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# MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** June 16, 2023

**TO:** MEMBERS, State Board of Education

**FROM:** TONY THURMOND, State Superintendent of Public Instruction

**SUBJECT:** Review of Methodology for Establishing Cut Points for Status and Change on the California School Dashboard and Establishing a Performance Level Color Scheme for the Five-by-Five Grid.

This memorandum provides a review of the methodology that the California State Board of Education (SBE) has used to establish cut points for status and change on the California School Dashboard (Dashboard) as well as the methodology for establishing the performance level color scheme for the five-by-five grid. This memo is designed to respond to the SBE’s request for additional information on this topic at the March 2023 SBE meeting and provide the background necessary for the discussion of the proposed changes to the 2023 Dashboard at the September 2023 SBE meeting.

## Summary of Key Issues

Following the adoption of the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) in the 2013–14 budget year, work began in earnest in 2014 to engage the SBE and members of public to transition to a new accountability system. Over the course of 10 meetings during a two-year period, the SBE directed the process to develop a new accountability system which included defining the methodology for determining performance on key indicators and approval of the design and descriptors for how to set performance bands (now referred to as cut scores) for individual indicators. The system design was informed by extensive outreach efforts led by the California Comprehensive Center at WestEd who convened meetings and User Acceptance Testing to gather critical feedback to inform the new system. Throughout this process, policy and technical considerations were presented to the California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG) which provided feedback for the SBE’s consideration at key decision points. The CPAG is responsible for advising the SBE on accountability related matters and also serves as the state’s committee of practitioners under federal Title I requirements.

The measurement, and specifically, the approach to setting cut scores used today in the Dashboard was adopted by the SBE in 2016, based, in part, on the evidence-based system used in Alberta, Canada. Referred to as “quality standards” in the Alberta model, this concept set specific expectations for performance based on consideration of improvement and outcomes, which were assigned based upon how a local educational agency (LEA), school, or subgroups performs for a specific metric relative to the overall distribution of results for the state. The cut score ranges were developed based on analysis of California-specific data, User Acceptance Testing applied research, input from educational partners, and technical feedback from the CDE’s Technical Design Group. (For additional details on the origins of this work, see Item 14 September 2016 <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr15/documents/sep15item14.doc> https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr15/documents/sep15item14.doc and Item 14and Item 14, Attachment 3, <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr15/documents/sep15item14a3rev.doc>).

The SBE formally adopted the methodology for determining performance for state indicators at their May 2016 meeting. This action was guided by data simulations based on the graduation rate example scenarios conducted by the California Department of Education (CDE). In July 2016, the SBE approved the final design and descriptors of the process to set performance bands (cut-scores), for each key indicator based on the methodology approved in May 2016. This process culminated in September 2016, when the SBE adopted percentile-based cut points for both “Status” and “Change” along with performance level color schemes for the five-by-five grid, in order to make an overall color performance level determination for each of the indicators.

With the adoption of the initial cut scores, staff noted that the Dashboard would need to evolve through the first couple of years of implementation. Accordingly, the SBE has reviewed and updated indicators, when necessary, to account large changes in the distribution of the data, as well as to accommodate any new data contributing to the indicator. Also, during this period, the SBE utilized this methodology to adopt new indicators on the Dashboard when statewide data became available for a multi-year period, such as the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator and the College/Career Indicator in 2018.

Attachment 1 details the process for setting cut points for indicators based on the methodology adopted by the SBE in 2016.

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

A series of information memoranda were posted in February 2016 to provide an update on the development of the new accountability and continuous improvement system for California. These memoranda were in response to direction provided by the SBE at its January 2016 meeting to clarify how California could establish a single, coherent accountability system that integrates local, state, and federal accountability components to support continuous improvement and systems of local and state support (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr16/documents/jan16item02rev.doc>).

The first information memorandum provided an updated timeline that details the proposed transition to the new accountability and continuous improvement system (. <http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-sbe-feb16item01.doc>

The second information memorandum established common terminology and definition of terms used to describe the proposed architecture for the new accountability and continuous improvement system (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-sbe-feb16item02.doc>).

The third information memorandum provided more clarity around how the pieces of the emerging, integrated accountability system would fit together (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-sbe-feb16item03.doc>).

The fourth information memorandum presented further analysis on the graduation rate indicator as a means to illustrate how standards, once established, may identify LEAs in need of technical assistance and state intervention under LCFF assistance and support provisions, which turn on the performance of student subgroups (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-sbe-feb16item04.doc>).

The fifth information memorandum provided a complete picture of how the current LCFF evaluation rubrics prototype would function by identifying indicators other than graduation rate that could be used as key indicators and by analyzing how these potential key indicators align with the indicators that also satisfy the requirements of the ESSA (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-sbe-feb16item05.doc>).

The sixth memo provided an overview of student-level growth models that can be used to communicate Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment results (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-dsib-amard-feb16item01.doc>).

The seventh and final memo provided an overview of two options for a College and Career Indicator (CCI) as one of the measures for an aligned state and federal accountability system (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-dsib-amard-feb16item02.doc>).

In May 2016, the SBE approved a design for the LCFF evaluation rubrics that includes: a set of state indicators; a methodology for calculating performance as a combination of status and change for the state indicators in order to differentiate performance at the LEA and school levels, and for student groups; a component that supports the use of local data; and concepts for a top-level display. The SBE also directed staff to prepare a recommendation for the July 2016 Board meeting for establishing standards for the LCFF priorities that are not addressed by the state indicators and options for incorporating college and career readiness, local climate surveys, and an English learner composite into the overall LCFF evaluation rubrics design (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr16/documents/may16item02revised.doc>).

In August 2016, the SBE received the following information memoranda on proposed percentile cut scores for state indicators. (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-dsib-amard-aug16item02rev.doc>)

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

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

In February 2018, the SBE received the following information memoranda on developing a new state accountability system and updates on the implementation of the College/Career Indicator; including the expansion of career measures and performance comparisons for Academic measures (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-feb18item02.docx>)

In March 2018, the SBE heard an update on the continuing development work of the Dashboard, including revisions under consideration for the 2018 Dashboard. Also, at this meeting, the SBE reviewed proposed revisions for the 2018 Dashboard, including the incorporation of modified methods for Dashboard Alternative School Status (DASS) schools. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/mar18item01.docx>)

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

Also, in April 2018, the SBE received the following Information Memoranda on the ongoing development of the new accountability system and 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 June 2018, the SBE received an Information Memorandum on the ongoing Development of California’s New Accountability System: Update on Revisions to Calculating the Graduation Rate and Impact on the California School Dashboard. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-jun18item02.docx>)

In March 2019, the SBE received and approved an update to the continuing developmental work on the Dashboard and revisions that were being considered by the CDE for the 2019 Dashboard. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr19/documents/mar19item17.docx>)

In March 2020, the SBE was provided an annual update to the continuing developmental work on the Dashboard and revisions that were being considered by the CDE for the 2020 Dashboard. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr20/documents/mar20item05.docx>)

In May 2021, the CDE provided an annual update on the accountability activities related for 2021. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr21/documents/may21item04.docx>)

In March 2022, the SBE received an annual update that was being considered by the CDE for the 2022 Dashboard. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr22/documents/mar22item04.docx>)

In July 2022, the SBE held a study session on the development history, implementation, and indicators in the Accountability System. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr22/documents/jul22item02.docx>)

In March 2023, the SBE received an annual update that was being considered by the CDE for the 2023 Dashboard. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr23/documents/mar23item03.docx>)

## Attachment(s)

* Attachment 1: Constructing the Dashboard: Setting Cut Points for Status and Change and Establishing the Performance Level Color Scheme for the Five-by-Five Grid (15 pages)

## Attachment 1

### Constructing the Dashboard: Setting Cut Points for Status and Change and Establishing the Performance Level Color Scheme for the Five-by-Five Grid

#### Background

The methodology for calculating performance for state indicators was adopted at the May 2016 State Board of Education (SBE) meeting. The methodology uses equally weighted percentile cut scores for status and change to determine a performance category for each state indicator. It applies to all local educational agencies (LEAs), including charter schools and county offices of education, and to individual school sites, as required by federal law, and presents performance data disaggregated by student subgroups.

This methodology was preferable because it could effectively control for variation and was likely to yield a more reliable measure of improvement. This is in contrast to the prior methodology under the No Child Left Behind which set a singular bar for schools to demonstrate improvement. Additionally, users found the methodology was easier to explain than many of the alternative approaches and supports reporting the results in manner that is transparent and accessible.

The methodology determines status and change from an initial distribution and holds them fixed for a number of years as described in the initial overview. The SBE subsequently has considered cut scores for each indicator based on the distribution described below for **status and change.**

#### How Status is Determined

Status is determined using the current year performance (i.e., current year chronic absenteeism rate). The results for all LEAs were ordered from highest to lowest (see Tables 1 and 3 for examples), or in the case of chronic absenteeism and suspension rates, lowest to highest, and four cut points were selected based on the distribution. These cut points created five “Status” levels which are:

* Very High
* High
* Medium
* Low
* Very Low

The first of the five status cut points set is the lowest achievable cut point, which is either “Very Low,” or “Very High” for the Suspension Rate and Chronic Absenteeism Indicators. This status level signifies the status level that is either a federally required minimum (as is the case with Graduation Rate) or a level of achievement that is representative of the bottom 5 to 10 percent of the LEA distribution.

The next status cut point set is that of “High,” or “Low” for the Suspension Rate and Chronic Absenteeism Indicators. This status level signifies the status level that is the goal for the state, either a federally required goal (as is the case with Graduation Rate) or a level of achievement that is representative of the 60th percentile and above of the distribution.

The remaining cut points for status are set around these established levels, with a goal of the “Medium” status level to include the largest portion of the distribution and create a normal distribution.

### Review of the Process Used to Adopt Status Levels for Existing Indicators

#### Graduation Rate

To demonstrate how this works, we can revisit how the status levels were set for the Graduation Rate Indicator in 2018. Since the Local Control Funding Formula is oriented towards support for LEAs, the distribution of all LEA graduation rates was used to set the cut points. This includes County Office of Education, District and charter school graduation rate rates. The SBE’s goal was for schools and LEAs to have a high graduation rate, therefore the results are ordered from highest to lowest. The distribution that was used to set the cut points in 2018 is displayed in Table 1.

#### Table 1: Status Distribution Used to Set Graduation Status Cut Points in 2018

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

| **Percentile** | **Graduation Rate** |
| --- | --- |
| 95 | 99% |
| 90 | 98.1% |
| 85 | 97.5% |
| 80 | 96.8% |
| 75 | 96.3% |
| 70 | 95.7% |
| 65 | 95.1% |
| 60 | 94.6% |
| 55 | 94% |
| 50 | 93.3% |
| 45 | 92.6% |
| 40 | 91.8% |
| 35 | 90.9% |
| 30 | 89.9% |
| 25 | 88.4% |
| 20 | 86.5% |
| 15 | 83.3% |
| 10 | 78.0% |
| 5 | 65.2% |

Based on simulations and recommendations produced by the CDE, the SBE approved the Status cut points shown in Table 2.

#### Table 2: Recommended Status Cut Points for the Graduation Rate Indicator

| **Status Level** | **Status Cut Points** | **Approximate Percentiles Represented** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Very High | Graduation rate is 95% or higher | Above the 65th percentile |
| High | Graduation rate is 90% to 94.9% | 35th to 65th percentile |
| Medium | Graduation rate is 80% to 89.9% | 15th to 35th percentile |
| Low | Graduation rate is 67.0% to 79.9% | 10th to 15th percentile |
| Very Low | Graduation rate is 66.9% or lower | Lower than the 10th percentile |

The first of the five status cut points set was the lowest achievable cut point, which is “Very Low” for the Graduation Rate Indicator. This cut point was set at 66.9 percent, which represents a little less than 0-10th percentile of the distribution. The next status cut point set was that of “High” for the Graduation Rate Indicator. It represented the 35th to 65th percentile of the distribution. The largest portions of the distribution are represented by the “Medium” and “High” status points, which extend from the 15th to 35th percentile and 35th to 65th percentiles.

#### Chronic Absenteeism

We can also revisit how the status levels were set for the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator in 2018. Since the Local Control Funding Formula was oriented towards support for LEAs, the distribution of all LEA chronic absenteeism rates was used to set the cut points. This includes County Office of Education, District and charter school chronic absenteeism rates. The SBE’s goal is for schools and LEAs to have a low chronic absenteeism rate, therefore the results are ordered from lowest to highest. The distribution that was used to set the cut points in 2018 is displayed in Table 3.

#### Table 3: Status Distribution Used to Set Cut Points in 2018

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

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

Based on simulations and recommendations produced by the CDE, the SBE approved the Status cut points shown in Table 4.

#### Table 4: Recommended Status Cut Points for the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator

| **Status Level** | **Status Cut Points** | **Approximate Percentiles Represented** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Very Low | Chronic absenteeism rate is 2.5% or less  | Above the 90th percentile |
| Low | Chronic absenteeism rate is 2.6% to 5.0% | 75th to 90th percentile |
| Medium | Chronic absenteeism rate is 5.1% to 10% | 40th to 75th percentile |
| High  | Chronic absenteeism rate is 10.1% to 20% | 10th to 40th percentile |
| Very High  | Chronic absenteeism rate is 20.1% or more | Lower than the 10th percentile |

The first of the five status cut points set was the lowest achievable cut point, which is “Very High” for the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator. This cut point was set at 20.1 percent, which represents a little more than 0-10th percentile of the distribution. The next status cut point set was that of “Low” for the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator. It represented the 75th to 90th percentile of the distribution. The largest portion of the distribution is represented by the “Medium” status points, which extend from the 45th to 75th percentile.

#### How Change is Determined

Change is the difference between performance from the current year and the prior year (e.g., the difference between the current year chronic absenteeism rate and prior year chronic absenteeism rate). The results for all LEAs are ordered separately from highest to lowest for positive change (see Tables 5 and 7 for examples) and, in the case of chronic absenteeism and suspension rate, lowest to highest for negative change. Four cut points were set, two for positive change and two for negative change, which created the following five “Change” levels:

* Increased Significantly
* Increased
* Maintained
* Declined
* Declined Significantly

The first of five change cut points set is the lowest achievable change cut point, which is either “Decreased Significantly,” or “Increased Significantly” for the Suspension Rate and Chronic Absenteeism Indicators. This level of achievement is representative of the bottom 5 to 10 percent of the LEA distribution.

The remaining cut points for change are set after, with a goal of the “Maintained” status level to include the largest portion of the distribution equally weighted around zero to create a normal distribution.

### Review of the Process Used to Adopt Change Levels for Existing Indicators

#### Graduation Rate

Again, we can use the cut point setting of the Graduation Rate Indicator in 2018 to assist in demonstrating this process. Paralleling the process used to establish the Status Levels, the distribution of the difference between the current year graduation rate and prior year graduation rate for all LEAs are used to set the cut points. This includes the same set of County Office of Education, District and charter school graduation data. The SBE’s goal was for schools and LEAs to increase their graduation rates over time, therefore the results are ordered from largest declines to largest increases. The distribution that was used to set the change cut points in 2018 is displayed in Table 5.

#### **Table 5: Change Distribution Used to Graduation Rate Set Cut Points in 2018**

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

| **Percentile** | **Difference from Prior Year to Current Year** |
| --- | --- |
| 95 | 9.1% |
| 90 | 5.5% |
| 85 | 3.5% |
| 80 | 2.7% |
| 75 | 2.2% |
| 70 | 1.7% |
| 65 | 1.3% |
| 60 | 1.0% |
| 55 | 0.6% |
| 50 | 0.3% |
| 45 | 0.0% |
| 40 | -0.3% |
| 35 | -0.7% |
| 30 | -1.0% |
| 25 | -1.4% |
| 20 | -2.0% |
| 15 | -3.0% |
| 10 | -4.3% |
| 5 | -7.0% |

Based on simulations and recommendations produced by the CDE, the SBE approved the Change cut points shown in Table 6.

#### Table 6: Recommended Change Cut Points for the Graduation Rate Indicator

| **Change Level** | **Change Cut Points** | **Approximate Percentiles Represented** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Increased Significantly   | Graduation rate increased by 5% or more | Above the 90th percentile |
| Increased | Graduation rate increased by 1% to 4.9% | 60th to 90th percentile |
| Maintained | Graduation rate declined or increased by 0.9% | 35th to 60th percentile |
| Declined | Graduation rate declined by 1% to 5% | 10th to35th percentile |
| Declined Significantly | Graduation rate declined by more than 5%  | Below the 10th percentile |

The first of the five change cut points set was the lowest achievable cut point, which is “Declined Significantly” for the Graduation Rate Indicator. This cut point was set at an increase of 5 percent or more, which represents a little less than 0-10th percentile of the distribution. The next change cut point set was that of “Increased” for the Graduation Rate Indicator. It represented a little more than the 60th to 90th percentile of the distribution. The “Maintained” change level extends from the 35th to 60th percentile.

#### Chronic Absenteeism

Another example is the Chronic Absenteeism indicator. The SBE’s goal is for schools and LEAs to decrease their chronic absenteeism rates over time, therefore the results are ordered from largest declines to largest increases. The distribution that was used to set the change cut points in 2018 is displayed in Table 7.

#### **Table 7: Change Distribution Used to Set Cut Points in 2018**

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

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

Based on simulations and recommendations produced by the CDE, the SBE approved the Change cut points shown in Table 8.

#### Table 8: Recommended Change Cut Points for the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator

| **Change Level** | **Change Cut Points** | **Approximate Percentiles Represented** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Declined Significantly | Chronic absenteeism rate declined by 3% or more  | Above the 90th percentile |
| Declined | Chronic absenteeism rate declined by 0.5% to 2.9% | 65th to90th percentile |
| Maintained | Chronic absenteeism rate declined or increased by 0.4% | 45th to 65th percentile |
| Increased | Chronic absenteeism rate increased by 0.5% to 2.9% | 15th to 45th percentile |
| Increased Significantly   | Chronic absenteeism rate increased by 3% or more | Below the 15th percentile |

The first of the five change cut points set was the lowest achievable cut point, which is “Increased Significantly” for the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator. This cut point was set at an increase of 3 percent, which represents a little less than 0-15th percentile of the distribution. The next change cut point set was that of “Declined” for the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator. It represented a little more than the 65th to 80th percentile of the distribution. The “Maintained” change level extends from the 45th to 65th percentile.

### How Performance Levels are Determined

The combination of an LEA’s or school’s “Status” and “Change” determines the performance category, which are represented by five ranked colors or Performance Levels:

* Blue (highest)
* Green
* Yellow
* Orange
* Red (lowest)

Each Indicator has its own distinct Performance Level color scheme for the five-by-five colored grid, which is adopted by the SBE along with the status and change cut points.

#### Revisiting How Performance Levels Were Adopted for Existing Indicators

#### Graduation Rate Indicator

The SBE adopted the Graduation Rate Performance Level color scheme for five-by-five colored grid as shown in Table 9.

Based on this grid, the SBE made the requirements for LEAs, schools and student groups to receive a blue Performance Level either a status of very high and a change level of maintained, increased or increased significantly, or a status of high and a change level of increased significantly. Conversely, an LEA, school or student group would receive a red Performance Level with a status level of low and a change level of decreased significantly, or a status level of very low and any change level.

#### Table 9: Graduation Rate Performance Levels (Colors)

| **Performance Level** | **Declined Significantly** | **Declined** | **Maintained** | **Increased** | **Increased Significantly** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Very High** | N/A | Green | Blue | Blue | Blue |
| **High** | Orange | Yellow | Green | Green | Blue |
| **Medium** | Orange | Orange | Yellow | Green | Green |
| **Low** | Red | Orange | Orange | Yellow | Yellow |
| **Very Low** | Red | Red | Red | Red | Red |

#### Chronic Absenteeism Indicator

The SBE adopted the Chronic Absenteeism Performance Level color scheme for five-by-five colored grid as shown in Table 10.

Based on this grid, the SBE made the requirements for LEAs, schools and student groups to receive a blue Performance Level either a status of very low and a change level of maintained, declined or declined significantly, or a status of low and a change level of declined significantly. Conversely, an LEA, school or student group would receive a red Performance Level with a status level of high and a change level of increased significantly, or a status level of very high and a change level of maintained, increased or increased significantly.

#### Table 10: Chronic Absenteeism Performance Levels (Colors)

| **Performance Level** | **Increased Significantly** | **Increased** | **Maintained** | **Declined** | **Declined Significantly** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Very Low** | Yellow | Green | Blue | Blue | Blue |
| **Low** | Orange | Yellow | Green | Green | Blue |
| **Medium** | Orange | Orange | Yellow | Green | Green |
| **High** | Red | Orange | Orange | Yellow | Yellow |
| **Very High** | Red | Red | Red | Orange | Yellow |

#### Additional Considerations

When different patterns of achievement have been observed across the State Indicators in different grade spans, the SBE has chosen to differentiate their respective cut points when setting both status and change. These differential five-by-fives are available within the Academic Indicator as well as the Suspension Rate Indicator.

#### Status Levels and Change Levels Over Time

California’s Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plan adopted by the SBE established an expectation that the performance levels for state indicators would be revised every seven years based on new distributions and established an annual review process to assess progress on all indicators statewide. This timeframe allows for stability in the Dashboard calculations and assists LEAs, schools and student groups in meeting their year-over-year growth expectations. During the adoption of the ESSA State Plan, the SBE expressed that constantly resetting the cut points could cause confusion in the field as to what the objectives are for success across all indicators on the Dashboard.

#### Revisiting the Stability of Graduate Rate Status and Change Levels Over Time

Table 11 displays the status distribution of Graduation rates in 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2022. Please note the following about the Graduation Rate indicator:

* The formula for the Graduation Rate Indicator in 2017 and 2018 did not include DASS schools in the distribution
* It changed in 2019 to include the DASS 1-year rate
* It included DASS schools in 2022 but with the combination graduation rate. In 2017, 2018 and 2019, the Graduation Rate status levels remained consistent. However, the 2022 status levels deviate in an extreme way from the prior two years on the Dashboard.

#### Table 11: Status Distributions for the 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2022 Graduation Rate

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

| **Percentile** | **2017****Graduation Rate Status** | **2018****Graduation Rate Status** | **2019****Graduation Rate Status** | **2022****Graduation Rate Status** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 95 | 99.0% | 98.7% | 99.1% | 98.9% |
| 90 | 97.6% | 97.6% | 97.8% | 97.9% |
| 85 | 96.7% | 96.7% | 96.9% | 96.9% |
| 80 | 95.9% | 95.9% | 95.9% | 96.3% |
| 75 | 95.1% | 95.3% | 95.3% | 95.7% |
| 70 | 94.3% | 94.4% | 94.4% | 94.9% |
| 65 | 93.6% | 93.8% | 93.8% | 93.9% |
| 60 | 92.5% | 93.0% | 93.1% | 93.2% |
| 55 | 91.9% | 92.0% | 92.3% | 92.5% |
| 50 | 91.2% | 91.3% | 91.6% | 91.8% |
| 45 | 90.5% | 90.4% | 90.8% | 90.6% |
| 40 | 89.5% | 89.7% | 89.9% | 89.4% |
| 35 | 88.0% | 88.5% | 88.7% | 88.1% |
| 30 | 86.1% | 86.5% | 87.3% | 86.2% |
| 25 | 83.9% | 84.6% | 85.7% | 84.1% |
| 20 | 81.3% | 82.1% | 83.7% | 80.0% |
| 15 | 77.2% | 77.1% | 79.2% | 72.0% |
| 10 | 63.3% | 66.1% | 69.6% | 59.0% |
| 5 | 49.1% | 52.5% | 47.9% | 37.2% |

Table 12 displays the change distribution of Graduation rates in 2018 and 2019. Data for 2017 is not available, as it was based on a difference between the current year and a three-year average. Data for 2022 is not available due to the status-only Dashboard that was published in that year.

In both 2018 and 2019, the Graduation change distributions remained consistent.

#### Table 12: Change Distributions for the 2018, 2019, and 2022 Chronic Absenteeism

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

| **Percentile** | **2018****Graduation** **Rate Change** | **2019****Graduation Rate Change** | **2022****Graduation Rate Change** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 95 | 13.1% | 11.4% | N/A |
| 90 | 6.9% | 6.6% | N/A |
| 85 | 4.7% | 5.1% | N/A |
| 80 | 3.2% | 3.7% | N/A |
| 75 | 2.5% | 2.7% | N/A |
| 70 | 1.9% | 2.1% | N/A |
| 65 | 1.5% | 1.5% | N/A |
| 60 | 1.1% | 1.1% | N/A |
| 55 | 0.6% | 0.7% | N/A |
| 50 | 0.3% | 0.4% | N/A |
| 45 | 0.1% | 0.0% | N/A |
| 40 | -0.2% | -0.3% | N/A |
| 35 | -0.5% | -0.7% | N/A |
| 30 | -1.0% | -1.1% | N/A |
| 25 | -1.4% | -1.7% | N/A |
| 20 | -2.2% | -2.5% | N/A |
| 15 | -3.4% | -3.6% | N/A |
| 10 | -5.0% | -5.5% | N/A |
| 5 | -7.9% | -11.1% | N/A |

#### Revisiting the Stability of Chronic Absenteeism Status and Change Levels Over Time

Table 13 displays the status distribution of Chronic Absenteeism rates in 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2022. In 2017, 2018 and 2019, the Chronic Absenteeism status levels remained consistent. However, the 2022 status levels deviate from the prior two years on the Dashboard due to the impacts of COVID-19 on the 2021-22 school year.

#### Table 13: Status Distributions for the 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2022 Chronic Absenteeism Rate

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

| **Percentile** | **2017****Chronic Absenteeism Status** | **2018****Chronic Absenteeism Status** | **2019****Chronic Absenteeism Status** | **2022****Chronic Absenteeism Status** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 95 | 0.9% | 0.6% | 0.8% | 2.0% |
| 90 | 2.2% | 2.3% | 2.2% | 6.1% |
| 85 | 3.3% | 3.3% | 3.4% | 9.1% |
| 80 | 4.0% | 4.3% | 4.3% | 11.9% |
| 75 | 4.8% | 4.9% | 5.1% | 14.4% |
| 70 | 5.5% | 5.7% | 5.8% | 16.9% |
| 65 | 6.1% | 6.2% | 6.5% | 19.3% |
| 60 | 6.8% | 6.9% | 7.3% | 21.6% |
| 55 | 7.5% | 7.7% | 8.2% | 24.0% |
| 50 | 8.2% | 8.5% | 9.0% | 26.1% |
| 45 | 9.0% | 9.3% | 9.7% | 28.1% |
| 40 | 9.8% | 10.3% | 10.8% | 30.3% |
| 35 | 10.8% | 11.3% | 11.7% | 32.6% |
| 30 | 12.0% | 12.4% | 13.0% | 35.2% |
| 25 | 13.6% | 13.7% | 14.3% | 37.5% |
| 20 | 15.4% | 15.6% | 16.2% | 40.6% |
| 15 | 17.7% | 18.2% | 18.5% | 44.3% |
| 10 | 22.3% | 22.7% | 23.2% | 48.6% |
| 5 | 32.3% | 34.1% | 31.6% | 56.5% |

Table 14 displays the change distribution of Chronic Absenteeism rates in 2018 and 2019. Data for 2022 is not available due to the status-only Dashboard that was published in that year. In both 2018 and 2019, the Chronic Absenteeism change distributions remained consistent.

#### Table 14: Change Distributions for the 2018, 2019, and 2022 Chronic Absenteeism

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

| **Percentile** | **2018****Chronic Absenteeism Change** | **2019****Chronic Absenteeism Change** | **2022****Chronic Absenteeism Change** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 95 | -6.0% | -6.9% | N/A |
| 90 | -3.5% | -3.9% | N/A |
| 85 | -2.3% | -2.6% | N/A |
| 80 | -1.7% | -1.7% | N/A |
| 75 | -1.2% | -1.3% | N/A |
| 70 | -0.7% | -0.9% | N/A |
| 65 | -0.5% | -0.6% | N/A |
| 60 | -0.2% | -0.3% | N/A |
| 55 | 0.0% | 0.0% | N/A |
| 50 | 0.1% | 0.1% | N/A |
| 45 | 0.4% | 0.4% | N/A |
| 40 | 0.6% | 0.6% | N/A |
| 35 | 0.9% | 0.9% | N/A |
| 30 | 1.2% | 1.2% | N/A |
| 25 | 1.7% | 1.6% | N/A |
| 20 | 2.2% | 2.1% | N/A |
| 15 | 3.1% | 3.1% | N/A |
| 10 | 4.5% | 4.6% | N/A |
| 5 | 7.8% | 7.3% | N/A |