. Based on these simulations, the CDE determined that while it is possible to calculate Status and Change using only two years of data, three years of ELP assessment results are required to provide a meaningful and fair measure of EL progress towards proficiency and appropriately place schools and LEAs in the Dashboard five-by-five grid.

The data simulation results shown in Table 3 are based on CELDT results from the 2016–17 file. The current year percent proficient was calculated using the current scores of annual testers. The prior year percent proficient was calculated using the prior scores found on 2016–17 CELDT file for this same cohort of students. Status in this simulation is a point-in-time measure of the percent of students who are proficient. Because Status in this simulation is a point-in-time measure, it does not capture the proportion of EL students who are on-track in making progress toward the goal of ELP as Status in the current ELPI does. In addition, Status in this simulation unfairly penalizes LEAs and schools when a higher proportion of EL students enter at low performance levels on the ELP assessment. Change in this simulation represents the growth in the percent of students who are proficient from the prior year to the current year instead of the year-to-year change in the rate at which schools and LEAs move EL students toward proficiency as measured by Change in the current ELPI. As a result, it is not a fair measure for LEAs and schools because it does not measure how well LEAs or schools are moving their ELs toward proficiency. In addition, using only two years of data to calculate Status and Change does not provide meaningful information to LEAs and Schools on the quality of their EL program.

This data simulation shows at the district-level that Change between two points in time for a matched cohort of students will only be positive. This is because, as expected, EL student progress toward proficiency on any ELP assessment typically follows an upward growth trajectory. Table 3 displays Status and Change using only two years of longitudinal data from 2016–17 CELDT file.

**Table 3: Status and Change Using Two Years of Longitudinal CELDT Data**

| **5th Percentile Cut Points** | **Status Level\*** | **Current Percent Proficient (Status)** | **Change** | **Change Level\*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 95 | Very High | 65.11 | 34.53 | Increased Significantly |
| 90 | Very High | 59.35 | 28.52 | Increased Significantly |
| 85 | High | 55.22 | 25.00 | Increased Significantly |
| 80 | High | 52.71 | 22.85 | Increased Significantly |
| 75 | High | 50.10 | 21.12 | Increased Significantly |
| 70 | High | 47.79 | 19.57 | Increased Significantly |
| 65 | Medium | 46.15 | 18.66 | Increased Significantly |
| 60 | Medium | 44.36 | 17.71 | Increased Significantly |
| 55 | Medium | 42.86 | 16.67 | Increased Significantly |
| 50 | Medium | 41.18 | 15.94 | Increased Significantly |
| 45 | Medium | 39.59 | 15.07 | Increased Significantly |
| 40 | Medium | 37.82 | 14.17 | Increased Significantly |
| 35 | Medium | 36.41 | 13.33 | Increased Significantly |
| 30 | Low | 35.14 | 12.26 | Increased Significantly |
| 25 | Low | 33.33 | 11.36 | Increased Significantly |
| 20 | Low | 31.49 | 9.93 | Increased |
| 15 | Low | 29.50 | 7.86 | Increased |
| 10 | Very Low | 27.15 | 5.83 | Increased |
| 5 | Very Low | 23.44 | 2.74 | Increased |

\*Status and Change levels are based on original ELPI cut points for LEA-level distribution as outlined in pages 125–128 of the California School Dashboard Technical Guide (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/cm/documents/dashboardguidefall17.pdf>).

Table 4 further depicts where districts would fall in the Dashboard five-by-five grid based on the current ELPI cut points for Status and Change and the current proficient percentages and change percentages reported in Table 3.

**Table 4: District Level\* English Learner Percent Proficient Status and Change Using Two Years of Longitudinal CELDT Data**

| **Level** | **Change: Declined Significantly** | **Change: Declined** | **Change: Maintained** | **Change: Increased** | **Change: Increased Significantly** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Status: Very High** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** | **Blue** | **Blue****190 Districts** |
| **Status: High** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Green** | **Blue****253 Districts**  |
| **Status: Medium** | **Orange** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Green****443 Districts** |
| **Status: Low** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Orange** | **Yellow****126 Districts** | **Yellow****127 Districts** |
| **Status: Very Low**  | **Red** | **Red** | **Red** | **Orange****126 Districts** | **Yellow** |

\*Including charter schools as districts and based on 2016-17 CELDT with N=1,265

As Tables 3 and 4 demonstrate, Change in every percentile is positive. However, placement in the Dashboard’s five-by-five grid relies on five levels of Change, ranging from negative to positive. The five Change levels are:

1. Increased Significantly
2. Increased
3. Maintained
4. Declined
5. Declined Significantly

Based on only positive levels of Change that result from using only two years of ELP assessment results for a matched cohort of students, there is insufficient differentiation in the performance between schools and LEAs, which is required in ESSA. Due to the fact that none of the values for Change illustrated in Table 4 show anything other than increases, this methodology would prevent the full use of the Dashboard five-by-five grid for ELPI. Perhaps most importantly, this limitation means that schools and LEAs cannot be identified as needing assistance if this model is used to place schools and LEAs on the Dashboard five-by-five grid. However, using the current ELPI methodology with three years of data provides adequate differentiation in performance between schools and LEAs and fully uses the five-by-five grid.

## 2018, 2019, 2020 Key Dates

Some proposed key dates for the ELPI in the 2018, 2019, and 2020 Dashboard, pending SBE adoption include:

* August 2018: Public release of Spring 2018 Summative ELPAC results.
* September 2018: SBE meeting, adopt 2018 Dashboard report of ELPAC performance levels.
* December 2018: 2018 Dashboard release includes reports on ELPAC performance levels.
* August 2019: Public release of the Spring 2019 ELPAC Summative results.
* September/November 2019: SBE meetings, adoption of Status cut scores for the ELPI.
* December 2019: 2019 Dashboard release includes Status only for the ELPI.
* August 2020: Public release of the Spring 2020 ELPAC Summative results.
* September/November 2020: SBE meetings, adoption of Change cut scores for the ELPI.
* December 2020: 2020 Dashboard release includes Status and Change for the ELPI.

## Stakeholder Feedback

The CDE received feedback and input from various stakeholder groups on the incorporation of the ELPAC into the ELPI. At the May 2018 Bilingual Coordinators Network (BCN) meeting, which is comprised of LEA representatives, researchers, and EL experts, the CDE presented the information outlined in this attachment. The BCN members generally supported the CDE’s one year plan to only report ELPAC Summative results for the 2018 Dashboard.

On June 12, 2018, the CDE presented to the LCFF Stakeholder group on reporting only the percent of students in each of the ELPAC’s four performance levels for schools and districts in the 2018 Dashboard and reporting only Status for the ELPI in the 2019 Dashboard. The meeting consisted of approximately 15 members who had no objections to this plan.

On June 14, 2018, the CDE presented to the TDG on the results of the data simulation using two years of CELDT data to determine Change. TDG members unanimously agreed that only Status can appropriately be reported with two years of ELPAC Summative results for the 2019 Dashboard and that three years would be required to calculate Change and assign a color on the Dashboard. The TDG also agreed with the CDE’s proposed three year ELPI timeline.

In addition, the CDE presented the same data simulation to the ELPI Workgroup on June 18, 2018. ELPI Workgroup members unanimously agreed that with only one year of ELPAC data available that reporting the percentage of students falling into different performance levels would be the appropriate plan for current year. Additionally, the ELPI Workgroup has asked CDE staff to look into the feasibility of reporting these data disaggregated by EL students’ years in US schools. Because EL students enter US schools at different levels of ELP, the number of years in US schools does not automatically determine whether particular EL students are on-track toward the goal of ELP. Therefore, this advisory note will be included in the data report. Finally, the ELPI Workgroup concurred that reporting only Status with two years of ELPAC Summative results would be appropriate and that three years of data would be required to calculate Change and assign a color on the Dashboard. The ELPI Workgroup also agreed with the CDE’s proposed three year ELPI timeline.

## Recommendation

The CDE is recommending that the SBE approve the three year ELPI timeline.

# Attachment 4

## Update on the California School Dashboard

The California School Dashboard (Dashboard) (<https://www.caschooldashboard.org/>) serves as California’s portal for parents, educators, and community members to track school and district performance and student group progress based on multiple measures. The most recent website statistics indicate that the site continues to grow in usage and is visited by over 100,000 users monthly.

## User Interface Improvements

In June 2018, the California State Legislature approved, and Governor Jerry Brown signed into law, the 2018–19 State Budget which provides $300,000 to update the Dashboard’s user interface. In anticipation of this action and in preparation for the 2018 Dashboard release, the San Joaquin County Office of Education released a Request for Proposal (RFP) for the Dashboard user interface. The purpose of the RFP was to improve the look and feel of the Dashboard so that it is intuitive, easy to use by a variety of audiences, and welcoming so users will want to return to the site regularly.

The RFP successful bidder was Collaborative Communications, which is a Washington, D.C. based company. They are nationally recognized for their work in the education sector and in data reporting with an emphasis on translating complex education data for lay audiences. Collaborative Communications uses human information design to display data in an accessible, appealing and actionable way, and has worked with the Illinois Board of Education and the D.C. Office of the State Superintendent of Education to build school reporting websites for the public.

To implement and test these changes prior to the local educational agency private preview of the Dashboard in November 2018, this project has an aggressive timeframe. Accordingly, the California Department of Education and State Board of Education are working closely together to ensure that stakeholder feedback from parents, including Spanish speaking parents, educators, and education and advocacy organizations, on the proposed design is obtained to inform the design changes prior to the 2018 Dashboard release.

# Attachment 5

## California School Dashboard Educational Outreach Activities

**Table 1. California Department of Education Policy Work Group Meetings**

| **Date** | **Title** | **Estimated Number of Attendees** | **Description** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| May 4, 2018 | California Advisory Task Force on Alternative Schools: Local Indicator Subcommittee | 6 | Shared the recommendation of the State Indicators Subcommittee on the one-year graduation rate and discussed next steps for the work on proposed local indicators for Dashboard Alternative School Status (DASS) schools.  |
| May 11, 2018 | California Advisory Task Force on Alternative Schools: Local Indicator Subcommittee | 6 | Shared the State Board of Education’s (SBE) approval of the one-year graduation rate and discussed next steps for the work on proposed local indicators for DASS schools. |
| May 23, 2018 | College/Career Indicator (CCI) Workgroup Subcommittee | 10 | Shared simulation results for new CCI career measures, including State Seal of Biliteracy, Golden State Seal Merit Diploma, Articulated Career Technical Education Data, and Leadership/Military Science. Sought feedback on proposed criteria for CCI levels for each new career measure. |
| May 24, 2018 | California Advisory Task Force on Alternative Schools: State Indicator Subcommittee | 18 | Reviewed actions taken at May 2018 SBE meeting. Shared simulation results on one-year graduation rate, based on option selected at March 2018 Task Force meeting. Shared proposed business rules and simulation results for one-year graduation rate rolled up to local educational agency (LEA) level. Shared simulation results for new CCI career measures. |
| June 14, 2018 | Technical Design Group (TDG) | 5 | Reviewed new analyses on the Residual growth (RG) model (presented by Educational Testing Service). Shared analysis of school-level variables for the growth model; reviewed analyses conducted on mathematics, using all three candidate growth models. Sought TDG guidance on appropriate method to incorporate the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) results into English Learner (EL) accountability. Reviewed simulations on chronic absenteeism data and sought TDG guidance on appropriate methodology. Shared results of Safety Net methodology applied at student-group level and its impact on LEA eligibility for Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) support, sought TDG guidance on appropriateness of applying the methodology to student group level and whether California Department of Education (CDE) should explore its application to the CCI. Reviewed simulation data (using three different weights) on the impact of incorporating the participation rate into the calculations for determining the Academic Indicator and sought TDG feedback on most appropriate methodology. |
| June 18, 2018 | English Learner Progress Indicator Workgroup | 8 | Reviewed the original rationale of the TDG regarding the current methodology of English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI). Shared the analyses conducted using two years of ELPAC data as a methodology, and sought the ELPI Workgroup feedback on the most appropriate methodology.  |

**Table 2. In-person Meetings/Conferences**

| **Date** | **Title** | **Estimated Number of Attendees** | **Description** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| April 26, 2018 | Science Community of Practice | 100 | Provided an update on the California School Dashboard (Dashboard) and System of Support.  |
| May 3, 2018 | Special Education Local Plan Area | 75 | Provided an update on DASS application process and on modified methods for DASS schools. |
| May 10, 2018 | 49th Annual Juvenile Court, Community and Alternative School Administrators Conference | 45 | Provided an overview of the Dashboard and of the criteria and application process for DASS schools. Reviewed modified methods for DASS schools (CCI and one-year graduation rate). Reviewed how inclusion of DASS school data in 2018 Dashboard will impact county offices of education and their eligibility for Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) support. Reviewed Safety Net methodology for schools with small student populations (Graduation and Suspension Rate Indicators) |
| May 16, 2018 | California County Superintendents Educational Services Association (CCSESA) Career Technical Education Subcommittee | 30 | Provided an overview and next steps for developing future College/Career Indicators. Responded to technical questions from practitioners. |
| May 16, 2018 | Regional Assessment Network | 20 | Provided an update on the State Every School Succeeds Act (ESSA) Plan, including revised criteria for identifying schools for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) and Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI). |
| May 17, 2018 | CCSESA Curriculum and Instruction Steering Committee | 75 | Provided an update on recent SBE action related to the growth model and ongoing development of the Dashboard. |
| May 17, 2018 | Leroy Green Academy Parent Teacher Association Meeting | 11 | Conducted an in-person parent focus discussion on the usability of the Dashboard. |
| May 17, 2018 | ESSA Roundtable | 80 | Provided an update on the State ESSA Plan, including revised criteria for identifying schools for CSI and TSI. |
| May 18, 2018 | State and Federal Program Directors Meeting | 100 | Provided an update on the changes to the 2018 Dashboard (including the reporting on DASS schools) and modified measures for CCI and Graduation Rate Indicator). Provided an update on the revised criteria for identifying schools for CSI and TSI.  |
| May 18, 2018 | CCSESA Technology and Telecommunications Steering Committee | 50 | Provided an overview on the Dashboard, the importance of good data quality, and discussed the timeframe for the 2018 launch.  |
| May 22, 2018 | Regional System of District and School Support  | 15 | Provided an update on the State ESSA Plan, including criteria for identifying schools for CSI and TSI |
| May 31, 2018 | California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) Technical Advisory Group | 15 | Discussed various growth models, including the Residual gain (RG) model and usefulness of growth model data in making decisions to improve student outcomes at the LEA and school levels.  |
| June 2, 2018 | California Education Policy Fellowship Program | 30 | Provided an overview of the Dashboard and release of the chronic absenteeism data from December 2017. |
| June 4, 2018 | English Learner Initiatives Implementation Monthly Conference Call | 15 | The English Learner Support Division holds a monthly call with other CDE staff and stakeholders to provide updates on matters relating to English Learner students. Analysis, Measurement, and Accountability Reporting Division staff presented updates on the development of the ELPI indicator and proposed timelines at the June 4, 2018 meeting. |
| June 7, 2018 | Western Association of Schools and Colleges Train the Trainer Workshop | 10 | Provided an overview of coming changes to the 2018 Dashboard, including an update on the College/Career and Chronic Absenteeism Indicators. |
| June 11, 2018 | CAASPP Stakeholder Meeting | 15 | Provided an update on exploration of the RG growth model for possible incorporation in the accountability system. |
| June 12, 2018 | LCFF Stakeholder Group | 10 | Provided an update on the ELPI and State ESSA Plan. Shared simulation results for application of Safety Net methodology at student-group level (for Graduation and Suspension Rate Indicators) and its impact on LEAs identified for LCFF support. Presented simulation results on proposed student growth model and sought feedback on its inclusion in 2018 Dashboard. |
| June 20, 2018 | Advisory Commission on Special Education | 20 | Provided an update on the possible revisions for the 2018 Dashboard. |

**Table 3. Webinars**

| **Date** | **Title** | **Estimated Number of Attendees** | **Description** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| May 30, 2018 | Accountability Coordinator Webinar on Student-level Growth Model and 2018 Dashboard Updates | 770 | Provided an update on the RG growth model and on new business rules for the inclusion of EL students in participation rate for English language arts/literacy. Reviewed timeline for submitting data in the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System for the 2018 Dashboard. |