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## Subject

Update on the Implementation of the Integrated Local, State, and Federal Accountability and Continuous Improvement System: Update and Recommended Action Regarding Local Indicators; and Update on the Continuing Development Work; and Revisions under Consideration for the 2019 California School Dashboard.

## Type of Action

Action, Information

## Summary of the Issue(s)

With the approval of a new accountability system in May 2016, the State Board of Education (SBE) established an annual review process of the California School Dashboard (Dashboard). This process includes the review of state and local indicators and performance standards to consider necessary changes or improvements based on newly available data, recent research, and/or stakeholder feedback.

Under this process, the California Department of Education (CDE) includes state and local indicators that need revisions or updates in the work plan presented at each March SBE meeting. This process allows for a gradual and deliberate approach to improving the state and local indicators and incorporating changes prior to the annual release of the Dashboard each fall.

This item will present recommended revisions to the self-reflection tool for Parental Involvement and Family Engagement (Local Control Funding Formula [LCFF] Priority 3). In addition, the item provides an extensive update on activities and recommendations for the 2019 Dashboard release and an update on the outreach activities completed to date on the Dashboard.

## Recommendation

The CDE recommends that the SBE approve: (1) the proposed revision to the self-reflection tool for Priority 3: Parental Involvement and Family Engagement.

In addition, the CDE recommends that the SBE provide guidance on the proposed work plan and take additional action as deemed necessary and appropriate.

## Brief History of Key Issues

To meet the requirements of California *Education Code* (*EC*) Section 52064.5, the SBE has approved standards for local indicators, i.e. indicators for which the state does not collect data, which support local educational agencies (LEAs) in measuring and reporting their progress within the appropriate priority area. The local indicators are as follows:

* Basic Services and Conditions (Appropriately Assigned Teachers, Access to Curriculum-Aligned Instructional Materials, and Safe, Clean and Functional School Facilities) (Priority 1)
* Implementation of State Academic Standards (Priority 2)
* Parent Engagement (Priority 3)
* School Climate (Priority 6)
* Access to a Broad Course of Study (Priority 7)
* Coordination of Services for Expelled Students (Priority 9, for county offices of education [COEs] only)
* Coordination of Services for Foster Youth (Priority 10, for COEs only)

For each local indicator, the SBE approved the following standard:

LEAs measure their progress on the local indicator based on locally available information and reports the results to the LEA's local governing board at a regularly scheduled meeting of the local governing board and to stakeholders and the public through the Dashboard. LEAs use self-reflection tools to measure and report their progress through the Dashboard and to reflect on their progress as part of local planning and improvement efforts. LEAs that meet the SBE approved standard for a local indicator identify the standard as “Met” in the Dashboard. LEAs that fail to meet the SBE approved standard will be identified as “Not Met” or “Not Met for Two or More Years” in the Dashboard.

In September 2018, Assembly Bill 2878 amended *EC* sections 52060(d)(3) and 52066(d)(3), to expand the description of LCFF Priority 3 (Parent Involvement) to include family engagement. AB 2878 retained the existing requirements for LEAs to seek parent input in making decisions for the school district and each individual school site and to promote parental participation in programs for unduplicated pupils and individuals with exceptional needs and added identified family engagement activities for LEAs to consider for implementation.

### Self-Reflection Tool

In 2017, the CDE established the Ad Hoc Family Engagement Workgroup (Workgroup) at the recommendation of the School Conditions and Climate Workgroup, to serve as a think tank of experts who could advise the CDE on policy related to family engagement. The Workgroup is composed of individuals with a wide range of expertise in family engagement.

For the past 18 months, the CDE in partnership with the Workgroup, has:

* Created a working definition of family engagement to inform its work
* Reviewed current research on family engagement
* Conducted research on the family engagement policies and tools in other states
* Identified potential challenges and barriers to engaging families
* Identified promising practices currently implemented in local educational agencies (LEAs) throughout California
* Analyzed the responses to the current self-reflection tool in the Dashboard
* Identified recommendations for improving the current self-reflection tool

The proposed self-reflection tool is based on current research, current state and federal guidance documents (e.g. Dual Capacity Building Framework, CDE Family Engagement Toolkit, etc.), and the recommendations of the Workgroup.

The Workgroup has made the following recommendations for the tool:

* Ensure that a diverse group of stakeholders is involved in the self-reflection process.
* Emphasize the importance of:
	+ Building relationships as the foundation for effective and equitable family engagement
	+ Connecting family engagement to student outcomes and making it an integral part of the process to develop and annually update Local Control and Accountability Plans (LCAPs)
	+ Seeking input to inform decision making
	+ Using accessible language and not educational jargon, to make the tool easily understandable for families and other stakeholders
	+ Using the tool as part of a continuous improvement process that informs the planning and development of the LCAP
* Include descriptions of effective family engagement practices taking place within the LEA
* Provide the opportunity for LEAs to provide a brief narrative about their ratings

The self-reflection tool is organized into three research supported areas:

* Building Relationships
* Building partnerships for improved student outcomes
* Seeking input for decision-making

On February 9, 2019, the draft self-reflection tool was shared with the California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG). Members expressed support for the tool and noted their appreciation for:

* Developing a tool that was user friendly, inclusive, and that incorporated promising practices supported by research.
* Engaging stakeholders in the self-reflection process, including the determination of the information/data that will help LEAs to reflect on any given practice
* The integration of practices to support engagement of underrepresented families.

Much of the feedback from the CPAG focused on how the tool would be implemented, such as how stakeholders would be identified, how stakeholders would be engaged, how data would be gathered, and how LEAs with multiple schools would gather evidence from school sites. The CDE intends to address these and other aspects of implementation through guidance and trainings.

On February 19, 2019, the CDE shared the tool with the LCFF stakeholder group and received positive feedback.

Attachment 1 contains the current self-reflection tool for LCFF Priority 3. Attachment 2 contains the Workgroup’s proposed Self Reflection Tool for LCFF Priority 3. The CDE recommends that the SBE approve the revised self-reflection tool for use in the 2019 Dashboard.

### The California School Dashboard

Since the SBE adopted the initial phase of the Dashboard at its September 2016 meeting, extensive feedback from numerous stakeholder input sessions and work groups continues to inform the state and local indicators and Dashboard displays and reports. The Spring 2017 Dashboard release was designed as a field test of the system. Accordingly, the system was intended to be flexible and further evolve based on user experiences and stakeholder feedback in anticipation of the first operational release of the Dashboard in fall 2017.

The 2018–19 state budget appropriated $300,000 to upgrade the look and feel of the Dashboard and make it more user-friendly. The new design is friendlier, simpler to use, easier to understand, and more intuitive. The Dashboard has been fully translated into Spanish to provide complete access to Spanish-speaking families. Web traffic statistics show that the newly redesigned Dashboard is much more widely used than the previous version. In the month of January 2019 alone, the Dashboard had over 136,000 page views and 69,000 unique users.

The CDE also developed several new resources to support the release of the 2018 Dashboard, which are posted on the CDE California School Dashboard and System of Support web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/cm/>. In addition, the School Dashboard Additional Reports and Data web page, at <https://www6.cde.ca.gov/californiamodel/>, provides several detailed reports, including the Five-by-Five Placement Reports, the College/Career Reports, the Participation Reports, and the Student Groups Report. These reports are highly popular with the public and LEA staff. In the month of January 2019, over 150,000 viewers, and over 14,223 unique users, visited the site.

The CDE will conduct a live demonstration of the Dashboard and the additional reports which support the Dashboard at the SBE March meeting.

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

In November 2014, the SBE adopted the LCAP template. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr14/documents/nov14item14.doc> )

In September 2016, the SBE approved the performance standards for all local indicators and the state indicators (except for the Academic Indicator), and the annual process for the SBE to review the rubrics to determine if updates or revisions are necessary. (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr16/documents/sep16item01.doc>)

In November 2016 meeting, the SBE approved tools for LEAs to determine progress on the local performance indicators for specific priorities within the LCFF statute. The self-reflection tools are for: Priority 1—Basic Services and Conditions at schools; Priority 6—School Climate; Priority 9—Coordination of Services for Expelled Students; and Priority 10—Coordination of Services for Foster Youth. (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr16/documents/nov16item03.doc>)

In January 2017, the SBE approved the Academic Indicator, based on student test scores on English language arts/literacy (ELA) and mathematics for grades three through eight that includes results from the second year of Smarter Balanced tests, as well as the definition of the English Learner (EL) student group for the Academic Indicator. Additionally, the SBE approved the self-reflection tools for LEAs to determine progress on the local performance indicators for Implementation of State Academic Standards (Priority 2) and Parent Engagement (Priority 3). (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/jan17item02.doc>)

Additionally, the SBE received the following Information Memorandum:

* Update on School Conditions and Climate Workgroup (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-exe-jan17item01.doc>)

In February 2017, the SBE received the following Information Memoranda:

* Updated Summary of SBE Actions Related to Adopting the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics ([http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-sbe-feb17item01v2.doc](https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-feb18item02.docx))
* Update on the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics Components: Statements of Model Practices (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-exe-jan17item02.doc>)

In March 2017, the SBE heard an update on the development of the new accountability system; an overview of alternative schools in preparation for the development of applicable indicators; a work plan for state indicator development; and an update on the local indicators—specifically, the work by the School Conditions and Climate Work Group. ([http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/mar17item02.doc](http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-exec-ocd-jun17item01.doc))

In May 2017, the SBE heard an update on the Dashboard, and received an overview of the recommendations of the English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) Workgroup. The SBE took action to approve the development of an application process to require alternative schools of choice and charter schools to re-certify—every three years—that at least 70 percent of their enrollment is comprised of high-risk students (as defined in the SBE-approved eligibility criteria) in order to continue participating as an alternative school in the accountability system. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/may17item01.doc>)

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>)

Also in November 2017, 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- 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>)

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

* Update on the Development of a Revised Self-Reflection Tool for the Local Performance Indicator for Local Control Funding Formula Priority 6, School Climate (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-exec-ocd-feb18item01.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 February 2018, the SBE received the following Information Memoranda:

* Developing a New State Accountability System: Update on the Implementation of the College/Career Indicator; Including the Expansion of Career Measures and Performance Comparisons for Academic Measures (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-feb18item02.docx>)
* Developing a New State Accountability System: Update on the Development of a Student-Level Growth Model (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-feb18item01.docx>)

In March 2018, the SBE heard an update on the continuing development work of the Dashboard, including revisions under consideration for the 2018 Dashboard, and an update on the local indicators—specifically, the proposed revision to the self-reflection tool for Priority 6: School Climate; in addition, the SBE approved the tool for LEAs to determine progress on the local performance indicators for LCFF Priority 7: Access to a Broad Course of Study. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/mar18item01.docx>)

In April 2018, the SBE approved revisions to California’s Every School Succeeds Act (ESSA) Plan for resubmission to the U.S. Department of Education (ED) (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/apr18item01.docx>)

Also in April 2018, the SBE received the following Information Memoranda:

* Request to the U.S. Department of Education to Waive the Every Student Succeeds Act Statute for the English Learner Proficiency Indicator. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-apr18item01.docx>)
* Update on the Development of the College/Career Indicator, Including an Overview of the Research Supporting the Current Model. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-apr18item02.docx>)
* Ongoing Development of California’s New Accountability System: Timeline of State Board of Education Agenda Items and Information Memoranda Regarding the California School Dashboard. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-mar18item01.docx>)

In May 2018, the SBE adopted methodology for calculating the one-year graduation rate for schools with Dashboard Alternative School Status (DASS). (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/may18item02.docx>)

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

* Update on the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California. <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-adad-jun18item02.docx>
* Ongoing Development of California’s New Accountability System: Update on Revisions to Calculating the Graduation Rate and Impact on the California School Dashboard. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-jun18item02.docx>)

In July 2018, the SBE approved the application of the safety net methodology at the student group level and the three-year plan for the ELPI. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/jul18item01.docx>)

In August 2018, the SBE received a revised draft of California’s ESSA Plan. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-exec-essa-aug17item01-rev.doc>)

In September 2018, the SBE approved two new measures—the State Seal of Biliteracy and Leadership/Military Science—for inclusion in the College/Career Indicator; the methodology for the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator; cut scores for the DASS graduation rate; and the reporting of the five-year graduation rate in the Dashboard. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/sep18item01.docx>)

In October 2018, the SBE received an Information Memorandum on the ongoing implementation of California’s accountability system, including a timeline of activities and SBE agenda items and Information Memoranda regarding the Dashboard. <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-oct18item02.docx>)

In November 2018, the SBE approved further amendments to California’s ESSA State Plan (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/nov18item05.docx>)

Also in November 2018, the SBE approved summative English Learner Proficiency Assessments for California threshold scores (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/nov18item09.docx>)

## Fiscal Analysis (as appropriate)

The 2018–19 state budget funds the Proposition 98 Minimum Guarantee at $78.4 billion. This reflects state funding of $54.9 billion and local funding of $23.5 billion, accounting for $11,631 in transitional kindergarten through grade twelve per-pupil funding. The budget package fully funds the LCFF two years ahead of the estimated time frame for implementation.

## Attachment(s)

* Attachment 1: Current Self Reflection Tool for Local Control Funding Formula Priority 3: Parental Involvement and Family Engagement (3 Pages)
* Attachment 2: Proposed Self Reflection Tool for Local Control Funding Formula Priority 3: Parental Involvement and Family Engagement (9 Pages)
* Attachment 3: Revisions Under Consideration for the 2019 California School Dashboard (6 Pages)
* Attachment 4: California School Dashboard Educational Outreach Activities
(8 Pages)

# Attachment 1

**Current Self Reflection Tool for Local Control Funding Formula Priority 3: Parental Involvement and Family Engagement**

## Parent Engagement

**Standard:** The local educational agency (LEA) annually measures its progress in: (1) seeking input from parents in decision making; and (2) promoting parental participation in programs, and reports the results to its local governing board at a regularly scheduled meeting and to stakeholders and the public through the California School Dashboard (Dashboard).

**Criteria:** The LEA will assess its performance on a (Met, Not Met, or Not Met for Two or More Years) scale.

**Evidence:** The LEA measures its progress using the self-reflection tool included in the Dashboard, and reports these results to its local governing board at a regularly scheduled meeting and through the local data selection option in the Dashboard.

## Approach for Self-Reflection Tool to Use as Evidence

LEAs will provide a narrative summary of their progress toward: (1) seeking input from parents/guardians in school and district decision making; and (2) promoting parental participation in programs.

The summary of progress must be based either on information collected through surveys of parents/guardians or other local measures. Under either option, the LEA briefly describes why it chose the selected measures, including whether the LEA expects that progress on the selected measure is related to goals it has established for other LCFF priorities in its local control and accountability plan (LCAP).

## OPTION 1: Survey

If the LEA administers a local survey to parents/guardians in at least one grade within each grade span that the LEA serves (e.g., K–5, 6–8, and 9–12), the LEA will summarize the following in the text box provided in the Dashboard:

1. The key findings from the survey related to seeking input from parents/guardians in school and district decision making;
2. The key findings from the survey related to promoting parental participation in programs; and
3. Why the LEA chose the selected survey and whether the findings relate to the goals established for other LCFF priorities in the LCAP.

[Insert text here]

## OPTION 2: Local Measures Summarize the following in the text box provided in the Dashboard:

The LEA’s progress on at least one measure related to seeking input from parents/guardians in school and district decision making;

1. The LEA’s progress on at least one measure related to promoting parental participation in programs; and
2. Why the LEA chose the selected measures and whether the findings relate to the goals established for other LCFF priorities in the LCAP.

Examples of measures that LEAs might select are listed below.

1. Seeking Input in School/District Decision Making
	1. Measure of teacher and administrator participation in professional development opportunities related to engaging parents/guardians in decision making.
	2. Measure of participation by parents/guardians in trainings that also involve school/district staff to build capacity in working collaboratively.
	3. Measure of parent/guardian participation in meetings of the local governing board and/or advisory committees.
2. Promoting Participation in Programs
3. Measure of whether school sites have access to interpretation and translation services to allow parents/guardians to participate fully in educational programs and individual meetings with school staff related to their child’s education.
4. Measure of whether school sites provide trainings or workshops for parents/guardians that are linked to student learning and/or social-emotional development and growth.
5. Measure of whether school and district staff (teachers, administrators, support staff) have completed professional development on effective parent/guardian engagement in the last two school years.

[Insert text here]

# Attachment 2

**Proposed Self Reflection Tool for Local Control Funding Formula Priority 3: Parental Involvement and Family Engagement**

## Self-Reflection Tool for Priority 3: Parent Engagement

**Standard:** The local educational agency (LEA) annually measures its progress in: (1) seeking input from parents in decision making; and (2) promoting parental participation in programs, and reports the results to its local governing board at a regularly scheduled meeting and to stakeholders and the public through the California School Dashboard (Dashboard).

**Criteria:** The LEA will assess its performance on a (Met, Not Met, or Not Met for Two or More Years) scale.

**Evidence:** The LEA measures its progress using the self-reflection tool included in the Dashboard, and reports these results to its local governing board at a regularly scheduled meeting and through the local data selection option in the Dashboard.

## Introduction

Family engagement is an essential strategy for building pathways to college and career readiness for all students and is an essential component of a systems approach to improving outcomes for all students. More than thirty years of research has shown that family engagement can lead to improved student outcomes (e.g. attendance, engagement, academic outcomes, social emotional learning, etc.). Consistent with the California Department of Education’s (CDE’s) Family Engagement Toolkit:[[1]](#footnote-2)

* Effective and authentic family engagement has been described as an intentional partnership of educators, families and community members who share responsibility for a child from the time they are born to becoming an adult.
* To build an effective partnership, educators, families, and community members need to develop the knowledge and skills to work together, and schools must purposefully integrate family and community engagement with goals for students' learning and thriving.

The Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) legislation recognized the importance of family engagement by requiring LEAs to address Priority 3 within their local control and accountability plan (LCAP). The self-reflection tool described below enables LEAs to reflect upon their implementation of family engagement as part of their continuous improvement process and prior to updating their LCAP.

For LEAs to engage all families equitably, it is necessary to understand the cultures, languages, needs and interests of families in the local area. Furthermore, developing family engagement policies, programs, and practices needs to be done in partnership with local families, using the tools of continuous improvement.

## Instructions

This self-reflection tool is organized into three sections. Each section includes promising practices in family engagement:

1. Building Relationships between School Staff and Families
2. Building Partnerships for Student Outcomes
3. Seeking Input for Decision-making

LEAs use this self-reflection tool to reflect on its progress, successes, needs and areas of growth in family engagement policies, programs, and practices. This tool will enable an LEA to engage in continuous improvement and determine next steps to make improvements in the areas identified.

The results of the process should be used to inform the LCAP and the development process, to assess prior year goals, actions and services as well as to plan or modify future goals, actions, and services in the LCAP.

For each statement in the table below:

1. Identify the diverse stakeholders that need to participate in the self-reflection process in order to ensure input from all groups of families, staff and students in the LEA, including families of unduplicated students and families of individuals with exceptional needs as well as families of underrepresented students.
2. Engage stakeholders in determining what data and information will be considered to complete the self-reflection tool. LEAs should consider how the practices apply to families of all student groups, including families of unduplicated students and families of individuals with exceptional needs as well as families of underrepresented students.
3. Based on the analysis of data, identify the number which best indicates the LEA’s current stage of implementation for each practice using the following rating scale (lowest to highest):

1 – Exploration and Research Phase

2 – Beginning Development

3 – Initial Implementation

4 – Full Implementation

5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability

1. Write a brief response to the prompts following each of the three sections.
2. Use the information from the self-reflection process to inform the LCAP and the LCAP development process, as well as the development of other school and district plans.

### Building Relationships

1. **Rate the LEA’s progress in developing the capacity of staff (i.e. administrators, teachers, and classified staff) to build trusting and respectful relationships with families.**

*Rating Scale (lowest to highest): 1 – Exploration and Research Phase; 2 – Beginning Development; 3 – Initial Implementation; 4 – Full Implementation; 5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability*

[Insert rating]

1. **Rate the LEA’s progress in creating welcoming environments for all families in the community.**

*Rating Scale (lowest to highest): 1 – Exploration and Research Phase; 2 – Beginning Development; 3 – Initial Implementation; 4 – Full Implementation; 5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability*

[Insert rating]

1. **Rate the LEA’s progress in supporting staff to learn about each family’s strengths, cultures, languages, and goals for their children.**

*Rating Scale (lowest to highest): 1 – Exploration and Research Phase; 2 – Beginning Development; 3 – Initial Implementation; 4 – Full Implementation; 5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability*

[Insert rating]

1. **Rate the LEA’s progress in developing multiple opportunities for the LEA and school sites to engage in 2-way communication between families and educators using language that is understandable and accessible to families.**

*Rating Scale (lowest to highest): 1 – Exploration and Research Phase; 2 – Beginning Development; 3 – Initial Implementation; 4 – Full Implementation; 5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability*

[Insert rating]

**Dashboard Narrative Box**

Briefly describe the LEA’s current strengths and progress in this area, and identify a focus area for improvement, including how the LEA will improve the engagement of underrepresented families.

 [Insert description]

### Building Partnerships for Student Outcomes

1. **Rate the LEA’s progress in providing professional learning and support to teachers and principals to improve a school’s capacity to partner with families.**

*Rating Scale (lowest to highest): 1 – Exploration and Research Phase; 2 – Beginning Development; 3 – Initial Implementation; 4 – Full Implementation; 5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability*

[Insert rating]

1. **Rate the LEA’s progress in providing families with information and resources to support student learning and development in the home.**

*Rating Scale (lowest to highest): 1 – Exploration and Research Phase; 2 – Beginning Development; 3 – Initial Implementation; 4 – Full Implementation; 5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability*

[Insert rating]

1. **Rate the LEA’s progress in implementing policies or programs for teachers to meet with families and students to discuss student progress and ways to work together to support improved student outcomes.**

*Rating Scale (lowest to highest): 1 – Exploration and Research Phase; 2 – Beginning Development; 3 – Initial Implementation; 4 – Full Implementation; 5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability*

[Insert rating]

1. **Rate the LEA’s progress in supporting families to understand and exercise their legal rights and advocate for their own students and all students.**

*Rating Scale (lowest to highest): 1 – Exploration and Research Phase; 2 – Beginning Development; 3 – Initial Implementation; 4 – Full Implementation; 5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability*

[Insert rating]

**Dashboard Narrative Box**

Briefly describe the LEA’s current strengths and progress in this area and identify a focus area for improvement, including how the LEA will improve the engagement of underrepresented families.

[Insert description]

### Seeking Input for Decision Making

1. **Rate the LEA’s progress in building the capacity of and supporting principals and staff to effectively engage families in advisory groups and with decision-making.**

*Rating Scale (lowest to highest): 1 – Exploration and Research Phase; 2 – Beginning Development; 3 – Initial Implementation; 4 – Full Implementation; 5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability*

[Insert rating]

1. **Rate the LEA’s progress in building the capacity of and supporting family members to effectively engage in advisory groups and decision-making.**

*Rating Scale (lowest to highest): 1 – Exploration and Research Phase; 2 – Beginning Development; 3 – Initial Implementation; 4 – Full Implementation; 5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability*

[Insert rating]

1. **Rate the LEA’s progress in providing all families with opportunities to provide input on policies and programs, and implementing strategies to reach and seek input from any underrepresented groups in the school community.**

*Rating Scale (lowest to highest): 1 – Exploration and Research Phase; 2 – Beginning Development; 3 – Initial Implementation; 4 – Full Implementation; 5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability*

[Insert rating]

1. **Rate the LEA’s progress in providing opportunities to have families, teachers, principals, and district administrators work together to plan, design, implement and evaluate family engagement activities at school and district levels.**

*Rating Scale (lowest to highest): 1 – Exploration and Research Phase; 2 – Beginning Development; 3 – Initial Implementation; 4 – Full Implementation; 5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability*

[Insert rating]

**Dashboard Narrative Box**

Briefly describe the LEA’s current strengths and progress in this area and identify a focus area for improvement, including how the LEA will improve the engagement of underrepresented families.

[Insert description]

## Appendix A: Resources

1. Southwest Educational Development Laboratory in Collaboration with the United States Department of Education. (2013) Partners in Education: A Dual Capacity Building Framework for Family School Partnerships. Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/documents/family-community/partners-education.pdf>
2. California Department of Education. (2017). Family Engagement Toolkit: Continuous Improvement through an Equity Lens. Sacramento, CA. Author. Retrieved from <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/documents/family-engagement.pdf>
3. California Department of Education. (2017). Editable Templates for Family Engagement Toolkit. Sacramento, CA. Author. Retrieved from <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/documents/toolkittemplates.doc>
4. United States Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Head Start, National Center on Parent, Family, and Community Engagement. (2018). [Head Start Parent, Family, and Community Engagement Framework](https://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/pdf/pfce-framework.pdf). Retrieved from <https://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/pdf/pfce-framework.pdf>
5. (2018). Head Start Parent, Family, and Community Engagement Framework. Retrieved from <https://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/pdf/pfce-framework.pdf>

# Attachment 3

## Revisions Under Consideration for the 2019 California School Dashboard

The State Board of Education (SBE) annually reviews the California School Dashboard (Dashboard) indicators and performance standards to consider whether changes or improvements are needed based on newly available data, recent research, and feedback from stakeholders. The annual review process requires that the California Department of Education (CDE) update the SBE at their March meeting on which indicators are under consideration for review and/or revisions for action by the SBE. The CDE is considering the following revisions to the 2019 Dashboard:

* Incorporation of the California Alternate Assessments (CAAs) in the Academic Indicator
* Incorporation of the Five-Year Graduation Rate into the Dashboard
* Application of the Three-by-Five Color Grid for the College/Career Indicator (CCI)
* Inclusion of Status for the English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) into the Dashboard
* Inclusion of Additional Measures in the CCI for Students with Disabilities

## Incorporation of the California Alternate Assessments in the Academic Indicator

Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are administered the CAAs for English language arts/literacy (ELA) and mathematics. Approximately one percent of all students statewide take the CAAs. In accordance with the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), states must incorporate the assessment results of all students—including those the most significant cognitive disabilities–into their state accountability systems. Beginning with the 2019 Dashboard, the CAA results will be incorporated in the calculations of the Academic Indicator.

Unlike students who take the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments, who are evaluated against meeting the California Common Core State Standards, students who take the CAAs are evaluated against their level of “understanding” of Common Core Alternate Standards:

* Level 1 is “limited understanding”
* Level 2 is “foundational understanding”’
* Level 3 is “understanding” of alternate standards

The first operational CAA was administered in spring of 2016, with the achievement standards (levels) approved by the SBE at its September 2016 meeting. In September 2017, the SBE determined that the incorporation of the CAAs into the Academic Indicator should be delayed until additional years of operational data were available and the multi-year rollout of the CAA test was complete.

In the 2018 Dashboard, CAA data (the percent of students who achieved Levels 1, 2, and 3) were displayed for informational purposes only. The CDE will be working with various stakeholder groups, as well as the Technical Design Group (TDG), to develop a methodology for incorporating the CAA results into the calculations of the Academic Indicator for the 2019 Dashboard.

## Incorporation of the Five-Year Graduation Rate into the Dashboard

Currently, the Graduation Rate Indicator only includes the four-year cohort graduation rate. It does not capture the progress of students who take five years to graduate from high school. The SBE previously expressed an interest in using the five-year cohort graduation rate as part of the Dashboard, as it could provide an opportunity for schools to demonstrate success with students who may need additional time to earn a regular high school diploma (e.g., students with disabilities and English learners).

The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) provides states the option to include a five-year graduation rate in the accountability system: however, states are required to set a more rigorous long-term goal for an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate (or five-year rate), as compared to the long-term goal set for the four-year cohort graduation rate. Based on a CDE review of the approved states plans for all 49 states and Puerto Rico, the U.S. Department of Education (ED) approved plans that create a combined four- and five-year graduation rate (e.g., simple or weighted average) and use the same long-term goal. Using a combined rate would allow California to take the five-year graduation rate into account without having to create a separate long-term goal.

Because schools with Dashboard Alterative Schools Status (DASS) have their graduation rate indicator calculated using the one-year graduation rate, the five-year graduation rate will only be applied to non-alternative schools. The options currently under consideration for incorporating the five-year graduation rate into the 2019 Dashboard include the following:

1. Provide a performance level (color) for the four-year cohort graduation rate only and continue to report the five-year graduation rate for informative data only.
2. Calculate a simple average for the four- and five-year cohort graduation rates. A simple average provides the same weight to all four and five year graduates.
3. Calculate a weighted average for the four- and five-year cohort graduation rates. This method provides more weight to students who graduate in four years (e.g., 2/3) rather than five years (e.g., 1/3).
4. Report both the four- and five-year cohort graduation rates on the Dashboard and assign the performance level (color) to the higher of the two rates.
5. Add the number of students who graduated in five years to the numerator and denominator of the four-year cohort rate.

## Application of the Three-by-Five Color Grid for the College/Career Indicator

In September 2017, the SBE approved an alternative methodology—known as the “Three-by-Five” color grid—for assigning performance levels to LEAs or schools that serve small student populations (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/sep17item02.doc>).

Application of the three-by-five color grid results in a refiguring of the performance level tables by removing two Change levels—Increased Significantly and Decreased Significantly—and thus limiting extreme changes in small student populations. This methodology, which limits large swings in the Change data that can be triggered by just a few students, was originally approved for two state indicators:

* Graduation Rate Indicator: Applied if 149 or fewer students are in the graduating cohort
* Suspension Rate Indicator: Applied if 149 of fewer are cumulatively enrolled

In July 2018, the SBE approved that the methodology also be applied at the student group level for these two indicators (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/jul18item01.docx>). At its November 2018 meeting, the SBE approved applying this methodology to the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator (reported for the first time in the 2018 Dashboard), when 149 or fewer students are enrolled (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/nov18item04.docx>).

The CDE proposes that, beginning with the 2019 Dashboard, the three-by-five methodology be applied to the CCI, which is based on the same cohort of students used in the calculations for the Graduation Rate Indicator. The CDE will bring this request to the SBE for approval in May 2019.

## Inclusion of Status for the English Learner Progress Indicator

In September 2016, the SBE adopted the methodology for the English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) using the results of the California English Language Development Test (CELDT). In 2017–18, California transitioned from the CELDT to the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC). This new assessment is substantially different from the CELDT because it is aligned to the more recently adopted 2012 California English language development standards, and it is inappropriate to compare ELPAC and CELDT results. Therefore, results from the spring 2018 and 2019 administrations of the ELPAC will serve as a baseline from which future EL progress will be measured.

As detailed in the July 2018 SBE item, the ELPI is the only indicator that measures **progress** **towards proficiency** rather than the end goal of proficiency itself (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/jul18item01.docx>). To measure progress toward proficiency (Status), two years of ELPAC Summative results are required. Accordingly, three years of ELPAC Summative results are required to calculate Status and Change for the ELPI (and therefore to report a color-coded performance level on the Dashboard).

At the November 2018 SBE meeting, the Board approved an updated timeline to the ESSA State plan to identify an additional cohort of schools under ESSA based on the 2019 Dashboard, including the ELPI based on Status only (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/nov18item05a1rev.docx>). Therefore, Status for this indicator will be reported in the 2019 Dashboard, when two years of ELPAC Summative results are available. CDE staff will bring a methodology for how to use the ELPI status in the identification of schools under ESSA to the SBE in the fall of 2019 for consideration.

The summative ELPAC was field tested in spring 2017 to determine test reliability and validity. The first operational ELPAC summative assessment was administered in spring 2018. The ELPAC cut scores were approved by the SBE in November 2018 (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/nov18item09.docx>). The ELPI Status cut scores are anticipated to be approved by the SBE in November 2019. A proposed three-year transition plan was included in the July 2018 SBE item.

## Inclusion of Additional Measures in the CCI for Students with Disabilities

Schools with Dashboard Alternative School Status (DASS) are schools that serve high-risk student populations, including students with disabilities. Although DASS schools are measured on the same set of indicators as non-alternative schools, modified methods are being developed in order to fairly evaluate their success and progress. The CDE has worked with the Alternative Schools Task Force—a joint project with the John W. Gardner Center at Stanford University supported with a grant from the Stuart Foundation—to identify modified measures for DASS schools and students with disabilities. Beginning in fall 2018, all DASS schools, which includes special education schools, received a Dashboard for the first time. They are held accountable for the same state indicators, although modified measures may be used to fairly evaluate the success of alternative schools and students with disabilities. These modified measures include a Grade 12 (one-year) graduation rate for DASS schools, which was approved by the SBE at its May 2018 meeting (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/may18item02.docx>).

Students who take the CAA are included in the calculation of the CCI. However, the CCI does not currently include measures that fairly evaluate the success of these students. Based on the recommendation of the Alternative Schools Task Force, the CDE will collect information on the completion of the Workability program, transitional services offered through the Department of Rehabilitation, and work-based learning for the first time this spring through the California Special Education Management Information System (CASEMIS). These data will be evaluated for possible inclusion in the 2019 Dashboard as a modified measure for students who have an Individualized Education Program (IEP).

The Alternative Task Force is also exploring additional career measures for the CCI. Some of these measures will be collected in the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) for the first time at the end of school year, for possible inclusion in the CCI for the 2020 Dashboard:

* Completion of a state or federal job program (limited to DASS schools)
* Completion of pre-apprenticeship (both DASS and non-DASS schools)
* Work Force Readiness Certificate (limited to DASS schools)

## Feedback from Stakeholder Groups

CDE staff received feedback from various stakeholder groups in regards to the proposed changes to the 2019 Dashboard. Members of the Regional Assessment Network (RAN) and the Capitol Regional Assessment Network (CRAN) indicated a desire not to implement any unnecessary changes to the 2019 Dashboard to allow for stability from one year to the next.

There was a consensus among the Local Control Funding Formula Stakeholder Group that at a minimum the five-year graduation rate should be included in the Dashboard for informational purposes. Several members also expressed support for including the five-year graduation rate in the determination of color performance. In addition, the Small Schools District Association supported applying the three-by-five color grid to the CCI.

The California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG) was supportive of adding a five-year graduation rate to the Dashboard. However, some members stated their preference to include it for informational purposes only. The remaining members, wanted to review the proposed methodology before determining how the five-year graduation rate should be included in the 2019 Dashboard. There was also support for including the use of the three-by-five color grid for the CCI.

Most CPAG members supported exploring other modified methods for DASS schools, especially Chronic Absenteeism and Suspension. However, some members expressed concerns regarding the addition of transitional services to the CCI.

At the February 2019 TDG meeting, members expressed support for adding a five-year graduation rate to the Dashboard, but emphasized that the methodology needs to ensure that the inclusion of fifth-year graduates only generated a positive impact on the Graduation Rate Indicator. They also stated their support for the recommended revisions to the CCI: (1) applying the three-by-five color grid, and (2) adding measures for students with disabilities. In addition, the TDG began exploring possible methodologies for incorporating the California Alternate Assessment into the Academic Indicator.

# Attachment 4

## California School Dashboard Educational Outreach Activities

**Table 1. In-person Meetings/Conferences**

| **Date** | **Title** | **Estimated Number of Attendees** | **Topics** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| October 25, 2018 | San Bernardino County Office of Education Counselor Network Meeting | 150 | * Overview of the California School Dashboard (Dashboard) and Accountability System
* Deep Dive into the College/Career Indicator (CCI)
* Rollout of the 2018 Dashboard
 |
| October 31, 2018  | California Practitioners Advisory Group | 25 | * Proposed Status and Change Cut Scores for Chronic Absenteeism Indicator
* Proposed Status Cut Scores for Graduation Rate Indicator
* Dashboard Alternative School Status (DASS) Graduation Rate and Updated on Use of Special Education Certificate of Completion
* Proposed Change Cut Scores for CCI
* Revised Proposed Status and Change Cut Scores for English Language Arts and Mathematics for Grade 11 Academic Indicator
 |
| November 2, 2018 | Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Stakeholder Session | 300 | * New Look and Feel of the 2018 Dashboard
* Inclusion of the Participation Rate into the Academic Indicator
* DASS
* Rollout of the 2018 Dashboard
* Identification of Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) for Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) Support
* Identification of Schools for Comprehensive, Targeted, and Additional Targeted Support and Improvement
 |
| November 5, 2018 | North Central Counties Professional Development Network  | 50 | * State Indicators Reported in the 2018 Dashboard
* Overview of the *N-*Size and DASS
* Changes to the Indicators in the 2018 Dashboard
* Inclusion of the Participation Rate into the Academic Indicator
* Application of the Three-by-Five Colored Tables in the 2018 Dashboard
* Rollout of the 2018 Dashboard
 |
| November 13–14, 2018 | California Educational Research Association Annual Conference | 165 | * New Look and Feel of the 2018 Dashboard
* Change to Indicators for the 2018 Dashboard
* Growing Up: Different Ways to Look at Student Growth on Assessments
* Unpacking the New CCI in the Dashboard
 |
| November 14, 2018 | Independent Study Conference | 75 | * DASS and the DASS Graduation Rate
 |
| November 15, 2018  | Alternative Accountability Policy Forum | 100 | * DASS and the DASS Graduation Rate
 |
| November 15, 2018  | Alternative Accountability Policy Forum: Closing Session | 125 | * Overview of CDE’s role in the education policy process under ESSA
* Status of the adoption of alternative accountability measures
 |
| November 28, 2018 | Regional Assessment Network | 45 | * Identification of Schools for Comprehensive and Targeted Support and Improvement
* Dashboard Updates
* Tying School Identification to the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) and Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA)
 |
| December 3, 2018 | Accountability Leadership Institute | 150 | * Overview of the Dashboard and Accountability System
* Incorporation of Participation Rate into Academic Indicator
* New Look and Feel of the Dashboard
* Resources Specific to English Learners
 |
| December 7, 2018 | System of Support Planning Group Meeting  | 75 | * Overview of 2018 Dashboard Data
* New Look and Feel of the Dashboard
 |
| December 7, 2018 | State and Federal Program Directors Meeting  | 100 | * 2018 Dashboard: Changes to Indicators
* LEAs and Schools Eligible for Support
* Perusing through the Dashboard
* Dashboard Resources
 |
| December 10, 2018 | Legislative Staff Briefing | 30 | * Overview of the New Dashboard
* Review of the System of Support
* ESSA Update
 |
| December 12, 2018  | LCFF Stakeholders: In-Person Study Session  | 12 | * 2018 Dashboard: Changes to Indicators
* LEAs Eligible for Support Under LCFF
* Perusing through the Dashboard and Resources
 |
| January 11, 2019  | Student Programs and Services Steering Committee | 40 | * Identification of LEAs for Support Under the LCFF
* Identification of Schools for Support and Improvement
* CCI: Potential New Measures in 2019
* Information Relating to Students with Disabilities
* Modified Methods Feedback
 |
| January 15, 2019  | CAASFEP Professional Development Institute  | 60 | * New Features and Changes to the Dashboard
* Identification of LEAs for Support Under the LCFF
* Identification of Schools for Support and Improvement
 |
| January 16, 2019  | Regional Assessment Network | 45 | * Revisions Under Consideration for the 2019 Dashboard
* Additional Reports
* Information Relating to Students with Disabilities
* Identification of LEAs for Support Under the LCFF
* Identification of Schools for Support and Improvement
* New Resources
 |
| January 18, 2019 | Juvenile Court, Community and Alternative School Administrators of California  | 40 | * New Features and Changes to the Dashboard
* DASS Graduation Rate
* Potential New College/Career Measures in 2019 Dashboard for DASS Schools
* Identification of Schools for Support and Improvement
 |
| January 25, 2019  | Capitol Regional Assessment Network  | 50  | * Revisions Under Consideration for the 2019 Dashboard
* Additional Reports
* Information Relating to Students with Disabilities
* New Resources
 |
| February 6, 2019 | California Practitioners Advisory Group | 25 | * Accountability 101: How We Got Here
* Developing the Dashboard Indicators
* Application of the Dashboard and Redesign
* Dashboard Live Demonstration
* Additional Reports and Resources
* Building a System of Support
* Proposed Changes for the 2019 Dashboard
* DASS: Developing Modified Methods for Other State Indicators
* Students with Disabilities: District of Residence Rule
 |
| February 20, 2019 | Advisory Commission on Special Education  | 28 | * Chronic Absenteeism Indicator
* Update on LEAs eligible for differentiated assistance in 2018-19
* Update on schools eligible for assistance under the Every Student Succeeds Act
 |
| February 22, 2019 | CISC Symposium | 50 | * Demonstrate new user interface for the Dashboard
* Explore Equity Report and Student Group Report to understand gaps between student groups
* Using the Dashboard, provide examples of districts eligible for differentiated assistance under LCFF and schools eligible for support under ESSA
 |

**Table 2. Webinars**

| **Date** | **Title** | **Estimated Number of Attendees** | **Topics** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| October 26, 2018 | DASS Module Presentation at the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence (CCEE) | 286 | * Overview of the DASS Module
* Accountability and Continuous Improvement
* DASS Program
* 2018 Dashboard
 |
| November 9, 2018  | CCI and Graduation Rate Webinar  | 445 | * Overview of the Dashboard and Accountability System
* New Look and Feel of the Dashboard
* Graduation Rate Indicator
* CCI
 |
| November 16, 2018  | Suspension and Chronic Absenteeism Webinar  | 393 | * Overview of the Dashboard and Accountability System
* Chronic Absenteeism Indicator
* Suspension Rate Indicator
* Methodology for Small Student Populations
 |
| November 26, 2018 | Academic and English Learner Progress Webinar  | 522 | * Overview of the Dashboard and Accountability System
* New Look and Feel of the Dashboard
* Academic Indicator
* Incorporation of Participation Rate into Academic Indicator
* Pair and Share
* English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI)
 |
| November 28, 2018 | Curriculum Instruction and Steering Committee: Science Sub-committee | 100 | * Update on the inclusion of the California Science Test (CAST)
* Overview of new look and feel of the Dashboard
 |
| December 10, 2018  | ESSA Stakeholder Session | 203 | * Identification of Schools for Support and Improvement
 |
| December 11, 2018  | System of Support Webinar  | 332 | * Overview of California’s System of Support
* Technical Assistance Opportunities and Support Provided by Divisions within the CDE
 |
| January 29, 2019  | Dashboard 101 Training Module with the CCEE | 208 | * Overview of the Dashboard
* Connecting the Dashboard to California’s Accountability and Continuous Improvement System
* Dashboard Methodology and Indicators
* Dashboard Analysis
* Connecting Dashboard Outcomes to School and Classroom Practice
* Dashboard Resources
 |
| January 30, 2019  | California Teachers Association  | 85 | * Overview of State and Local Indicators
* Dashboard demonstration
* Purpose of the Dashboard
* How we use this data (LCAP, LEA Identification, School Identification)
* System of Support
 |
| January 31, 2019  | ACSA Middle Grades and Secondary Council Dashboard Presentation  | 85 | * 2018 Dashboard: Changes to Indicators
* Dashboard Live Demonstration
* Revisions Under Consideration for the 2019 Dashboard
 |
| February 15, 2019 | ESSA Implementation Stakeholder Sessions | 202 | * ESSA Updates
* Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) and Additional Targeted Support and Improvement
* CSI Funding Support
* Changes to the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP)
* School Plan for Student Achievement
 |
| February 19, 2019 | LCFF Stakeholder Group | 15 | * CSI Funding Support
* Changes to the self-reflection tool for Priority 3: Parental Involvement and Family Engagement.
* Proposed changes to the 2019 Dashboard
 |
| February 26, 2019  | California Teachers Association  | 61 | * Overview of State and Local Indicators
* Dashboard demonstration
* Purpose of the Dashboard
* How we use this data (LCAP, LEA Identification, School Identification)
* System of Support
 |

1. California Department of Education. (2017). Family Engagement Toolkit: Continuous Improvement through an Equity Lens. Sacramento, CA: Author. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)