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# MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** February 26, 2018

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

**FROM:** TOM TORLAKSON, State Superintendent of Public Instruction

**SUBJECT:** Update on the Development of a Revised Self-Reflection Tool for the Local Performance Indicator for Local Control Funding Formula Priority 6, School Climate.

## Background

With the approval of a new accountability system in May 2016, the State Board of Education (SBE) established an annual review process for the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) evaluation rubrics, which are reported through the online California School Dashboard (Dashboard). This process includes the review of state and local indicators and performance standards to consider necessary changes or improvements based on newly available data, recent research, and stakeholder feedback. As part of this process, the California Department of Education (CDE) includes state and local indicators that need revisions or updates in the work plan presented at each March SBE meeting. This process allows for a gradual and deliberate approach to improving the state and local indicators and incorporating changes before the annual release of the Dashboard each fall.

## Summary of Key Issues

Responding to May 2016 SBE guidance(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-dsib-amard-jun16item02.doc> ), the CDE, in partnership with the California Comprehensive Center at WestEd, convened the School Conditions and Climate Work Group (CCWG) to explore options to advise the State Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI) on the further development of school conditions and climate measures (LCFF Priority 6) in California’s accountability and continuous improvement system. The CCWG includes a broad range of stakeholders including practitioners (teachers and administrators), researchers, parents, and advocates.

At the November 2017 SBE meeting, CCWG members presented the SBE with a summary report of the work of the CCWG, including a synopsis of its recommendations framework. These include recommendations that can be acted upon with existing resources and authority and those for which additional resources and authority will be necessary to implement (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/nov17item03rev.doc>). The presentation also included a discussion of the recommendation for revision of the Dashboard self-reflection tool that the CDE will bring forward to the SBE for consideration and approval in March 2018. The SBE also requested that the CDE bring the final set of CCWG recommendations as well as the recommendations for SBE consideration back to the California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG) for additional feedback and guidance.

In response, the CDE presented the CPAG with an update on the work of the CCWG on Tuesday, December 5, 2017. The presentation included a review of the workgroup’s State Level and local educational agency (LEA) level recommendations and provided an opportunity for CPAG members to generate feedback on the first set of recommendations the CDE will present for consideration by the SBE in March 2018. The CPAG session also included time to reflect on and share their thoughts on themed feedback from the November 2017 CCWG SBE presentation.

Specifically, the CDE provided CPAG with the opportunity to provide input on the school conditions and climate recommendations and to make suggestions for improvement using a customized reflection tool. In addition CPAG members were asked to respond feedback from the November 2017 CCWG SBE presentation. This feedback is helping to guide the SPI and CDE as they continue to meet with CCWG members and key stakeholder partners to actively work towards the implementation of the full set of CCWG recommendations.

To that end, the CCWG recommendations have been divided into three “buckets” for follow-up covering actions that:

* Require legislative action and additional financial investments;
* Can be taken by the SBE as part of the Dashboard’s continuous improvement process; and
* Can be taken by the CDE and other participants in California’s Statewide System of Support.

This memo focuses explicitly on actions in the second bucket —the CCWG’s recommendations for changes to the current self-reflection tool for the school climate local indicator (Priority 6).

### Current SBE Approved Standard and Self-Reflection Tool for LCFF Priority 6

The following information is from the California School Dashboard Technical Guide, pages 65–66, and Appendix B

(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/cm/documents/dashboardguidespring17.pdf>).

In addition to state indicators, the Dashboard also reports progress on local indicators, which are used to support LEAs in identifying strengths, weaknesses, and areas that need improvement. To meet the LCFF statutory requirements, the new accountability system includes standards for local indicators to help LEAs measure and report their progress. For each local indicator reported on the Equity Report page, LEAs complete the following steps to meet the approved standards:

* Measure their progress using locally available information;
* Report the results to the LEA’s local governing board at a regularly scheduled public meeting of the local governing board; and
* Upload and publically report the results through the Dashboard.

An LEA measures progress by locally completing the SBE adopted self-reflection tools that are provided in the Dashboard. After the completion of the self-assessment/local measure options and reporting of progress, LEAs use the following criteria to assess its performance:

* Met
* Not Met
* Not Met for Two of More Years

The SBE approved standard for LCFF Priority 6 (School Climate) states:

* The 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 at a regularly scheduled meeting of the local governing board and to stakeholders and the public through the Dashboard.

The SBE adopted self-reflection tool for LCFF Priority 6 (School Climate) asks the following of LEAs:

* LEAs will provide a narrative summary of the local administration and analysis of a local climate survey that captures a valid measure of student perceptions of school safety and connectedness in at least one grade within the grade span (e.g., K–5, 6– 8, 9–12) in a text box provided in the Dashboard. Specifically, LEAs will have an opportunity to include differences among student groups, and for surveys that provide an overall score, such as the California Healthy Kids Survey, report the overall score for all students and student groups. This summary may also include an analysis of a subset of specific items on a local survey that is particularly relevant to school safety and connectedness.

The proposed revision to the self-reflection tool for Priority 6 maintains the basis of the current SBE adopted self-reflection tool, making minor modifications including the addition of guiding questions based on an analytical framework described below to facilitate LEA and stakeholder learning, reflection, and action in relation to school climate.

As LEAs engage in the process to complete self-reflection tools locally, they reflect on actions they have taken to improve each LCFF Priority, such as school climate. This is done with the intent to assess if they are on the right course or if revisions to those actions are necessary. The self-reflection tools help LEAs communicate this reflective process with the field.

### Revising the Self-Reflection Tool

The CCWG suggested revisions for the Priority 6 self-reflection tool that would better support LEAs work within their Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP) processes. The revisions are based on the work group’s proposed three-part methodology for approaching school conditions and climate accountability and continuous improvement work—Data, Meaning, and Use (see graphic below). This method helps to ensure that LEAs are not collecting data for purely compliance purposes, but rather moving towards a helpful and practical approach to continuous improvement and accountability.



The three primary components of the CCWG’s recommended continuous improvement approach include:

#### Data

* A variety of data gathering tools should be employed and should involve collection of data from major school and district stakeholders’ (students, parents and families, teachers, administrators, and other school staff).

#### Meaning

* From data collected, the next step is to derive meaning. The CCWG recommends that school districts and schools utilize a variety of modalities to gather input on the “meaning” of the data. For example, focus groups can be facilitated, campus walk-throughs undertaken to see if the data collected is visually and physically apparent, listening circles formed to include the stakeholders most impacted by the data (e.g., student listening circles, teacher listening circles, etc.), and interviews conducted to explore the impact of the data on individuals and groups of stakeholders.

#### Use

* One of the most significant challenges, but also one of the highest priorities for the new accountability system, and LCFF Priority 6 is the importance of effective use or application of the data gathered, and the meaning derived. Both data collected and meaning derived should stimulate inquiry and deepen the meaning and understanding of “continuous improvement” for LEAs and schools. Use should directly apply to evaluating existing, and incorporating new, goals, actions, and services within LCAPs and the development and implementation of programs and policies.

Building on this methodology, the CDE and CCWG proposed the following revision for the self-reflection tool, which was shared with CPAG members on December 5, 2017.

#### Proposed DRAFT Revision for the Self-Reflection Tool for School Climate (Priority 6)\*

\* December 5, 2017, CPAG Version

LEAs will provide a narrative summary of the local administration and analysis of a local climate survey that captures a valid measure of student perceptions of school safety and connectedness in at least one grade within the grade span (e.g., K–5, 6– 8, 9–12) in a text box provided in the Dashboard. LEAs will have an opportunity to include differences among student groups, and for surveys that provide an overall score, report the overall score for all students and student groups. This summary may also include an analysis of a subset of specific items on a local survey that is particularly relevant to school conditions and climate. Specifically, the LEA should include responses to the following guiding questions to help frame the narrative summary.

* Reflect on the key learnings from the survey results and share what the LEA learned.
* Given the disaggregated results of the survey and other data collection methods, what does that reveal about schools in the LEA?
* What revisions, decisions, or new actions will the LEA implement in response to the results for continuous improvement purposes? Why?

Enter text for self-reflection tool response.

### Summarized CPAG Feedback for the Self-Reflection Tool—December 5, 2017, CPAG Version

A summary of CPAG member feedback and suggestions for the revised self-reflection tool is provided below based on the following guiding prompts 1) List what worked well; 2) List your thoughts on what needs adjusting; and 3) Share a solution for how to make/implement the suggested adjustment.

#### Guiding Prompt 1 Feedback and Suggestions: List what worked well (Areas of strength)

* Overall the updates were considered to be very helpful.
* The three guiding questions—data, meaning, and use—are well liked and supported. Suggestions to use this frame with other local indicator self-reflection tools were expressed. Member Kenne shared, “I think it really helps give people an idea of the planning phase of continuous improvement in a nice short way.” She further stated, “I really appreciate the recommendations for changing the self-reflection tool to get into that data, you know what did you see, meaning, what do you think it meant for you, and how are you going to use it?”
* The guiding questions were considered to be helpful. Several members suggested that all self-reflection tools should be aligned to contain similar guiding questions. In particular, Member Kaminski shared, “the first question speaks to how the LEAs reflect their key learnings on access and results. The second speaks to disaggregated data—which is helpful for us to see what is occurring. And the third is what is our next step—helps us to deepen what we are doing, expand, or change course.” Question number two of the suggested guiding questions was highlighted because answering it should give support to LEAs on what to focus on when writing the narrative.
* Members expressed that including a link to the LEA’s school climate data report is a good idea. They expressed that doing this gives more than one opportunity for stakeholders to see the school climate results beyond the local governing stakeholder meeting where the local indicator results are shared. Member Simeon shared, “it is a good idea to have the report linked up to the dashboard. Otherwise just presenting it once, it is unlikely that you are going to reach the audience.”

The table below summarizes CPAG feedback to guiding prompts two and three.

| Guiding Prompt 2 Feedback and Suggestions: List your thoughts on what needs adjusting with the self-reflection Tool | Guiding Prompt 3 Feedback and Suggestions: Share a solution for how to make/implement the suggested adjustment to the self-reflection tool |
| --- | --- |
| * Met/Not Met –perhaps add another level of accountability.
 | * Better aligned to LCAP goals may help with the levels of accountability.
 |
| * Is there a place to go to help with solutions? Such as the URL
 | * Add a link to the URL to make it useful and where to find it.
 |
| * The questions are good but can be broadened. For question three ask about what is next. We emphasize what is new, instead of on what is currently happening to show that what you are currently doing is important. Pause and reflect.
 | * For question two, try listing some of the barriers they identified. For question three, not just talk about new actions, but current actions now you are already doing, reflect on past actions you have already changed, and did they give the change you were hoping for. Make it a past, current, and future question
 |
| * Add the words data, meaning, and use to the appropriate guiding question on the tool.
 | * Solution included with suggested adjustment
 |
| * The language from the currently adopted approach is vague - include an analysis of a subset of specific items on a local survey.
 | * Perhaps add the domain language (safety relationships, conditions for teaching and learning, empowerment) within the descriptor rather than language that says, “analysis of a subset of specific items on a local survey…”
 |

Based on the December 5, 2017, CPAG feedback, the CDE updated the draft revision of the self-reflection tool for Priority 6 and conducted additional stakeholder engagement to solicit feedback using the draft revision. In particular, the draft was shared with CPAG members on February 15, 2018, LCFF stakeholder group members on February 21, 2018, representatives of small and rural school districts on February 22, 2018, and via an online public survey that opened on February 8, 2018 and closed on February 23, 2018. The February 2018 draft update for the self-reflection tool for Priority 6 and a summary of the responses and feedback received from each stakeholder engagement opportunity is included in Attachment 1.

The additional feedback has been used to further improve the self-reflection tool as appropriate (see Attachment 2). An updated stakeholder engagement timeline is also included in Attachment 3.

Currently, the CDE intends to bring the proposed draft revision to the self-reflection tool for Priority 6 (see Attachment 2) to the SBE for discussion with a recommendation for approval at its March board meeting in order to further support LEAs as they share how they identify strengths, weaknesses, and areas that need improvement with their stakeholders.

## Attachment(s)

**Attachment 1:** Stakeholder Feedback Regarding Revised Self-Reflection Tool (February Version) (10 pages)

**Attachment 2:** Updated Draft Revision to the Self-Reflection Tool for Priority 6 (2 pages)

**Attachment 3:** Timeline for Ongoing Developmental Activities for Priority 6 (3 pages)

# Attachment 1: Stakeholder Feedback Regarding Revised Self-Reflection Tool (2018 Version)

What follows is a summary of the stakeholder feedback the California Department of Education (CDE) received regarding the draft revision of the self-reflection tool for Priority 6 based on feedback received from California Practitioner Advisory Group Members (CPAG) on December 5, 2017. The stakeholder feedback is presented after the draft revision and questions stakeholders were asked regarding the draft revision below.

## 2018 DRAFT Revision to the Self-Reflection Tool for Priority 6

### Updated Self-reflection Tool Language\*

Local educational agencies (LEAs) will provide a narrative summary of the local administration and analysis of a local climate survey that captures a valid measure of student perceptions[[1]](#footnote-1) of school safety and connectedness in at least one grade within the grade span (e.g., K–5, 6–8, 9–12) in a text box provided in the California School Dashboard. LEAs will have an opportunity to include differences among student groups, and for surveys that provide an overall score, report the overall score for all students and student groups. This summary may also include an analysis of a subset of specific items on a local survey that is particularly relevant to school conditions and climate. Please use the following guiding questions to help frame the narrative summary:

1. **DATA:** Reflect on the key learnings from the survey results and share what the LEA learned.
2. **MEANING**: What do the disaggregated results[[2]](#footnote-2) of the survey and other data collection methods reveal about schools in the LEA, such as areas of strength or growth, challenges, and barriers?
3. **USE**: What revisions, decisions, or actions has, or will, the LEA implement in response to the results for continuous improvement purposes? Why? If you have already implemented actions, did you see the results you were seeking?

Enter text for self-reflection tool response.

**\*Please note**: The proposed revision to the self-reflection tool for Priority 6 maintains the basis of the current SBE adopted self-reflection tool, making minor modifications to the guiding questions to facilitate LEA and stakeholder learning, reflection, and action in relation to school climate (see the Local Performance Indicator Quick Guide on the CDE Web site at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/cm/documents/localindicatorsquickref.pdf> for the current adopted language).

#### Questions regarding the DRAFT revision for the self-reflection tool for Priority 6

The following questions were developed by CDE staff to better understand whether stakeholders felt the draft revisions to the tool were useful. Stakeholders had the opportunity to answer the questions if so desired, and the offer suggestions for further refinements and additional comments.

1. This proposed update to the self-reflection tool assists school districts to better communicate what is occurring with school climate in their district.
	* Strongly Disagree
	* Disagree
	* Neither Agree or Disagree
	* Agree
	* Strongly Agree
2. This tool help parents, families, and community members better understand the climate of schools in their districts.
	* Strongly Disagree
	* Disagree
	* Neither Agree or Disagree
	* Agree
	* Strongly Agree
3. This tool helps communicate decisions made and actions taken to address school climate issues in school districts.
	* Strongly Disagree
	* Disagree
	* Neither Agree or Disagree
	* Agree
	* Strongly Agree
4. Are there any more refinements?

## Summary of Stakeholder Feedback

The draft revision to the self-reflection tool for Priority 6 was shared with CPAG members on February 15, 2018, Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) Stakeholder group members on February 21, 2018, representatives of small and rural school districts on February 22, 2018, and via an online public survey that closed on February 23, 2018.

Stakeholders responded to a similar set of reflection questions regarding the draft (shared above). Stakeholders were also asked to share any additional comments especially with regards to further refinement of the tool. CPAG members were also asked to share thoughts on how well CDE staff incorporated previous CPAG feedback in the 2018 draft update of the self-reflection tool. A summary of each stakeholder group’s responses follows.

### Feedback from CPAG Members at the February 15, 2018, Meeting

#### Quantitative Results

CPAG members overwhelmingly support the changes to the draft reflection tool as evidenced by the responses to each of the three questions. Please note there were 14 CPAG members present at the February 15, 2018, meeting.

#### Additional CPAG Feedback and Suggestions

* A request was made of school districts to write in parent-friendly language. In particular, CPAG members suggested that this request be added to the directions for completing the self-reflection tool.
* Create a list of terms including definitions to accompany the self-reflection tool.
* Provide exemplars of narrative responses for Priority 6 based on this draft update.
* Move footnote for question two into the text of the question.
* Include suggestions for climate tools and data analysis support. Ensure that when the tool is implemented that supports and tools are included to build the capacity of school districts as they work to improve their school's conditions and climates, especially given that school districts may have varying levels of capacity in working with and presenting school climate data.
* Continued appreciation for the School Conditions and Climate Work Group’s continuous improvement approach of Data, Meaning, and Use.
* The three questions articulated in the self-reflection tool can apply to other local indicator self-reflection tools.
* Prior CPAG feedback integrated into the new draft accurately captures what members have shared with the CDE staff. This draft tool is an example of how the CDE is listening to and incorporating CPAG member’s feedback into their work.
* Remember to continually inform stakeholders that we are learning on a continuous basis. We will learn from this [draft self-reflection tool] and adapt as well.

#### Feedback from the February 21, 2018, LCFF Stakeholder Group Meeting

* Questions were raised about how disaggregation of school conditions and climate survey results would work at the local level. Questions included whether local educational agencies (LEAs) would be expected to disaggregate for all 13 student groups. Alternatively, whether districts would be dinged for not reporting disaggregated survey results.
* A suggestion for refinement was made to guide LEAs to reference, if need be, pages in their Local Control Accountability Plans (LCAPs) that speak to how they will use climate data to make improvements for continuous improvement purposes. This was suggested as a way to mitigate the field thinking that this tool is a mini-LCAP.
* A suggestion to add the standard into the tool was made so that the field would know that this tool has not changed the approved State Board of Education (SBE) standard of administering climate surveys every other year.
* Concerns were raised about timing. That is, depending on when the LEA completes the self-reflection tool they may not have new actions to speak about as referenced in question three. An appreciation for question number three’s wording that allows an LEA to discuss actions it has or will take in response was expressed.
* Gratitude was expressed that LEAs could respond to the data, meaning, and use questions the Priority 6 self-reflection tool in the aggregate versus one at a time.
* A caution to remember that the accountability for the self-reflection tools is at the local level. A suggested refinement for the inclusion of a question about how LEAs engaged stakeholders as they completed the self-reflection tool was offered.
* Questions about the wording of the current SBE approved standard to include a climate survey score were raised. A suggestion that the SBE revisit this at some point was raised.
* Overall guidance was requested on how the CDE envisions the self-reflection tool(s) to be used.

#### Feedback from the February 22, 2018, conversation with Small and Rural School District

Participants in this conversation included small and rural school superintendents, advocates, and Small School District Association Representatives. What follows is a summary of their feedback and suggestions.

* Representatives expressed the need for understanding how the results of school climate surveys that measure perception data are skewed with small numbers of students. For example, a climate survey taken at a school site with 11 students could have their results overwhelmingly skewed by one student. It is imperative that small and rural schools have a way to alert their stakeholders of the context in which they are operating in addition to the narrative text box. A suggestion was made to include a checkbox or drop-down box to the Dashboard that allows LEAs to indicate if they are a small or rural school district when they are inputting their information for local indicators.
* Small and rural school districts also rely on additional data tools such as focus groups to collect school conditions and climate data. They would like to be able to express these results, in addition, to survey results in the self-reflection tool narrative.
* Add the standard and evidence criteria back into the self-reflection tool to ensure that LEAs know that the draft revisions do not change the standard of conducting climate surveys every other year.
* Include framing language in a possible set of instructions that defines what it means to be a small or rural school district.
* Add language to question two that states disaggregate where possible and to the extent that is beneficial to make needed improvements or adjustments locally.
* Offer guidance to County Offices of Education (COE) to support small and rural school districts with Priority 6.
* Provide a list of best practices, resources, and TA for LEAs, especially small and rural, to support effective implementation of school conditions and climate practices and self-reflection tool completion
* Create and communicate an implementation plan for all newly revised self-reflection tools, including but not limited to, webinars and supporting guides.

#### 2018 School Climate Reflection Tool Update Online Survey Results

On February 8, 2018, the CDE, in collaboration with the California Comprehensive Center at WestEd, asked stakeholders to give input on the 2018 draft version of the self-reflection to for Priority 6 via an online survey. The survey took approximately 10 minutes to complete, and stakeholders had a little over two weeks to complete it. The chart below shows the percentages of each stakeholder group who completed the survey with the largest group of respondents being school and district administrators. Online responses show that stakeholders support the changes to the draft reflection tool as evidenced by the responses to each of the three questions presented below. There were 157 responses to the survey.

#### Proposed Revisions and Response Based On Stakeholder Feedback

The CDE appreciates the thoughtful and detailed feedback of each of the stakeholder groups. It is apparent that all stakeholder groups want to ensure that students experience optimal school conditions and climate

In response to the additional stakeholder input received, the CDE recommends that small technical revisions to the self-reflection tool be made to the extent possible as suggested by stakeholders (See Attachment 2). Additional CDE recommendations include:

* Providing support to LEAs in the form of an instructional guide that will help LEAs to maximize the use and effectiveness of the self-reflection tool. Content for the instructional guide could include:
* Language that recognizes the need for LEAs to communicate clearly with their stakeholder groups via the use of parent-friendly language;
* The inclusion of a list of key terms and definitions;
* Suggestions for implementation timelines for the annual completing of self-reflection tools that could coincide with the stakeholder engagement that already occurs as part of the annual update to LCAPs;
* Exemplars of narrative responses based on this draft revision, including how an LEA might discuss all the data tools they used to assess Priority 6 locally as well as ways the narrative response could refer readers back to specific LCAP sections as needed;
* Framing language that explains how the context of survey data and how collection differs depending on the size of the school district.
* Providing technical assistance (TA) via webinar(s) to introduce the newly revised self-reflection tool to the field. The TA could include resources that:
* Provide guidance on the administration of surveys such as developing an administration protocol with stakeholders that address issues such as time frame for respondents to complete the survey.
* Help LEAs make sense of their data via data review protocols and interpretation suggestions that support LEAs as they use the data to inform their practice in the area of school conditions and climate including the use of disaggregated data.
* Ensure to the extent possible that this work is done in conjunction with other self-reflection tool revisions to maximize the support the CDE can offer to the field as they complete their local indicators.

#### A Note on Disaggregation

The guiding question that asks LEAs to reflect on disaggregated results supports LEAs to examine systematic differences in their students’ experiences of school climate and is important for creating a more equitable schooling experience for all students. This is especially true if the data suggests that students’ perceptions of school conditions and climate differ by a student group. Disaggregating school climate data by the groups that exist within school districts helps to uncover these differences, allowing educators and administrators to more efficiently allocate resources and target supports in ways that create positive school experiences and close achievement gaps for each student.

As a best practice in communicating with stakeholders, it is recommended that disaggregated survey results be shared, where applicable to provide context for the actions discussed in the narrative response. However, if it is not possible the standard for the self-reflection tool will still be met as long as the LEA meets requirements of the SBE approved standard.

# Attachment 2: Updated 2018 DRAFT Revision to the Self-Reflection Tool for Priority 6

**Standard:** The local educational agency (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 at a regularly scheduled meeting of the local governing board and to stakeholders and the public through the Dashboard.

**Evidence:** The LEA administers a survey as specified and reports the results to its local governing board and through the local data selection option in the Dashboard.

## Updated Self-reflection tool language\*

Local educational agencies (LEAs) will provide a narrative summary of the local administration and analysis of a local climate survey that captures a valid measure of student perceptions[[3]](#footnote-3) of school safety and connectedness in at least one grade within the grade span (e.g., K–5, 6–8, 9–12) in a text box provided in the California School Dashboard. LEAs will have an opportunity to include differences among student groups[[4]](#footnote-4), and for surveys that provide an overall score, such as the California Healthy Kids Survey, report the overall score for all students and student groups. This summary may also include an analysis of a subset of specific items on a local survey and additional data collection tools that are particularly relevant to school conditions and climate. Please use the following guiding questions to help frame the narrative summary:

1. **DATA:** Reflect on the key learnings from the survey results and share what the LEA learned.
2. **MEANING**: What do the disaggregated results (if applicable) of the survey and other data collection methods reveal about schools in the LEA, such as areas of strength or growth, challenges, and barriers?
3. **USE**: What revisions, decisions, or actions has, or will, the LEA implement in response to the results for continuous improvement purposes? Why? If you have already implemented actions, did you see the results you were seeking?

Enter text for self-reflection tool response.

**\*Please note**: The proposed revision to the self-reflection tool for Priority 6 maintains the basis of the current SBE adopted self-reflection tool, making minor modifications in the areas of:

* The guiding questions based on data, meaning, and use (see the Local Performance Indicator Quick Guide on the CDE Web site at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/cm/documents/localindicatorsquickref.pdf> for the current adopted language);
* The addition of the language *additional data collection tools* to account for small and rural school district context;
* The addition of the term best practice and movement of the language regarding disaggregation and the inclusion of the words if applicable to question two.

# Attachment 3: Timeline for Ongoing Developmental Activities for Priority 6

The California Department of Education (CDE) continues to explore options to implement the remaining School Conditions and Climate Work Group (CCWG) recommendations to further the development of school conditions and climate measures in California’s accountability and continuous improvement system, including the seeking of additional stakeholder feedback on the proposed recommendations beginning in November 2017. [[5]](#footnote-5),[[6]](#footnote-6)

## Additional School Conditions and Climate Stakeholder Engagement

| Month | Method | Event Details |
| --- | --- | --- |
| November 2017 | In-Person | * A subset of CCWG and additional stakeholder partners meet to discuss how best to implement the work of the CCWG, including legislation.
* CCWG and Partners School Climate and Conditions Planning Meeting, November 29, 2017
 |
| December 2017 | In-person | * The CDE continues working to refine recommendations that will be brought before the State Board of Education (SBE) for consideration.
* California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG), December 5, 2017
* CCWG and Partners School Climate and Conditions Planning Meeting, December 13, 2017
 |
| January 2018 | In-Person | * The CDE continues working to refine recommendations that will be brought before the State Board of Education (SBE) for consideration.
* CAPTA Legislative Conference, Panel Discussion on School Climate and Safety, January 22, 2018
* California State Social Emotional Learning Team Meeting, School Conditions and Climate update, January 22, 2018
 |
| February 2018 | In-Person, WebEx, Conference Call, and Online | * The CDE will continue working to refine recommendations that will be brought before the State Board of Education (SBE) for consideration.
* CPAG, February 15, 2018
* February LCFF Stakeholder Meeting, February 21, 2018
* Discussion with representatives of small and rural school districts and the Small Schools District Association (SSDA), February 22, 2018
* Online survey where stakeholders can share thoughts on the proposed revision of the self-reflection tool, which closed on February 23, 2018
 |
| March 2018 | In-Person | * The CCWG and additional stakeholder partners will continue working to develop and refine recommendations
* Note: The CDE anticipates presenting preliminary recommendations/options to the State Board of Education (SBE) for transition plan to support the use of school conditions and climate measures in the accountability and continuous improvement system (SBE Meeting on March 14–15, 2018)
 |
| April 2018 and beyond | TBD | * As necessary, the CDE will continue working with stakeholders to refine and implement recommendations
 |

1. California *Education Code* Section 52060(d)(6)(C) states, “Other local measures, including surveys of pupils, parents, and teachers on the sense of safety and school connectedness.” [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. LEAs should report the results of their school conditions and climate tools on the Dashboard, by including a URL to a district Web site that shows the school conditions and climate survey results, disaggregated by student groups, with a minimum n-size, for each school site, if applicable. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. California *Education Code* Section 52060(d)(6)(C) states, “Other local measures, including surveys of pupils, parents, and teachers on the sense of safety and school connectedness.” [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. As a best practice, LEAs should report the results of their school conditions and climate tools on the Dashboard, by including a URL to a district Web site that shows the school conditions and climate survey results, disaggregated by student groups, with a minimum n-size, for each school site, if applicable. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Dates and proposed development activities are subject to change. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. For a comprehensive list of stakeholder engagement conducted prior to November 2017 please see the School Conditions and Climate Work Group Recommendation Framework at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-ocd-oct17item01a1.pdf>. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)