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# **MEMORANDUM**

**DATE:** August 22, 2018

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

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

**SUBJECT:** Developing a New State Accountability System: Update on the Inclusion of the Five-Year Graduation Rate, the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator, New Measures for the College/Career Indicator, and Proposed Cut Scores for the Dashboard Alternative School Status One-Year Graduation Rate.

## Summary of Key Issues

In preparation for the release of the 2018 California School Dashboard (Dashboard), the California Department of Education (CDE) is providing the State Board of Education (SBE) an update on the ongoing development of the Dashboard, including: (1) options for incorporating the five-year graduation rate into the Dashboard, (2) a proposed methodology for the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator, (3) the inclusion of new career and college measures in the College/Career Indicator (CCI), and (4) proposed cut scores for the one-year graduation rate for schools with Dashboard Alternative School Status (DASS).

### **Five-Year Graduation Rate**

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 allows 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 [ELs]).

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.

The CDE has explored possible methodologies for incorporating the five-year cohort rate in the Dashboard. This information, along with data on the five-year graduation rate produced under California’s former accountability system, are provided in Attachment 1.

### **Chronic Absenteeism Indicator**

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 ESSA requirements. Chronic absenteeism is a metric identified as part of LCFF Priority 5 (Pupil Engagement) and, under the ESSA, states are required to collect data to identify students who are chronically absent and to report chronic absenteeism rates for schools in the ESSA State Report Card. The Chronic Absenteeism Indicator will be reported for the first time in the 2018 Dashboard. A proposed methodology for calculating this indicator is included in Attachment 2.

### **College/Career Indicator**

The goal of the CCI is to emphasize that a high school diploma represents the completion of a broad and rigorous course of study that prepares students for success after high school. The CCI takes into consideration the diverse resources and needs of student populations across the state by including multiple pathways for schools to demonstrate student preparedness for college and career. The CCI will display performance levels for local educational agencies (LEAs) and schools for the first time on the 2018 Dashboard. The CCI is not a student level indicator and, as such, students will not receive their own individual college/career status. The model allows for additional new measures and for the removal of measures as they become obsolete. Three new measures are being proposed for inclusion in the 2018 Dashboard, as detailed in Attachment 3.

### **One-Year Graduation Rate**

The one-year graduation rate is designed to more fairly evaluate the success and progress of alternative schools that serve high-risk students. Beginning with the 2018 Dashboard, DASS schools will receive performance levels for the first time for all applicable indicators. The proposed Status and Change cut scores for the one-year graduation rate are detailed in Attachment 4.

## Prior State Board of Education Action and Discussion

### **Five-Year Graduation Rate**

At the March 2018 SBE meeting, the CDE provided an update on the development of the work to incorporate the five-year graduation rate into the Dashboard (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/mar18item01.docx>).

### **Chronic Absenteeism Indicator**

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

### **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 (<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 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 are 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 and incorporated 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.

**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 for DASS schools (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/jul18item01.docx>).

## Attachment(s)

* **Attachment 1**: Five-Year Graduation Rate: Proposed Methodology for Incorporating the Five-Year Graduation Rate into the 2018 California School Dashboard (6 Pages)
* **Attachment 2**: Proposed Methodology for the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator
(2 Pages)
* **Attachment 3:** Proposed New Measures for Inclusion in the College/Career Indicator (7 Pages)
* **Attachment 4:** Proposed Cut Scores for the One-Year Graduation Rate (2 Pages)

## Attachment 1:

**Five-Year Graduation Rate: Proposed Methodology for Incorporating the Five-Year Graduation Rate into the 2018 California School Dashboard**

### **Prior Five-Year Graduation Rate Data**

At March 2018 State Board of Education (SBE) meeting, the SBE requested that the California Department of Education (CDE) provide the statewide five-year graduation rate data that was produced for the former accountability system in the Adequate Yearly Progress statewide report. Although the CDE had three years of data, the methodology for calculating the five-year rate changed after it was produced for the graduating class of 2012–13. Therefore, comparing the rates between the graduating class of 2012–13 and 2013–14 would not be appropriate. As a result, only two years of statewide data is presented for the five-year cohort rate in the table below.

**Table 1: Comparisons of Four- and Five-Year Graduation Rate Data**

| **Year Students First Entered Grade Nine** | **4-Year Cohort Graduating Year** | **4-Year Cohort Rate** | **5-Year Cohort Graduating Year** | **5-Year Cohort Rate** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2009–10 | 2012–13 | 80.4% | 2013–14 | 84.9% |
| 2010–11 | 2013–14 | 80.9% | 2014–15 | 86.3% |

Please note the calculation of the five-year graduation rate in 2012–13 used different logic than that which was applied in 2013–14 and 2014–15. In calculating the 2012–13 five-year cohort graduation rate, transfers were included; these students should only have been included in the four-year cohort.

**Proposed Methodology for Incorporating a Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rate in the California School Dashboard**

At the request of the SBE, the CDE has worked on calculating a five-year cohort graduation rate. Unlike the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate (ACGR), which is defined for all states under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), there is no standardly accepted or utilized definition for a five-year cohort graduation rate and states utilize various methodologies for calculating this rate.

Methodologies for calculating a five-year cohort graduation rate generally evaluate the outcome of the preceding four-year cohort non-graduates in year five. As such, the four and five-year cohort graduation rates share the same cohort of students in common, all of whom started grade 9 at the same time and were expected to graduate on-time four years later. (Please note that the five-year graduation rate is available only to traditional schools. Dashboard Alternative School Status [DASS] schools will use the one-year graduation rate, which is a modified measure for the Graduation Rate Indicator.)

There are several benefits and objectives for calculating a five-year cohort graduation rate. Two primary objectives 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).

#### **Four-Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate**

The four-year ACGR is the number of students who graduate from high school in four years with a regular high school diploma divided by the number of students who form the adjusted cohort for the graduating class. According to the non-regulatory guidance for the four-year ACGR, the cohort is “based on the number of students who enter grade 9 for the first time adjusted by adding into the cohort any student who transfers in later during grade 9 or during the next three years and subtracting any student from the cohort who transfers out, emigrates to another country, transfers to a prison or juvenile facility, or dies during that same period.” Given these allowable adjustments in the four-year ACGR, the cohort in year 1 and year 4 are not likely to be the same due to factors largely related to mobility, particularly at the school level. In the four-year ACGR, the last school and district in which the student is enrolled is held accountable for their four-year outcome, positive or negative, and some students are removed from the cohort completely. Cohort removals reduce the overall cohort denominator, thereby increasing the final graduation rate.

#### **Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rate**

As previously stated, the five-year cohort graduation rate is a determination of the high school outcomes of the preceding four-year cohort *non-graduates* in year five. For the purposes of calculating a five-year cohort graduation rate, the cohort or denominator is largely held constant, with a few exceptions, and the emphasis is placed on moving four-year cohort non-graduates into the numerator as five-year graduates. To do this, we developed the four overarching business rules:

1. Students in the *final* four-year cohort for each school and district will remain constant in year 5 with each final four-year cohort student receiving one of the following outcomes at the end of year 5:
	* Graduated
	* Non-graduate Completer (i.e., California High School Proficiency Exam, Adult Education Diploma, Special Education Certificate of Completion, and General Equivalency Diploma Completers)
	* Transferred to another school/district (Graduate)
	* Transferred to another school/district (Non-Graduate Completer)
	* Other Transfers (e.g., transferred out of state/country, or transferred to an Adult Education or Community College program)
	* Died
	* Dropout
2. A student who transfers from their final four-year cohort school or district to another school or district in year 5 will be added to the cohort of the receiving school or district *ONLY* if they graduate in year 5. This same student will also remain in the cohort of the sending school or district and be counted in one of the outcomes listed above (e.g., transferred to another school/district [Graduate], transferred to another school/district [Non-Graduate Completer], or transferred to another school/district [Dropout]). This ensures that the sending school or district will not experience a change in their five-year graduation rate simply by removing or adding students to the denominator based on transfers alone. This also incentivizes enrolling and graduating students who transfer to a new school or district in year 5 without exposing these entities to the possibility of a decreased graduation rate by adding these transfer students to their cohort denominator unless they graduate.
3. An original four-year cohort student who was removed from the cohort during the original four years (e.g., transferred out of state or transferred out of country) and transfers back to California in year 5 will be added to the cohort of the receiving school or district *ONLY* if they graduate in year 5 for the same reasons articulated above.
4. All students who do not graduate by the end of year 5 will be counted as dropouts at the county and state levels on DataQuest. Only the resulting five-year graduation rate will be incorporated into the California School Dashboard (Dashboard).

The above rules for calculating the five-year graduation rate ensure the following:

* Five-year graduation rate denominators remain stable at the school and district level thus preventing changes to five-year rates based strictly on students being removed or added to school or district cohorts.
* Unlike the four-year ACGR, schools and districts are held harmless for enrolling students in year 5 who do not graduate but will receive credit for students they enroll in year 5 who do graduate. However, all students who do not graduate by the end of year 5 will be accounted for at the final county and state levels as dropouts.
* Although some students may be in two school or district denominators for the five-year cohort (one as a transfer and one as a graduate), students will only be counted once at the final county and state levels on DataQuest.

In summary, the five-year graduation rate is intended to be a determination of the high school outcomes of the preceding four-year cohort *non-graduates* in year five. As such, it compares the outcomes of the same group of students one year later and offers schools and districts with additional time and incentive to work with and provide support to those students who did not graduate on time in four years. Finally, the business rules largely hold the final four-year cohort denominator constant, unless it is to the benefit of the school or district, thereby ensuring that five-year graduation rates are not susceptible to change based solely on adjustments to the denominator.

At its August 2018 meeting, the Technical Design Group (TDG) reviewed the proposed methodology, along with distributions based on this methodology, and determined that it was technically sound.

#### **Incorporating the Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rate into the Dashboard**

Several options for incorporating the five-year graduation rate into the Dashboard were presented to advisory groups and stakeholders:

1. Provide a performance level (color) for the four-year cohort graduation rate only and report the five-year graduation rate as informative data. This method could be implemented for the 2018 Dashboard.
2. Calculate a simple average for the four- and five-year cohort graduation rate. A simple average provides the same weight to all four- and five-year graduates. This method requires two years of data and could not be implemented before 2019.
3. Calculate a weighted average four- and five-year cohort graduation rate. 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 could not be implemented before 2019.
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 could 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 TDG. At the August 2018 CPAG meeting, members were divided into three discussion groups to review the options. Their feedback is provided below:

* Two groups recommended the weighted average option 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 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. However, it discussed several additional options that were not previously explored but that might be appropriate. One option of interest to many group members was to use the four-year cohort graduation rate as the base, but provide additional credit for any five-year students from the previous year’s cohort. An example of this option is provided below:

*At Emerald High School, there are 100 students in the Class of 2018 (the four-year graduation cohort). Of these 100 students, 95 graduated within four years (e.g., by spring 2017). In addition, five students from the previous year’s four-year graduation cohort (Class of 2017) graduated at the end of 2016–17 school year. These five students are therefore counted in the five-year graduation rate.*

*To produce a combined graduation rate for the four- and five-year graduates for 2018, we first add the number of graduates in both cohorts: 95 + 5 = 100.*

*This number is the numerator of the combined rate.*

*The denominator is the sum of the 2018 four-year graduation cohort and the additional five-year graduates from the previous year’s cohort: 100 + 5 = 105.*

*The combined rate is 95.24 percent (100/105).*

#### **Impact of Audit Findings on Reporting Two Years of Graduation Data in 2018 Dashboard**

The CDE was required to address audit findings from the U.S. Department of Education Office of Inspector General related to California’s four-year cohort graduation rate calculation and its alignment with guidance and definitions provided in the *Every Student Succeeds Act High School Graduation Rate Non-Regulatory Guidance* (2017). Based on these findings, it was necessary to 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>).

The new federal rules will be used to calculate Status and Change for the four-year graduation rate cohort. However, because 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.

Since all recommended options for incorporating the five-year cohort rate into the Dashboard will require two five-year graduation rates, the TDG recommended the following:

1. Report the five-year graduation rate for the Class of 2017, for informational purposes only, in the 2018 Dashboard, and
2. Revisit additional options (e.g., simple and weighted average of four- and five-year graduate rates, boosting the four-year graduation cohort rate by providing credit for five-year graduates from previous cohort) for incorporating the five-year rate into the performance determination for the Dashboard after the five-year cohort graduation is available for the Class of 2018 and simulations can be produced.

## Attachment 2: Proposed Methodology for the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator

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 Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) requirements. Chronic absenteeism is a metric identified as part of LCFF Priority 5 (Pupil Engagement) and, under the ESSA, states are required 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, students who are absent 10 percent or more of the instructional days they were expected to attend are defined as “chronically absent.” Chronic absenteeism data is collected through the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System. This data was collected for the first time at the end of the 2016–17 school year.

California Department of Education (CDE) staff conducted multiple analyses to determine the data quality and identify any potential issues. The analyses indicated that the data was of high quality and could be used in the 2018 California School Dashboard (Dashboard). As a result of the analyses, the CDE met with the Technical Design Group (TDG) in June 2018 to explore the most valid methodology for calculating the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator. Two sets of simulations were reviewed, using data for students in Kindergarten through grade eight. No Dashboard Alternative School Status schools were included in the simulations. Students were included in the denominator if they attended the school or district for at least one day.

The two simulations used different methodologies.

1. *First methodology:*
* 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.
1. *Second methodology:*
* Assign different weights to chronically absent students based on whether they were enrolled at the school less than or more than half the instructional days.
	+ Those students enrolled for more than 50 percent of the instructional days were assigned full weight.
	+ Those students enrolled equal to or less than half of the instructional days were given a reduced weight based on the number of instructions days enrolled divided by half of the number of instruction days. (Example: The number of instructional days is 180. If a student was enrolled for 35 of those instructional days, the weight for the student would be given in the numerator is 38.9 percent [35/90].)

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:
* 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. Both methodologies were presented to the California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG) at their August 2018 meeting. CPAG members had an in-depth discussion regarding chronic absenteeism and encouraged the CDE to use less technical terminology and to consider providing a Webinar on Chronic Absenteeism before the public release of the Dashboard.

## Attachment 3: Proposed New Measures for Inclusion in the College/Career Indicator

With the adoption of the College/Career Indicator (CCI) in 2016, the California Department of Education (CDE) committed to building out the CCI to include additional career and college measures. The measures proposed in this attachment were developed in consultation with the CCI Work Group. The CCI Work Group reviewed four new proposed CCI measures for inclusion in the 2018 Dashboard that are based on data collected in the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS).

1. **State Seal of Biliteracy (SSB)**: Biliteracy is increasingly important to employment in an international and global context. Therefore, California passed legislation to make the SSB effective on January 1, 2012 to recognize students who demonstrate proficiency in speaking, reading, and writing in at least one or languages in addition to English. SSB data was collected for the first time in CALPADS for 2016–17 school year. Note: The SSB is a measure of both college and career preparedness.
2. **Golden State Seal Merit Diploma (GSSMD)**: To earn the 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. GSSMD data was collected for the first time in CALPADS for 2016–17 school year. Note: The GSSMD is a measure of college preparedness.
3. **Leadership/Military Science**: Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) opens up a viable and well-respected career opportunity for students. If a student passes the military’s academic requirement (e.g. pass the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery), 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 Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps provides six months of credit and the Navy provides nine months of credit. In ROTC courses, 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 preparedness.
4. **Articulated Career Technical Education (CTE) Courses**: An articulated course is a course in a CTE pathway that, if passed, will allow the student to enroll directly in an intermediate-level course at the college with which the articulation agreement is held. Note: The Articulated CTE is a measure of career preparedness.

As is done with current CCI measures, each new proposed measure was evaluated against performance on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment for ELA and mathematics to determine its appropriateness and placement criteria, as shown in Tables 1 through 8.

### **State Seal of Bilitearcy**

**Table 1: Performance on the ELA Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for Students with and without the SSB**

| **SSB** | **ELA Standard Not Met** | **ELA Standard Nearly Met** | **ELA Standard Met** | **ELA Standard Exceeded** | **Total** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Earned SSB | 337(0.8%) | 1,590(3.9%) | 16,064(39.0%) | 23,163(56.3%) | 41,154 |
| Did Not Earn SSB | 73,872 (19.6%) | 91,460 (24.2%) | 125,495 (33.2%) | 86,724(23.0%) | 377,551 |

**Table 2: Performance on the Mathematics Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for Students with and without the SSB**

| **SSB** | **Math Standard Not Met** | **Math Standard Nearly Met** | **Math Standard Met** | **Math Standard Exceeded** | **Total** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Earned SSB | 3,969(9.7%) | 9,493(23.2%) | 13,577(33.1%) | 13,938(34.0%) | 40,977 |
| Did Not Earn SSB | 170,555 (45.4%) | 94,660(25.2%) | 70,874(18.9%) | 39,887(10.6%) | 375,976 |

#### **Proposed Placement Criteria for the SSB**

Based on these data and the requirement that students must score “Standard Met” on the ELA Smarter Balanced Assessment to earn an SSB, the CCI Work Group recommended that the following placement criteria be applied for this measure:

* **“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(i.e., 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).

#### **Stakeholder Feedback**

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 TDG. Their feedback appears below:

* The Task Force supported the proposed criteria for the “Prepared” level and the inclusion of the SSB in the CCI.
* Initially, the CDE did not propose any criteria for the “Approaching Prepared” level. However, based on feedback from one member of the LCFF stakeholder group, an “Approaching Prepared” criteria has been added for consideration.
* 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 that it be removed.
* 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**

**Table 3: Performance on the ELA Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for Students with and without the GSSMD**

| **GSSMD** | **ELA Standard Not Met** | **ELA Standard Nearly Met** | **ELA Standard Met** | **ELA Standard Exceeded** | **Total** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Earned GSSMD | 1,567(1.7%) | 4,911(5.4%) | 29,071(31.9%) | 55,657(61.0%) | 91,206 |
| Did Not Earn GSSMD | 72,642 (22.2%) | 88,139 (26.9%) | 112,488 (34.3%) | 54,230(16.6%) | 327,499 |

**Table 4: Performance on the Mathematics Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for Students with and without the GSSMD**

| **GSSMD** | **Math Standard Not Met** | **Math Standard Nearly Met** | **Math Standard Met** | **Math Standard Exceeded** | **Total** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Earned GSSMD | 5,915(6.5%) | 14,260(15.7%) | 36,258(39.8%) | 34,645(38.0%) | 91,078 |
| Did Not Earn GSSMD | 168,609(51.7%) | 89,893(27.6%) | 48,193(14.8%) | 19,180(5.9%) | 325,875 |

Based on these data, 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 students (2.5 percent) in the class of 2017 would earn the “Prepared” level on the CCI (duplicative count).

#### **Stakeholder Feedback**

This information was shared with the Task Force, the LCFF Stakeholder Group, CPAG and TDG. Their feedback appears below:

* The Task Force members supported the proposed criteria and the inclusion of the GSSMD in the CCI.
* One member of the LCFF voiced concern that there was no proposed criteria for “Approaching Prepared”.
* Several CPAG members supported the inclusion of GSSMD in the CCI, stating that earning a GSSMD is highly valued by students.
* The TDG supported the proposed criteria and the inclusion of the GSSMD in the CCI. Members were comfortable with not having an “Approaching Prepared” criterion.

### **Leadership/Military Science: Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC)**

**Table 5: Performance on the ELA Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for Students with 1, 2, 3, and 4 Years of ROTC**

| **# Years of ROTC** | **ELA Standard Not Met** | **ELA Standard Nearly Met** | **ELA Standard Met** | **ELA Standard Exceeded** | **Total** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 Year | 1,302 (28.2%) | 1,259 (27.3%) | 1,374 (29.8%) | 674 (14.6%) | 4,609 |
| 2 Years | 497 (21.5%) | 635 (27.5%) | 747 (32.4%) | 429 (18.6%) | 2,308 |
| 3 Years | 246 (21.1%) | 295 (25.3%) | 385 (33.0%) | 240 (20.5%) | 1,166 |
| 4 Years | 171 (12.5%) | 307 (22.5%) | 537 (39.4%) | 348 (25.5%) | 1,363 |

**Table 6: Performance on the Mathematics Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for Students Completing 1, 2, 3, and 4 Years of ROTC**

| **# Years of ROTC** | **Math Standard Not Met** | **Math Standard Nearly Met** | **Math Standard Met** | **Math Standard Exceeded** | **Total** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 Year | 2,651(57.8%) | 1,080(23.5%) | 596(13.0%) | 261(5.7%) | 4,588 |
| 2 Years | 1,119(48.8%) | 610(26.6%) | 396(17.3%) | 170(7.4%) | 2,295 |
| 3 Years | 541(46.5%) | 283(24.3%) | 229(19.7%) | 111(9.5%) | 1,164 |
| 4 Years | 496(36.7%) | 386(28.6%) | 301(22.3%) | 169(12.5%) | 1,352 |

#### **Proposed Placement Criteria for the ROTC**

The data suggest that years of ROTC completion are correlated with higher performance on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments. Therefore, the CCI Work Group recommended that the following placement criteria be applied for this measure:

* **“Prepared” Level**: Student completes at least 2 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 2 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

#### **Stakeholder Feedback**

This information was shared with the Task Force, the LCFF Stakeholder Group, CPAG and TDG. Their feedback appears below:

* 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.

### **Articulated CTE Courses**

In order to determine whether CTE pathways with articulated courses are more rigorous than CTE pathway with no articulated courses, comparisons with Smarter Balanced performance were made for both sets of data.

**Table 7: Performance on the ELA Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for CTE Completers in CTE Courses**

| **CTE Pathway Completers** | **ELA Standard Not Met** | **ELA Standard Nearly Met** | **ELA Standard Met** | **ELA Standard Exceeded** | **Total** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| With 1 or more articulated courses | 4,561 (16.8%) | 7,128 (26.2%) | 9,782 (36.0%) | 5,703 (21.0%) | 27,174 |
| With no articulated courses | 5,479 (13.8%) | 9,203(23.1%) | 14,850 (37.3%) | 10,293 (25.8%) | 39,825 |

**Table 8: Performance on the Mathematics Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for CTE Completers in CTE Courses**

| **CTE Pathway Completers** | **Math Standard Not Met** | **Math Standard Nearly Met** | **Math Standard Met** | **Math Standard Exceeded** | **Total** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| With 1 or more articulated courses | 12,046(44.5%) | 7,466(27.6%) | 5,004(18.5%) | 2,575(9.5%) | 27,091 |
| With no articulated courses | 15,577(39.3%) | 10,800(27.2%) | 8,395(21.2%) | 4,877(12.3%) | 39,649 |

#### **Analysis of Results**

Based on the data, the articulation of CTE courses does not provide a better measure of career and college preparedness than do non-articulated CTE courses. Therefore, the CDE does not recommend that this measure be added to the CCI.

#### **Stakeholder Feedback**

This information was shared with the Task Force, the LCFF Stakeholder Group, CPAG and TDG. All groups agreed with the CDE recommendation to not treat CTE pathways with articulated courses any different than CTE pathways with no articulated course.

## Attachment 4: 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 Dashboard Alternative School Status (DASS) schools 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. The calculation methodology of the one-year rate was approved by the State Board of Education (SBE) at their May 2018 meeting.

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 will be applied to DASS schools’ one-year graduation rates to determine performance levels. Therefore, similar to the Status cut scores approved for non-DASS schools, the Status cut scores for “Very Low” are being set at less than 67 percent.

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

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

| Level | **Change:** Declined Significantlyby greater than 10.0% | **Change:** Declinedby 3.0% to 10.0% | **Change:** MaintainedDeclined or increased by less than 3.0%  | **Change:** Increasedby 3.0% to less than 10.0% | **Change:** Increased Significantlyby 10.0% or greater |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Status:** Very High90.0% or greater | N/A | 4 | 8 | 27 | 0 |
| **Status:** High80.0% to less than 90.0% | 0 | 25 | 21 | 28 | 2 |
| **Status:** Medium70.0% to less than 80.0% | 0 | 33 | 13 | 33 | 2 |
| **Status:** Low67.0% to less than 70.0% | 0 | 10 | 3 | 12 | 2 |
| **Status:** Very LowLess 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 |