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# California State Board of Education September 2018 Agenda Item #01

## Subject

Developing an Integrated Local, State, and Federal Accountability and Continuous Improvement System: Approval of the New Measures for the College/Career Indicator, Methodology for the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator, Cut Scores for the Dashboard Alternative Schools Status One-Year Graduation Rate, Reporting of the Five-Year Graduation Rate, and an Update on the California School Dashboard.

## Type of Action

Action, Information

## Summary of the Issue(s)

This is a standing item for the State Board of Education (SBE) to receive updates on the ongoing development of the California School Dashboard (Dashboard). The California Department of Education (CDE) is proposing changes to prepare for the inclusion of two new indicators for the 2018 Dashboard—the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator and the College/Career Indicator (CCI)—and to report a five-year graduation rate for high schools. In addition, the CDE is proposing Status and Change cut scores to the one-year graduation rate for schools with Dashboard Alternative School Status (DASS). Consistent with the Fall 2017 Dashboard release, in which the CDE presented proposed changes to the Dashboard throughout the spring and summer, the CDE is requesting that the SBE adopt comprehensive changes to the state indicators on the Dashboard at this meeting and the November 2018 SBE meeting. In addition, the CDE will share the the most recent proptoype for the redesign of the Califoria School Dashboard (Dashboard).

## Recommendation

The CDE recommends that the SBE approve: (1) the inclusion of the State Seal of Biliteracy, Golden State Seal Merit Diploma, and Leadership/Military Science: Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) as additional measures in the College/Career Indicator, (2) the methodology for the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator, (3) the proposed cut scores for the Dashboard Alternative School Status one-year graduation, and (4) the reporting of the five-year graduation rate in the California School Dashboard.

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

### 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 the 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-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 on the implementation of the CCI, including the development of new career measures, such as Leadership/Military Science: ROTC, 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.

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>).

### Chronic Absenteeism

In November 2014, the SBE adopted the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) 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 informed of the revisions made to the Fall 2017 Dashboard, including items that are being prepared 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>).

### One-Year Graduation Rate

In July 2017, the SBE approved criteria for schools to apply for DASS (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/jul17item01.doc>).

In March 2018, the SBE reviewed proposed revisions for the 2018 Dashboard, including the incorporation of modified methods for DASS schools (<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 July 2018, the SBE approved the application of the Safety Net methodology at the student group level which will be applied to the one-year graduation rate (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/jul18item01.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>).

### Five-Year Graduation Rate

At the March 2018 SBE meeting, the CDE provided an update on the five-year graduation rate (<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 incorporating the five-year graduation rate in the Dashboard (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-aug18item02.docx>).

## 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 New Measures for Inclusion in the College/Career Indicator (4 Pages)
* Attachment 2: Proposed Methodology for Calculating the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator (3 Pages)
* Attachment 3: Proposed Cut Scores for the One-Year Graduation Rate (3 Pages)
* Attachment 4: Incorporating the Five-Year Graduation Rate into the California School Dashboard (3 Pages)
* Attachment 5: Update on the California School Dashboard (2 Pages)
* Attachment 6: California School Dashboard Educational Outreach Activities   
  (4 Pages)

# Attachment 1

**Proposed New Measures for Inclusion in the College/Career Indicator**

## Background

With the adoption of the College/Career Indicator (CCI) in 2016, the California Department of Education (CDE) committed to building out the CCI over several years as data becomes available to include additional career and college measures.

At the September 2017 State Board of Education (SBE) meeting, the CDE presented a three-year plan to fully build this indicator (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/sep17item02.doc>).To assist with this ongoing work, the CDE established the CCI Work Group, which consists of researchers, business representatives, and Career Technical Education (CTE) subject matter experts throughout the state to advise the CDE on the ongoing development of the CCI.

In February 2018, the CDE shared an Information Memorandum that provided an update on the CDE’s progress in reporting the CCI, the status of the three-year CCI timeline presented to the SBE in September 2017, an update on the collection of new career measures for future California School Dashboards (Dashboards), and comparisons between student performance on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment and student performance across CCI measures currently reported in the Dashboard   
(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-feb18item02.docx>).

In March 2018, the CDE shared the CCI Work Group recommendation to include three new CCI measures in the 2018 Dashboard:

1. **State Seal of Biliteracy (SSB)**: Students demonstrate proficiency in speaking, reading, and writing in at least one or more languages in addition to English. Note: The SSB is a measure of both career and college preparedness.
2. **Golden State Seal Merit Diploma (GSSMD)**: To earn a GSSMD, students must demonstrate mastery in at least six subject areas: English language arts/literacy (ELA), mathematics, science, U.S. history, and two additional subject areas of the student’s choosing. Mastery is demonstrated by earning a grade of B or B+ (depending on the subject) or earning a qualifying score on select assessments. Note: The GSSMD is a measure of college prepardness.
3. **Leadership/Military Science: Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC)**: Students participate in a physical conditioning program aimed at promoting military values and military precision in group activities, such as rifle corps or marching squad. (Note: For secondary students, this course also brings together information from other subject areas, and relates these skills and knowledge to a military setting. Examples include engine mechanics, electricity or electronics, and aviation techniques.) Note: The ROTC is a measure of career prepardness.

## Analyses and Proposed Placement Criteria

As done with the current CCI measures, new measures were evaluated against performance on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment to help inform the use and placement of each measure across the three CCI levels: “Prepared”, “Approaching Prepared”, and “Not Prepared”. (Performance comparisons on CCI measures currently reported in the Dashboard were provided in the Feburary 2018 Information Memorandum, at (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-feb18item02.docx>). Comparisons and proposed placement criteria for each of the newly proposed measures were provided in the August 2018 SBE Information Memorandum, at (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-aug18item02.docx>).

### State Seal of Biliteracy

Based on analyses for the SSB, the CCI Work Group recommended the following “Prepared” placement criteria:

* **“Prepared” Level**: Student earns the SSB **and** scores
* At least “Standard Met” on ELA and
  + At least “Standard Nearly Met” on mathematics
* **“Approaching Prepared” Level**: Students earns the SSB and scores
  + At least “Standard Met” on ELA(Note: The mathematics criteria is removed)

Based on the proposed placement criteria for this measure, 35,982 students (7.5 percent) in the class of 2017 would earn the “Prepared” level on the CCI (duplicative count).

This information was shared with the California Task Force on Alternative Schools (Task Force), the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) Stakeholder Group, the California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG), and the Technical Design Group (TDG):

* The Task Force supported the proposed criteria for the “Prepared” level and the inclusion of the SSB in the CCI.
* A majority of CPAG members supported the inclusion of the SSB in the CCI. However, some members voiced concerns regarding the inclusion of the “Standard Nearly Met” on mathematics requirement and recommended it be removed.
* Initially, the CDE did not propose any criteria for the “Approaching Prepared” level. However, based on feedback from the LCFF stakeholder group, an “Approaching Prepared” criteria was added for consideration.
* The TDG supported the inclusion of the SSB in the CCI and indicated that it was important to keep the additional criteria of the ELA and mathematics in order to align with the criteria adopted for the CTE Pathway Completion and the a-g measures.

### Golden State Seal Merit Diploma

Based on analyses for the GGSMD, the CCI Work Group recommended that the following placement criteria be applied for this measure:

* **“Prepared” Level**: Student earns the GSSMD: Stand-alone measure
* **“Approaching Prepared” Level**: Do not include any criteria for “Approaching Prepared”

Based on the proposed placement criteria for this measure, 12,206 (2.5 percent) in the class of 2017 would earn the “Prepared” level on the CCI (duplicative count).

This information was shared with the Task Force, the LCFF Stakeholder Group, CPAG, and TDG:

* The Task Force supported the proposed criteria and the inclusion of the GSSMD in the CCI.
* The LCFF Stakeholder Group voiced concern that there was no proposed criteria for “Approaching Prepared”.
* Several CPAG members supported the inclusion of GSMD in the CCI, stating that earning a GSSMD is highly valued by both teachers and students.
* The TDG supported the proposed criteria and the inclusion of the GSSMD in the CCI. Members did not have concerns with the lack of an “Approaching Prepared” criterion.

### Leadership/Miliary Science: ROTC

ROTC opens up a viable and well respected career opportunity for students. If a student passes the military’s academic requirement, completes two years of ROTC and enlists, the military provides the student with an advanced rank. The advanced rank translates into work experience credit. For example, the U.S. Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps provide six months of credit and the Navy provides nine months of credit.

Based on analyses for the ROTC, the CCI Work Group recommended that the following placement criteria be applied for this measure:

* **“Prepared” Level**: Student completes at least two years of ROTC and scores:
  + At least “Standard Met” in ELA or math, and
  + At least “Standard Nearly Met” in the other subject area
* **“Approaching Prepared” Level**: Student completed at least two years of ROTC

Based on the proposed placement criteria for this measure:

* 2,236 students (0.5 percent) in the class of 2017 would earn the “Prepared” level on the CCI, and
* 2,601 students (0.5 percent) in the class of 2017 would earn the “Approaching Prepared” level on the CCI

This information was shared with the Task Force, the LCFF Stakeholder Group, CPAG, and the TDG:

* The Task Force supported the proposed criteria and the inclusion of the ROTC.
* CPAG members were not familiar enough with the ROTC program to provide feedback.
* The TDG supported the proposed criteria and the inclusion of the ROTC in the CCI.

## Recommendation

The CDE recommends the SBE adopt the proposed criteria for the SSB, GSSDM, and ROTC and include all three measures in the CCI Indicator for the 2018 Dashboard.

# Attachment 2

**Proposed Methodology for Calculating 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 LCFF Priority 5 (Pupil Engagement).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 expected 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. This data was released publicly in December 2017 and is currently reported on the California School Dashboard (Dashboard) through a direct link to the California Department of Education’s (CDE’s) reporting web site, 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>.

It is important to note that the chronic absenteeism data collected through CALPADS is a separate collection from the average daily attendance (ADA) data submission. The purpose of the ADA collection is for funding the LCFF or other similarly based programs. However, to the extent possible, the CDE utilized the same definitions so that LEAs could use the data that they already collected through the ADA submission process for their student-level submission to CALPADS.

In addition, since this data collection occurs through CALPADS on an annual basis, the CDE also continues to emphasize to LEAs that it: (1) is not intended to be an early warning system, and (2) will be useful to identify schools/LEAs that may require assistance in addressing attendance problems.

LEAs and their supervisors of attendance (*EC* Section 48240) should continue to utilize local strategies, and organizational structures such as the School Attendance Review Boards (SARBs) to ensure students attend school, as required by California education law. The SARB process includes notifying the parent or guardian upon a pupil’s initial classification as a truant (*EC* Section 48260.5) and a conscientious effort to hold a meeting with the parent or guardian and the pupil before deeming the child a habitual truant (*EC* Section 48262).

## Implementation of the Chronic Absenteesim Indicator in 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. As indicated in the ESSA State Plan, this indicator is limited to grades K–8 and will not be applied to grades nine throught twelve. There are currently two indicators (graduation rate and college/career) that capture the impact of chronic absenteeism at the high school level.

Since two years of data is required to calculate Status and Change, the CDE is preparing for the inclusion of this indicator in the 2018 Dashboard by first presenting the methodology for consideration and approval. At the November 2018 State Board of Education (SBE) meeting, the CDE will present proposed cut scores and performance levels for the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator.

## Methodologies and Analyses

Prior to proposing a methodology for calculating chronic absenteeism, CDE staff researched the methodologies that other states have adopted and spoke with subject matter experts to ensure that any methodology it proposed would produce a valid, reliable and fair measure. Using data for students in kindergarten through grade eight, it produced two sets of simulations, which it shared with both the Technical Design Group (TDG), at its June 2018 meeting, and the California Practioners Advisory Group (CPAG), at its August 2018 meeting.

The two simulations used different methodologies. The first simulation only included students who were enrolled for at least 31 instructional days, and assigned the same weight to all students who met the chronically absent criteria.

The second simulation assigned different weights to chronically absent students, depending on whether they attended school less than or more than half of the school year. Those students enrolled for more than 50 percent of the instructional days were assigned full weight.

The two methodologies produced different results.

1. The first methodology, based on a minimum enrollment of 31 instructional days, yielded the following mean chronic absenteeism rates:

* Local educational agencies (LEAs) (including charter schools): 8.7 percent
* Schools: 8.9 percent

1. The second methodology, which assigns varying weights to students based on their enrolled instructional days, yielded the following mean chronic absenteeism rates:

* LEAs (including charter schools): 9.4 percent
* Schools: 9.7 percent

The TDG recommended the first methodology, which yielded lower chronic absenteeism rates for both LEAs and schools, because it is valid, reliable, fair, and is easy communicated. CPAG members had an in-depth discussion regarding the chronic absenteeism data at their August 2018 meeting, but did not discuss the methodology.

CDE staff will bring proposed cut scores to the SBE for consideration at the November 2018 SBE meeting.

## Recommendation

The CDE recommends that the SBE approve the first methodology, based on the minimum enrollment of 31 instructional days, for the calculation of the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator.

# Attachment 3

**Proposed Cut Scores for the One-Year Graduation Rate**

The California School Dashboard (Dashboard) currently uses the **four-year** cohort graduation rate for the Graduation Rate Indicator for non-alternative schools. Because students in schools with Dashboard Alternative School Status (DASS) are highly mobile and credit deficient, using the four-year cohort is not an appropriate measure of the impact that these schools have on their students. Therefore, the California Advisory Task Force for Alternative Schools (Task Force) proposed the use of a **one-year** graduation rate for DASS schools and a methodology for calculating the one-year rate. This methodology was approved by the State Board of Education (SBE) at its May 2018 meeting. Prior to the May 2018 meeting, the CDE shared the proposed methodology with several stakeholder groups, including

* The Advisory Commission on Special Education
* The Local Control Funding Formula Stakeholder Group
* The California Practitioners Advisory Group
* The Capital Regional Assessment Network
* Reaching At-Promise Students Association Webinar, which included the participation of accountability coordinators

The Task Force also recommended that Status and Change cut scores be established based on one-year results for graduating classes 2016 and 2017. For non-DASS schools, cut scores were set based on local educational agency (LEA)-level distributions. However, the cut scores for DASS schools were set based on the DASS school-level distributions. Tables 1 and 2 contain the proposed cut scores.

**Table 1: Proposed Status Cut Scores**

| **Status Level** | **Recommended Status Cut Scores** |
| --- | --- |
| Very Low | Graduation rate is less than 67% |
| Low | Graduation rate is 67% to less than 70% |
| Medium | Graduation rate is 70% to less than 80% |
| High | Graduation rate is 80% to less than 90% |
| Very High | Graduation rate is 90% or greater |

**Table 2: Proposed Change Cut Scores**

| **Change Level** | **Recommended Change Cut Scores** |
| --- | --- |
| Declined Significantly | Graduation rate declined by more than 10% |
| Declined | Graduation rate declined by 3% to 10% |
| Maintained | Graduation rate declined or increased by less than 3% |
| Increased | Graduation rate increased by 3% to less than 10% |
| Increased Significantly | Graduation rate increased by 10% or greater |

The same five-by-five colored table approved for the Graduation Rate Indicator for non-DASS schools and districts will be applied to the DASS schools’ one-year graduation rates to determine performance levels. As required by the Every Student Succeeds Act, the Status cut scores for “Very Low” are set at less than 67 percent.

There are a total of 1,074 DASS schools, of which 953 serve grade twelve students. Because many DASS schools serve a small number of students, only 553 met the n-size requirement of 30 students in the graduating class to receive a performance level.

Table 3 shows the five-by-five colored table with the proposed Status and Change cut scores and impact to DASS schools.

**Table 3: Five-by-Five Colored Table with Proposed Cut Scores**

| Level | **Change:** Declined Significantly  by greater than 10.0% | **Change:** Declined  by 3.0% to 10.0% | **Change:** Maintained  Declined or increased by less than 3.0% | **Change:** Increased  by 3.0% to less than 10.0% | **Change:** Increased Significantly  by 10.0% or greater |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Status:** Very High  90.0% or greater | N/A | 4 | 8 | 27 | 0 |
| **Status:** High  80.0% to less than 90.0% | 0 | 25 | 21 | 28 | 2 |
| **Status:** Medium  70.0% to less than 80.0% | 0 | 33 | 13 | 33 | 2 |
| **Status:** Low  67.0% to less than 70.0% | 0 | 10 | 3 | 12 | 2 |
| **Status:** Very Low  Less than 67.0% | 18 | 150 | 70 | 80 | 13 |

Table 4 shows the number of schools that would receive each performance color after the proposed cut scores are applied. The data are based on the graduating classes of 2016 and 2017.

**Table 4: One-Year Graduation Results Using Proposed Cut Scores**

| **All Schools** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 553 | 331 | 45 | 52 | 84 | 41 |

## Recommendation

The CDE recommends that the SBE approve the proposed cut scores described in Table 1 for the one-year graduation rate for the DASS.

# Attachment 4

**Incorporating the Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rate into the California School Dashboard**

## Background

Currently, the Graduation Rate Indicator only includes the four-year cohort graduation rate and does not capture the progress of students who take five years to graduate from high school. The addition of a five-year graduation rate would allow schools to demonstrate its success with students who may need additional time to earn a regular high school diploma (e.g., students with disabilities and English learners).

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

Because schools with Dashboard Alterative Schools Status (DASS) have their graduation rate indicator calculated using the one-year graduation rate, the five-year graduation rate will only be applied to non-alternative schools.There are several benefits and objectives for calculating a five-year cohort graduation rate for non-alternative schools. Two primary considerations of a five-year cohort graduation rate include:

1. Incentivizing schools and districts to enroll four-year cohort non-graduates in year five by giving schools and districts credit for graduating four-year cohort non-graduates in year five.
2. Limiting year five changes (adjustments) to the four-year cohort denominator to ensure that year five changes in cohort graduation rates reflect actual changes in the numerator (graduates), not changes in the denominator (transfers in/out).

## Options for Incorporating the Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rate into the Dashboard

As discussed in the August 2018 State Board of Education (SBE) Information Memorandum, the CDE is exploring multiple options for incorporating the five-year graduation rate into the California School Dashboard (Dashboard). However, due to audit findings from the U.S. Department of Education Office of Inspector General related to California’s four-year cohort graduation rate calculation, the CDE was required recalculate the 2016–17 and 2017–18 graduation rates using the new rules. An update on the revisions to calculating the graduation rate and impact on the Dashboard regarding these changes was provided in the June 2018 SBE Information Memorandum (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-jun18item02.docx>).

Since the CDE is not re-calculating graduation rates using these new rules prior to 2016–17, only one year of data is available for the five-year graduation rate cohort. Therefore Change, which requires two years of data, cannot be reported for the five-year graduation cohort until the 2019 Dashboard.

The options currently under consideration include the following:

1. Provide a performance level (color) for the four-year cohort graduation rate only and report the five-year graduation rate for informative data only. This method can be implemented for the 2018 Dashboard.
2. Calculate a simple average for the four- and five-year cohort graduation rates. A simple average provides the same weight to all four and five year graduates. This method requires two years of data and therefore cannot be implemented until the 2019 Dashboard.
3. Calculate a weighted average for the four- and five-year cohort graduation rates. This method provides more weight to students who graduate in four years (e.g., 2/3) rather than five years (e.g., 1/3). This method requires two years of data and therefore cannot be implemented until the 2019 Dashboard.
4. Report both the four- and five-year cohort graduation rates on the Dashboard and assign the performance level (color) to the higher of the two rates. ESSA requires that the state adopt a higher goal for the five-year cohort graduation rate than the 90 percent goal established for the four-year cohort graduation rate. This method can be implemented for the 2018 Dashboard using the class of 2018 four-year cohort data and the class of 2017 five-year cohort data.

This information was presented to the California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG), the Local Control Funding Formula Stakeholder Group, and the Technical Design Group (TDG).

At the August 2018 CPAG meeting, the members divided into three discussion groups and provided the CDE with the following feedback:

* Two groups recommended the weighted average because it provides an incentive to keep students at the non-alternative school, if necessary, but emphasizes that graduating students in four years is the priority.
* One group recommended assigning the color to the higher of the two rates (four or five year), but indicated they were not opposed to a four- and five-year weighted average.

The TDG recommended that the five-year graduation rate be incorporated into the performance determination for the Graduation Rate Indicator to eliminate the need for separate graduation rate five-by-five grids. They also discussed additional options that they believed warranted further exploration. Because the recommended option for all the stakeholder groups require two five-year graduation rates to determine Status and Change, the TDG recommended that the five-year graduation rate (for the class of 2017) be reported in the 2018 Dashboard for information purposes only and that the CDE continue to explore options on how to incorporate the five-year graduation rate into the performance determination for the Dashboard after the five-year graduation rate is available for the class of 2018 and simulations can be produced.

## Recommendation

The CDE recommends that the SBE approve the inclusion of the five-year cohort graduation rate in the 2018 Dashboard for informational purposes only and direct CDE staff to further explore options for incorporating the five-year cohort rate into the 2019 Dashboard. Because each option will have different policy implications, CDE staff will provide the SBE with updates on the progress of this analysis in the spring and summer of 2019.

# Attachment 5

**Update on the California School Dashboard**

The California School Dashboard (Dashboard) (<https://www.caschooldashboard.org/>) serves as California’s portal for parents, educators, and community members to track school and district performance and student group progress based on multiple measures.

Since the release of the Dashboard in spring 2017, the California Department of Education (CDE) and State Board of Education (SBE) have heard from thousands of users. Users have also expressed that the Dashboard needs to be more engaging and less complicated. We have also heard that the display for the performance levels (color pies) continue to be confusing to some users. Additionally, Spanish speaking users expressed concerns with the accuracy of Google translate.

## Dashboard Redesign Work

The 2018–19 state budget appropriated $300,000 to upgrade the look and feel of the Dashboard and make it more user-friendly. A portion of this funding was used to secure a contract with Collaborative Communications (a Washington, D.C.-based company), which is nationally recognized for making education data reporting appealing and accessible to a wide audience. Collaborative Communications has worked with the Data Quality Campaign, the Office of the State Superintendent of Education in Washington, D.C., and on the Illinois State Report Card, which also uses a Dashboard approach. The remaining funds will be used by the San Joaquin County Office of Education to develop the new website in preparation for the public release in December 2018.

Beginning in mid-July, the Dashboard redesign prototype was shared through in-person meetings and formal presentations with the following stakeholders:

* Statewide Education Associations and Equity Groups (Stakeholder Focus Group)
* Third District Parent Teacher Association Focus Group
* Association of California School Administrators Focus Group
* Californians for Justice Parents and Community Members (Note: This session was conducted in English and Spanish)
* California Advisory Task Force for Alternative Schools
* California Community of Practice on Secondary Transition
* County Office of Education Leadership for School Counselors
* State and Federal Program Directors
* California Practitioners Advisory Group
* Advisory Commission on Special Education
* Local Control Funding Formula Stakeholder Group
* Broad Stakeholder Webinar on the Dashboard Redesign

Based on user comments, questions, and polling results, the design was further modified and improved. The new design is friendlier, simpler to use, easier to understand, and more intuitive. The reaction from a variety of audiences has been overwhelmingly positive. A demonstration of the Dashboard redesign prototype will take place as part of the presentation of this item.

# Attachment 6

**California School Dashboard Educational Outreach Activities**

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

| **Date** | **Title** | **Estimated Number of Attendees** | **Topics** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| August 8, 2018 | California Advisory Task Force on Alternative Schools | 25 | * One-year graduation rate and modified methods for the College/Career Indicator (CCI) * Communications to the field on the California School Dashboard (Dashboard) Alternative School Status (DASS) * New look and feel of the 2018 Dashboard * DASS local indicators |
| August 13, 2018 | Local Control Funding Formula Stakeholder Group | 10 | * Five-year graduation rate and incorporation into 2018 Dashboard * New proposed measures for the CCI |
| August 16, 2018 | Technical Design Group | 12 | * Discussion on validity of the Change methodology * New proposed cut scores for the grade eleven Academic Indicator * Impact of including DASS schools for Academic Indicator, Suspension Rate Indicator, and Graduation Rate Indicator * Review of five-year graduation rate and incorporation into 2018 Dashboard * Review simulation results for new CCI measures |

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

| **Date** | **Title** | **Estimated Number of Attendees** | **Topics** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| July 17, 2018 | Statewide Education Associations and Equity Groups: Stakeholder Focus Group | 30 | * Introduction to the major design improvements planned for the 2018 Dashboard * Solicited feedback to ensure that the needs of all stakeholders were being addressed |
| July 17, 2018 | Third District Parent Teacher Association Focus Group | 20 | * Introduction to the major design improvements planned for the 2018 Dashboard * Solicited feedback to ensure that the needs of all stakeholders were being addressed |
| July 24, 2018 | County Office of Education Leadership for School Counselors | 15 | * Overview of the CCI * CCI levels of preparedness * Current CCI measures * New CCI measures proposed for 2018 Dashboard * New look and feel of the 2018 Dashboard |
| July 25, 2018 | Multi-tiered System of Support (MTSS) Professional Learning Institute: College and Career Readiness within MTSS | 45 | * Overview of the CCI * Introduction to the major design improvements planned for the 2018 Dashboard |
| July 26, 2018 | Student Programs and Services Steering Committee: DASS Dashboard Workgroup | 25 | * New indicator data reported in 2018 Dashboard * Incorporation of participation rate in Academic Indicator * Modified methods for DASS schools * Application of Safety Net Methodology at student-group level * New look and feel of the 2018 Dashboard |
| August 6, 2018 | California Community of Practice on Secondary Transition: Annual Leadership Meeting | 22 | * Overview of the Dashboard * Overview of the CCI * Modified CCI measures for DASS schools and students with disabilities |
| August 8, 2018 | California Practitioners Advisory Group | 25 | * Chronic Absenteeism Indicator: review of methodology * Five-year graduation rate and incorporation into 2018 Dashboard |
| August 14, 2018 | Curriculum and Instruction Steering Committee: Science Subcommittee Meeting | 40 | * Overview of 2018 Dashboard updates * Discussion of alternatives and timing for incorporating the science assessment into the Dashboard |
| August 17, 2018 | State and Federal Programs Directors | 100 | * Update on the Dashboard redesign |
| August 22, 2018 | Advisory Commission on Special Education | 20 | * Redesign of the Dashboard * Five-year graduation rate and incorporation into 2018 Dashboard |

**Table 3. Webinars**

| **Date** | **Title** | **Estimated Number of Attendees** | **Topics** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| July 18, 2018 | Association of California School Administrators: Focus Group on Dashboard Redesign | 30 | * Introduction to the major design improvements planned for the 2018 Dashboard * Solicited feedback to ensure that the needs of all stakeholders were being addressed |
| July 19, 2018 | California for Justice: Parent and Community Members Dashboard Presentation  *Note: This webinar was conducted in English and Spanish* | 7 | * Introduction to the major design improvements planned for the 2018 Dashboard * Solicited feedback to ensure that the needs of all stakeholders were being addressed |
| July 23, 2018 | California School Dashboard: Broad Stakeholder Webinar on Dashboard Redesign | 400 | * Introduction to the major design improvements planned for the 2018 Dashboard * Solicited feedback to ensure that the needs of all stakeholders were being addressed |