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## Subject

Update on the Implementation of the Integrated Local, State, and Federal Accountability and Continuous Improvement System: Update on the Continuing Development Work and Revisions under Consideration for the 2020 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 in December.

This item presents activities and proposed changes for the 2020 Dashboard, including:

* Inclusion of a Student Growth Model
* Addition of new career measures in the College/Career Indicator (CCI)
* The application of a new methodology to determine the performance levels of state indicators in order to stabilize change over time
* Inclusion of Change and Color for the English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI)

In addition, work will begin this spring to incorporate additional metrics into future Dashboards. Specifically, CDE is reviewing:

* The inclusion of additional career measures in the CCI
* Incorporating the results from the California Science Test (CAST)

While no changes to the local indicators are proposed in this item, the 2020–21 proposed budget would allocate $150,000 to convene a workgroup to further develop school climate measures as follows:

* Support the identification of standardized items for school climate surveys for students.
* Evaluate the feasibility of developing standardized items for surveys of parents, teachers, and staff.
* Assess how standardized survey items and other data could strengthen local indicators.

Finally, Attachment 3 provides an update on the outreach activities completed on the Dashboard.

## Recommendation

The CDE recommends that the SBE provide guidance on the revisions under consideration for the 2020 Dashboard and take additional action as deemed necessary and appropriate.

## Brief History of Key Issues

### Student Growth Model

Since March of 2015, when the SBE began work on the development and implementation of a new integrated system, the SBE has expressed an interest in the inclusion of a growth model. At its January 2016 SBE meeting, the SBE requested that the CDE provide information on the options for a student-level growth model. The CDE has engaged the Educational Testing Services (ETS) to assist with this work. ETS conducted simulations and analyses on three growth models:

(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.

1. “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.
2. “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.

The SBE directed the CDE to further explore the Residual Gain model, and the CDE has engaged the California Comprehensive Center (CCC) to facilitate a stakeholder process on the future direction of this work. The stakeholder group is comprised of researchers, advocacy groups, and county and district staff. The group has met several times to advance this work.

### College/Career Indicator

In response to SBE direction to include more career measures in the CCI, the CDE has worked with interested stakeholders including, but not limited to, the Alternative Schools Task Force, the Technical Design Group (TDG), the CCI Work Group, and the Advisory Commission on Special Education to identify additional career measures for potential inclusion in the 2020 Dashboard. These include:

* Workforce Readiness Certificate Program Completion
* Food Handler Certification Program Completion
* Pre-Apprenticeship Program Completion
* State or Federal Job Program Completion
* Transition Program: Classroom-Based Learning Experiences
* Transition Program: Work-Based Learning Experiences

These measures were included in the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALAPDS) during the 2018–19 school year. In early 2020, the CDE will meet with its stakeholder groups, along with the TDG, to determine the appropriateness of these measures for inclusion in the 2020 Dashboard and develop criteria for placement in the Prepared and Approaching Prepared levels. The final recommendations will be made to the SBE at its July 2020 meeting.

### Stability of State Indicators

In November 2017, the SBE determined that, for the Academic Indicator, the distributions for Change were considerably varied from year to year, making it difficult to predict future change results. As a result, it set new cut scores and adopted new five-by-five colored tables for mathematics and English language arts/literacy (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/nov17item03.doc>). The new color designation limits each row to two colors, bringing more stability to the indicator.

The CDE has also analyzed the stability of the indicators for small student populations and found that large swings of data can be triggered by the performance of just a few students. As a result, the SBE has approved the application of a three-by-five color table for four state indicators, where 149 or fewer students are represented. Application of the three-by-five color table 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.

The CDE now has three years of Dashboard data, and in response to feedback from SBE and the field, it will analyze the trend data to evaluate the stability of all indicators for student populations greater than 149. Based on the results of its analysis, and recommendations from the TDG, the CDE may propose alternative methodologies for determining the performance levels for select indicators.

### English Learner Progress Indicator

With the introduction of a new assessment for English Learners in 2018, the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC), the CDE revised its methodology to calculate the ELPI. In July 2018, the SBE adopted the three-year plan for the ELPI where ELPI Status is reported using two years of ELPAC Summative Assessment results on the 2019 Dashboard. The CDE worked with various stakeholder groups, including the ELPI Workgroup, the TDG, and others to further refine the ELPI Status methodology, which was approved by the SBE in November 2019. ELPI Status, based on two years of ELPAC Summative Assessment results, was published on the 2019 California School Dashboard. ELPI Status was used to determine eligibility for differentiated assistance under the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/dec19memoamard01.docx>) and for school assistance determinations under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/feb20memoamard01.docx>). In 2020, the CDE will validate the existing calculations for Status, and calculate Change and Color for ELPI based on three years of ELPAC Summative Assessment data. Attachment 2 provides additional background information on the methodology used to set Status cut scores for the ELPI, which was based on the methodology used for all other state indicators.

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

### Student Growth Model

In a June 2016 Information Memorandum, 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 Information Memorandum that provided an overview of student-level growth models that can be used to communicate Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment results (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-dsib-amard-feb16item01.doc>).

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

Following the SBE discussion in January 2017, the CDE further consulted with ETS, the TDG, the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) Technical Advisory Group (TAG), and the Statewide Assessment Stakeholder Group, regarding potential growth models. Three models were selected for simulation. The discussion and recommendations of the groups were summarized and presented to the SBE in a June 2017 Information Memorandum (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-asb-adad-jun17item03.doc>).

In February 2018, the SBE received an Information Memorandum with the results of the ETS Growth Study, which provided a statistical analysis of three proposed growth models (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-feb18item01.docx>).

In May 2018, the SBE reviewed analyses of the three student-level growth models conducted by ETS and directed the CDE to further explore the Residual Gain model for possible inclusion in the Dashboard (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/may18item02.docx>).

At its July 2018 meeting, the SBE directed the CDE to conduct further analyses on the Residual Growth model, including the impact of future years of assessment data, changes in the model to reduce year-to-year volatility, consideration of additional growth models or options, and an examination of growth models implemented in other states (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/jul18item01.docx>).

The CDE engaged the CCC to conduct this research and facilitate a stakeholder process on the future direction of this work. In February 2019, the SBE received an Information Memorandum, providing a summary of the first Student Growth Model stakeholder meeting (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-feb19item03.docx>).

In April 2019, the SBE received an Information Memorandum, providing a summary of the second growth model stakeholder feedback group meeting (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-apr19item02.docx>).

In November 2019, the SBE received an Information Memorandum, providing a summary of the growth model stakeholder feedback group process (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/nov19memoamard01.docx>).

### College/Career Indicator

In July 2016, the SBE reviewed and approved the CCI as a state indicator to be part of the design of the LCFF evaluation rubrics (which is currently reported through the Dashboard) (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/mt/ms/documents/finalminutes1314jul2016.doc>).

In September 2016, the SBE reviewed and approved Status performance levels for the CCI based on the 2013–14 cohort data file, and approved the re-evaluation of the performance levels in September 2017 once the first year of results of Smarter Balanced assessment were included in the CCI. The SBE also directed the removal of the “Well Prepared” category until additional data on career readiness becomes available (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr16/documents/sep16item01.doc>).

In September 2017, the SBE reviewed a three-year implementation plan for the CCI (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/sep17item02.doc>).

In September 2017, the SBE reviewed a clarification to one of the CCI criterion in the “Approaching Prepared” level within the CCI and the recommended revised Status cut scores based on the Class of 2016. The SBE approved the revised cut scores for Status. The SBE also reviewed the three-year plan timeline for fully building out this indicator to include additional career and college measures (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/sep17item02.doc>).

In February 2018, the SBE received an Information Memorandum that provided an update on the status of the three-year CCI timeline (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-feb18item02.docx>).

In February 2018, the SBE received an Information Memorandum on the implementation of the CCI, including the development of new career measures, such as Leadership/Military Science, in consultation with the CCI Work Group and California Task Force on Alternative Schools, and performance comparisons on the academic measures in the CCI (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-feb18item02.docx>).

In March 2018, the SBE was informed of the revisions made to the Fall 2017 Dashboard, including items that were being prepared for the 2018 Dashboard release, such as the potential use of the following three CCI measures: State Seal of Biliteracy, Golden State Seal Merit Diploma, and Articulated Career Technical Education Courses (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/mar18item01.docx>).

In April 2018, the SBE received an Information Memorandum that provided an overview of the research conducted in the development of the 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>).

In May 2018, the SBE received a presentation from a local educational agency (LEA) on their local use of the CCI (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/may18item02slides.pdf>).

In August 2018, the SBE received an Information Memorandum on the additional measures proposed for the CCI for the 2019 Dashboard
(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-aug18item02.docx>).

In September 2018, the SBE approved the State Seal of Biliteracy and Leadership/Military Science for inclusion in the CCI. In addition, the SBE approved placement criteria for the two new measures (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/sep18item01.docx>).

In November 2018, the SBE approved Status and Change cut scores for the CCI. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/nov18item04.docx>)

In April 2019, the CDE provided an Information Memorandum on the history, implementation, and purpose of the CCI in the Accountability System (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-apr19item01.docx>). This Information Memorandum provided background and preparation for the May 2019 SBE Study Session on the CCI (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr19/documents/may19item01studysession.docx>).

In June 2019, the SBE received an Information Memorandum providing an update on the definitions used in CALPADS and California Special Education Management Information System (CASEMIS) for career measures collected in 2018–19 and 2019–2020 for possible inclusion in the CCI (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-jun19item02.docx>).

### Stability of State Indicators

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>).

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>).

In July 2018, the SBE approved that the methodology also be applied at the student group level for the graduation rate and suspension rate indicators (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/jul18item01.docx>).

At the 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>).

At the March 2019 SBE meeting, the CDE proposed that beginning with the 2019 Dashboard, the three-by-five methodology be applied to the CCI (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr19/documents/mar19item17.docx>). This proposal was made because the CCI is based on the same cohort of students used in the calculations for the Graduation Rate Indicator, which already applies the three-by-five table to small student populations. The proposal receives the support of the TDG.

In July 2019, the SBE approved the application of the three-by-five methodology be applied to the CCI (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr19/documents/jul19item01.docx>).

### English Learner Progress Indicator

In July 2018, the SBE adopted the CDE’s recommendation for the ELPI three year plan (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/jul18item01.docx>).

In November 2018, the SBE recommended that the CDE include ELPI Status into the calculations for eligibility for differentiated assistance under LCFF and for school assistance eligibility under ESSA (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/nov18item04.docx>).

In September 2019, the CDE provided the SBE with an update on the methodology for ELPI Status using two years of ELPAC Summative Assessment data (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr19/documents/sep19item01.docx>).

In November 2019, the SBE approved: (1) the methodology and cut scores for ELPI Status by splitting levels 2 and 3 of the ELPAC Summative Assessment thereby creating six ELPI levels based on the ELPAC, and (2) use the “Very Low” Status to determine LEA and school eligibility for support (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr19/documents/nov19item04.docx>).

## Fiscal Analysis (as appropriate)

The 2019–2020 state budget funds the Proposition 98 Minimum Guarantee at $81.1 billion. This reflects state funding of $55.9 billion and local funding of $25.2 billion, accounting for $11,993 in transitional kindergarten through grade twelve per-pupil funding. Additionally, the state budget prevised $350,000 in one-time Proposition 98 General Funds to begin development of a single sign-on portal and data integration for the Dashboard, the Local Control and Accountability Plan electronic template, and other school site and school district reporting tools (including the School Accountability Report Card).

## Attachment(s)

* Attachment 1: Revisions Under Consideration for the 2020 California School Dashboard (6 Pages)
* Attachment 2: Revisions Under Consideration for the 2020 English Learner Progress Indicator (6 Pages)
* Attachment 3: California School Dashboard Educational Outreach Activities
(7 Pages)

# Attachment 1

## R**evisions under Consideration for the 2020 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 2020 Dashboard:

* Incorporation of a Student Growth Model
* Inclusion of Additional Career Measures in the College/Career Indicator (CCI)
* Inclusion of Change and Color for the English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) (Note: A detailed work plan for this indicator is outlined in Attachment 2.)

### Incorporation of a Student Growth Model

The CDE began exploring the incorporation of a Student Growth Model into the Accountability system in the fall of 2015. The SBE paused the incorporation of a Student Growth Model into the Accountability System in July 2018 following the results of an evaluation study on Student Growth Models by Educational Testing Services (ETS) and subsequent stakeholder outreach on the results. The selected growth model, the residual gain model, showed high volatility in the cross-time school and local educational agency (LEA) results. Additionally, there was confusion concerning what information the growth model should provide about school/LEA achievement.

In 2019, the CDE began a year-long process partnering with the California Comprehensive Center (CCC) to engage stakeholders in conversations and learning opportunities around student-level growth. These discussions clarified the goals that stakeholders wanted the growth model to meet, as well as set expectations for interpretations of the results. As a result, the CDE is recommending to continue working on the residual gain model in 2020. As directed by the SBE during the initial work, student demographics will not be included as a control variable in the growth model.

In a commitment to explore how to best share student assessment growth results, the CDE will spend 2020 investigating how additional modifications to a residual gain model could enhance the validity and cross-time stability through the following methods:

* Adjustments to the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress’s vertical scale
* Additional technical adjustments
* Modifying business rules for the inclusion of student scores in the model

After completing these technical explorations, the CDE will make recommendations to the SBE for consideration.

### Inclusion of Additional Career Measures in the CCI

The CDE is committed to building out the CCI over several years as data becomes available to include additional career measures. During deliberations at the
September 2016 SBE meeting, and in subsequent conversations, there were concerns that the CCI did not contain sufficient career measures. To explore how to provide a better balance of college and career measures in the CCI, the CDE has worked closely with the CCI Work Group, along with the Alternative Schools Task Force (a joint project with the John W. Gardner at Stanford University, which is supported by a grant from the Stuart Foundation) and the Advisory Commission on Special Education (ACSE) to:

* Define the career measures recommended by the CCI Work Group for collection through the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS), and
* Identify career measures specific to Dashboard Alternative Schools Status (DASS) schools.

During the 2018–19 school year, the CDE collected the following career measures in CALPADS, for possible inclusion in the 2020 Dashboard:

* Workforce Readiness Certificate (limited to DASS schools)
* Completion of Food Handler Certification Program (limited to DASS schools)
* Completion of a Pre-Apprenticeship (both DASS and non-DASS schools)
* Completion of a State or Federal Job Program (limited to DASS schools)
* Workability I Work-Based Learning Program Completion (limited to students with an Individualized Education Program [IEP]) Note: Based on stakeholder feedback, this measure will be revised for the 2020 Dashboard.
* Transition Partnership Program and Work-based Learning Completion (limited to students with an IEP) Note: Based on stakeholder feedback, this measure will be revised for the 2020 Dashboard.

As consistent with the adoption process for other CCI measures, the CDE will conduct simulations for each measure under consideration and share its analyses with the Technical Design Group (TDG), along with the CCI Work Group, the Alternative Task Force, the California Practitioners Advisory Group, and ACSE, in order to: (1) determine if the measures are valid and reliable, and (2) set criteria that graduates must meet to be placed in the Prepared or Approaching Prepared CCI levels. Once these determinations are made, the CDE will make its recommendations to the SBE for consideration.

### Stability of State Indicators

In May 2016, the SBE approved the design for the Dashboard that included the establishment of a unique set of cut scores for each indicator, using distributions based on LEA-level data, which includes charter schools, and applying the LEA cut scores to all schools, where appropriate. The methodology used to produce the cut scores considers the LEA level distributions for Status and Change, respectively. This methodology is effective with data that is relatively stable year to year, producing a smooth trend in the data. Trend data show a pattern of gradual change in a certain direction over time—up, down, or sideways. Trend data provides the information to establish cut points that will remain stable over multiple years.

In November 2017, the SBE determined that, for the Academic Indicator, the distributions for Change were considerably varied from year to year, making it difficult to predict future change results. As a result, it set new cut scores and adopted new five-by-five colored grids for mathematics and English language arts/literacy (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/nov17item03.doc>).

In addition, the CDE has determined that for very small student populations, large swings of data can be triggered by the performance of just a few students. As a result, the CDE has recommended, and the SBE has approved, the application of a three-by-five color table for several state indicators, including:

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

Application of the three-by-five color table 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.

In recent years, the CDE has received feedback from various stakeholders on the stability of the state indicators for large student populations as well (i.e., 150 or more students). In addition, the SBE has expressed interest in examining the stability of all of the state indicators. The CDE is reviewing the data to determine whether large swings in results are occurring from year to year. Based on the results of its analysis, it will work with the TDG to consider alternative methodologies, such as:

* Revising the five-by-five grids for each state indicator to limit each row to two colors (as currently applied for the Academic Indicator) and eliminate the three-by-five grids for all indicators.
* Moving to the use of the three-by-five grids for all population sizes, including the *n-*size has 149 or fewer students.

The CDE will then bring any recommendations to the SBE for consideration.

## California Practitioners Advisory Group

CDE presented the 2020 Dashboard work plan to the California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG) on February 19, 2020, and it was well-received by CPAG members. They were pleased to learn that the work on the growth model was moving forward and that the new career measures were available for possible inclusion in the CCI.

## Pending Budget Proposals

The Governor’s proposed 2020–21 budget includes funding for the following activities, which, if approved, would be considered for future Dashboard releases:

### Workgroup for Development of School Climate Measures

The sum of $150,000 is proposed for the CDE to contract with a local educational agency (LEA) to support the following work:

* Identify standardized items for school climate surveys for students,
* Evaluate the feasibility of developing standardized items for surveys of parents, teachers, and staff
* Assess how standardized survey items and other data could strengthen local indicators

### Special Education Alternative Pathways to a Diploma Workgroup

The sum of $250,000 is proposed for the Superintendent of Public Instruction to contract with an LEA to convene a work group to examine and propose alternate pathways to a high school diploma for students with disabilities. The work group would develop recommendations on the following:

* Studying existing and developing new alternative pathways for students with disabilities to access the core curriculum in order to satisfy the requirements for a high school diploma
* Developing an alternate diploma aligned to the state’s alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities

## Projected Work beyond 2020 Dashboard

The CDE is considering additional revisions to the Dashboard beyond the 2020 timeline. Specifically, the CDE is reviewing:

* Inclusion of additional career measures in the CCI
* Incorporation of results from the California Science Test (CAST)

### Inclusion of Additional Career Measures in the CCI

#### Collection of student test data from the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVB)

The CDE is exploring the possibility of collecting student ASVB test results, which is a multi-aptitude test and career exploration program developed and maintained by the Department of Defense and administered to high school students nationwide. While the composite score is used to determine eligibility to enlist in the U.S. Army, students also receive sub scores in three areas—Verbal Skills, Math Skills, Science and Technical Skills—which can be used to match student strengths to specific career options. These scores could potentially be used to determine whether students were career ready.

#### **Inclusion of the State Seal of Civic Engagement in the College/Career Indicator**

As shared with the SBE in an August 2019 Information Memorandum, the CDE is examining the inclusion of the State Seal of Civic Engagement (SSCE) as a potential career measure in the CCI (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-branch-eeed-aug19item02.docx>).

California *Education Code* sections 51470–51474 direct the State Superintendent of Public Instruction (SSPI) to develop, and the SBE to adopt, a set of criteria for awarding the SSCE, a seal to be awarded to students who have demonstrated excellence in civics education and participation and an understanding of the United States Constitution and the democratic system of government. The statute requires the SSPI to recommend the criteria to the SBE by January 1, 2020, and that the SBE take final action on the criteria by January 31, 2021.

The CDE plans to convene a policy and technical group to explore possible criteria for a CCI-eligible SSCE. (These criteria were outlined in the August 2019 Information Memorandum.) The first meeting of this workgroup is planned for spring 2020.

### Reporting of California Science Test Results

The CAST is administered every year to students in grades five and eight and one time during high school (i.e., in grade ten, eleven, or twelve). The CAST was field-tested in 2017–18, and the first operational test was administered in 2018–19. Since students in grades ten or eleven who tested in 2017–18 were not required to retest the following year, results from the first operational year (2018–19) did not capture the performance of all high school students. In addition, the 2017–18 field test and the 2018–19 operational test are not comparable. In order to ensure the validity and reliability of test results, accountability judgments will need to be made on the basis of the results of an entire class of students. Students who were in grade 10 in 2018–19 will be the first cohort for which status can be calculated. The first year Status can be calculated is 2020-21. Therefore, the CDE anticipates that a CAST performance color would be reported for the first time on the 2022 Dashboard.

Another consideration for incorporating the CAST in the Dashboard is that schools need sufficient time to adopt and implement the new science instructional materials, which are based on the California Next Generation Science Standards (CA NGSS). The SBE adopted these new instructional materials in November 2018. As a result, many students in the first CAST cohort did not have the benefit of receiving instruction based on the new materials before taking the CAST.

Additionally, the CDE plans to begin conversations with the U.S. Department of Education (ED) on the inclusion of a new state indicator in California’s Every Student Succeeds Act Consolidated State Plan. ED’s approval of the accountability system is contingent on maintaining a balance between academic and non-academic indicators. It is important to verify with ED that the inclusion of CAST will not generate an imbalance of indicators. Lastly, the CDE staff will review with TDG and stakeholder groups the various methodologies for incorporating the CAST into the Dashboard and representing multiple years of high school scores in the accountability system.

# Attachment 2

## Revisions Under Consideration for the 2020 English Learner Progress Indicator

### Inclusion of Change and Color for the English Learner Progress Indicator

In 2018, California transitioned from the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) to the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC). The English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) is unique in that it measures progress towards English proficiency and two years of data are required to calculate Status for this indicator on the California School Dashboard (Dashboard). The State Board of Education (SBE) approved a three-year plan for the ELPI in July 2018. With one year of data available in 2018, the California Department of Education (CDE) reported only the percentage of students in each of the four ELPAC performance categories on the 2018 Dashboard. With two years of data available in 2019, the CDE calculated Status for the ELPI, and reported Status on the 2019 Dashboard.

In 2020, with three years of ELPAC Summative Assessment data available, the CDE will validate the existing calculations for Status and calculate Change, and determine a Performance Color for all schools and districts for inclusion in the 2020 Dashboard. The CDE will meet with the ELPI Workgroup, Technical Design Group (TDG), California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG) and other stakeholders to review the analyses of the 2020 ELPAC Summative Assessment results to propose cut scores for Change.

With this third year of data, the CDE will also validate the current Status cut scores. Based on the data and feedback from the ELPI Workgroup and the TDG the CDE will then present recommendations for cut scores at the November 2020 SBE meeting.

Table 1 describes the CDE’s month-by-month workplan for the ELPI Indicator for 2020:

**Table 1: CDE Month-by-Month Workplan for ELPI Indicator in 2020**

| **Date** | **Activities** |
| --- | --- |
| February 2020 | Update on the ELPI Indicator at the CPAG meeting and the Bilingual Coordinators Network Meeting |
| March 2020 | Provide updates to SBE for ELPI Workplan; Update on the ELPI Indicator to the Regional Assessment Network (RAN)  |
| April 2020 | Attend the California Association of Bilingual Educators (CABE) Annual Conference and present two sessions, “Update on the English Learner Progress Indicator and School Dashboard” and "Continuous Improvement for English Learners: Establishing Systems of Support with EL Typologies, EL Roadmap, and Data Systems" |
| May 2020 | Provide update to the Bilingual Coordinators Network Meeting |
| June 2020 | Initial ELPAC Summative Assessments results provided to CDE; CDE will meet with TDG to discuss data simulations based on ELPAC data and the ELPI Workgroup Meeting; The CDE will present to the CPAG related to updates on the ELPI |
| July 2020 | CDE conducts additional simulations on ELPAC data per TDG feedback |
| August 2020 | Final ELPAC Summative Assessments results provided to CDE; Present additional simulations to the TDG |
| September 2020 | Discuss ongoing work with the Bilingual Coordinators Network  |
| October 2020 | Present findings and solicit recommendations from the ELPI Workgroup and CPAG  |
| November 2020 | SBE meeting, make recommendations for adoption of cut scores and color |
| December 2020 | 2020 Dashboard release, including ELPI Status, Change, and Color |

### Methodology for Setting Status Level Cut Scores on the California School Dashboard

At the January 2020 SBE meeting, some members of the public raised concerns about the validity of the cut scores adopted by the SBE for the ELPI in November 2019. Specifically, there are concerns that the adopted cut scores led to an under identification of local educational agencies for differentiated assistance. To address these concerns, the remainder of this Attachment describes the basis for the November 2019 action, the methodology for districts eligible for differentiated assistance and an overview of the districts for 2019.

In recommending the ELPI cut scores for Status in 2019, the CDE relied on the cut score methodology the SBE adopted for the new accountability system at their May 2016 meeting. This methodology was developed with extensive stakeholder input as well as technical input from the TDG. Since the initial release of the Dashboard, the CDE has utilized this approved methodology for all state indicators subsequently added (e.g., the College/Career Indicator). In recommending this methodology to the SBE at their May 2016 meeting, the CDE addressed a concern expressed in prior SBE discussions about the possibility of over identifying LEAs, schools, or students’ groups in the Very Low Status level across the different state indicators. One set of concerns was based on past experience with Program Improvement under the No Child Left Behind legislation when nearly all Title I schools were eventually identified for Program Improvement. This was the result of Program Improvement determinations being made on aspirational performance. In approving the cut score methodology that is based on actual performance across the state, the SBE aimed to ensure that those LEAs that needed the most support would be eligible to receive it.

The five Status levels were established for **each state indicator** through the following process (Note this information can be found on page 18 of the 2019 Dashboard Technical Guide at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/cm/documents/dashboardguide19.pdf>):

1. The data used for each indicator were collected for all local educational agencies (LEAs) and charter schools statewide.
2. These results were ordered from highest to lowest.
3. Four cut scores were established based on the percentile distributions to create five Status levels.

Applying the same SBE approved methodology used to determine the Status cut scores for all the other state indicators, Table 2 displays the number and percentage of LEAs at each ELPI Status level and Table 3 provides the number and percentages of schools at each ELPI Status level.

**Table 2: LEA ELPI Status Distribution (Includes Charter Schools)**

| **Status Level** | **Number of LEAs** | **Percentage of LEAs** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Very Low | 118 | 9.0% |
| Low | 309 | 23.7% |
| Medium | 546 | 41.8% |
| High | 247 | 18.9% |
| Very High | 85 | 6.5% |

**Table 3: Schools ELPI Status Distribution (Excludes Charter Schools)**

| **Status Level** | **Number of Schools** | **Percentage of Schools** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Very Low | 585 | 9.8% |
| Low | 1,567 | 26.2% |
| Medium | 2,112 | 35.3% |
| High | 1,190 | 19.9% |
| Very High | 527 | 8.8% |

Using these cut scores, we find that this distribution represents a consistent distribution of LEAs in the different ELPI Status Levels.

Similarly, the CDE reported Status **only** for the College/Career Indicator on the 2017 Dashboard. The CDE applied the same methodology for the CCI Status on the 2017 Dashboard as was used for ELPI Status on the 2019 Dashboard. Table 4 displays the number and percentage of LEAs at each CCI Status level, and Table 5 provides the number and percentages of schools at each CCI Status level.

**Table 4: LEA CCI Status Distribution (Includes Charter Schools)**

| **Status Level** | **Number of LEAs** | **Percentage of LEAs** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Very Low | 63 | 9.5% |
| Low | 177 | 26.7% |
| Medium | 252 | 38.0% |
| High | 112 | 16.9% |
| Very High | 60 | 9.0% |

**Table 5: Schools CCI Status Distribution (Excludes Charter Schools)**

| **Status Level** | **Number of Schools** | **Percentage of Schools** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Very Low | 65 | 5.9% |
| Low | 299 | 27.1% |
| Medium | 467 | 42.3% |
| High | 177 | 16.0% |
| Very High | 97 | 8.8% |

Using these Status cut scores, we find that this distribution represents a consistent distribution of LEAs and schools across the different CCI Status Levels.

The CDE presented the results of these data simulations to the ELPI Workgroup and the TDG, who supported the distributions shown in Tables 2 and 3. Additionally, the CDE presented the proposed ELPI Status cut scores to the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) and Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Stakeholder Groups, State and Federal Program Directors, the Bilingual Coordinators Network (BCN) and CPAG who also provided feedback on the proposed methodology. In November 2019, the SBE subsequently approved the ELPI Status cut scores. It is important to note, however, that it was not possible to conduct data simulations for differentiated assistance for the SBE to review the impact of adding ELPI to the 2019 Dashboard. This is due to the requirement that data from all of the Dashboard indicators must be completed to run the simulations for differentiated assistance.

For the 2019 Dashboard, districts that received a “Very Low” Status on ELPI, **were not guaranteed eligibility for differentiated assistance** as it is one of three measures in LCFF State Priority area 4 (English language arts, mathematics, and the ELPI), and a student group must meet the criteria in at least two priority areas for LEAs to be eligible for support. Table 6 shows the performance of English learners in “Amethyst Unified School District” and represents an example where a “Very Low” ELPI Status would not make a district eligible for differentiated assistance.

**Table 6: Differentiated Assistance Criteria for “Amethyst Unified School District” based on English Learner Performance on 2019 California School Dashboard**

| LCFF State Priority Area | State Indicator | 2019 Dashboard |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority 4** | **English Language Arts/Literacy (ELA)** | **Red** |
| **Priority 4** | **Mathematics** | **Red** |
| **Priority 4** | **ELPI Status** | **Very Low** |
| Priority 5 | Chronic Absenteeism | Green |
| Priority 5 | Graduation Rate | Yellow |
| Priority 6 | Suspension Rate | Green |
| Priority 8  | College/Career Indicator (CCI) | Orange |
| Priority 1, 2, 3, 6, & 7 | Local Indicators | Met |

In the case of “Amethyst Unified School District”, while all three of the indicators in LCFF State Priority Area 4 (English Language Arts, Mathematics, and ELPI) are either Red or “Very Low” Status, it is the only LCFF State Priority Area in the Red or “Very Low” Status category. As a district can only be eligible for differentiated assistance **if two or more** LCFF State Priority Areas meet these criteria, “Amethyst Unified School District” would not be eligible for differentiated assistance based on the information provided in Table 6.

Conversely, a “Very Low” ELPI Status does contribute to the eligibility for differentiated assistance for some districts. Using the 2019 Dashboard results, ELPI “Very Low” Status, 13 districts are eligible for differentiated assistance based on results for English learners. An additional 44 districts were identified as eligible for differentiated assistance based upon the performance of English learners in different state indicators, for a total of 57 districts being eligible based on English learner performance.

See Table 7 below illustrating an example of how “Very Low” ELPI Status contributes to “Crystal Unified School District’s” eligibility for differentiated assistance based on the performance of English learners:

**Table 7: Differentiated Assistance Criteria for “Crystal Unified School District” based on English Learner Performance on 2019 California School Dashboard**

| LCFF State Priority Area | State Indicator | 2019 Dashboard |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Priority 4 | English Language Arts/Literacy (ELA) | Orange |
| Priority 4 | Mathematics | Yellow |
| **Priority 4** | **ELPI Status** | **Very Low** |
| **Priority 5** | **Chronic Absenteeism** | **Red** |
| Priority 5 | Graduation Rate | Yellow |
| Priority 6 | Suspension Rate | Green |
| Priority 8  | College/Career Indicator (CCI) | Orange |
| Priority 1, 2, 3, 6, & 7 | Local Indicators | Met |

As illustrated in Table 7 above, “Very Low” Status on the ELPI would in fact make “Crystal Unified School District” eligible for differentiated assistance. This is because both LCFF State Priority Areas 4 and 5 have values of a Red on Chronic Absenteeism, which is in Priority Area 5, and “Very Low” Status for ELPI in LCFF State Priority Area 4 and these criteria must be met in two or more LCFF State Priority Areas in order to be eligible for differentiated assistance.

Note that with the inclusion of “Change” and the application of the five-by-five table for ELPI in 2020, the distribution of the ELPI indicator for schools and LEAs will change substantially, as a “decreased significantly” Change value in a state indicator can often lead to the assignment of the Red color on the Dashboard. As such, it is important to note that “Change” plays a significant role in how state indicators are calculated and reported on the Dashboard.

# Attachment 3

## California School Dashboard Educational Outreach Activities

### Table 1.

**California Department of Education Policy Work Group Meetings**

| **Date** | **Title** | **Estimated Number of Attendees** | **Topics** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| October 23, 2019 | English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) Workgroup | 20 | * ELPI Status Used in Distinguished Schools
* ELPI Dashboard Display
* Summary of English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) Results
* Splitting ELPAC Levels 2 and 3
* Setting ELPI Status Cut Scores
 |
| January 24, 2020 | Statewide Alternative Education Task Force | 20 | * Participation Rate for Dashboard Alternative School Status (DASS) Schools
 |
| February 18, 2020 | Alternative Education Task Force Subcommittee | 5 | * Participation Rate for DASS Schools
* Collee/Career Indicator: New Career Measures
* DASS Graduation Rate
 |
| February 12, 2020 | Advisory Commission on Special Education (ACSE) | 105 | * Proposed Work Plan for the 2020 Dashboard
 |
| February 19, 2020 | California Practitioners Advisory Group | 136 | * Accountability 101
* Proposed Work Plan for the 2020 Dashboard
 |

### Table 2.

**In-person Meetings/Conferences**

| **Date** | **Title** | **Estimated Number of Attendees** | **Topics** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| October 24, 2019 | San Bernardino Counselors Network Conference | 60 | * Update on the College/Career Indicator (CCI): New Career Measures
 |
| October 25, 2019 | Capital Regional Assessment Network  | 40 | * Updates to the 2019 California School Dashboard (Dashboard)
 |
| October 30, 2019 | Assessment Stakeholder Meeting | 20 | * Dashboard Mobile App
* Changes to the 2019 Dashboard
* 2019 Dashboard Rollout
* 2020 Participation Rate
 |
| November 5, 2019 | Shanghai Education Commission | 17 | * Overview of the Dashboard
 |
| November 6, 2019 | Curriculum and Instruction Steering Committee, Accountability Sub-Committee | 10 | * Update on November 2019 State Board of Education meeting
* Update on Local Indicators
* 2019 Dashboard Rollout
 |
| November 6, 2019 | Association of California School Administrators (ACSA) | 25 | * Updates for the 2019 Dashboard
* New Career Measures Collected in 2018–19
* New Career Measures Proposed for Collection in 2020–21
 |
| November 7, 2019 | Independent Study Conference | 120 | * Changes to the 2019 Dashboard
* Upcoming Changes to the 2020 Dashboard
* Eligibility Criteria for Schools to Receive Support under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).
 |
| November 8, 2019 | Student Programs and Services Steering Committee | 45 | * Updates for the 2019 Dashboard
* New Career Measures Collected in 2018–19
* New Career Measures Proposed for Collection in 2020–21
 |
| November 8, 2019 | Bilingual Coordinators Network | 70 | * Update on ELPI
* 2019 Dashboard Rollout and Resources
 |
| November 13, 2019 | Curriculum and Instruction Steering Committee | 120 | * Updates and Rollout for the 2019 Dashboard
 |
| November 13, 2019 | [Alternative Accountability Policy Forum](https://www.alternativeaccountabilityforum.org/news/welcome-to-the-2019-alternative-accountability-policy-forum) | 70 | * Elements of DASS Dashboard
* Students Included in the Metrics
* Suggestions for Better Reporting and Integrating of DASS metrics in the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) and Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) local indicators
* How CCI Has Been Adapted for Alternative Schools
* How to Submit College Credit-Bearing Courses
* How New CASEMIS Is Integrated in CALPADS;
* What Does CalSAAS Mean for DASS Schools
* What We’ve Learned about the New One Year Graduation Rate
* What Changes to the Dashboard Are on the Horizon
 |
| November 18, 2019 | California Educational Research Association (CERA) | 80 | GIS and the Geo-Hub |
| November 19, 2019 | CERA | 50 | Debunking Myths, Legends and Tall Tales about the California School Dashboard |
| November 19, 2019 | CERA | 40 | LEA Eligibility for LCFF Assistance, Office Hours |
| November 19, 2019 | CERA | 15 | Dashboard, Office Hours |
| November 19, 2019 | CERA | 20 | CCI: Accountability and Improvement |
| November 19, 2019 | CERA | 50 | Connecting Your Dashboard and CALPADS Data: Like Two Peas in a Pod |
| January 6, 2020 | Briefing to California State Legislative Staff on the Dashboard  | 25 | * Introduction and Overview of the Dashboard
* 2019 Dashboard Results and Eligibility of Districts in Differentiated Assistance
 |
| January 8, 2020 | Curriculum and Instruction Steering Committee, Accountability Sub-Committee | 10 | * Update on the 2019 Dashboard Rollout
* Rollout of Data file of Schools Eligible for Assistance
* Workplan for 2020 Dashboard
 |
| January 13, 2020 | Foster Youth Education Task Force Meeting | 30 | * LCFF definition of foster youth
* Weekly Foster youth match process between the CDE and the California Department of Social Services (CDSS)
* 2018-19 educational outcomes, by county, for foster youth
* How to access and monitor outcomes for foster youth on the Dashboard and DataQuest
* Differences between DataQuest and the Dashboard
 |
| January 14, 2020 | Regional Assessment Network (RAN) | 30 | * Growth Model
* New CCI measures
* District of Residence for All State Indicators
* New Federal Requirements for Participation Rate
 |
| January 16, 2020 | Special Education Administrators of County Offices | 45 | * Overview of the 2019 Dashboard
* Considerations for the 2020 Dashboard related to students with disabilities
 |
| January 16, 2020 | Middle Grades Elementary Council Meeting | 20 | * What’s New with the 2019 Dashboard
* Debunking Dashboard Myths
 |
| January 17, 2020 | Equity Conference 2020 - Educational Access and Outcomes for Foster Youth | 25 | * Foster youth definition under LCFF
* Foster match process
* Educational outcomes for foster youth on the Dashboard and DataQuest
* CDE multi-disciplinary approach and team focus on supporting the needs of foster youth in CA schools
* Overview of Assembly Bill 2083 and the interagency state team
* How to access educational outcomes for foster youth on DataQuest and the Dashboard
 |
| January 20, 2020 | 2020 International School Choice and Reform Conference | 10 | * Overview of California’s Accountability System
* Charter School Eligibility Criteria for LCFF Support
* Charter School Eligibility Criteria for Support and Assistance for Schools under ESSA
 |
| January 28, 2020 | California Association of Administrators of State and Federal Education Programs (CASSFEP) Conference | 250 | * Purpose and Use of the Dashboard
* What’s New with the Dashboard
	+ New Translations
	+ State Indicators Revisions
* Debunking Dashboard Myths
 |
| January 31, 2020 | Los Angeles Unified School District Continuous Improvement Data Committee | 20 | * Overview of the Dashboard
* Deep dive into the Academic Indicator
 |
| January 31, 2020 | Juvenile Court, Community, and Alternative Schools Administrators (JCCASAC) Presentation | 20 | * DASS Application Renewal Reminder
* Exploring New Modifications for the Academic Indicator
* CCI: New Career Measures
* District of Residence Rule: Expanding to All State Indicators
* CALPADS Reminders
 |
| February 11, 2020 | Innovating for Equity Summit: Updates to the English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) on the California School Dashboard | 125 | * Purpose and Use of the Dashboard
* Updates on the 2019 Dashboard
* Use of the ELPI in Differentiated Assistance and School Eligibility
* Resources
 |
| February 12, 2020 | Innovating for Equity Summit: What You Need to Know About the California School Dashboard | 75 | * Purpose and Use of the Dashboard
* What’s New with the Dashboard
	+ New Translations
	+ State Indicators Revisions
* Debunking Dashboard Myths
* Resources
 |
| February 20, 2020 | LCFF Stakeholder Office Hours | 2 | * Responded to participant questions regarding materials presented at the February 2020 CPAG meeting
 |
| February 21, 2020 | State and Federal Program Directors | 100 | * Proposed Work Plan for the 2020 Dashboard
 |

### Table 3.

**Webinars**

| **Date** | **Title** | **Estimated Number of Attendees** | **Topics** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| October 29, 2019 | 2019 Dashboard Webinar Series: Introduction to the 2019 Dashboard | 332 | * Overview of the Dashboard and Accountability System
* Navigating the 2019 Dashboard
* Preview and Webinar Schedule for 2019 Dashboard
* Resources on the Dashboard
 |
| October 30, 2020 | Charter School Identification Under LCFF | 238 | * Criteria for identification of charter schools under LCFF
 |
| November 4, 2019 | 2019 Dashboard Webinar Series: Suspension and Chronic Absenteeism Indicators | 480 | * Suspension Rate Indicator
* Chronic Absenteeism Indicator
 |
| November 12, 2019 | 2019 Dashboard Webinar Series: Graduation Rate and College/Career Indicators | 551 | * Graduation Rate Indicator
* Combined Four- and Five-Year Graduation Rate
* Graduation Rate for Schools with DASS
* New Threshold for the Graduation Rate
* CCI
 |
| November 18, 2019 | 2019 Dashboard Webinar Series: Academic and English Learner Progress Indicators | 465 | * Academic Indicator
* Incorporation of Participation Rate
* Separate cut scores for alternative schools
* Pair and Share
* District of Residence Rule
* English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI)
 |