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# California State Board of Education November 2018 Agenda Item #04

## Subject

Update on the Implementation of the Integrated Local, State, and Federal Accountability and Continuous Improvement System: Action to Finalize the State and Local Indicators, Performance Standards, and Eligibility Criteria for Differentiated Assistance for Local Educational Agencies for the 2018 California School Dashboard.

## Type of Action

Action, Information

## Summary of the Issue(s)

This is a standing item for the State Board of Education (SBE) to receive updates on the ongoing implementation of the California School Dashboard (Dashboard). Consistent with the annual review process for the Dashboard in which the California Department of Education (CDE) provides an update at the March SBE meeting on the proposed revisions, the November item completes the incorporation of the final technical revisions prior to the public release in early December.

The CDE is proposing that the SBE take action on the following issues:

* Adopting cut points to prepare for the inclusion of two new indicators for the 2018 Dashboard—the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator (Attachment 1) and College/Career Indicator (CCI) (Attachment 4)—as well as for the inclusion of grade 11 Smarter Balanced Assessment results in the Academic Indicator (Attachment 5).
* Refining the Status cut scores for the Graduation Rate Indicator to take into consideration modifications made to the calculations of the graduation rate and the incorporation of alternative schools into local educational agency (LEA) performance for the 2018 Dashboard (Attachment 2).
* Refining the criterion for students earning the special education certificate of completion to be included in the one-year graduation rate for alternative schools (Attachment 3).
* Updating the criteria for differentiated assistance under the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) to incorporate the new local indicator for Access to a Broad Course of Study (LCFF Priority 7) (Attachment 6).
* Making minor technical revisions to the self-reflection tool for the local indicator for Implementation of State Academic Standards (LCFF Priority 2) (Attachment 7).

Additionally, this item provides an update on the development and anticipated release of the 2018 California School Dashboard in December 2018 and actions anticipated for the 2019 and 2020 Dashboards (Attachments 8 and 9).

## Recommendation

The CDE recommends that the SBE approve: (1) Status and Change cut scores and the five-by-five grid for the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator and the application of the three-by-five grid for LEAs, schools, and student groups with fewer than 150 students, (2) revised Status cut scores for the Graduation Rate Indicator, (3) modification of the criteria to count students earning the special education certificate of completion as graduates for purposes of the alternative school graduation rate, (4) Change cut scores and the five-by-five grid for the CCI, (5) Status and Change cut scores and five-by-five grid for the high school Academic Indicator, (6) updating of the criteria for identifying local educational agencies for differentiated assistance under the Local Control Funding Formula to incorporate the new local indicator for Access to a Broad Course of Study, and (7) technical revisions to the local indicator self-reflection tool for Implementation of Academic Standards.

## Brief History of Key Issues

The CDE released the first operational version of the Dashboard ([https://www.caschooldashboard.org/](https://www.caschooldashboard.org/#/Home)) on December 7, 2018. This Dashboard provides parents and educators with meaningful information on school and district progress so that they can participate in decisions to improve student learning. With the upcoming release of the 2018 Dashboard in early December, a new redesigned web site will be released that responds to feedback from parents, educators, and stakeholders received since the initial field test (the Spring 2017 Dashboard) was released in March 2017. A one-page flyer, “The Dashboard has a New Look” outlining these changes is now available on the CDE Accountability Model & School Dashboard web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/cm/documents/dashboardnewlook.pdf>. The 2018 Dashboard will also reflect SBE actions taken over the last several meetings and at the November 2018 meeting, as described in the Summary of Key Issues section above.

The CDE regularly obtains feedback from stakeholder groups on the ongoing development of the Dashboard. During the September 2018 SBE meeting presentation, the CDE shared with members the short timeframe for the CDE to process and analyze the data certified by LEAs in the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) to formulate recommended cut scores for the Dashboard indicators. To ensure the recommendations are valid and reliable, the CDE dual processes all data simulations and provides recommended cut scores for consideration by the CDE’s technical advisory group, the Technical Design Group (TDG). Due to this compressed timeframe, the CDE was not able to obtain feedback on the attachments related to the proposed cut scores for the indicators. As detailed in Attachment 8, from September through mid-October, the CDE presented at various statewide, regional, and local conferences/meetings with approximately 1,900 attendees providing information on the proposed revisions to the state indicators for the 2018 Dashboard and informing attendees that the SBE would adopt cut points for multiple state indicators at the November 2018 meeting. In addition, the CDE will present the information in this item to the California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG) on October 31, 2018, and verbally present their feedback and any public speakers’ feedback at the November SBE meeting.

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

The SBE has received an update on the development and implementation of the new accountability system at every meeting since 2015. The following items provide links to the related agenda and Information Memoranda on measures being considered at the November SBE 2018 meeting.

### 2018 California School Dashboard

The SBE received updates to the CDE’s timeline for the development of the 2018 Dashboard as follows:

In the March 2018, the SBE reviewed the ongoing development work and revisions under consideration for the 2018 Dashboard. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/mar18item01.docx>)

In March 2018, the SBE received an Information Memorandum outlining the timeline of SBE Agenda Items and Information Memoranda Regarding the Dashboard. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-mar18item01.docx>)

In August 2018, the SBE received an Information Memorandum detailing an overview of the topics for consideration at the September and November 2018 SBE meetings. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-mar18item01.docx>)

In October 2018, the SBE received an Information Memorandum detailing the Agenda Items and Information Memoranda planned for consideration between November 2018 and November 2020 related to the implementation of the Dashboard. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-oct18item02.docx>

### Chronic Absenteeism

In November 2014, the SBE adopted the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) template, which included the formula for calculating the Chronic Absenteeism rate. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr14/documents/nov14item14.doc>)

In May 2016, the SBE adopted Chronic Absenteeism as a state indicator. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr16/documents/may16item02revised.doc>)

At the September 2017 SBE meeting, the CDE provided an update on the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator and the collection of chronic absenteeism data. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/sep17item02.doc>)

At the November 2017 SBE meeting, the CDE provided extensive background on the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator and requested that the SBE: (1) include information in the Fall 2017 Dashboard to redirect users to the Chronic Absenteeism reports on DataQuest; (2) direct CDE staff to develop a recommendation for the March 2018 SBE meeting on proposed Status cut scores that will subsequently be used to update the Fall 2017 Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism Indicator; and (3) direct CDE staff to develop a recommendation for the September or November 2018 SBE meeting on proposed Change cut scores. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/nov17item03.doc>)

In March 2018, the SBE was provided an update on proposed changes to the Dashboard for the 2018 Dashboard release, including an update on the development of the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/mar18item01.docx>)

In August 2018, the SBE received an Information Memorandum on the proposed methodology for calculating the chronic absenteeism rate. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-aug18item02.docx>)

In September 2018, the SBE approved the methodology for calculating the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/sep18item01.docx>)

### Graduation Rate Indicator

In September 2016, the SBE approved Status and Change cut scores for the Graduation Rate Indicator, based on the four-year graduation cohort. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr16/documents/sep16item01.doc>)

In March 2018, the SBE reviewed proposed revisions for the 2018 Dashboard, including the incorporation of modified methods for schools with Dashboard Alternative School Status. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/mar18item01.docx>)

In May 2018, the SBE approved methodology for calculating the one-year graduation rate. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/may18item02.docx>)

In June 2018, the SBE received an Information Memorandum on the revisions made to the calculation of the four-year cohort graduation rate to address audit findings from the U.S. Department of Education (ED) Office of Inspector General (OIG). (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-jun18item02.docx>)

In August 2018, the SBE received an Information Memorandum on the proposed Status and Change Cut scores for the one-year graduation rate for DASS schools.   
(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-aug18item02.docx>)

In September 2018, the SBE approved Status and Change cut scores for the one-year graduation rate for DASS schools. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/sep18item01.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 categories for the CCI based on the 2013–14 cohort data file, and approved the re-evaluation of the performance categories 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 become 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 an 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.   
(<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>)

### Grade Eleven Academic Indicator

At the July 2016 SBE meeting, the SBE approved the CCI, which uses grade eleven assessment results, as a state indicator. Additionally, the SBE approved the removal of the grade eleven assessment results from the Academic Indicator. Therefore, the Academic Indicator was based only on the assessment results for students in grades three through eight. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr16/documents/jul16item02.doc>)

In September 2016, the SBE directed CDE staff to develop recommended cut scores and performance categories for the ELA and mathematics assessments in grades three through eight. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr16/documents/sep16item01.doc>)

In January 2017, the SBE adopted performance standards for the Academic Indicator, based on a methodology that calculates the average distance between students’ scale scores on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for English language arts/literacy (ELA) and mathematics and the lowest possible score for the Standard Met Achievement Level (Level 3). (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/jan17item02.doc> and <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/jan17item02a1addendum.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 April 2018, the SBE approved the inclusion of Grade 11 Smarter Balanced Summative Results for English language arts/literacy (ELA) and mathematics in the Academic Indicator, based on feedback received from the U.S. Department of Education (ED) on California’s Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Plan. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/apr18item01.docx>)

### Local Indicator for Access to a Broad Course of Study

In July 2016, the SBE approved the CCI as a state indicator and included it under two state priority areas: Access to a Broad Course of Study (LCFF Priority 7) and Outcomes in a Broad Course of Study (LCFF Priority 8) to ensure that there would be at least one performance standard for each LCFF priority area, as required by state law. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/mt/ms/documents/finalminutes1314jul2016.doc>)

In November 2017, the SBE approved the adoption of a local indicator for Access to a Broad Course of Study.

(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/nov17item03rev.doc>)

In March 2018, the SBE approved the standard and proposed self-reflection tool for LEAs to determine progress on the local performance indicator for Access to a Broad Course of Study.

(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/mar18item01.docx>)

### Self- Reflection Tool for the Local Indicator for Implementation of State Academic Standards

In January 2017, the SBE approved the self-reflection tool for the local indicator for Implementation of State Academic Standards (LCFF Priority 2). (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/jan17item02a3addendum.doc>)

## Fiscal Analysis (as appropriate)

The 2018–19 state budget funds the Proposition 98 Minimum Guarantee at $78.4 billion. The budget package fully funds the LCFF two years ahead of the estimated time frame for implementation. Over the past six years of LCFF implementation, the state has dedicated nearly $21 billion of increased Proposition 98 resources to the LCFF; this includes $3.6 billion provided in the 2018–19 state budget.

## Attachment(s)

* Attachment 1: Proposed Status and Change Cut Scores and Five-by-Five Grid for the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator (11 Pages)
* Attachment 2: Revised Status Cut Scores for the Graduation Rate Indicator  
  (9 Pages)
* Attachment 3: Adjustment to the Graduation Rate Methodology for Schools with Dashboard Alternative School Status (2 Pages)
* Attachment 4: Proposed Change Cut Scores and Five-by-Five Grid for the College/Career Indicator (7 Pages)
* Attachment 5: Proposed Status and Change Cut Scores and Five-by-Five Grid for the High School Academic Indicator (24 Pages)
* Attachment 6: Proposed Update of the Differentiated Assistance Criteria for Access to a Broad Course of Study (3 Pages)
* Attachment 7: Proposed Technical Revision to the Self-Reflection Tool for the Local Indicator for Implementation of State Academic Standards (2 Pages)
* Attachment 8: California School Dashboard Educational Outreach Activities  
  (10 Pages)
* Attachment 9: 2018–20 Timeline of Activities Relating to the Implementation of California’s Accountability System (4 Pages)

# Attachment 1

## Proposed Status and Change Cut Scores for the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator

### Background

California’s new multiple measures accountability and continuous improvement system was developed to align with the priorities of the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) and to meet the requirements under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). Chronic absenteeism is a metric identified as part of Pupil Engagement (LCFF Priority 5).The ESSA requires states to collect data to identify students who are chronically absent and report chronic absenteeism rates for schools in the ESSA State Report Card (Section 1111[h][1][C][viii]).

For purposes of the Local Control and Accountability Plan, a student who is absent 10 percent or more of the instructional days they were enrolled to attend is defined as “chronically absent.” Chronic absenteeism data is collected through the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) and is used to calculate this indicator. This data was collected for the first time at the end of the 2016–17 school year and released publicly in December 2017. It is currently reported on the California School Dashboard (Dashboard) through a direct link to the California Department of Education’s (CDE’s) reporting website, DataQuest. The 2016–17 Chronic Absenteeism Rate Statewide Report is available at the following web page: <https://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/DQCensus/AttChrAbsRate.aspx?agglevel=State&cds=00&year=2016-17>.

### Implementation of the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator on the Dashboard

Chronic absenteeism will serve as an additional academic indicator for kindergarten through grade eight (K–8), given its strong correlation with future academic attainment (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/sep18item01.docx>). The methodology used to calculate this indicator was approved at the September 2018 State Board of Education meeting. It is based on a minimum enrollment of 31 instructional days where students attend at least one day and assigns the same weight to all students who meet this criterion.

### Proposed Status and Change Cut Scores for the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator

Beginning with the 2018 Dashboard, schools and local educational agencies (LEAs) will receive a performance level (color) for this indicator, based on 2017 and 2018 data. In order to propose Status and Change cut scores for this indicator, the CDE conducted several data analyses, which were shared with the Technical Design Group (TDG) at its October 2018 meeting.

Based on simulations produced by the CDE and analyses conducted by the TDG, the CDE recommends the Status and Change cut points shown in Tables 1 and 2.

**Table 1: Recommended Status Cut Scores for the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator**

| **Status Level** | **Status Cut Scores** |
| --- | --- |
| Very Low | Chronic absenteeism rate is 2.5% or less |
| Low | Chronic absenteeism rate is 2.6% to 5.0% |
| Medium | Chronic absenteeism rate is 5.1% to 10% |
| High | Chronic absenteeism rate is 10.1% to 20% |
| Very High | Chronic absenteeism rate is 20.1% or more |

**Table 2: Recommended Change Cut Scores for the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator**

| **Change Level** | **Change Cut Scores** |
| --- | --- |
| Declined Significantly | Chronic absenteeism rate declined by 3% or more |
| Declined | Chronic absenteeism rate declined by 0.5% to 2.9% |
| Maintained | Chronic absenteeism rate declined or increased by 0.4% |
| Increased | Chronic absenteeism rate increased by 0.5% to 2.9% |
| Increased Significantly | Chronic absenteeism rate increased by 3% or more |

Applying these proposed cut scores, Tables 4 and 5 show the Status and Change distributions for chronic absenteeism rates, respectively, using the current and prior-year data.

**Table 3: Status Distribution –2018 Chronic Absenteeism Rates**

(Based on County Office of Education, District, and All Charter School Data)

| **Percentile** | **Chronic Absenteeism Rate** | **Status Level** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | 0.9 | Very Low |
| 10 | 2.5 | Very Low |
| 15 | 3.5 | Low |
| 20 | 4.3 | Low |
| 25 | 5.0 | Low |
| 30 | 5.7 | Medium |
| 35 | 6.2 | Medium |
| 40 | 6.9 | Medium |
| 45 | 7.7 | Medium |
| 50 | 8.4 | Medium |
| 55 | 9.2 | Medium |
| 59.4 | 10.0 | Medium |
| 60 | 10.1 | High |
| 65 | 11.1 | High |
| 70 | 12.2 | High |
| 75 | 13.3 | High |
| 80 | 15.0 | High |
| 85 | 17.4 | High |
| 88.9 | 20.0 | High |
| 90 | 21.3 | Very High |
| 95 | 29.0 | Very High |

**Table 4: Change Distribution– Difference between 2018 and 2017 Chronic Absenteeism Rates**

(Based on County Office of Education, District, and All Charter School Data)

| **Percentile** | **Difference from Prior Year to Current Year** | **Change Level** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | -5.5 | Declined Significantly |
| 10 | -3.4 | Declined Significantly |
| 11.9 | -3.0 | Declined Significantly |
| 15 | -2.3 | Declined |
| 20 | -1.6 | Declined |
| 25 | -1.2 | Declined |
| 30 | -0.7 | Declined |
| 35 | -0.5 | Declined |
| 40 | -0.2 | Maintained |
| 45 | 0.0 | Maintained |
| 50 | 0.1 | Maintained |
| 55 | 0.4 | Maintained |
| 59.3 | 0.5 | Increased |
| 60 | 0.6 | Increased |
| 65 | 0.9 | Increased |
| 70 | 1.2 | Increased |
| 75 | 1.6 | Increased |
| 80 | 2.1 | Increased |
| 85 | 2.8 | Increased |
| 86.0 | 3.0 | Increased Significantly |
| 90 | 4.2 | Increased Significantly |
| 95 | 6.8 | Increased Significantly |

Table 5 is the five-by-five colored table produced using the proposed Status and Change cut scores.

**Table 5: Chronic Absenteeism Performance Levels (Colors)**

| **Performance Level** | **Increased Significantly**  from Prior Year (by 3.0% or more) | **Increased**  from Prior Year (by 0.5% to less than 3.0%) | **Maintained**  from Prior Year (declined or increased by less than 0.5%) | **Declined**  from Prior Year (by 0.5% to less than 3.0%) | **Declined Significantly**  from Prior Year (by 3.0% or more) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Very Low**  2.5% or less in Current Year | 0  (0.0%)  Yellow | 62  (0.8%)  Green | 168  (2.2%)  Blue | 185  (2.4%)  Blue | 53  (0.7%)  Blue |
| **Low**  More than 2.5% to 5.0% in Current Year | 18  (0.2%)  Orange | 361  (4.7%)  Yellow | 311  (4.1%)  Green | 386  (5.1%)  Green | 61  (0.8%)  Blue |
| **Medium**  More than 5.0% to 10.0% in Current Year | 139  (1.8%)  Orange | 1,106  (14.5%)  Orange | 520  (6.8%)  Yellow | 856  (11.2%)  Green | 214  (2.8%)  Green |
| **High**  More than 10.0% to 20.0% in Current Year | 459  (6.0%)  Red | 960  (12.6%)  Orange | 311  (4.1%)  Orange | 587  (7.7%)  Yellow | 245  (3.2%)  Yellow |
| **Very High**  More than 20.0% in Current Year | 182  (2.4%)  Red | 227  (3.0%)  Red | 36  (0.5%)  Red | 138  (1.8%)  Orange | 47  (0.6%)  Yellow |

The CDE is also proposing that the application of the three-by-five grid for LEAs, schools and student groups with fewer than 150 students be approved for the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator. This methodology prevents large swings in data that are triggered by the results of a few students, which can lead to an over-identification of schools in the Red and Blue performance levels when the number of students in specified indicators are small. At the September 2017 SBE meeting, the SBE approved this methodology 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 be applied at the student group level for these two indicators.

Reconfiguring the performance level tables—from a five-by-five grid to a three-by-five grid—by removing two Change levels (Increased Significantly and Decreased Significantly) limits extreme changes in small student populations. For the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator the methodology would be applied when 149 or fewer students are cumulatively enrolled.

The tables below show the number of LEAs and schools that would receive each performance color based on the proposed cut scores. The tables also provide a comparison of the results based on the three-by-five colored grid vs. the five-by-five colored grid.

### Statewide Districts’ Performance for Chronic Absenteeism

**Table 6: 3X5 Colored Grid Applied to Districts**

| **# of LEAs** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 872 | 88  (10.1%) | 326  (37.4%) | 246  (28.2%) | 175  (20.1%) | 37  (4.2%) |

**Table 7: 5X5 Colored Grid Applied to Districts**

| **# of LEAs** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 872 | 100  (11.5%) | 301  (34.5%) | 259  (29.7%) | 171  (19.6%) | 41  (4.7%) |

### Statewide Schools’ Performance Based for Chronic Absenteeism

**Table 8: 3X5 Colored Grid Applied to Schools**

| **# of Schools** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7,632 | 900  (11.8%) | 2,680 (35.1%) | 1,756 (23.0%) | 1,829 (24.0%) | 467  (6.1%) |

**Table 9: 5X5 Colored Grid Applied to Schools**

| **# of Schools** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7,632 | 946  (12.4%) | 2,578 (33.8%) | 1,812 (23.7%) | 1,818 (23.8%) | 478  (6.3%) |

### Statewide Performance on Chronic Absenteeism by School Type

**Table 10: 3X5 Grid Results by School Type**

| **School Type** | **# of Schools** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Charter | 912 | 132 (14.5%) | 230 (25.2%) | 188 (20.6%) | 222 (24.3%) | 140 (15.4%) |
| Non Charter | 6,720 | 768 (11.4%) | 2,450 (36.5%) | 1,568 (23.3%) | 1,607 (23.9%) | 327 (4.9%) |
| Small Schools\* | 485 | 118 (24.3%) | 172 (35.5%) | 78 (16.1%) | 75 (15.5%) | 42  (8.7%) |
| Non Small Schools | 7,147 | 782 (10.9%) | 2,508 (35.1%) | 1,678 (23.5%) | 1,754 (24.5%) | 425 (6.0%) |
| DASS | 150 | 62 (41.3%) | 59 (39.3%) | 17 (11.3%) | 7  (4.7%) | 5  (3.3%) |
| Non DASS | 7,482 | 838 (11.2%) | 2,621 (35.0%) | 1,739 (23.2%) | 1,822 (24.4%) | 462 (6.2%) |

**Table 11: 5X5 Colored Grid Result by School Type**

| **School Type** | **# of Schools** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Charter | 912 | 146 (16.0%) | 204 (22.4%) | 200 (21.9%) | 219 (24.0%) | 143 (15.7%) |
| Non Charter | 6,720 | 800 (11.9%) | 2,374 (35.3%) | 1,612 (24.0%) | 1,599 (23.8%) | 335 (5.0%) |
| Small Schools\* | 485 | 164 (33.8%) | 70 (14.4%) | 134 (27.6%) | 64 (13.2%) | 53 (10.9%) |
| Non Small Schools | 7,147 | 782 (10.9%) | 2,508 (35.1%) | 1,678 (23.5%) | 1,754 (24.5%) | 425 (6.0%) |
| DASS | 150 | 64 (42.7%) | 23 (15.3%) | 51 (34.0%) | 7  (4.7%) | 5  (3.3%) |
| Non DASS | 7,482 | 882 (11.8%) | 2,555 (34.2%) | 1,761 (23.5%) | 1,811 (24.2%) | 473 (6.3%) |

\*Small schools have 30 to 149 cumulatively enrolled students and meet the inclusion criteria.

Student-group results, for districts and schools, are shown in Tables 12 and 13.

Note: For all percentages calculated for Table 12, the total number of districts (872) was used for the denominator, in order to show how many districts statewide would have a student group in each color-coded performance level. For all percentages calculated for Table 13 the total number of schools (7,632) was used for the denominator.

**Table 12: Chronic Absenteeism Rate Indicator**

**District Student Group Results (Three-by-Five Colored Grid Applied)**

| **Student Groups** | **Total\*** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All Districts  (Total=872) | 872 | 88 (10.1%) | 326 (37.4%) | 246 (28.2%) | 175 (20.1%) | 37 (4.2%) |
| African American | 339 | 83 (9.5%) | 131 (15.0%) | 67 (7.7%) | 46 (5.3%) | 12 (1.4%) |
| Asian | 384 | 4  (0.5%) | 56 (6.4%) | 86 (9.9%) | 113 (13.0%) | 125 (14.3%) |
| Filipino | 285 | 2  (0.2%) | 55 (6.3%) | 64 (7.3%) | 101 (11.6%) | 63 (7.2%) |
| Hispanic/Latino | 765 | 80 (9.2%) | 298 (34.2%) | 197 (22.6%) | 157 (18.0%) | 33 (3.8%) |
| Native American | 174 | 43 (4.9%) | 65 (7.5%) | 40 (4.6%) | 24 (2.8%) | 2  (0.2%) |
| Pacific Islander | 138 | 31 (3.6%) | 64 (7.3%) | 20 (2.3%) | 20 (2.3%) | 3  (0.3%) |
| Two or More Races | 459 | 51 (5.8%) | 153 (17.5%) | 120 (13.8%) | 111 (12.7%) | 24 (2.8%) |
| White | 772 | 82 (9.4%) | 265 (30.4%) | 214 (24.5%) | 185 (21.2%) | 26 (3.0%) |
| English Learners | 658 | 39 (4.5%) | 266 (30.5%) | 135 (15.5%) | 183 (21.0%) | 35 (4.0%) |
| Foster | 356 | 101 (11.6%) | 113 (13.0%) | 88 (10.1%) | 43 (4.9%) | 11 (1.3%) |
| Homeless | 457 | 199 (22.8%) | 139 (15.9%) | 74 (8.5%) | 36 (4.1%) | 9  (1.0%) |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 824 | 96 (11.0%) | 366 (42.0%) | 216 (24.8%) | 123 (14.1%) | 23 (2.6%) |
| Students with Disabilities | 677 | 127 (14.6%) | 299 (34.3%) | 161 (18.5%) | 78 (8.9%) | 12 (1.4%) |

\*Total = Number of districts that have, for the student group category, 30 or more cumulatively enrolled students in both prior and current years (except for Foster and Homeless, these two student groups only need to have an N size of 15 or more to get a performance color). These students must meet the inclusion criteria.

**Table 13: Chronic Absenteeism Rate Indicator**

**School Student Group Results (Three-by-Five Colored Grid Applied)**

| **Student Groups** | **Total\*** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All Schools  (Total=7,632) | 7,632 | 900 (11.8%) | 2,680 (35.1%) | 1,756 (23.0%) | 1,829 (24.0%) | 467 (6.1%) |
| African American | 2,193 | 669 (8.8%) | 777 (10.2%) | 375 (4.9%) | 286 (3.7%) | 86 (1.1%) |
| Asian | 2,572 | 20 (0.3%) | 458 (6.0%) | 400 (5.2%) | 718 (9.4%) | 976 (12.8%) |
| Filipino | 796 | 8  (0.1%) | 165 (2.2%) | 131 (1.7%) | 209 (2.7%) | 283 (3.7%) |
| Hispanic/Latino | 7,138 | 821 (10.8%) | 2,774 (36.3%) | 1,523 (20.0%) | 1,648 (21.6%) | 372 (4.9%) |
| Native American | 64 | 22 (0.3%) | 25 (0.3%) | 12 (0.2%) | 3  (0.0%) | 2  (0.0%) |
| Pacific Islander | 32 | 14 (0.2%) | 9  (0.1%) | 4  (0.1%) | 5  (0.1%) | 0  (0.0%) |
| Two or More Races | 2,280 | 162 (2.1%) | 734 (9.6%) | 430 (5.6%) | 596 (7.8%) | 358 (4.7%) |
| White | 5,101 | 463 (6.1%) | 1,703 (22.3%) | 1,049 (13.7%) | 1,395 (18.3%) | 491 (6.4%) |
| English Learners | 6,225 | 490 (6.4%) | 2,401 (31.5%) | 1,119 (14.7%) | 1,689 (22.1%) | 526 (6.9%) |
| Foster | 66 | 19 (0.2%) | 19 (0.2%) | 17 (0.2%) | 9  (0.1%) | 2  (0.0%) |
| Homeless | 1,532 | 414 (5.4%) | 576 (7.5%) | 282 (3.7%) | 215 (2.8%) | 45 (0.6%) |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 7,280 | 1,109 (14.5%) | 2,789 (36.5%) | 1,718 (22.5%) | 1,400 (18.3%) | 264 (3.5%) |
| Students with Disabilities | 6,406 | 1,125 (14.7%) | 2,585 (33.9%) | 1,405 (18.4%) | 1,062 (13.9%) | 229 (3.0%) |

\*Total = Based on cumulative enrollment for students that met the eligibility criteria.

### Recommendation

The CDE recommends that the SBE approve the proposed cut scores and performance levels for the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator. The CDE also recommends that the three-by-five grid be applied to the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator for both the all students and student group levels, whenever there are fewer than 150 students.

# Attachment 2

## Revised Status Cut Scores for the Graduation Rate Indicator

### Background

In September 2016, the SBE approved Status and Change cut scores for the Graduation Rate Indicator, based on the four-year graduation cohort. Since then, several new developments require a re-evaluation of the Status cut scores used for the four-year graduation rate. These include a change in business rules in response to federal audit findings and recent SBE decisions related to the indicator.

* **Business Rule Changes to Calculate the Four-Year Graduation Cohort:** Based on audit findings from the U.S. Department of Education Office of Inspector General, the CDE changed certain business rules to calculate the four-year graduation cohort calculation. These findings were shared with the SBE in a June 2018 Information Memorandum. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-jun18item02.docx>). The following changes impact the graduation rate results used for the Graduation Rate Indicator:
* **Transfer to an Adult Education Program or Community College:** Students who transfer to an adult education program or to community college within four years of entering high school without earning a regular high school diploma will no longer be removed from the cohort. These students will now remain in the cohort and be counted as dropouts.
* **Adult Education Diploma No Longer Counted as Graduates:** Students who receive an adult education diploma will no longer be counted as high school graduates as they do not meet the definition for receiving a “regular high school diploma.”
* **California High School Proficiency Exam (CHSPE) No Longer Counted as Graduates:** Students who passed the CHSPE do not meet the federal definition of a regular high school diploma. Therefore, these students will no longer be counted as high school graduates.
* **Using Prior Year Data to Calculate Change:** For the Fall 2017 California School Dashboard (Dashboard), the Graduation Rate Indicator was the only state indicator that used a three-year average rate to calculate Change. In March 2018, the CDE presented planned changes for the 2018 Dashboard, which included proposed modifications to calculating Change for the Graduation Rate Indicator. Rather than using a three-year weighted average to calculate Change, only one year of data (from the prior year) would be used. Based on positive feedback from SBE members, the CDE has implemented this modification. Therefore, beginning with the 2018 Dashboard, the calculation for Change will be the difference in graduation rates between the current and prior school years.
* **Approval of the One-Year Graduation Rate Status and Change Cut Scores for DASS Schools:** At the May 2018 SBE meeting, the SBE approved the methodology for calculating the one-year graduation rate for schools with Dashboard Alternative School Status (DASS). In September 2018, the SBE approved Status and Change cut scores to be applied to the one-year graduation rate.
* **Incorporating the One-Year Graduation Rate into LEA Graduation Rates:** Beginning with the 2018 Dashboard, the one-year graduation rate for DASS schools will be incorporated into the LEA-level Dashboard report. (Note: the number of graduates in the four-year cohort graduation rate and DASS graduation rate are divided by the number of students in the four-year cohort and DASS graduation rate to obtain the combined graduation rate for districts.)

Due to these new developments, the CDE is proposing new Status cut scores for the Graduation Rate Indicator. These revised cut scores will be applied to comprehensive high schools (i.e., schools with a four-year graduation cohort rate) as well as in the calculations for the combined four-year cohort and DASS graduation rate for LEAs with both comprehensive and DASS schools. The California Department of Education (CDE) and the Technical Design Group (TDG) reviewed the data from prior years and determined that revisions to the Change cut scores were not necessary.

The CDE is recommending Status cut score changes for “Low” and “Medium” status levels. The status level for “Very Low” (below 67 percent) is based on criteria set by the ED. The Status level for “High” established the graduation rate goal of 90 percent, which has already been approved by the ED in California’s ESSA State Plan. Therefore, the CDE proposes revising only the “Low” and “Medium” status levels. Table 1 shows the proposed Status cut scores and Table 2 shows the Change Cut scores that the State Board adopted in September 2016.

**Table 1: Proposed Status Cut Scores for the Graduation Rate**

| **Status Level** | **Status Cut Scores** |
| --- | --- |
| Very Low | Graduation rate is 66.9% or lower |
| Low | Graduation rate is 67.0% to **79.9%** (previously 67% to **84.9%)** |
| Medium | Graduation rate is **80.0%** to 89.9% (previously **85%** to 89.9% |
| High | Graduation rate is 90.0% 94.9% |
| Very High | Graduation rate is 95.0% or higher |

**Table 2: Current Change Cut Scores for the Graduation Rate**

**(Note: No revisions are being proposed for the Change cut scores)**

| **Change Level** | **Change Cut Scores** |
| --- | --- |
| Declined Significantly | Declined by more than 5% |
| Declined | Declined by 1% to 5% |
| Maintained | Declined by 0.9% or increased by 0.9% |
| Increased | Increased by 1% to 4.9% |
| Increased Significantly | Increased by 5% or more |

Table 3 shows the new Status distributions that result from applying the proposed Status cut scores to the 2018 Graduation Rate Indicator. The distribution reflect the four-year cohort data for all districts and charter schools.

**Table 3: Status Distribution–2018 Graduation Rates**

(Based on District [4-year cohort] and Non-DASS Charter [4-year cohort] Data)

| **Percentile** | **Graduation Rate** | **Status Level**  **Proposed Cut Scores** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | 65.2 | Very Low |
| 5.4 | 67.2 | Low |
| 10 | 78 | Low |
| 11.5 | 80.2 | Medium |
| 15 | 83.3 | Medium |
| 20 | 86.5 | Medium |
| 25 | 88.4 | Medium |
| 30 | 89.9 | Medium |
| 31 | 90.1 | High |
| 35 | 90.9 | High |
| 40 | 91.8 | High |
| 45 | 92.6 | High |
| 50 | 93.25 | High |
| 55 | 94 | High |
| 60 | 94.6 | High |
| 65 | 95.1 | Very High |
| 70 | 95.7 | Very High |
| 75 | 96.3 | Very High |
| 80 | 96.8 | Very High |
| 85 | 97.5 | Very High |
| 90 | 98.1 | Very High |
| 95 | 99 | Very High |

**Table 4: Change Distribution– Difference between 2018 and 2017 Graduation Rates\***

(Based on District [4-year cohort] and Non-DASS Charter [4-year cohort] Data

| **Percentile** | **Difference from Prior Year to Current Year** | **Change Level 2017 Cut Scores** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | -7 | Declined Significantly |
| 6.5 | -4.9 | Declined |
| 10 | -4.3 | Declined |
| 15 | -3 | Declined |
| 20 | -2 | Declined |
| 25 | -1.4 | Declined |
| 30 | -1 | Declined |
| 31.5 | -0.9 | Maintained |
| 35 | -0.7 | Maintained |
| 40 | -0.3 | Maintained |
| 45 | 0 | Maintained |
| 50 | 0.3 | Maintained |
| 55 | 0.6 | Maintained |
| 60 | 1 | Increased |
| 65 | 1.3 | Increased |
| 70 | 1.7 | Increased |
| 75 | 2.2 | Increased |
| 80 | 2.7 | Increased |
| 85 | 3.5 | Increased |
| 89.4 | 5 | Increased  Significantly |
| 90 | 5.5 | Increased  Significantly |
| 95 | 9.1 | Increased  Significantly |

\*Note: The CDE is not proposing any revisions to cut points for Change.

**Table 5: Graduation Rate Performance Levels (Colors)   
(With Proposed Cut Scores)**

| Performance Level | **Declined Significantly**  From Prior Year (by 5.1% or greater) | **Declined**  From Prior Year (by 1.0% to 5.0%) | **Maintained**  From Prior Year (declined or increased by less than 1.0%) | **Increased**  From Prior Year (by 1.0% to 4.9%) | **Increased Significantly**  From Prior Year (by 5.0% or greater) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Very High**  95.0% or greater in Current Year | N/A | 72  (5.3%)  Blue | 251  (18.4%)  Blue | 186  (13.6%)  Blue | 8  (0.6%)  Blue |
| **High**  90.0% to less than 95.0% in Current Year | 2  (0.2%)  Orange | 142  (10.4%)  Yellow | 126  (9.2%)  Green | 120  (8.8%)  Green | 7  (0.5%)  Blue |
| **Medium**  80.0% to less than 90.0% in Current Year | 13  (1%)  Orange | 109  (8.0%)  Orange | 58  (4.2%)  Yellow | 86  (6.3%)  Green | 12  (0.9%)  Green |
| **Low**  67.0% to less than 80.0% in Current Year | 7  (0.5%)  Red | 44  (3.2%)  Orange | 11  (0.8%)  Orange | 32  (2.3%)  Yellow | 5  (0.4%)  Yellow |
| **Very Low**  Less than 67.0% in Current Year | 2  (0.2%)  Red | 29  (2.1%)  Red | 6  (0.4%)  Red | 37  (2.7%)  Red | 2  (0.2%)  Red |

Tables 6 and 7 show the number of districts and schools, respectively, that would receive each performance color after the proposed cut scores are applied. Table 8 shows the performance colors by school type.

**Table 6: Graduation Rate—Statewide Districts’ Performance**

| **# of LEAs** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 382 | 2  (0.5%) | 44  (11.5%) | 61  (16.0%) | 171  (44.8) | 104 (27.2%) |

**Table 7: Graduation Rate—Statewide Schools’ Performance**

| **# of Schools** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1,367 | 83  (6.1%) | 179  (13.1%) | 237  (17.3%) | 344  (25.2%) | 524  (38.3%) |

**Table 8: Graduation Rate – Performance by School Type**

| **School Type** | **# of Schools** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Non Charter | 1,090 | 46  (4.2%) | 127  (11.7%) | 192  (17.6%) | 289  (26.5%) | 436  (40.0%) |
| Charter | 277 | 37  (13.4%) | 52  (18.8%) | 45  (16.2%) | 55  (19.9%) | 88  (31.8%) |
| Non Small Schools | 875 | 19  (2.2%) | 92  (10.5%) | 161  (18.4%) | 245  (28.0%) | 358  (40.9%) |
| Small Schools\* | 492 | 64  (13.0%) | 87  (17.7%) | 76  (15.4%) | 99  (20.1%) | 166  (33.7%) |

\*Small schools have 30 to 149 students in the graduating class.

Student-group results, for districts and schools, are shown in Tables 9 and 10. Note: For all percentages calculated for Table 9, the total number of districts (382) was used for the denominator, in order to show how many districts statewide would have a student group in each color-coded performance level. For all percentages calculated for Table 10, the total number of schools (1,367) was used for the denominator.

**Table 9: Graduation Rate Indicator**

**District Student Group Results**

| **Student Groups** | **Total\*** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All Districts  (Total=382) | 382 | 2  (0.5%) | 44 (11.5%) | 61 (16.0%) | 171 (44.8%) | 104 (27.2%) |
| African American | 121 | 0  (0.0%) | 29 (7.6%) | 32 (8.4%) | 41 (10.7%) | 19 (5.0%) |
| Asian | 158 | 0  (0.0%) | 4  (1.0%) | 18 (4.7%) | 42 (11.0%) | 94 (24.6%) |
| Filipino | 99 | 0  (0.0%) | 5  (1.3%) | 13 (3.4%) | 18 (4.7%) | 63 (16.5%) |
| Hispanic/Latino | 337 | 1  (0.3%) | 57 (14.9%) | 59 (15.4%) | 142 (37.2%) | 78 (20.4%) |
| Native American | 7 | 0  (0.0%) | 2  (0.5%) | 2  (0.5%) | 1  (0.3%) | 2  (0.5%) |
| Pacific Islander | 11 | 0  (0.0%) | 3  (0.8%) | 4  (1.0%) | 4  (1.0%) | 0  (0.0%) |
| Two or More Races | 95 | 1  (0.3%) | 16 (4.2%) | 14 (3.7%) | 25  (6.5%) | 39 (10.2%) |
| White | 309 | 5  (1.3%) | 34 (8.9%) | 58 (15.2%) | 104 (27.2%) | 108 (28.3%) |
| English Learner | 233 | 21 (5.5%) | 69 (18.1%) | 63 (16.5%) | 72 (18.8%) | 8  (2.1%) |
| Foster | 66 | 24 (6.3%) | 16 (4.2%) | 17 (4.5%) | 8  (2.1%) | 1  (0.3%) |
| Homeless | 202 | 21 (5.5%) | 87 (22.8%) | 29 (7.6%) | 54 (14.1%) | 11 (2.9%) |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 366 | 2  (0.5%) | 63 (16.5%) | 74 (19.4%) | 161 (42.1%) | 66 (17.3%) |
| Student with Disabilities | 246 | 50 (13.1%) | 72 (18.8%) | 63 (16.5%) | 61 (16.0%) | 0  (0.0%) |

\*Total = Number of districts with 30 or more students in the graduating class at the district level and student group level in both the current and prior year (except for Foster and Homeless, these two student groups need to have an N size of 15 or more to get a performance color).

**Table 10: Graduation Rate Indicator**

**School Student Group Results**

| **Student Groups** | **Total\*** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All Schools  (Total=1,367) | 1,367 | 83 (6.1%) | 179 (13.1%) | 237 (17.3%) | 344 (25.2%) | 524 (38.3%) |
| African American | 209 | 6  (0.4%) | 55 (4.0%) | 26 (1.9%) | 62 (4.5%) | 60 (4.4%) |
| Asian | 305 | 0  (0.0%) | 16 (1.2%) | 34 (2.5%) | 42 (3.1%) | 213 (15.6%) |
| Filipino | 102 | 0  (0.0%) | 5  (0.4%) | 14 (1.0%) | 12 (0.9%) | 71 (5.2%) |
| Hispanic/Latino | 1,099 | 51 (3.7%) | 167 (12.2%) | 190 (13.9%) | 280 (20.5%) | 411 (30.1%) |
| Native American | 1 | 0  (0.0%) | 0  (0.0%) | 0  (0.0%) | 0  (0.0%) | 1  (0.1%) |
| Pacific Islander | 0 | 0  (0.0%) | 0  (0.0%) | 0  (0.0%) | 0  (0.0%) | 0  (0.0%) |
| Two or More Races | 64 | 2  (0.1%) | 3  (0.2%) | 7 (  0.5%) | 6  (0.4%) | 46 (3.4%) |
| White | 723 | 26 (1.9%) | 83 (6.1%) | 119 (8.7%) | 133 (9.7%) | 362 (26.5%) |
| English Learners | 583 | 90 (6.6%) | 202 (14.8%) | 109 (8.0%) | 148 (10.8%) | 34 (2.5%) |
| Foster | 0 | 0  (0.0%) | 0  (0.0%) | 0  (0.0%) | 0  (0.0%) | 0  (0.0%) |
| Homeless | 198 | 8  (0.6%) | 72 (5.3%) | 35 (2.6%) | 56 (4.1%) | 27 (2.0%) |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 1,244 | 67 (4.9%) | 213 (15.6%) | 239 (17.5%) | 349 (25.5%) | 376 (27.5%) |
| Students with Disabilities | 635 | 141 (10.3%) | 200 (14.6%) | 125 (9.1%) | 142 (10.4%) | 27 (2.0%) |

\*Total = Number of schools with 30 or more students in the graduating class at the school level and student group level in both the current and prior year..

### Recommendation

The CDE recommends that the SBE approve the revised Status cut scores for the Graduation Rate Indicator that is applied to districts and comprehensive high schools.

# Attachment 3

## Adjustment to the Graduation Rate Methodology for Schools with Dashboard Alternative School Status

Currently, the criteria used to determine “who is a graduate” under the one-year graduation rate for schools with Dashboard Alternative School Status (DASS) include students who earn a Special Education Certificate of Completion. Based on feedback from advocacy groups, guidance from the Advisory Commission on Special Education (ACSE), and internal discussions with leadership in the Special Education Division, the California Department of Education (CDE) recommends a re-evaluation of the criterion for the certificate.

Because there is no consistent statewide criteria for awarding the Certificate of Completion, the CDE is recommending adding some standardized criteria for when students who are awarded the Certificate of Completion are included in the one-year graduation rate for alternative schools. This will allow for fairer comparisons across districts and county offices. The CDE is proposing that the criteria for counting students who earn a Certificate of Completion as graduates in DASS graduation rate be revised as follows:

* If students who earn the Certificate of Completion are under the age of 20, they must be eligible to take the California Alternate Assessments (CAAs). Otherwise, they cannot be counted as graduates under the DASS Graduation Rate.
* If students who earn the Certificate of Completion are 20 or older, they will automatically be counted as graduates under the DASS Graduation Rate.

This option ensures that DASS schools receive credit only for students under the age of 20 who fall within the statewide one-percent threshold for taking the CAAs. The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) established a one percent threshold, statewide, on the number of students who could take alternate assessments. The intent of this threshold is to address concerns about disproportionality related to potentially over-identifying students for alternate assessments.

Because matching assessment data to students is more difficult as time passes, and because most students who are age of 20 or older are participating in a transition program, these students will automatically be counted as graduates.

The CDE presented the proposed criteria for the Certificate of Completion to ACSE at their October 24, 2018 meeting. There was a robust discussion regarding how to fairly incorporate students who earn a certificate of completion in the accountability system, while ensuring that students continue to be placed in the most appropriate educational settings. ACSE members were supportive of the proposed criteria and indicated it provides appropriate safe guards for determining which students with disabilities should be included as graduates.

These criteria are being proposed on a short term basis (potentially two years). The CDE anticipates pursuing legislation in 2019 to allow for the establishment of a criterion-based alternate diploma for students with disabilities. This long-term option provides that once an alternate diploma is established, only students who earn the diploma will be counted as graduates in the DASS graduation rate. An additional benefit to the alternate diploma is that ESSA allows states to count students who earn the diploma as graduates in the four-year cohort, providing fairer comparisons across districts and county offices of education.

Table 1 shows the number of students who earned a Certificate of Completion at a DASS school and met the grade and enrollment criteria to be included in the calculation of the DASS graduation rate for the 2018 Dashboard.

**Table1: Students Who Earned a Certificate of Completion**

| **Graduating Class** | **Number of Students Earning a Certificate** | **Number of Students Under the Age of 20** | **Number Eligible to Take an Alternate Assessment** | **Number of Students Age 20 or Older** | **Number of Students Counted as Graduates** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Class of 2017** | 1,062 | 283 | 104 | 779 | 883  (83%) |
| **Class of 2018** | 1,177 | 425 | 380 | 752 | 1,132  (96%) |

### Recommendation

The CDE recommends that the SBE approve the revised eligibility criteria for counting students who earn the Special Education Certificate of Completion as graduates in the DASS graduation rate.

# Attachment 4

## Proposed Change Cut Scores for the College/Career Indicator

### Background

At the September 2017 State Board of Education (SBE) meeting, the SBE approved revised Status cut points for the College/Career Indicator (CCI), which are shown in Table 1 below. Based on simulations and analyses of three years of CCI Status data, the California Department of Education (CDE) is not recommending any changes to the Status cut scores.

**Table 1: SBE-Approved Status Cut Scores for the CCI**

| **Status Level** | **Status Cut Scores** |
| --- | --- |
| Very Low | Less than 10.0% percent of students Prepared |
| Low | 10.0% to less than 35.0% percent of students Prepared |
| Medium | 35.0% to less than 55.0% percent of students Prepared |
| High | 55.0% to less than 70.0% percent of students Prepared |
| Very High | 70.0% or more percent of students Prepared |

Beginning with the 2018 California School Dashboard (Dashboard), local educational agencies (LEAs) and schools will receive a CCI performance level (color) for the first time. On the 2018 Dashboard, status will be based on results for the graduating class of 2018. Change will be calculated based on the difference between the 2018 and 2017 graduating classes.

Based on simulations produced by the CDE and analyses conducted by the Technical Design Group, the CDE recommends the CCI Change cut scores shown in Table 2:

**Table 2: Recommended Change Cut Scores for the CCI**

| **Change Level** | **Percent of Prepared Students** |
| --- | --- |
| Declined Significantly | Declined by 9.1% or more |
| Declined | Declined 2.0% to 9.0% |
| Maintained | Declined or increased by 1.9% |
| Increased | Increased by 2.0% to 8.9% |
| Increased Significantly | Increased 9.0% or more |

Table 3 shows the Status distribution, based on the Class of 2018, which was produced by applying the SBE-adopted Status cut scores.

**Table 3: Status Distribution—Class of 2018**

(Based on All Districts and All Charter Schools)

| **Percentile** | **Percent Prepared (Status)**  **(n=763)** | **Status Level** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **5** | 0.0 | Very Low |
| **10** | 2.2 | Very Low |
| **15** | 6.8 | Very Low |
| **17.1** | **10.0** | Low |
| **20** | 13.2 | Low |
| **25** | 20.9 | Low |
| **30** | 28.1 | Low |
| **35** | 32.1 | Low |
| **40** | 34.8 | Low |
| **40.4** | **35.0** | Medium |
| **45** | 38.2 | Medium |
| **50** | 41.2 | Medium |
| **55** | 43.8 | Medium |
| **60** | 46.7 | Medium |
| **65** | 49.3 | Medium |
| **70** | 52.3 | Medium |
| **73.7** | **55.0** | High |
| **75** | 56.0 | High |
| **80** | 59.8 | High |
| **85** | 65.5 | High |
| **88.4** | **70.0** | Very High |
| **90** | 71.0 | Very High |
| **95** | 77.2 | Very High |

**Table 4: Change Distribution—– Difference between 2018 and 2017 Status**

(Based on All Districts and All Charter Schools)

| **Percentile** | **Difference in Status from 2017 to 2018**  **(n=763)** | **Change Level** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **5** | -11.1 | Declined Significantly |
| **6.1** | **-9.0** | Declined |
| **10** | -6.4 | Declined |
| **15** | -4.6 | Declined |
| **20** | -3.1 | Declined |
| **25** | -2.2 | Declined |
| **27** | **-2.0** | Declined |
| **30** | -1.3 | Maintained |
| **35** | -0.6 | Maintained |
| **40** | 0 | Maintained |
| **45** | 0.4 | Maintained |
| **50** | 1.1 | Maintained |
| **55** | 1.5 | Maintained |
| **58** | **2.0** | Increased |
| **60** | 2.3 | Increased |
| **65** | 3.2 | Increased |
| **70** | 4.2 | Increased |
| **75** | 5.2 | Increased |
| **80** | 6.5 | Increased |
| **85** | 8.4 | Increased |
| **86.3** | **9.0** | Increased Significantly |
| **90** | 10.9 | Increased Significantly |
| **95** | 15 | Increased Significantly |

Combining the current Status cut scores and the recommended Change cut scores yields the five-by-five colored grid shown in Table 5:

**Table 5: Five-by-Five Colored Table for the CCI**

| **Performance Level** | **Declined Significantly**  From Prior Year (by 9.1% or more) | **Declined**  From Prior Year (by 2.0% to 9.0%) | **Maintained**  From Prior Year (declined or increased by 1.9%) | **Increased**  From Prior Year (by 2.0% to 8.9%) | **Increased Significantly**  From Prior Year (by 9.0% or more) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Very High**  70.0% or greater in Current Year | 6  (0.3%)  Yellow | 35  (1.9%)  Green | 62  (3.4%)  Blue | 71  (3.9%)  Blue | 40  (2.2%)  Blue |
| **High**  55.0% to less than 70.0% in Current Year | 11  (0.6%)  Orange | 53  (2.9%)  Yellow | 70  (3.9%)  Green | 89  (4.9%)  Green | 69  (3.8%)  Blue |
| **Medium**  35.0% to less than 55.0% in Current Year | 36  (2.0%)  Orange | 136  (7.6%)  Orange | 114  (6.3%)  Yellow | 147  (8.2%)  Green | 92  (5.1%)  Green |
| **Low**  10.0% to less than 35.0 in Current Year% | 42  (2.3%)  Red | 85  (4.7%)  Orange | 59  (3.3%)  Orange | 72  (4.0%)  Yellow | 30  (1.7%)  Yellow |
| **Very Low**  Less than 10.0% in Current Year | 5  (0.3%)  Red | 74  (4.1%)  Red | 321  (17.8%)  Red | 82  (4.6%)  Orange | 0  (0.0%)  Yellow |

Tables 6 and 7 provide the number of high school districts and high schools, respectively, which would receive each performance color after the proposed cut scores are applied.

**Table 6: Statewide Districts’ Performance**

| **# of LEAs** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 443 | 64 (14.4%) | 107 (24.2%) | 95 (21.4%) | 137 (30.9%) | 40 (9%) |

**Table 7: Statewide Schools’ Performance**

| **# of Schools** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1,801 | 442 (24.5%) | 409 (22.7%) | 275 (15.3%) | 433 (24%) | 242 (13.4%) |

Table 8 provides a breakdown of the results by school type.

**Table 8: Performance by School Type**

| **School Type** | **# of Schools** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Charter | 361 | 99 (27.4%) | 83 (23%) | 65 (18%) | 63 (17.5%) | 51 (14.1%) |
| Non Charter | 1,440 | 343 (23.8%) | 326 (22.6%) | 210 (14.6%) | 370 (25.7%) | 191 (13.3%) |
| Small Schools\* | 826 | 328 (39.7%) | 194 (23.5%) | 103 (12.5%) | 117 (14.2%) | 84 (10.2%) |
| Non Small Schools | 975 | 114 (11.7%) | 215 (22.1%) | 172 (17.6%) | 316 (32.4%) | 158 (16.2%) |
| DASS Schools | 436 | 349 (80%) | 68 (15.6%) | 16 (3.7%) | 2 (0.5%) | 1 (0.2%) |
| Non-DASS Schools | 1,365 | 93 (6.8%) | 341 (25%) | 259 (19%) | 431 (31.6%) | 241 (17.7%) |

\*Small schools have 30 to 149 students in the graduation cohort (comprehensive or Dashboard Alternative School Status [DASS]).

Student-group results, for districts and schools, are shown in Tables 9 and 10. Note: For all percentages calculated for Table 9, the total number of districts (443) was used for the denominator, in order to show how many districts statewide would have a student group in each color-coded performance level. For all percentages calculated for Table 10, the total number of schools (1,801) was used for the denominator.

**Table 9: District Student Group Results for CCI**

| **Student Group** | **Total\*** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All Districts | 443 | 64 (14.4%) | 107 (24.2%) | 95 (21.4%) | 137 (30.9%) | 40 (9%) |
| African American | 144 | 29 (6.5%) | 53 (12%) | 35 (7.9%) | 25 (5.6%) | 2 (0.5%) |
| Asian | 161 | 1 (0.2%) | 9 (2%) | 21 (4.7%) | 52 (11.7%) | 78 (17.6%) |
| Filipino | 99 | 0 (0%) | 21 (4.7%) | 18 (4.1%) | 32 (7.2%) | 28 (6.3%) |
| Hispanic/Latino | 387 | 55 (12.4%) | 125 (28.2%) | 93 (21%) | 107 (24.2%) | 7 (1.6%) |
| Native American | 9 | 1 (0.2%) | 2 (0.5%) | 3 (0.7%) | 3 (0.7%) | 0 (0%) |
| Pacific Islander | 13 | 2 (0.5%) | 4 (0.9%) | 5 (1.1%) | 2 (0.5%) | 0 (0%) |
| Two or More Races | 100 | 9 (2%) | 20 (4.5%) | 15 (3.4%) | 27 (6.1%) | 29 (6.5%) |
| White | 349 | 33 (7.4%) | 81 (18.3%) | 73 (16.5%) | 115 (26%) | 47 (10.6%) |
| English learners | 260 | 95 (21.4%) | 65 (14.7%) | 90 (20.3%) | 10 (2.3%) | 0 (0%) |
| Foster | 85 | 43 (9.7%) | 21 (4.7%) | 19 (4.3%) | 2 (0.5%) | 0 (0%) |
| Homeless | 225 | 65 (14.7%) | 95 (21.4%) | 43 (9.7%) | 21 (4.7%) | 1 (0.2%) |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 426 | 73 (16.5%) | 137 (30.9%) | 93 (21%) | 114 (25.7%) | 9 (2%) |
| Students with Disabilities | 277 | 154 (34.8%) | 55 (12.4%) | 66 (14.9%) | 1 (0.2%) | 1 (0.2%) |

\*Total = Number of districts with 30 or more students in the student group category in both prior and current year graduation cohorts (except for Foster and Homeless, these two student groups only need to have an N size of 15 or more to get a performance color).

**Table 10: School Student Group Results for CCI**

| **Student Group** | **Total\*** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All Schools | 1,801 | 442 (24.5%) | 409 (22.7%) | 275 (15.3%) | 433 (24%) | 242 (13.4%) |
| African American | 253 | 78 (4.3%) | 71 (3.9%) | 57 (3.2%) | 43 (2.4%) | 4 (0.2%) |
| Asian | 305 | 1 (0.1%) | 23 (1.3%) | 36 (2%) | 87 (4.8%) | 158 (8.8%) |
| Filipino | 102 | 0 (0%) | 18 (1%) | 17 (0.9%) | 31 (1.7%) | 36 (2%) |
| Hispanic/Latino | 1,410 | 338 (18.8%) | 379 (21%) | 238 (13.2%) | 331 (18.4%) | 124 (6.9%) |
| Native American | 1 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Pacific Islander | 0 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Two or More Races | 68 | 4 (0.2%) | 10 (0.6%) | 8 (0.4%) | 9 (0.5%) | 37 (2.1%) |
| White | 796 | 89 (4.9%) | 147 (8.2%) | 144 (8%) | 209 (11.6%) | 207 (11.5%) |
| English learners | 673 | 231 (12.8%) | 192 (10.7%) | 205 (11.4%) | 43 (2.4%) | 2 (0.1%) |
| Foster | 3 | 2 (0.1%) | 1 (0.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Homeless | 219 | 54 (3%) | 68 (3.8%) | 45 (2.5%) | 44 (2.4%) | 8 (0.4%) |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 1,617 | 421 (23.4%) | 423 (23.5%) | 252 (14%) | 375 (20.8%) | 146 (8.1%) |
| Students with Disabilities | 693 | 322 (17.9%) | 173 (9.6%) | 188 (10.4%) | 10 (0.6%) | 0 (0%) |

\*Total = Number of districts with 30 or more students in the student group category in both prior and current year graduation cohorts.

### Recommendation

The CDE recommends that the SBE approve the proposed Change cut scores and performance levels for the CCI.

# Attachment 5

## Proposed Status and Change Cut Scores for the Grade 11 Academic Indicator

### Background

In July 2016, the SBE approved the College/Career Indicator (CCI) as a state indicator. The CCI includes assessment results for students in grade eleven. The SBE also approved removing the grade eleven assessment results from the Academic Indicator. Therefore, the 2017 California School Dashboard (Dashboard) Academic Indicator is based on the assessment results of students in grades three through eight only.

The U.S. Department of Education (ED) reviewed California’s Every Student Succeeds (ESSA) Plan and submitted feedback in December 2017. The ED required several changes to the State ESSA Plan, including the use of the grade eleven assessment results in the Academic Indicator. In April 2018, the SBE approved including these results in the Academic Indicator. Beginning with the 2018 California School Dashboard (Dashboard), the Academic Indicator will include the assessment results for students in grades three through eight and grade eleven.

The cut scores set for the Academic Indicator were originally set based on the assessment results of students in grades three through eight only. In August and October 2018, the Technical Design Group (TDG) examined the impact of applying these cut scores to grade eleven results.

**English Language Arts/Literacy (ELA)**

Tables 1 and 2 show the Status and Change cut scores, based on Distance from Standard (DFS) that have been set for grades three through eight.

**Table 1: Status Cut Scores for Academic Indicator, ELA, Grades 3–8**

| **Status Level** | **Status Cut Scores** |
| --- | --- |
| Very Low | Average DFS is -70.1 points or lower |
| Low | Average DFS is -5.1 to -70 points |
| Medium | Average DFS is -5 to +9.9 points |
| High | Average DFS is 10 to 44.9 points |
| Very High | Average DFS is 45 points or higher |

**Table 2: Change Cut Scores for Academic Indicator, ELA, Grades 3–8**

| **Change Level** | **Change Cut Score** |
| --- | --- |
| Declined Significantly | Average DFS declined by 15.1 or more points. |
| Declined | Average DFS declined by 3 to 15 points. |
| Maintained | Average DFS declined by less than 2.9 points or increased by less than 2.9 points. |
| Increased | Average DFS increased by 3 to 14.9 points. |
| Increased Significantly | Average DFS increased by 15 or more points. |

Table 3 shows the distributions, based on the 2018 results for the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for ELA, for grades three through eight, when these Status cut scores are applied.

**Table 3: ELA Status Distributions for Grades 3–8**

**Based on 2018 Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment Results**

| **Percentile** | **ELA** Average Distance from Standard | **Status Level** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2.5 | -77.2 | Very Low |
| 4.0 | -70.0 | Low |
| 5 | -65.8 | Low |
| 10 | -54.5 | Low |
| 15 | -46.3 | Low |
| 20 | -39.7 | Low |
| 25 | -34.0 | Low |
| 30 | -28.9 | Low |
| 35 | -24.5 | Low |
| 40 | -19.4 | Low |
| 45 | -15.1 | Low |
| 50 | -10.8 | Low |
| 55 | -6.7 | Low |
| 57.0 | -5.0 | Medium |
| 60 | -1.5 | Medium |
| 65 | 3.5 | Medium |
| 69.9 | 10.0 | High |
| 70 | 10.1 | High |
| 75 | 18.0 | High |
| 80 | 26.5 | High |
| 85 | 36.0 | High |
| 89.7 | 45.0 | Very High |
| 90 | 46.2 | Very High |
| 95 | 61.4 | Very High |

For grades three through eight, Status at the 50th percentile is -10.8. Districts at and above the 69.9th percentile receive a “High” Status level,” while those at and above the 89.7th percentile receive a “Very High” Status level.

Application of these cut scores to grade eleven would result in many more districts receiving a “High” and “Very High” Status level, as shown in Table 4.

**Table 4: ELA Status Distributions for High Schools & High School Districts (Grades 7–12) Based on 2018 Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment Results**

**Current 3–8 Cut Scores Applied**

| **Percentile** | **ELA** Average Distance from Standard | **Status Level** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | -85.5 | Very Low |
| 8.7 | -70.0 | Low |
| 10 | -65.7 | Low |
| 15 | -41.6 | Low |
| 20 | -30.3 | Low |
| 25 | -21.3 | Low |
| 30 | -14.2 | Low |
| 35 | -9.3 | Low |
| 37.1 | -5.0 | Medium |
| 40 | -0.5 | Medium |
| 45 | 5.3 | Medium |
| 47.5 | 10.0 | High |
| 50 | 12.7 | High |
| 55 | 15.9 | High |
| 60 | 21.6 | High |
| 65 | 31.8 | High |
| 70 | 38.0 | High |
| 72.9 | 45.0 | Very High |
| 75 | 49.6 | Very High |
| 80 | 54.6 | Very High |
| 85 | 63.1 | Very High |
| 90 | 76.0 | Very High |
| 95 | 91.4 | Very High |

For grade eleven, Status at the 50th percentile is +12.7.

If the ELA Status cut scores for grades three through eight were applied to grade eleven, a significantly higher number of districts would receive a “High” Status (those above the 45th percentile, compared with about the 70th percentile for grades three through eight), and “Very High” Status (those at above the 70th percentile, compared with about the 90th percentile for grades three through eight).

It will therefore be necessary to develop new cut scores for grade eleven ELA to ensure a distribution consistent with those of the other indicators in the Dashboard. These cut scores will be applied to high schools (schools serving students in grades seven through twelve) and high school districts only. Unified districts and K-12 schools will continue to have the grades three through eight cut scores applied to their assessment results. Tables 5 and 6 show proposed cut scores for grade eleven ELA.

**Table 5: Proposed Status Cut Scores for High Schools & High School Districts: ELA**

**(Note: The proposed status cut scores are based on the 2018 ELA status distribution)**

| **Status Level** | **Status Cut Scores** |
| --- | --- |
| Very Low | DFS is -45.1 points or lower |
| Low | DFS is -0.1 to -45 points |
| Medium | DFS is 0 to 29.9 points |
| High | DFS is 30 points to 74.9 points |
| Very High | DFS is 75 points or higher |

**Table 6: Proposed Change Cut Scores for High Schools and High School Districts: ELA**

| **Change Level** | **Change Cut Scores** |
| --- | --- |
| Declined Significantly | declined by 15.1 points or more |
| Declined | declined by 3.0 points to 15 points |
| Maintained | declined by 2.9 points or increased by 2.9 points |
| Increased | increased by 3 points to 14.9 points |
| Increased Significantly | Increased by 15 points or more |

Table 7 shows the new Status distributions that result from applying the proposed Status cut scores to the 2018 results for the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for ELA.

**Table 7: ELA Status Distributions for High Schools & High School Districts (Grades 7–12) Using Proposed Status Cut Scores**

(Based the 2018 ELA results for All Districts and All Charter Schools)

| **Percentile** | **ELA** Average Distance from Standard | **Status Level** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | -85.5 | Very Low |
| 10 | -65.7 | Very Low |
| 14.1 | -45 | Low |
| 15 | -41.6 | Low |
| 20 | -30.3 | Low |
| 25 | -21.3 | Low |
| 30 | -14.2 | Low |
| 35 | -9.3 | Low |
| 40 | -0.5 | Low |
| 40.5 | 0.0 | Medium |
| 45 | 5.3 | Medium |
| 50 | 12.7 | Medium |
| 55 | 15.9 | Medium |
| 60 | 21.6 | Medium |
| 63.7 | 30 | High |
| 65 | 31.8 | High |
| 70 | 38 | High |
| 75 | 49.6 | High |
| 80 | 54.6 | High |
| 85 | 63.1 | High |
| 88.9 | 75 | Very High |
| 90 | 76 | Very High |
| 95 | 91.4 | Very High |

In the spring of 2018, the statewide ELA grade 11 Smarter Balanced results decreased from the prior year. As a result, the distribution in Table 9 shows a “Change” distribution that is negatively skewed (i.e., positive Change does not begin until after the 75th percentile). Recall, that the initial Change cut scores for the Academic Indicator (grades 3-8) were initially established based on a distribution that was positively skewed—positive Change for ELA started at the 20th percentile and for math at the 25th percentile. The following year (spring 2017) the Smarter Balanced results produced a more normal Change distribution. Positive Change started at the 55th percentile for both ELA and math. The shift from a skewed to a more normal distribution prompted revisions to the grades 3-8 Change cut scores in the Fall 2017 Dashboard.

At the October 2018 TDG meeting, members had an in-depth discussion regarding the setting of the ELA Change cut scores for high schools. Therefore, the TDG recommended that the high school Change cut scores be based on the distribution generated by the 2016 and 2017 assessment results.

Because we anticipate a more normal distribution in future years, the CDE agrees with the TDG that it is more technically sound and is likely to bring greater stability to the Dashboard to establish cut scores based on a normal distribution rather than a skewed distribution. Accordingly, the CDE recommends adopting Change cut scores based on the more normal distribution generated by the 2016 and 2017 assessment results.

Table 8 shows the Change between the 2017 and 2016 Smarter Balanced Assessment results. Positive change begins around the 50th percentile providing a more normal distribution.

**Table 8: Change Distribution–Difference between 2017 and 2016 Smarter Balanced Results for High Schools & High School Districts (Grades 7–12)**

| Percentile | **ELA** **Change from**  **Prior Year to Current Year** |
| --- | --- |
| P05 | -29.8 |
| P10 | -21 |
| P15 | -14.7 |
| P20 | -12.3 |
| P25 | -9.5 |
| P30 | -7.1 |
| P35 | -5.2 |
| P40 | -4.2 |
| P45 | -2.1 |
| P50 | 0.15 |
| P55 | 2.6 |
| P60 | 4.1 |
| P65 | 6.1 |
| P70 | 8.7 |
| P75 | 11.2 |
| P80 | 14.9 |
| P85 | 20.5 |
| P90 | 30.9 |
| P95 | 37.6 |

Table 9 displays the impact of applying the high school proposed Change cut scores generated by the data in Table 8 to the current distribution (difference between the 2018 and 2017 results).

**Table 9: Change Distribution–Difference between 2018 and 2017 Smarter Balanced Results for High Schools & High School Districts (Grades 7–12) Using Proposed Change Cut Scores**

(Based on All Districts and All Charter Schools Data)

| **Percentile** | **ELA** Change from Prior Year to Current Year | **Change Level** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | -46.3 | Declined Significantly |
| 10 | -36.3 | Declined Significantly |
| 15 | -30.4 | Declined Significantly |
| 20 | -27.2 | Declined Significantly |
| 25 | -23.4 | Declined Significantly |
| 30 | -19.4 | Declined Significantly |
| 35 | -16.7 | Declined Significantly |
| 39.9 | -15.0 | Declined |
| 40 | -14.9 | Declined |
| 45 | -12.8 | Declined |
| 50 | -10.7 | Declined |
| 55 | -8.1 | Declined |
| 60 | -6 | Declined |
| 65 | -4.2 | Declined |
| 70 | -3.1 | Declined |
| 70.6 | -3 | Declined |
| 75 | -0.4 | Maintained |
| 80 | 2.2 | Maintained |
| 81.7 | 3.0 | Increased |
| 85 | 7.3 | Increased |
| 90 | 12.2 | Increased |
| 92.4 | 15 | Increased Significantly |
| 95 | 18.2 | Increased Significantly |

Table 10 is the five-by-five colored table for high schools and high school districts produced using the proposed Status and Change cut scores for ELA.

**Table 10: ELA – High School District Performance Levels (Colors)**

| **Performance Level** | **Declined Significantly**  from Prior Year (by 15.1 points or more) | **Declined**  from Prior Year (by 3.0 to 15 points) | **Maintained**  from Prior Year (declined or increased by 2.9 points or less) | **Increased**  from Prior Year (by 3 points to 14.9 points) | **Increased Significantly**  from Prior Year (by 15 points or more) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Very High**  +75 points or higher in Current Year | 26  (1.9%)  Green | 42  (3.1%)  Green | 23  (1.7%)  Blue | 23  (1.7%)  Blue | 20  (1.4%)  Blue |
| **High**  +30 to +74.9 points in Current Year | 106  (7.9%)  Green | 94  (7.0%)  Green | 37  (2.8%)  Green | 54  (4.0%)  Green | 32  (2.4%)  Blue |
| **Medium**  0 to +29.9 points in Current Year | 110  (8.2%)  Yellow | 72  (5.4%)  Yellow | 39  (2.9%)  Yellow | 40  (3.0%)  Green | 30  (2.2%)  Green |
| **Low**  -0.1 to -45 points in Current Year | 166  (12.3%)  Orange | 83  (6.2%)  Orange | 29  (2.2%)  Orange | 37  (2.8%)  Yellow | 28  (2.1%)  Yellow |
| **Very Low**  -45.1 points or lower in Current Year | 115  (8.5%)  Red | 54  (4.0%)  Red | 17  (1.3%)  Red | 33  (2.5%)  Orange | 30  (2.2%)  Orange |

Tables 11 and 12 show the number of districts and schools, respectively that would receive each performance color after the proposed cut scores are applied.

**Table 11: ELA – Statewide Districts’ Performance**

| **# of LEAs** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 72 | 1  (1.4%) | 22  (30.6%) | 23  (31.9%) | 23  (31.9%) | 3  (4.2%) |

**Table 12: ELA – Statewide Schools’ Performance**

| **# of Schools** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1,346 | 186 (13.8%) | 347 (25.8%) | 286 (21.3%) | 429 (31.9%) | 98  (7.3%) |

**Table 13: ELA – Performance by School Type**

| **School Type** | **# of Schools** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Non Charter | 1,156 | 159 (13.8%) | 299 (25.9%) | 250 (21.6%) | 372 (32.2%) | 76 (6.6%) |
| Charter | 190 | 27 (14.2%) | 48 (25.3%) | 36 (19.0%) | 57 (30.0%) | 22 (11.6%) |
| Non Small Schools\* | 862 | 51  (5.9%) | 214 (24.8%) | 213 (24.7%) | 321 (37.2%) | 63 (7.3%) |
| Small Schools | 484 | 135 (27.9%) | 133 (27.5%) | 73 (15.1%) | 108 (22.3%) | 35 (7.2%) |
| Non DASS | 1,189 | 90  (7.6%) | 293 (24.6%) | 281 (23.6%) | 428 (36.0%) | 97 (8.2%) |
| DASS | 157 | 96 (61.2%) | 54 (34.4%) | 5  (3.2%) | 1  (0.6%) | 1  (0.6%) |

\*Small schools = schools with 30 to 149 students with Smarter Balanced test scores.

Student-group results, for districts and schools, are shown in Tables 14 and 15. Note: For all percentages calculated for Table 14, the total number of districts (72) was used for the denominator, in order to show how many districts statewide would have a student group in each color-coded performance level. For all percentages calculated for Table 15, the total number of schools (1,346) was used for the denominator.

**Table 14: ELA – Academic Indicator High School District**

**District Student Group Results**

| **Student Groups** | **Total\*** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All Districts  (Total = 72) | 72 | 1  (1.4%) | 22 (30.6%) | 23 (31.9%) | 23 (31.9%) | 3 (4.2%) |
| African American | 24 | 8 (11.1%) | 8 (11.1%) | 7  (9.7%) | 1  (1.4%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| Asian | 35 | 0  (0.0%) | 0  (0.0%) | 2  (2.8%) | 24 (33.3%) | 9 (12.5%) |
| Filipino | 26 | 0  (0.0%) | 0  (0.0%) | 2  (2.8%) | 17 (23.6%) | 7 (9.7%) |
| Hispanic/Latino | 65 | 6  (8.3%) | 32 (44.4%) | 22 (30.6%) | 4  (5.6%) | 1 (1.4%) |
| Native American | 3 | 0  (0.0%) | 3  (4.2%) | 0  (0.0%) | 0  (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| Pacific Islander | 4 | 1  (1.4%) | 2  (2.8%) | 1  (1.4%) | 0  (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| Two or More Races | 28 | 0  (0.0%) | 2  (2.8%) | 7  (9.7%) | 18 (25.0%) | 1 (1.4%) |
| White | 66 | 0  (0.0%) | 4  (5.6%) | 19 (26.4%) | 39 (54.2%) | 4 (5.6%) |
| English Learners | 50 | 41 (56.9%) | 6  (8.3%) | 3  (4.2%) | 0  (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| Foster | 8 | 6  (8.3%) | 2  (2.8%) | 0  (0.0%) | 0  (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| Homeless | 30 | 16 (22.2%) | 8 (11.1%) | 5  (6.9%) | 1  (1.4%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 69 | 7  (9.7%) | 38 (52.8%) | 19 (26.4%) | 4  (5.6%) | 1 (1.4%) |
| Students with Disabilities | 52 | 39 (54.2%) | 12 (16.7%) | 1  (1.4%) | 0  (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) |

\*Total = Number of districts with 30 or more students at the district level and student group level with English Language Arts/Literacy Smarter Balanced Assessment results in both the current and prior year (except for Foster and Homeless, these two student groups only need to have an N size of 15 or more to get a performance color).

**Table 15: ELA – Academic Indicator High School District**

**School Student Group Results**

| **Student Groups** | **Total\*** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All Schools  (Total = 1,346) | 1,346 | 186 (13.8%) | 347 (25.8%) | 286 (21.2%) | 429 (31.9%) | 98 (7.3%) |
| African American | 183 | 63 (4.7%) | 66 (4.9%) | 32 (2.4%) | 13 (1.0%) | 3 (0.2%) |
| Asian | 306 | 4  (0.3%) | 8  (0.6%) | 25 (1.9%) | 168 (12.5%) | 95 (7.1%) |
| Filipino | 100 | 1  (0.1%) | 2  (0.1%) | 11 (0.8%) | 53 (3.9%) | 27 (2.0%) |
| Hispanic/Latino | 1,127 | 160 (11.9%) | 411 (30.5%) | 270 (20.1%) | 234 (17.4%) | 51 (3.8%) |
| Native American | 9 | 2  (0.1%) | 1  (0.1%) | 0  (0.0%) | 0  (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| Pacific Islander | 5 | 0  (0.0%) | 0  (0.0%) | 0  (0.0%) | 0  (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| Two or More Races | 79 | 0  (0.0%) | 6  (0.4%) | 6  (0.4%) | 41 (3.0%) | 21 (1.6%) |
| White | 660 | 9  (0.7%) | 61 (4.5%) | 117 (8.7%) | 335 (24.9%) | 136 (10.1%) |
| English Learners | 658 | 421 (31.3%) | 174 (12.9%) | 51 (3.8%) | 8  (0.6%) | 2 (0.1%) |
| Foster | 6 | 0  (0.0%) | 0  (0.0%) | 0  (0.0%) | 0  (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| Homeless | 80 | 17 (1.3%) | 32 (2.4%) | 17 (1.3%) | 8  (0.6%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 1,193 | 187 (13.9%) | 439 (32.6%) | 291 (21.6%) | 228 (16.9%) | 48 (3.6%) |
| Students with Disabilities | 451 | 293 (21.8%) | 137 (10.2%) | 19 (1.4%) | 0  (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) |

\*Total = Number of schools with 30 or more students at the school level and student group level with English Language Arts/Literacy Smarter Balanced Assessment results in both the current and prior year.

**Mathematics**

Unlike the case for ELA, applying the original Status cut scores for mathematics to grade eleven would result in many more districts receiving a “Low” Status level. Tables 16 and 17 show the Status and Change cut scores that have been set for mathematics for grades three through eight.

**Table 16: Status Cut Scores for Academic Indicator, Mathematics, Grades 3–8**

| **Status Level** | **Status Cut Scores** |
| --- | --- |
| Very Low | Average DFS is -95.1 points or lower |
| Low | Average DFS is -25.1 to -95 points |
| Medium | Average DFS is -25 to less than zero. |
| High | Average DFS is zero to 34.9 points |
| Very High | Average DFS is 35 points or higher |

**Table 17: Change Cut Scores for Academic Indicator, Mathematics, Grades 3–8**

| **Change Level** | **Change Cut Score** |
| --- | --- |
| Declined Significantly | Average DFS declined by more than 15 points. |
| Declined | Average DFS declined by 3 to 15 points. |
| Maintained | Average DFS declined by less than 3 points or increased by less than 3 points. |
| Increased | Average DFS increased by 3 to less than 15 points. |
| Increased Significantly | Average DFS increased by 15 or more points. |

Table 18 shows the distributions, based on the 2018 results for the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for mathematics, for grades three through eight, when these Status cut scores are applied.

**Table 18: Mathematics Status Distributions for Grades 3–8**

**Based on 2018 Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment Results**

| **Percentile** | **MATH** Average Distance from Standard | **Status Level** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | -105.7 | Very Low |
| 8.5 | -95.0 | Low |
| 10 | -90.1 | Low |
| 15 | -79.3 | Low |
| 20 | -71.6 | Low |
| 25 | -65.0 | Low |
| 30 | -59.3 | Low |
| 35 | -53.0 | Low |
| 40 | -48.1 | Low |
| 45 | -42.1 | Low |
| 50 | -37.5 | Low |
| 55 | -32.3 | Low |
| 60 | -26.7 | Low |
| 61.3 | -25.0 | Medium |
| 65 | -20.0 | Medium |
| 70 | -12.0 | Medium |
| 75 | -4.4 | Medium |
| 77.7 | 0.0 | High |
| 80 | 4.7 | High |
| 85 | 14.8 | High |
| 90 | 29.7 | High |
| 91.7 | 35.0 | Very High |
| 95 | 46.6 | Very High |

For grades three through eight, Status at the 50th percentile is -37.5. Districts below the 8.5th percentile receive a “Very Low” Status level,” while those above the 61.3th percentile receive a “Low” Status level.

Application of these cut scores to grade eleven results would result in many more districts receiving a “Low” and “Very Low” Status level, as shown in Table 19.

**Table 19: Mathematics Status Distributions for Grade 11**

**Current Cut Scores for Grades 3–8 Applied**

**(Based on 2018 Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment Results)**

| **Percentile** | **Math** Average Distance from Standard | **Status Level** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | -180.8 | Very Low |
| 10 | -148.6 | Very Low |
| 15 | -134.6 | Very Low |
| 20 | -125.8 | Very Low |
| 25 | -110.0 | Very Low |
| 30 | -100.7 | Very Low |
| 34.3 | -95.0 | Low |
| 35 | -93.3 | Low |
| 40 | -83.3 | Low |
| 45 | -72.7 | Low |
| 50 | -67.35 | Low |
| 55 | -64.1 | Low |
| 60 | -56.6 | Low |
| 65 | -50.4 | Low |
| 70 | -40.6 | Low |
| 75 | -27.0 | Low |
| 77.2 | -25.0 | Medium |
| 80 | -17.6 | Medium |
| 85 | -7.2 | Medium |
| 86.8 | 0.0 | High |
| 90 | 14.0 | High |
| 94.8 | 35.0 | Very High |
| 95 | 44.0 | Very High |

For grade eleven, Status at the 50th percentile is -67.35. If the original cut scores are applied to grade eleven, many more districts would be assigned to the “Very Low” Status (those within the 30th percentile compared to the 5th percentile for grades three through eight).

As with grade eleven ELA, it will therefore be necessary to develop new cut scores for grade eleven mathematics to ensure a distribution consistent with those of the other indicators in the Dashboard. At the October 2018 TDG meeting, the TDG recommended Status and Change cut scores for grade eleven mathematics, which are shown in Tables 20 and 21. It is important to note that the Change distributions between 2017 and 2016 and 2018 and 2017 had only negligible differences. As a result, the recommended Change cut scores would be the same for both distributions.

**Table 20: Proposed Status Cut Scores for High Schools & High School Districts: Mathematics**

| **Status Level** | **Status Cut Scores** |
| --- | --- |
| Very Low | DFS is -115.1 points or lower |
| Low | DFS is -60.1 to -115 points |
| Medium | DFS is -0.1 to -60 points |
| High | DFS is 0 points to 24.9 points |
| Very High | DFS is 25 points or higher |

**Table 21: Proposed Change Cut Scores for High Schools & High School Districts: Mathematics**

| **Change Level** | **Change Cut Scores** |
| --- | --- |
| Declined Significantly | declined 15.1 points or more |
| Declined | declined 3 points to 15 points |
| Maintained | declined by 2.9 or increased by 2.9 points |
| Increased | increased by 3 points to 14.9 points |
| Increased Significantly | Increased by 15 or more points |

Tables 22 shows the Status distributions that result from applying the proposed Status cut scores to the 2018 results for the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for mathematics.

Tables 23 shows the Change distributions that result from applying the proposed Change cut scores to the 2018 results for the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for mathematics.

**Table 22: Mathematics Status Distributions for High Schools & High School Districts (Grades 7–12) Using Proposed Status Cut Scores**

(Based on All Districts and All Charter Schools)

| **Percentile** | **Math** Average Distance from Standard | **Status Level** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | -180.8 | Very Low |
| 10 | -148.6 | Very Low |
| 15 | -134.6 | Very Low |
| 20 | -125.8 | Very Low |
| 23.8 | -115.0 | Low |
| 25 | -110 | Low |
| 30 | -100.7 | Low |
| 35 | -93.3 | Low |
| 40 | -83.3 | Low |
| 45 | -72.7 | Low |
| 50 | -67.35 | Low |
| 55 | -64.1 | Low |
| 58.2 | -60.0 | Medium |
| 60 | -56.6 | Medium |
| 65 | -50.4 | Medium |
| 70 | -40.6 | Medium |
| 75 | -27 | Medium |
| 80 | -17.6 | Medium |
| 85 | -7.2 | Medium |
| 86.8 | 0 | High |
| 90 | 14.0 | High |
| 93.6 | 25.0 | Very High |
| 95 | 44.0 | Very High |

**Table 23: Mathematics Change Distributions for High Schools & High School Districts (Grades 7–12) Using Proposed Status Cut Scores**

(Based on All Districts and All Charter Schools)

| **Percentile** | **Math** Change from Prior Year to Current Year | **Change Level** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | -31.4 | Declined Significantly |
| 10 | -26.5 | Declined Significantly |
| 15 | -23.1 | Declined Significantly |
| 19.2 | -20.0 | Declined Significantly |
| 20 | -19.4 | Declined Significantly |
| 25.4 | -15.0 | Declined |
| 25 | -15.3 | Declined |
| 30 | -12.3 | Declined |
| 35 | -10.8 | Declined |
| 40 | -8.4 | Declined |
| 45 | -6.9 | Declined |
| 50 | -4.1 | Declined |
| 52.9 | -3.0 | Declined |
| 55 | -2.4 | Maintained |
| 60 | -0.9 | Maintained |
| 65 | 0.6 | Maintained |
| 70 | 2.3 | Maintained |
| 70.7 | 3.0 | Increased |
| 75 | 4.4 | Increased |
| 80 | 7.5 | Increased |
| 85 | 11.0 | Increased |
| 89.9 | 15 | Increased Significantly |
| 90 | 15.6 | Increased Significantly |
| 95 | 25.5 | Increased Significantly |

Table 24 shows the five-by-five colored table for high schools and high school districts that results when using the proposed Status and Change cut scores for mathematics.

**Table 24: Math – High School District Performance Levels (Colors)**

| **Performance Level** | **Declined Significantly**  from Prior Year (by 15.1 points or more) | **Declined**  from Prior Year (by 3 to 15 points) | **Maintained**  from Prior Year (declined by 2.9 or increased by 2.9 points) | **Increased**  from Prior Year (by 3 to 14.9 points) | **Increased Significantly**  from Prior Year (by 15 points or more) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Very High**  +25 points or higher in Current Year | 17  (1.3%)  Green | 23  (1.7%)  Green | 14  (1.1%)  Blue | 28  (2.1%)  Blue | 26  (2.0%)  Blue |
| **High**  0 to +24.9 points in Current Year | 14  (1.1%)  Green | 19  (1.4%)  Green | 11  (0.8%)  Green | 23  (1.7%)  Green | 8  (0.6%)  Blue |
| **Medium**  -0.1 to -59.9 points in Current Year | 74  (5.5%)  Yellow | 99  (7.4%)  Yellow | 52  (3.9%)  Yellow | 82  (6.2%)  Green | 62  (4.7%)  Green |
| **Low**  -60.1 to -115 points in Current Year | 118  (8.8%)  Orange | 121  (9.0%)  Orange | 68  (5.1%)  Orange | 79  (5.9%)  Yellow | 59  (4.4%)  Yellow |
| **Very Low**  -115.1 points or lower in Current Year | 116  (8.7%)  Red | 95  (7.1%)  Red | 36  (2.7%)  Red | 55  (4.1%)  Orange | 33  (2.4%)  Orange |

Tables 25 and 26 show the number of districts and schools, respectively, that would receive each performance color after the proposed cut scores are applied.

**Tables 25: Math—Statewide Districts’ Performance**

| **# of LEAs** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 72 | 5  (6.9%) | 26  (36.1%) | 28  (38.9%) | 10  (13.9%) | 3  (4.2%) |

**Table 26: Math –Statewide Schools’ Performance**

| **# of Schools** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1,338 | 247  (18.5%) | 401  (30.0%) | 363  (27.1%) | 251  (18.8) | 76  (5.7%) |

**Table 27: Math – Performance by School Type**

| **School Type** | **# of Schools** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Non Charter | 1,152 | 202 (17.5%) | 348 (30.2%) | 324 (28.1%) | 217 (18.8%) | 61  (5.3%) |
| Charter | 186 | 45 (24.2%) | 53 (28.5%) | 39 (21.0%) | 34 (18.3%) | 15  (8.1%) |
| Non Small Schools\* | 861 | 92 (10.7%) | 256 (29.7%) | 272 (31.6%) | 186 (21.6%) | 55  (6.4%) |
| Small Schools | 477 | 155 (32.5%) | 145 (30.4%) | 91 (19.1%) | 65 (13.6%) | 21  (4.4%) |
| Non DASS | 1,183 | 152 (12.9%) | 345 (29.2%) | 360 (30.4%) | 251 (21.2%) | 75  (6.3%) |
| DASS | 155 | 95 (61.3%) | 56 (36.1%) | 3  (1.9%) | 0  (0.0%) | 1  (0.7%) |

\*Small schools = schools with 30 to 149 students with Smarter Balanced test scores.

Student-group results, for districts and schools, are shown in Tables 28 and 29. Note: For all percentages calculated Table 28, the total number of districts (72) was used for the denominator, in order to show how many districts statewide would have a student group in each color-coded performance level. For all percentages calculated for Table 29, the total number of schools (1,332) was used for the denominator.

**Table 28: Math – Academic Indicator High School District**

**District Student Group Results**

| **Student Groups** | **Total\*** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All Districts  (Total = 72) | 72 | 5  (6.9%) | 26 (36.1%) | 28 (38.9%) | 10 (13.9%) | 3 (4.2%) |
| African American | 24 | 9 (12.5%) | 8 (11.1%) | 6  (8.3%) | 1  (1.4%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| Asian | 35 | 0  (0.0%) | 0  (0.0%) | 4  (5.6%) | 13 (18.1%) | 18 (25.0%) |
| Filipino | 26 | 0  (0.0%) | 1  (1.4%) | 6  (8.3%) | 14 (19.4%) | 5 (6.9%) |
| Hispanic/Latino | 65 | 11 (15.3%) | 37 (51.4%) | 14 (19.4%) | 2  (2.8%) | 1 (1.4%) |
| Native American | 3 | 0  (0.0%) | 1  (1.4%) | 2  (2.8%) | 0  (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| Pacific Islander | 4 | 0  (0.0%) | 3  (4.2%) | 0  (0.0%) | 1  (1.4%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| Two or More Races | 28 | 1  (1.4%) | 6  (8.3%) | 7  (9.7%) | 10 (13.9%) | 4 (5.6%) |
| White | 66 | 1  (1.4%) | 12 (16.7%) | 28 (38.9%) | 19 (26.4%) | 6 (8.3%) |
| English Learners | 50 | 34 (47.2%) | 12 (16.7%) | 2  (2.8%) | 2  (2.8%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| Foster | 8 | 5  (6.9%) | 3  (4.2%) | 0  (0.0%) | 0  (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| Homeless | 30 | 14 (19.4%) | 9 (12.5%) | 6  (8.3%) | 1  (1.4%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 69 | 14 (19.4%) | 31 (43.1%) | 19 (26.4%) | 5  (6.9%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| Students with Disabilities | 50 | 30 (41.7%) | 17 (23.6%) | 2  (2.8%) | 1  (1.4%) | 0 (0.0%) |

\*Total = Number of districts with 30 or more students at the district level and student group level with Math Smarter Balanced Assessment results (except for Foster and Homeless, these two student groups only need to have an N size of 15 or more to get a performance color).

**Table 29: Math – Academic Indicator High School**

**School Student Group Results**

| **Student Groups** | **Total\*** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All Schools  (Total = 1,332) | 1,338 | 247 (18.5%) | 401 (30.0%) | 363 (27.1%) | 251 (18.8%) | 76 (5.7%) |
| African American | 174 | 78 (5.8%) | 61 (4.6%) | 25 (1.9%) | 9  (0.7%) | 1 (0.1%) |
| Asian | 299 | 1  (0.1%) | 15 (1.1%) | 42 (3.1%) | 124 (9.3%) | 117 (8.7%) |
| Filipino | 95 | 0  (0.0%) | 6  (0.4%) | 33 (2.5%) | 31 (2.3%) | 25 (1.9%) |
| Hispanic/Latino | 1,123 | 237 (17.7%) | 459 (34.3%) | 280 (20.9%) | 132 (9.9%) | 15 (1.1%) |
| Native American | 3 | 2  (0.1%) | 1  (0.1%) | 0  (0.0%) | 0  (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| Pacific Islander | 0 | 0  (0.0%) | 0  (0.0%) | 0  (0.0%) | 0  (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| Two or More Races | 72 | 0  (0.0%) | 5  (0.4%) | 18 (1.3%) | 27 (2.0%) | 22 (1.6%) |
| White | 656 | 22 (1.6%) | 77 (5.8%) | 228 (17.0%) | 238 (17.8%) | 91 (6.8%) |
| English Learners | 652 | 344 (25.7%) | 223 (16.7%) | 47 (3.5%) | 26 (1.9%) | 12 (0.9%) |
| Foster | 0 | 0  (0.0%) | 0  (0.0%) | 0  (0.0%) | 0  (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| Homeless | 71 | 19 (1.4%) | 33 (2.5%) | 14 (1.0%) | 5  (0.4%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 1,189 | 257 (19.2%) | 459 (34.3%) | 314 (23.5%) | 133 (9.9%) | 26 (1.9%) |
| Students with Disabilities | 448 | 252 (18.8%) | 182 (13.6%) | 14 (1.0%) | 0  (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) |

\*Total = Number of schools with 30 or more students at the school level and student group level with Math Smarter Balanced Assessment results.

The CDE conducted an analysis on the cut scores for grades 3-8 to determine if recommended revisions should be considered for the 2018 Dashboard. Based on the data analysis, the CDE is not recommending any revisions to the grades 3-8 cut scores for the Academic Indicator.

It is important to note that the calculation of the 2018 Dashboard includes the incorporation of the participation rate adjustment required under the Every Student Success Act (ESSA). In accordance with ESSA, all schools and districts must test at least 95 percent of their students. If they fail to meet this target, their DFS score will be reduced by one-quarter point for each percentage point that they fall short of the 95 percent target. (Example: If a school has a participation rate of 79 percent, it is 16 points short of the 95 percent target. To determine the adjustment, the 16 points is multiplied by 0.25 for an adjustment of 4 points.)

Although adjustments have been made to the calculation of the Academic Indicator for grades 3–8, the impact on schools is negligible. In addition, resetting cut scores yet again would impact the ability of schools to demonstrate progress over time. Table 30 provides the percent of schools with grades 3–8 that will continue to have the same color performance in the 2018 Dashboard as they did in the Fall 2017 Dashboard, and the percent of schools with grade 3–8 students that will have a change in performance colors in the 2018 Dashboard. Based on these results, the CDE is not recommending any revisions to the established cut scores for grades 3–8.

**Table 30: Difference in School Performance Color from 2017 to 2018**

| **Type** | **Declined**  **2+ Colors** | **Declined**  **1 Color** | **Same**  **Color** | **Increased**  **1 Color** | **Increased**  **2+ Colors** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ELA | 1.3% | 14.1% | 44.7% | 32.2% | 7.8% |
| Math | 2.1% | 19.6% | 47.9% | 26.5% | 4.1% |

### Recommendation

The CDE recommends that the SBE approve the proposed Status and Change cut scores for the Grade 11 Academic Indicator for ELA and mathematics.

# Attachment 6

## Proposed Update of the Differentiated Assistance Criteria for Access to a Broad Course of Study

Local educational agencies (LEAs) are identified for differentiated support under the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) when at least one student group meets the criteria in two or more priority areas.

In July 2016, the State Board of Education (SBE) approved the College/Career Indicator (CCI) as a state indicator and included it under two state priority areas: Access to a Broad Course of Study (Priority 7) and Outcomes in a Broad Course of Study (Priority 8). Because the SBE had not yet approved a local indicator for Access to a Broad Course of Study when the SBE initially approved the differentiated assistance criteria in September 2016, the CCI was used to ensure there was a performance standard for both Access to a Broad Course of Student (Priority 7) and Outcomes in a Broad Course of Study (Priority 8).

In November 2017, the SBE adopted a local indicator for Access to a Broad Course of Study, and in March 2018, the SBE adopted the performance standard and narrative self-reflection tool for the Access to a Broad Course of Study local indicator.

This local indicator is designed to provide more accurate information on the extent to which students have access to, and are enrolled in, a board course of study.

The SBE, however, has not updated the criteria to reflect the new local indicator. Accordingly, the California Department of Education recommends that the SBE update the criteria to incorporate the new local indicator for Access to a Broad Course of Study. As a result, the CCI will remain as the indicator for Outcomes in a Broad Course of Study (Priority 8) but will be replaced by the new local indicator as the indicator for Access to a Broad Course of Study (Priority 7).

Table 1 provides the state and/or local criteria for each LCFF priority area.

**Table 1: Indicators by Priority Areas**

| **Local Control Funding Formula Priority** | **State Indicators** | **Local Indicators** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority 1:** Basic Services or Basic Conditions at Schools | N/A | Text books availability, adequate facilities, and correctly assigned teachers |
| **Priority 2:** Implementation of State Academic Standards | N/A | Annually report on progress in Implementing the standards for all content areas |
| **Priority 3:** Parent Engagement | N/A | Annually report progress toward: (1) seeking input from parents/guardians in decision making; and (2) promoting parental participation in programs |
| **Priority 4:** Student Achievement | Academic Indicator (3-8, 11)  English Learner Progress Indicator (1-12) | N/A |
| **Priority 5:** Student Engagement | Chronic Absence Indicator (K-8)  Graduation Rate Indicator (9-12) | N/A |
| **Priority 6:** School Climate | Suspension Rate Indicator (K-12) | Administer a Local Climate Survey every other year |
| **Priority 7:** Access to a Broad Course of Study | College/Career Indicator (9-12) (Requesting SBE remove this indicator from this priority area.) | Annually report progress on the extent students have access to, and are enrolled in, a broad course of study |
| **Priority 8:** Outcomes in a Broad Course of Study | College/Career Indicator (9-12) | N/A |
| **Priority 9 (COE Only)** Services for Expelled Students | N/A | Annually report on the coordination of Services for Expelled Students |
| **Priority 10 (COE Only)** Services for Foster Youth | N/A | Annually report on the coordination of Services for Foster Youth |

### Recommendation

The CDE recommends that the SBE update the criteria for differentiated assistance to incorporate the new local indicator for Access to a Broad Course of Study.

# Attachment 7

## Proposed Revision to the Self-Reflection Tool for the Local Indicator for Implementation of State Academic Standards

This Attachment proposes a technical revision to the optional reflection tool (Option 2) for Implementation of State Academic Standards (Priority 2).

### Summary of Recommendations

The current approved prompt for item five of the optional reflection tool, provided below, contains a specific reference to the 2015–16 school year, which, in subsequent years, has led to confusion in the field. In addition the tables included in the optional reflection tools do not comply with the new Section 508 requirements that took effect earlier this year.

1. **During the 2015–16 school year (including summer 2015), rate the LEA’s success at engaging in the following activities with teachers and school administrators?**

*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** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Identifying the professional learning needs of groups of teachers or staff as a whole |  |  |  |  |  |
| Identifying the professional learning needs of individual teachers |  |  |  |  |  |
| Providing support for teachers on the standards they have not yet mastered |  |  |  |  |  |

The CDE recommends: (1) revising the reference to the 2015–16 school year to a general reference to the prior school year, (2) revising the prompt’s wording to improve the readability, and (3) updating the tables throughout the local indicators to adhere to Section 508 requirements, as demonstrated on the following page.

The proposed revised prompt and Section 508 compliant table is as follows:

1. **Rate the LEA’s success at engaging in the following activities with teachers and school administrators during the prior school year (including the summer preceding the prior school year).**

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

| **Activities** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Identifying the professional learning needs of groups of teachers or staff as a whole | [Enter 1, if applicable] | [Enter 2, if applicable] | [Enter 3, if applicable] | [Enter 4, if applicable] | [Enter 5, if applicable] |
| Identifying the professional learning needs of individual teachers | [Enter 1, if applicable] | [Enter 2, if applicable] | [Enter 3, if applicable] | [Enter 4, if applicable] | [Enter 5, if applicable] |
| Providing support for teachers on the standards they have not yet mastered | [Enter 1, if applicable] | [Enter 2, if applicable] | [Enter 3, if applicable] | [Enter 4, if applicable] | [Enter 5, if applicable] |

### Recommendation

The CDE recommends that the SBE approve the proposed technical revisions to the self-reflection tool for Implementation of State Academic Standards, and allow the CDE, in collaboration with SBE staff, to make any necessary technical amendments to the local indicator self-reflection tools to improve readability and adhere to Section 508 requirements.

# Attachment 8

## California School Dashboard Educational Outreach Activities

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

| **Date** | **Title** | **Estimated Number of Attendees** | **Topics** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| September 18, 2018 | Alternative School Taskforce State Indicators Sub-committee | 10 | * Review proposed criteria for the Special Education Certification of Completion requirements for use in the one year graduation rate for Dashboard Alternative Status Schools (DASS) |
| October 10, 2018 | Alternative School Taskforce State Indicators Sub-committee | 12 | * Review proposed criteria and data simulations for the Special Education Certification of Completion requirements for use in the one year graduation rate for Dashboard Alternative Status Schools (DASS) |
| October 23, 2018 | Technical Design Group | 8 | * New Change Cut Scores for the College/Career Indicator (CCI) * New Status and Change Cut Scores for the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator * Revisions to Graduation Rate Indicator * New Status and Change Cut Scores for Grade 11 Academic Indicator |

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

| **Date** | **Title** | **Estimated Number of Attendees** | **Topics** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| September 12, 2018 | Regional Assessment Network | 45 | * New Look and Feel of the 2018 Dashboard * Identification of Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) for Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) Support * Identification of Schools for Comprehensive and Targeted Support and Improvement * Rollout of the 2018 Dashboard |
| September 12, 2018 | Curriculum and Instructional Steering Committee Accountability Sub-Committee | 15 | * Overview of September 2018 State Board of Education accountability related decisions * New measures for 2018 Dashboard * Identification of Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) for Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) Support * Identification of Schools for Comprehensive and Targeted Support and Improvement |
| September 13, 2018 | Curriculum and Instructional Steering Committee | 150 | * New State Indicator Data Reported in 2018 Dashboard * Incorporation of Participation Rate in Academic Indicator * Modified Methods for Schools with Dashboard Alternative School Status (DASS) * Application of Three-by-Five Colored Grid at Student-Group Level * New Look and Feel of the 2018 Dashboard |
| September 20, 2018 | North Assessment and Accountability Information Meeting (Sacramento) | 363 | * State and Local Indicators Reported in 2018 Dashboard * DASS * Identification of LEAs for LCFF Support * Identification of Schools for Comprehensive and Targeted Support and Improvement * New Look and Feel of 2018 Dashboard * Rollout of 2018 Dashboard |
| September 21, 2018 | Dual Enrollment Presentation to California Coalition of Early & Middle Colleges (CCEMC) and the California Community College Chancellor’s Office | 180 | * CCI: College Credit Courses * California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) Data Submission for College Credit Courses * CALPADS Reports |
| September 21, 2018 | Special Education Administrators of County Offices of Education | 45 | * State and Local Indicators Reported in 2018 Dashboard * DASS * New Look and Feel of 2018 Dashboard * Rollout of 2018 Dashboard |
| September 27, 2018 | South Assessment and Accountability Information Meeting (Ontario and Virtual) | 1,030 | * State and Local Indicators Reported in 2018 Dashboard * DASS * Identification of LEAs for LCFF Support * Identification of Schools for Comprehensive and Targeted Support and Improvement * New Look and Feel of 2018 Dashboard * Rollout of 2018 Dashboard |
| October 4, 2018 | El Dorado County Office of Education Superintendent’s Council | 20 | * New State Indicators Reported in 2018 Dashboard * DASS * Incorporation of Participation Rate in Academic Indicator * Identification of LEAs for LCFF Support * Identification of Schools for Comprehensive and Targeted Support and Improvement * New Look and Feel of the 2018 Dashboard * Rollout of the 2018 Dashboard |
| October 5, 2018 | ESSA Stakeholder Input Session | 300 | * Differentiated Assistance and School Identification * California School Dashboard * State Educational Agency and Local Educational Agency Report Cards |
| October 9, 2018 | Title I  Conference | 200 | * Overview of the Dashboard * DASS * State Indicators Reported in 2018 Dashboard * Incorporation of Participation Rate in Academic Indicator * Identification of Schools for Comprehensive and Targeted Support and Improvement * New Look and Feel of the 2018 Dashboard * Rollout of 2018 Dashboard |
| October 16, 2018 | California Student Data Day Hosted by the Santa Clara County Office of Education | 50 | * Overview of the Dashboard and Accountability System * Demographic Data for Student Groups * Deep Dive into the State Indicators * Rollout of the 2018 Dashboard |
| October 18, 2018 | LCFF Stakeholders Meeting | 25 | * State Indicators in the 2018 Dashboard * Special Education Certificate of Completion Criteria for the one-year graduation rate |
| October 19, 2018 | Sacramento County Office of Education Fall Curriculum Meeting | 150 | * New State Indicators Reported in 2018 Dashboard * DASS * Incorporation of Participation Rate in Academic Indicator * Identification of LEAs for LCFF Support * Identification of Schools for Comprehensive and Targeted Support and Improvement * New Look and Feel of the 2018 Dashboard * Rollout of the 2018 Dashboard |

**Table 3. Webinars**

| **Date** | **Title** | **Estimated Number of Attendees** | **Topics** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| August 28, 2018 | Local Indicators Overview | 574 | * The background related to the development of the local indicators * The general requirements for the local indicators * How to incorporate results from the local indicators into the LCAP and the LCAP development process |
| September 4, 2018 | Local Indicators: Priority 7 | 360 | * Review the general background of the local indicators * The requirements for the local indicator for priority 7 * The standard and the self-reflection tool for priority 7 * How to incorporate the results from the self-reflection tool of the local indicator for Priority 7 into the LCAP and the LCAP development process |
| September 11, 2018 | Local Indicators: Priority 1 | 300 | * Review the general background of the local indicators * The requirements for the local indicator for priority 1 * The standard and the self-reflection tool for priority 1 * How to incorporate the results from the self-reflection tool of the local indicator for Priority 7 into the LCAP and the LCAP development process |
| September 18, 2018 | Local Indicators: Priority 3 | 288 | * Review the general background of the local indicators * The requirements for the local indicator for priority 3 * The standard and the self-reflection tool for priority 3 * Examples of local measures that LEAs might select * How to incorporate the results from the self-reflection tool of the local indicator for Priority 3 into the LCAP and the LCAP development process * Resources for continuous improvement |
| September 25, 2018 | Local Indicators: Priority 2 | 200 | * Review the general background of the local indicators * The requirements for the local indicator for priority 2 * The standard and the self-reflection tool for priority 2 * How to incorporate the results from the self-reflection tool of the local indicator for priority 2 into the LCAP and the LCAP development process * Stakeholder engagement and data analysis |
| September 28, 2018 | Dashboard Alternative School Status and three-by-five Colored Grid  Hosted by the Ventura County Office of Education | 35 | * Overview of DASS graduation rate and the three-by-five colored grid for small n-size * Update on AB 716 * Update on the ESSA State Plan |
| October 2, 2018 | Local Indicators: Priority 6 | 278 | * Review the general background of the local indicators * The requirements for the local indicator for priority 6 * The standard and the self-reflection tool for priority 6 * How to incorporate the results from the self-reflection tool of the local indicator for priority 6 into the LCAP and the LCAP development process |

# Attachment 9

## 2018–20 Timeline of Activities Relating to the Implementation of California’s Accountability System

| **Date** | **Activity** | **Description** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| November 2018 | SBE Agenda Items | * CCI: Approval of proposed cut scores for Change * Chronic Absenteeism Indicator: Approval of proposed Status and Change cut scores and application of the three-by-five colored grid for small n-size * Grade 11 Academic Indicator: Approval of proposed Status and Change cut scores * Adjustment to the Dashboard Alternative School Status (DASS) Graduation Rate criteria * Graduation Rate Indicator: Revisions to the Status and Change cut scores * Approval of Update of Local Indicator Self-Reflection Tool for Priority 2 * Update on the Dashboard redesign |
| November 2018 | Revisions to ESSA State Plan | * Following SBE action on the cut scores for the CCI and Chronic Absenteeism Indicator, submit five-by-five grids and other necessary amendments to conform with SBE action to the U.S. Department of Education (ED) |
| December 2018 | SBE Information Memoranda | * Local Control Funding Formula identification of local educational agencies for differentiated assistance * Update on the Growth Model—Research and next steps * Current status of the CCI and future CCI measures previously approved by the SBE in the three-year plan |
| January 2019 | SBE Agenda Items | * Update on the 2018 Dashboard rollout * Update on ESSA Implementation |
| February 2019 | SBE Information Memorandum | * Identification of schools for Comprehensive and Targeted Support and Improvement |
| March 2019 | SBE Agenda Items | * Review possible revisions to the 2019 Dashboard, including the incorporation of results on the California Alternate Assessments into the Academic Indicator * Review and approval of the recommended revisions to Parent Engagement (Priority 3) * Study Session on CCI history, policy, and multi-year plan for future implementation, including an analysis on the comparability of the CCI measures |
| April 2019 | SBE Information Memorandum | * Options for incorporating the five-year graduation rate into the Dashboard |
| April 2019 | SBE Information Memorandum | * Growth Model update |
| May 2019 | SBE Agenda Items | * Update on options for using the ELPI status in the identification of schools for support under the Every Student Succeeds Act * Proposed development of additional modified methods for DASS schools * Implementation options for inclusion of the five-year graduation rate into the Dashboard |
| June 2019 | SBE Information Memorandum | * Modified methods for DASS schools |
| July 2019 | SBE Agenda Items | * Action on the application of three-by-five colored grid for Chronic Absenteeism Indicator * Modified methods for DASS schools * Finalize options for inclusion of the five-year graduation rate into the Dashboard |
| August 2019 | SBE Information Memorandum | * Growth Model update * CCI update |
| September 2019 | SBE Agenda Item | * Incorporating transitional services provided by the Department of Rehabilitation and the WorkAbility Programs (e.g., job skills, occupational training, work-based learning) for students with disabilities into the CCI |
| November 2019 | SBE Agenda Items | * ELPI: Approval of Status cut scores |
| March 2020 | SBE Agenda Item | * Review possible revisions to the 2020 Dashboard |
| November 2020 | SBE Agenda Items | * CCI: Proposed new measures for the CCI, including additional career measures and modified measures for DASS schools * ELPI: Approval of Change cut scores |