CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Proposed Approaches to Determine Progress on the Local Control Funding Formula Evaluation Rubrics Local Performance Indicators

Nancy Brownell

Senior Fellow, Local Control and Accountability

State Board of Education

September 29, 2016

Presentation to the California Practitioners Advisory Group

CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Local Performance Indicators

At the July 2016 meeting, the SBE approved an approach for setting standards for local performance indicators within the LCFF priorities that are not addressed by state indicators.

The approach is based on collecting and reporting locally held information, which is likely to enhance local decision making for the relevant LCFF priority.

CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Local Performance Indicators

The SBE's approval of the approach to establishing the standards included approval of criteria for measuring progress on the standards.

Specifically, local educational agencies (LEAs) will assess their progress on these indicators on a *[Met / Not Met / Not Met for Two or More Years]* scale.

CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Local Performance Indicators

At the September 2016 meeting, the SBE approved the proposed standards for the local performance indicators as part of its action to adopt the initial phase of the LCFF evaluation rubrics

The proposed standards are summarized on the remaining slides.

The SBE directed staff to consult with stakeholders to develop specific approaches for supporting LEAs in determining progress on the local performance indicators.

CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Appropriately Assigned Teachers, Access to Curriculum-Aligned Instructional Materials, and Safe, Clean and Functional School Facilities (Priority 1)

- *Standard*: LEA annually measures its progress in meeting the *Williams* settlement requirements at 100% at all of its school sites, as applicable, and promptly addresses any complaints or other deficiencies identified throughout the academic year, as applicable; and provides information annually on progress meeting this standard to its local governing board and to stakeholders and the public through the evaluation rubrics.

- *Evidence*: LEA would use locally available information, including data currently reported through the School Accountability Report Card (SARC), and determine whether it reported the results to its local governing board and through the local data selection option in the evaluation rubrics.

- *Criteria*: LEA would assess its performance on a [Met / Not Met / Not Met for Two or More Years] scale.

CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Implementation of State Academic Standards (Priority 2)

- *Standard*: LEA annually measures its progress implementing state academic standards and reports the results to its local governing board and to stakeholders and the public through the evaluation rubrics.

- *Evidence*: LEA would determine whether it annually measured its progress, which may include use of a self-assessment tool or selection from a menu of local measures that will be included in the evaluation rubrics web-based user interface, and reported the results to its local governing board and through the local data selection option in the evaluation rubrics.

- *Criteria*: LEA would assess its performance on a [Met / Not Met / Not Met for Two or More Years] scale.

CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Example self-assessment tool

During the 2015-16 school year (including summer 2015), how successful do you feel your district was at engaging in the following activities with teachers and school administrators?

	Not at all successful	Somewhat Unsuccessful	Somewhat Successful	Very Successful	Don't Know
a. Identifying the professional development needs of groups of teachers or staff as a whole					
b. Identifying the professional development needs of individual teachers					
c. Ensuring that teachers receive support for the California standards they have not yet mastered					

CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Parent Engagement (Priority 3)

- *Standard*: LEA annually measures its progress in (1) seeking input from parents in decision making and (2) promoting parental participation in programs, and reports the results to its local governing board and to stakeholders and the public through the evaluation rubrics.

- *Evidence*: LEA would determine whether it annually measured its progress, which may include use of a self-assessment tool or selection from a menu of local measures that will be included in the evaluation rubrics web-based user interface, and reported the results to its local governing board and through the local data selection option in the evaluation rubrics.

- *Criteria*: LEA would assess its performance on a [Met / Not Met / Not Met for Two or More Years] scale.

CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Example Draft Menu of Local Measures

Involvement in School/District Decision Making

Representation

- Percent of parents on required school/district committees, excluding those who are also school/district staff.
- Percent of parent/caregivers of pupils identified in Local Control Funding Formula statute (English language learners, low-income students, and foster youth) who participated in LCAP development and state-required school/district committees.

Training

- Percent of teachers and administrators who have participated in one or more professional development opportunities related to engaging parents/caregivers as decision makers.
- Percent of representatives on school/district committees who have participated in cross-trainings to support dual capacity building.

CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

School Climate – Local Climate Surveys (Priority 6)

- *Standard*: LEA administers a local climate survey at least every other year that provides a valid measure of perceptions of school safety and connectedness, such as the California Healthy Kids Survey, to students in at least one grade within the grade span(s) that the LEA serves (e.g., K-5, 6-8, 9-12), and reports the results to its local governing board and to stakeholders and the public through the evaluation rubrics.

- *Evidence*: LEA would determine whether it administered a survey as specified and reported the results to its local governing board and through the local data selection option in the evaluation rubrics.

- *Criteria*: LEA would assess its performance on a [Met / Not Met / Not Met for Two or More Years] scale.

CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Coordination of Services for Expelled Students – COE Only (Priority 9)

- *Standard*: COE annually measures its progress in coordinating instruction as required by *Education Code* Section 48926 and reports the results to its local governing board and to stakeholders and the public through the evaluation rubrics.

- *Evidence*: COE would determine whether it annually measured its progress, which may include use of a self-assessment tool or selection from a menu of local measures that will be included in the evaluation rubrics web-based user interface, and reported the results to its local governing board and through the local data selection option in the evaluation rubrics.

- *Criteria*: LEA would assess its performance on a [Met / Not Met / Not Met for Two or More Years] scale.

CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Coordination of Services for Foster Youth – COE Only (Priority 10)

- *Standard*: COE annually measures its progress in coordinating services for foster youth and reports the results to its local governing board and to stakeholders and the public through the evaluation rubrics.

- *Evidence*: COE would determine whether it annually measures its progress, which may include use of a self-assessment tool or selection from a menu of local measures that will be included in the evaluation rubrics web-based user interface, and reported the results to its local governing board and through the local data selection option in the evaluation rubrics.

- *Criteria*: LEA would assess its performance on a [Met / Not Met / Not Met for Two or More Years] scale.

CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Discussion Questions

- What are the areas of strengths with the current proposed approaches to measure performance? What are the areas in need of improvement?
- What are some additional ways LEAs may collect and report this information? Is anything missing from the list of examples?
- At what point during the LCFF evaluation rubrics cycle should these data be collected?
- In what ways does the inclusion of the local performance assessment contribute to the local reflective processes to support continuous improvement?