Putting the Pieces Together

Session 2

Utilizing the LCAP Rubric to create a high quality annual review
The LCFF Evaluation Rubric

The California School Dashboard

Using the New System
(Part 1)
State Performance Indicators

Initial Phase of LCFF Evaluation Rubrics

**STATE PERFORMANCE CATEGORY LEGEND**

- **Blue**: Highest
- **Green**: Between 11 and 29 pupils
- **Yellow**: Less than 11 pupils
- **Orange**: N/A
- **Red**: Data is not available or the performance indicator is not applicable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Priority</th>
<th>Academic Achievement Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grades 3-8 Smarter Balanced results in ELA and Math; status and change will be a scale score (TBD at SBE January meeting) Results on the Next Generation Science Standards assessment, when available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>English Learner Indicator</td>
<td>CELDT score and reclassification rate; status and change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>High School Graduation Rate Indicator</td>
<td>4-year cohort; status and change 3-year average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Suspension Rate Indicator</td>
<td>By grade span</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 &amp; 8</td>
<td>College/Career Indicator</td>
<td>1st phase; status and change Combines Grade 11 test scores on ELA and math and other measures of college and career readiness (i.e., AP classes, A-G courses) Results on the College and Career Indicator, when available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chronic Absence Indicator</td>
<td>Populated when data becomes available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Between 11 and 29 pupils for whom data is reported for the applicable performance indicator

Less than 11 pupils for the applicable performance indicator

Not applicable or applicable
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Performance Categories

❖ For each indicator, the **combination of status and change** results in a performance category.*

❖ Each performance category is represented by a color.

❖ **GREEN** or **BLUE** are the performance targets.

❖ **RED**, **ORANGE**, or **YELLOW** means there is work to be done.

* Except for new / first-year data.
Students groups are identified with **30 or more pupils LEA-wide**.

Foster Youth & Homeless = **15 or more pupils LEA-wide**.

- Students groups are identified with **30 or more pupils LEA-wide**.
- Foster Youth and Homeless are identified as a significant subgroup with **15 or more pupils**.

A new addition to the LCAP Plan Summary will be to ask districts to address student subgroup performance when the subgroup is 2 or more performance categories apart from the “ALL” student group.

**Example:**
- **RED/ORANGE** student group
- **GREEN** “ALL students” group
A new website that shows how local educational agencies (LEAs) and schools are performing on the indicators included in California’s new school accountability system.
Background

- The State Board of Education (SBE) adopted a new accountability tool required by LCFF, called the **evaluation rubrics**, that includes a set of state and local measures.

- The tool is the result of **more than a year of stakeholder engagement** and SBE actions.

- The Dashboard is how performance data from the evaluation rubrics are shown to LEAs and the public.

- Stakeholders can use the Dashboard to see how LEAs and schools are meeting the needs of their students.
## Key Shifts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More than a single number</th>
<th>Equity</th>
<th>Supports Local Decision-Making</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A quality education is defined by <strong>more</strong> than a single test score</td>
<td><strong>Increased</strong> focus on addressing disparities among student groups</td>
<td><strong>More</strong> information to support the local strategic planning process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Features

- **Easy to use reports:** The Dashboard includes reports showing LEA or school performance on:
  - 6 state performance indicators, and
  - 4 local indicators
    - 6 for county offices of education (COEs)

- **LEA/school search:** Users can view reports that present the performance data in different ways.
## Indicators by Priority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Control Funding Formula Priority</th>
<th>State Indicator</th>
<th>Local Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Basics Conditions at School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation of State Academic Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parent Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 4</td>
<td>Academic Indicator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 5</td>
<td>Chronic Absence Indicator, Graduation Rate Indicator*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 6</td>
<td>Suspension Rate Indicator</td>
<td>Local Climate Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 7</td>
<td>College/Career Indicator*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 8</td>
<td>College/Career Indicator*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordination of Services for Expelled Students**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordination of Services for Foster Youth**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reference Charts (AKA 5 X 5 Grids)

- The model uses percentiles to create a 5x5 grid that combine **Status** and **Change** that are equally valued in making an overall determination for a **Performance Category** (represented by a color) for each indicator.

- The model will be applied to all LEAs, schools (except Alternative Schools), and significant student groups.

**Change** is the difference between performance from the **prior** year and **current** year, or between the **current** year and a **multi-year average** - if available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Gray</th>
<th>Blue</th>
<th>Blue</th>
<th>Blue</th>
<th>Blue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Santa Clara County Office of Education
Example: An LEA with a “High” **Status** and an “Increased” in **Change** will receive an overall performance of **Green**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Declined Significantly</th>
<th>Declined</th>
<th>Maintained</th>
<th>Increased</th>
<th>Increased Significantly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td><strong>Green</strong></td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
State Performance Levels

- Blue: Highest
- Green: Intermediate
- Yellow: Lower
- Orange: Lowest
- Red: Lowest

The color and amount of fill (e.g., Green always has four segments filled, Red always has only one segment filled) are two ways of showing the performance level. This ensures accessibility for all individuals and that the reports are useable when printed in black-and-white or photocopied.
Numerically Significant Student Groups

Less than 30 students

- **No performance level reported** for any indicator with fewer than 30 students
- **Status and change displayed** for student groups with 11 to 29 students.
- Reported as an *asterisk* (*) for all students and student groups ≤ 10.

No Available Data

- Where data is currently not available, it is reported as **not applicable** (N/A).
## State versus Local Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>![State Performance Chart]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance determined by state based on reference charts</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Met for Two or More Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance determined by LEA based on state-created standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methodology

State used actual results for districts and school types to place districts on a continuum.

- Each indicator has its own set of cut points which are intended to be a realistic expectation for attainment.
- Cut points will stay the same for 3-5 years or until SBE determines a need to make a change.

See SBE Memo “Proposed Percentile Cut Scores for State Indicators”
The tables display “Status” cut scores based on the statewide LEA distribution.
CDE staff worked with ETS and the TDG on multiple approaches for using scale scores, focusing on a methodology known as Distance from Level 3 (i.e., Distance from “Standard Met”).

In this methodology, each student’s assessment score is compared to the lowest possible scale score to achieve Level 3 (standard met).
Shift to Scale Score Methodology

- Percent proficient (under NCLB) skewed attention toward students scoring just below the proficiency threshold ("bubble kids"). Disincentivized schools from looking at the academic performance of all students.

- Schools and districts are given credit for each student’s growth.

- Provides a fairer way to provide equal weight to all students.
Scaled scores can be used to illustrate both students’ and their cohorts’ current level of achievement and their growth over time.
Distance from Level 3

MATH CAASPP Scale Score Ranges

- **3rd Grade**: 2189 - 2417 - 2436 - 2621
- **4th Grade**: 2204 - 2455 - 2485 - 2659
- **5th Grade**: 2219 - 2482 - 2528 - 2700
- **6th Grade**: 2235 - 2507 - 2552 - 2748
- **7th Grade**: 2250 - 2521 - 2567 - 2778
- **8th Grade**: 2265 - 2537 - 2586 - 2802

Categories:
- LOSS (Lowest Obtainable Scale Score)
- HOSS (Highest Obtainable Scale Score)
- Average Grade Level Scale Score
- Met Scale Score
Distance from Level 3 (Cont.)

- The results of DF3 show, on average, the needed improvement to bring the average student to Level 3 or the extent to which the average student exceeds Level 3.
- Note: A student must be continuously enrolled to be included in the calculations. (Continuous enrollment is defined as enrollment from Fall Census Day [first Wednesday in October] to testing without a gap in enrollment of more than 30 consecutive calendar days.)
Next Steps: Moving Toward a Growth Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 2017</td>
<td>SBE engages in conversation and provides direction on the growth model selection criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2017</td>
<td>The CDE, along with technical advisors, reviews potential growth models to the SBE suggested growth model selection criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2017</td>
<td>The CDE presents to the SBE the results of the review of the growth models to the selection criteria. The CDE recommends, and the SBE takes action on, which growth models to conduct simulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring/Summer 2017</td>
<td>The CDE, along with technical experts, conduct data simulations on the models approved at the March SBE meeting. The CDE conducts outreach stakeholder outreach to gather input on the various options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer/Fall 2017</td>
<td>The CDE will provide an SBE Information Memorandum that provides an update on the status of the review of models.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
<td>The CDE presents to the SBE the results of the data simulations and outreach activities for information purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2018</td>
<td>The CDE recommends, and the SBE approves, the selection of a growth model for inclusion in the 2018 accountability system (baseline).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Academic Indicator

**Status**
A district's "Status" is calculated by adding the 'Distance From Level 3' (DF3) scores of all students in grades 3rd - 8th, and dividing the sum by the total number of students.

*For example:*

- 3rd grade students' DF3 is -20 points
- 4th grade students' DF3 is +14 points
- 5th grade students' DF3 is +20 points
- 6th grade students' DF3 is -13 points
- 7th grade students' DF3 is +6 points
- 8th grade students' DF3 is +23 points

\[
\text{Distance From Level 3 Average} = \frac{-20 + 14 + 20 - 13 + 6 + 23}{6}
\]

= 5 points above DF3

**Change**
A district's "Change" is calculated by finding the difference between the current year's and the prior year's "Status." The example below illustrates a district's "Change" from 2015 (7 points below DF3) to 2016 (5 points above DF3).

Increased **12** points

7 points below DF3

5 points above DF3
### Academic Indicator: ELA/Literacy

**Status** is measured by the average Distance From Level 3 (DF3) of all students in grades 3rd - 8th.

**Change** is based on the difference in "Status" from current year to prior year.

**Performance** is the 25 color categories based on "Status" and "Change."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Declined Significantly by more than 15 points</th>
<th>Declined by 1 to 15 points</th>
<th>Maintained Declined by less than 1 point or improved by less than 7 points</th>
<th>Increased by 7 to less than 20 points</th>
<th>Increased Significantly by 20 points or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High 45 or more points above</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High 10 above to less than 45 points above</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median 5 below to less than 10 points above</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low More than 5 below to 70 points below</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low More than 70 points below</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Simulation Results Using DF3 Methodology

### School Distribution of the EL Student Group: ELA Academic Indicator Performance Categories by Student Group Definition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EL Student Group Definition</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>Orange</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Blue</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EL Plus Four Years RFEP or Less</td>
<td>760 (13.3%)</td>
<td>847 (14.8%)</td>
<td>3,271 (57.2%)</td>
<td>507 (8.9%)</td>
<td>337 (5.9%)</td>
<td>5,722</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL Plus Two Years RFEP or Less</td>
<td>1,142 (21.3%)</td>
<td>985 (18.4%)</td>
<td>2,779 (52%)</td>
<td>242 (4.5%)</td>
<td>201 (3.8%)</td>
<td>5,349</td>
<td>-373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL Only</td>
<td>1,818 (40.3%)</td>
<td>1,153 (25.6%)</td>
<td>1,469 (32.6%)</td>
<td>40 (0.9%)</td>
<td>29 (0.6%)</td>
<td>4,509</td>
<td>-1,213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Denominators & Definitions of ELs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Denominator</th>
<th>English Learner (EL) Definition</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td>All students in the four-year graduation cohort</td>
<td>EL at any time during the four-years in high school</td>
<td>CALPADS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension Rate</td>
<td>Enrollment (Cumulative enrollment or the total count of unique [unduplicated] primary, secondary, and short-term enrollments within the academic year.)</td>
<td>EL at any time during the current year</td>
<td>CALPADS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Learner</td>
<td>Annual CELDT test takers plus English learners who were reclassified in the prior year</td>
<td>(see column to the left)</td>
<td>CELDT file from testing vendor; reclassification data from CALPADS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/Career</td>
<td>All students in the four-year graduation cohort</td>
<td>EL at any time during the four-years in high school</td>
<td>CALPADS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic (ELA, math)</td>
<td>All students who take the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments in grades three through eight and are continuously enrolled*.</td>
<td>EL at the time of testing plus ELs who were reclassified within the last four years. (Note: The State Board is reviewing the reclassification criteria.)</td>
<td>CAASPP file from testing vendor; reclassification data from CALPADS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
English Learner Progress Indicator

• This indicator applies to LEAs and schools that have 30 or more students who took an annual California English Language Development Test (CELDT).

• **Note:** Because 86% of schools have no significant, or only one significant race/ethnic student group within the EL group, only EL data will be reported for the ELPI.
The CELDT has five overall performance levels:

- Beginning
- Early Intermediate
- Intermediate
- Early Advanced
- Advanced
Because the CELDT Intermediate performance level has a large range of scale scores, many students stay in the intermediate level for multiple years. As a result, stakeholders advised, and the SBE approved, that this level be divided into two, for accountability purposes only, to recognize the substantial growth that can be made within this particular level.
Therefore, the ELPI uses **six** overall CELDT performance levels:

- Beginning
- Early Intermediate
- *Low* Intermediate
- *High* Intermediate
- Early Advanced
- Advanced
• Students who scored Early Advanced or Advanced Proficient in the prior year and maintained that performance level for the current year will be included in the numerator for the ELI calculation. This is the only set of annual CELDT test takers who are not required to advance one CELDT performance level.

• ELs who were reclassified in the prior year will also be included in the numerator and denominator for the ELI calculation.
ELPI Formula: Numerator

- Annual CELDT test takers who:
  - Increased at least one CELDT level compared to the prior year
  - Maintained Early Advanced/Advanced English Proficient
- ELs who were reclassified in the prior year
ELPI Formula: Denominator

- Total number of annual CELDT test takers
- ELs who were reclassified in the prior year
### ELPI: Student Case Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student 1:</th>
<th>No Progress</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Last year’s overall CELDT score was Early Advanced</td>
<td>CELDT 1 Year Progress</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reclassified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This year:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Overall CELDT score of Early Advanced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CELDT reading score of Early Advanced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CELDT writing score of Early Advanced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Met district criteria for Academic Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Teacher recommends student for reclassification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Parent agrees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student 2:</th>
<th>No Progress</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Last year’s overall CELDT score was Early Advanced</td>
<td>CELDT 1 Year Progress</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reclassified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This year:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Overall CELDT score of Advanced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CELDT reading score of Early Advanced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CELDT writing score of Early Advanced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Did not meet district criteria for Academic Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student 3:</th>
<th>No Progress</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Last year’s overall CELDT score was Early Advanced</td>
<td>CELDT 1 Year Progress</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reclassified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This year:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Overall CELDT score of Early Advanced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CELDT reading score of High Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CELDT writing score of Low Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Met district criteria for Academic Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Teacher recommends student for reclassification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Parent does not agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student 4:</th>
<th>No Progress</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Last year’s overall CELDT score was Early Advanced</td>
<td>CELDT 1 Year Progress</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reclassified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This year:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Overall CELDT score of Advanced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CELDT reading score of Advanced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CELDT writing score of Early Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Met district criteria for Academic Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Progress</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>___/4 = ___%</td>
<td>___/4 = ___%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**English Learner Progress Indicator**

**Status** is the current percent of English Learners that moved up at least one proficiency level on the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) and the percent of English Learners who were Reclassified Fluent English Proficient (RFEP) from prior year to current year.

**Change** is the difference between the current year's percentage and the prior year.

**Performance** is the 25 color categories based on "Status" and "Change."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Declined Significantly by more than 10%</th>
<th>Declined by 1.5% - 10%</th>
<th>Maintained Declined or improved by less than 1.5%</th>
<th>Increased by 1.5% to less than 10%</th>
<th>Increased Significantly by 10% or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85% or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% to less than 85%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67% to less than 75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% to less than 67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assignment of Performance Category

• Schools that did not test at least 50 percent of their EL population in the CELDT are automatically assigned an Orange performance category.

• Determination of the 50 percent is based on the EL demographic data reported for **mathematics** in the Smarter Balanced Assessment file from the testing vendor.
Suspension Rate

• If a student is suspended multiple times, the student is counted as being suspended only once.

• **LEA Example:** If a student was suspended:
  • Five times at School A,
  • Twice at School B, and
  • Twice at School C

The student would be counted as being suspended once at the LEA.
Suspension Rate (Cont.)

Status
• The 2014–15 suspension rate will be used for Status for the initial release of the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics.

Change:
• Change uses current and prior year suspension rates.

Change Formula:
• 2014–15 rate \textit{minus} 2013–14 rate
Suspension Rate (Cont.)

• Data simulations revealed that suspension data varies widely among LEA and school type. Therefore, multiple suspension cut scores were set for LEAs and schools based on their type.

• This resulted in six different sets of cut scores:
  – Three at LEA-level: Elementary, High, and Unified
  – Three at School-level: Elementary, Middle, and High
Key Difference in Goal

• It is important to remember that for this indicator, the goal is reversed.

• For all other state indicators, the desired outcome and goal is to achieve a high percent for Status and Change.

• However, the desired outcome and goal for the Suspension Rate Indicator is to have a low suspension rate, which translates to a low percent for Status and Change.

• For this reason, the Status and Change levels on the 5 x 5 color grids are in reverse order compared to the grids for the other indicators.
## Key Difference in 5 X 5 Grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Increased Significantly</th>
<th>Increased</th>
<th>Maintained</th>
<th>Declined</th>
<th>Declined Significantly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Schools that did not certify (or submit) suspension data in the CALPADS are automatically assigned the Orange performance category.
Graduation Rate Indicator

• This indicator applies to LEAs, schools, and student groups that have **30 or more students in the four-year cohort graduation**.
• For the initial release of the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics, the 2014–15 four-year cohort graduation rate, or the **class of 2015** graduation data, will be used to determine Status.
• Prior three-years of four-year cohort graduation data were used to calculate the three-year weighted average to determine Change.
• **Note!** This is the **only** state indicator that uses a three-year weighted average to calculate Change.
Three-Year Weighted Average Formula

Class of 2012 Graduates + Class of 2013 Graduates + Class of 2014 Graduates

\[ \text{divided by} \]

Students in the Class of 2012 + Students in the Class of 2013 + Students in the Class of 2014
Three-Year Weighted Average Formula (Cont.)

- It is important to note that if the LEA, school, or student group does not have cohort data for all prior three graduating classes, then the weighted average for Change was calculated using the **one or two years** of available cohort data.
Change Formula

Current Status (Class of 2015)

*minus*

Three-Year Weighted Average
Topaz High School

Status
• Class of 2015 Graduation Rate: \textbf{89.4\%}

Change:
• \textbf{Step 1}: Obtain Cohort Graduation Data for the Prior Three Years
• \textbf{Step 2}: Calculate the Weighted Average
• \textbf{Step 3}: Calculate Change
Steps 1 & 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Three-Year Data</th>
<th>Number of Students in the Cohort</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class of 2014</td>
<td>3,346</td>
<td>2,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 2013</td>
<td>3,343</td>
<td>2,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 2012</td>
<td>3,558</td>
<td>2,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>10,247</td>
<td>8,685</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weighted Average: 
\[
\frac{8,685}{10,247} = 84.8\%
\]
Example (Cont.)

• **Step 3:** Calculate Change
  Current Status (Class of 2015) *minus*
  Three-Year Weighted Average

  \[ 89.4\% \text{ minus } 84.8\% = +4.6\% \]
### Example (Cont.)

**Status:** 89.4%

**Change:** +4.6%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduation Status</th>
<th>Declined Significantly by more than 5%</th>
<th>Declined by 1% to 5%</th>
<th>Maintained Declined or improved by less than 1%</th>
<th>Increased by 1% to less than 5%</th>
<th>Increased Significantly by 5% or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% to less than 95%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85% to less than 90%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67% to less than 85%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
College and Career Indicator

For this indicator, "Status" is the percent of graduates in the four-year graduation cohort who met the CCI benchmark for "Prepared."

**Not Prepared**
- Students did not meet any measures

**Approaching Prepared**
- High School Diploma
- & any one of the following:
  - Dual Enrollment: Completion of one semester/two quarters of Dual Enrollment with a passing grade (Academic/CTE subjects)
  - CTE: Career Technical Education Pathway completion
  - UC A-G: Completion of courses that meet the University of California A-G criteria
  - Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments: Scored at least "Standard Nearly Met" on one or both ELA and Mathematics

**Prepared**
- High School Diploma & any one of the following:
  - Dual Enrollment: Completion of two semesters/three quarters of Dual Enrollment with a passing grade (Academic and/or CTE)
  - CTE: Career Technical Education Pathway Completion plus one of the following criteria:
    - One semester/two quarters of Dual Enrollment with a passing grade (Academic/CTE subjects)
    - Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments: At least "Standard Met" on English language arts/literacy (ELA) or Mathematics and at least "Standard Nearly Met" in the other subject area
  - UC A-G: Completion of courses that meet the University of California A-G criteria plus one of the following criteria:
    - One semester/two quarters of Dual Enrollment with a passing grade (Academic/CTE subjects)
    - CTE Pathway completion
    - Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments: At least "Standard Met" on English language arts/literacy (ELA) or Mathematics and at least "Standard Nearly Met" in the other subject area
    - Passing score on one AP Exam OR on one IB Exam
  - Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments: At least "Standard Met" on both ELA and Mathematics
  - AP/IB Exams: Passing Score on two Advancement Placement (AP) Exams or two International Baccalaureate (IB) Exams
### College and Career Indicator: Case Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student 1:</th>
<th>Not Prepared</th>
<th>Approaching Prepared</th>
<th>Prepared</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from High School in June 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed one semester with a B+ in an Early Childhood Education Dual Enrollment course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scored &quot;Standard Met&quot; on the ELA portion of the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment and &quot;Standard Nearly Met&quot; in Math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student 2:</th>
<th>Not Prepared</th>
<th>Approaching Prepared</th>
<th>Prepared</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Technical Education Pathways completion in Digital Media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled in a Dual Enrollment graphic design course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 more credits needed for graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student 3:</th>
<th>Not Prepared</th>
<th>Approaching Prepared</th>
<th>Prepared</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from High School in June 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near completion of the UC A-G requirements - Just missing the F requirement in Visual and Performing Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of the CTE Pathway in Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received a C+ grade for one semester in an algebra Dual Enrollment course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student 4:</th>
<th>Not Prepared</th>
<th>Approaching Prepared</th>
<th>Prepared</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On track to graduate in Spring 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near completion of the UC A-G requirements - Finishing the last year of Spanish to fulfill the E requirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed the CTE Pathway in Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently enrolled in a Biology Dual Enrollment course for the semester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Prepared</th>
<th>Approaching Prepared</th>
<th>Prepared</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/4</td>
<td>/4</td>
<td>/4</td>
<td>/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**College and Career Indicator (CCI)**

**Status** is the percentage of graduates in the four-year graduation cohort who met the CCI benchmark for "Prepared".

**Change** is based on the difference in "Status" from current year to prior year.

**Performance** is the 25 color categories based on "Status" and "Change".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Declined Significantly by more than 10%</th>
<th>Declined by 1.5% - 10%</th>
<th>Maintained Declined or Increased by less than 1.5%</th>
<th>Increased by 1.5% to less than 10%</th>
<th>Increased Significantly by 10% or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very High 60% or more</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High 45% to less than 60%</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median 25% to less than 45%</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low 10% to less than 25%</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Less than 10%</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Then a State Indicator

- Although the CCI was planned to be reported as a state indicator, the SBE approved that:
  - The CCI will be reported as a **local** indicator for the initial release of the rubrics based on **Status only**. (The CDE will pre-populate the CCI data in the rubrics.)
Local Indicators

Data is not collected at the state level for some LCFF Priorities. For these priorities, LEAs will measure and report on their progress through the Dashboard based on locally collected data. These are called local indicators:

- Basic Services (Priority 1)
- Implementation of State Academic Standards (Priority 2)
- Parent Engagement (Priority 3)
- School Climate (Priority 6)
- Expelled Youth – COEs Only (Priority 9)
- Foster Youth Services – COEs Only (Priority 10)

Local indicators **do not** apply to individual schools.
Local Indicators: Uploading Data

- Dashboard Coordinators are able to upload local information to meet the standards for the local indicators.

- **No deadline** for uploading information during the field test:
  - If the LEA completes the self-reflection tool and otherwise meets the standard for a local indicator, the Dashboard will show as *Met.*
  - If the LEA does not complete the self-reflection tool for a local indicator, the Dashboard will show an *N/A.*

- LEAs are **strongly encouraged** to use this functionality prior to the full implementation of the Dashboard in 2017–18.
  - Beginning in 2017–18, there will be a date-certain in the fall when LEAs must complete the self-reflection tool in order to receive a *Met* rating.
Local Indicators: Sample Interface

Coordination of Services for Expelled Students (Priority 9)

This is the submission form for the county office of education rubrics coordinator to complete on the local performance indicator for the coordination of services for expelled students (priority 9). This form is for county offices of education only.

Standard: COE annually measures its progress in coordinating instruction as required by Education Code Section 48926 and reports the results to its local governing board at a regularly scheduled meeting of the local governing board and to stakeholders and the public through the evaluation rubrics.

Instructions: COE determines its progress by completing the self-reflection tool below and reports these results to its local governing board and through the local data selection option in the evaluation rubrics.

Assess the degree of implementation of the progress in coordinating instruction for expelled students in your county?
Rating Scale (lowest to highest): 1 - Exploration and Research Phase; 2 - Beginning Development; 3 - Initial Implementation; 4 - Full Implementation; 5 - Full Implementation and Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Assessing status of triennial plan for providing educational services to all expelled students in the county, including:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Review of required data.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Identifying existing educational alternatives for expelled pupils, gaps in educational services to expelled pupils, and strategies for filling those service gaps.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Identifying alternative placements for pupils who are expelled and placed in district community day school programs, but who fail to meet the terms and conditions of their rehabilitation plan or who pose a danger to other district pupils.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Equity Report

**West Chavez Unified School District - San Joaquin County**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>Total Student Groups</th>
<th>Student Groups in Red/Orange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Absenteeism</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension Rate (K-12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Learner Progress (K-12)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate (9-12)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College &amp; Career</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Arts (K-8)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics (K-8)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basics (Teachers, Instructional Materials, Facilities)</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of Academic Standards</td>
<td>Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Engagement</td>
<td>Not Met for Two Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Climate Survey</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- A dash (—) indicates that the student group consists of less than 11 students, the minimum size for any reporting; an asterisk (*) indicates the student group consists of less than 30 students, and the performance level (color) is not presented or included for accountability purposes. An N/A indicates that data is not currently available. Additional details can be found in the California School Dashboard Technical Manual (link will be provided).

**Narrative**

The narrative text box is provided as an optional feature for local educational agencies to describe their performance on the state indicators and local indicators. This option allows LEAs to provide additional information and context as part of the display.
The top of every page of the Dashboard identifies the LEA or school and which report the user has selected, along with key demographic information.

West Chavez Unified School District - San Joaquin County

- Enrollment: 2,500 students
- Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: 87%
- English Learners: 76%
- Foster Youth: N/A
- Grade span: K-12
- Charter School: No
- Year: Data 2015-16
The Dashboard shows the performance levels using the color-coded images below.

Performance Levels: Blue (Highest) Green Yellow Orange Red (Lowest)
Dashboard: Navigating to Reports

Users can choose from four different reports by selecting tabs underneath the demographic information included at the top of the web page.
LEAs also have the option of adding additional information in a narrative box that will show up at the bottom of each report.

This gives LEAs the opportunity to explain their local context or identify any circumstances that may have impacted their LEA during the year.
Dashboard: Narrative Summary

LEAs also have the option of adding additional information in a narrative box that will show up at the bottom of each report. This gives LEAs the opportunity to explain their local context or identify any circumstances that may have impacted their LEA during the year.

The narrative text box is provided as an optional feature for local educational agencies to describe their performance on the state indicators and local indicators. This option allows LEAs to provide additional information and context as part of the display.
Equity Report: State Indicators

- Shows the **performance level of all students** on state indicators.

- Shows the **total number of student groups** that are large enough to receive a performance level on each state indicator.
  - The number of total student groups may differ across indicators due to the grade levels applicable for each indicator.

- Shows the number of those **student groups in the Red or Orange performance levels**.
  - Quick overview of overall performance and whether any student groups are struggling on the state indicators.
The Equity Report provides the performance levels for the state indicators and identifies the total number of student groups represented in each indicator, in addition to the number of student groups in red/orange.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Indicators</th>
<th>All Students Performance</th>
<th>Total Student Groups</th>
<th>Student Groups in Red/Orange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Absenteeism</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension Rate (K-12)</td>
<td>🟡</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Learner Progress (K-12)</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate (9-12)</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College &amp; Career</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Arts (K-8)</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics (K-8)</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Status and Change Report

Shows the performance level for each state indicator and the current performance (Status) and difference from past performance (Change) that resulted in that performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Indicators</th>
<th>All Students Performance</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Absenteeism</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension Rate (K-12)</td>
<td>Very Low 0.5%</td>
<td>Declined -1.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Learner Progress (K-12)</td>
<td>Low 42%</td>
<td>Increased +1.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate (9-12)</td>
<td>Medium 86%</td>
<td>Increased +5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College &amp; Career</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Arts (K-8)</td>
<td>Low 60 points below level 3</td>
<td>Declined -10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics (K-8)</td>
<td>Very Low 15 points above level 3</td>
<td>Declined Sig. -25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Detailed Reports

- Shows year-by-year data for the state indicators and additional state data that is relevant to the state indicators.
  - For LEAs, it also shows the locally collected data reported on the local indicators.

- Users will see the data organized into at least three groupings:
  - Academic performance,
  - Academic engagement, and
  - School conditions and climate.

- The groupings reinforce the relationships among the indicators and will make the information more digestible.
Student Group Report

- Shows year-by-year data for the state indicators and additional state data that is relevant to the state indicators.
  - For LEAs, it also shows the locally collected data reported on the local indicators.

- Users will see the data organized into at least three groupings:
  - Academic performance,
  - Academic engagement, and
  - School conditions and climate.

- The groupings reinforce the relationships among the indicators and will make the information more digestible.
Embargo

- The private preview is intended to allow you and your colleagues to become familiar with the Dashboard and the indicators and methodology for measuring performance.

- Resources to assist communicating with stakeholders about the Dashboard and a media toolkit will be available by Monday, February 13.

- Access to the Dashboard is being provided on an embargoed basis through 8 a.m. on Wednesday, February 22.
  
  This means that, as a condition of accessing the Dashboard, you cannot share any reports or data in the Dashboard outside employees of your LEA during the embargo period and must ensure that any LEA employees who receive Dashboard reports or data understand and agree to honor the embargo.

- The embargo ends prior to the Dashboard’s public launch in March 2017. LEAs may begin sharing their performance data with local stakeholders at that time, and it is up to each LEA to determine whether to do so and, if so, how.
Accessing the Dashboard

Dashboard Coordinators:

- Receive user name and password to access Coordinator Landing Page and Resources related to the Dashboard
- Superintendent/Charter School Administrator must approve enrollment for Coordinator to receive user name and password
- If Coordinators completed the registration form but have not received user name and password, follow up with their Superintendent/Charter School Administrator
Coordinator Landing Page:

- Links to Resources related to the Dashboard
  - Resources specific to Coordinators and
  - Resources for general public

- Back-end access to complete self-reflection tools and upload information for the local indicators

- Back-end access to complete optional narrative text box to provide additional local information or context to the public Dashboard display
Additional Resources and Training

- **Link on Dashboard Coordinator page** to resources
  - Technical resource on indicators and calculating performance

- **Announcements to Dashboard Coordinator distribution list** when new resources available

- **Toolkit to support communication** with local stakeholders and media about the Dashboard
  - *Coming week of February 13th*
Additional Resources and Training

**Future, In-Depth Webinars:**

1. Dashboard and Impact on the Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP) Development
2. Academic Indicator
3. English Learner Progress and Suspension Rate Indicators
4. Graduation Rate and Career/College Indicators
5. Statements of Model Practices, Local Indicators and Chronic Absenteeism (review of local data)
### Key Shifts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More than a single number</th>
<th>Equity</th>
<th>Supports Local Decision-Making</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A quality education is defined by <strong>more</strong> than a single test score</td>
<td><strong>Increased</strong> focus on addressing disparities among student groups</td>
<td><strong>More</strong> information to support the local strategic planning process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Areas of Focus

- Ensuring continual improvement of the new accountability system

- Performance data to inform assistance and support

- Using Dashboard data in the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) process
The LCFF Evaluation Rubric

The California School Dashboard

Sharing your results
Engaging your community

(Part 2)
The California Way rests on the belief that educators want to excel, trusts them to improve when given the proper supports, and provides local schools and districts with the leeway and flexibility to deploy resources so they can improve.
The New Accountability System  (Part 1)

The LCFF Evaluation Rubric

The California School Dashboard

- Local Control Plan – your LCAP accountability is to your stakeholders – students and families: What actions and services are you providing to improve outcomes from all students? How are your expenditures aligned to improving those outcomes?

- Accountability for Outcomes – County Office of Education is a support to help districts identify strengths and weaknesses, provide support upon request, or offer differentiated assistance if necessary.
Local Measures & Targets; Leading Indicators

Triangulation for Root Cause Analysis & Improvement

Quantitative Data

Qualitative & Perception Data

Research & Model Practices

Other perception data “beyond the data”

Annual Update: local targets

Annual Update: effectiveness
Integrated Local State and Federal Accountability and Continuous Improvement System

Focus This Year

Support LEAs in Identifying Strengths & Weaknesses

Assist in Determining Eligibility for Technical Assistance

Assist the SSPI in Determining Eligibility for Intensive Interventions

3 Statutory Purposes of LCFF Rubrics

- Support LEAs in Identifying Strengths & Weaknesses
- Assist in Determining Eligibility for Technical Assistance
- Assist the SSPI in Determining Eligibility for Intensive Interventions
Three Levels of Support for LEAs & Schools

Level 1
Supports for all LEAs & Schools

Level 2
Differentiated Assistance

Level 3
Intensive Intervention

Three levels of support to LEAs and schools to promote continuous improvement and equity.

NOTE: LCFF evaluation rubrics are aligned to the statutory provisions of Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)
LEAs are eligible for technical assistance if the LEA “fails to improve pupil achievement across more than one state priority for one or more pupil subgroup.”

In the initial year that an LEA becomes eligible for technical assistance, technical assistance will involve identification in writing of the LEAs strength and weaknesses.

NOTE: A charter school is eligible for technical assistance and may be referred to the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence if three or more student groups (or all the student groups if there are less than three student groups) met the (below) Criteria for one or more state or school priority identified in the charter for three out of four consecutive school years. When determining a charter school’s eligibility for technical assistance or referral to the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence, an authorizer may consider only performance on indicators that are included in the charter school’s underlying petition.

EC 5207 1(b)
Level 2- Differentiated Assistance

EC Section 52071 (Districts)

- If a County Superintendent does not approve an LCAP, or a local governing board requests technical assistance, then the County Superintendent shall provide any of the following:

1. Identification of strengths and weaknesses in writing
   - Including a review of effective practices or programs that relate to the LEA’s goals

2. Assignment of expert or team to assist LEA
   - Including requesting that another LEA within the county partner to support the LEA’s improvement

3. Request that the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI) assign the CCEE to provide advice and assistance to the LEA

Technical Assistance is never about just sending a letter with a district's strengths and weaknesses. It is about providing support and assistance.
NOTE: LCFF evaluation rubrics are aligned to the statutory provisions of Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)

Three Levels of Support for LEAs & Schools

Three levels of support to LEAs and schools to promote continuous improvement and equity.
● Any subgroup that did not meet the performance criteria for 2 or more priorities.

● 3 or more student groups did not meet the performance criteria for 2 or more priorities in 3 out of 4 consecutive years.

- SPI intervention or charter revocation
- SPI takes over a district’s budget
Determining Eligibility

**Basics (Priority 1)**
- Not Met for Two or More Years on Local Performance Indicator

**Implementation of State Academic Standards (Priority 2)**
- Not Met for Two or More Years on Local Performance Indicator

**Parent Engagement (Priority 3)**
- Not Met for Two or More Years on Local Performance Indicator

**Pupil Achievement (Priority 4)**
- Red on both English Language Arts and Math tests OR
- Red on English Language Arts or Math test AND Orange on the other test OR
- Red on the English Learner Progress Indicator (English learner student group only)

**Pupil Engagement (Priority 5)**
- Red on Graduation Rate Indicator OR
- Red on Chronic Absence Indicator

**School Climate (Priority 6)**
- Red on Suspension Rate Indicator OR
- Not Met for Two or More Years on Local Performance Indicator

**Access to and Outcomes in a Broad Course of Study (Priorities 7 & 8)** on College/Career Indicator
## Priorities, State and Local Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LCFF Priority</th>
<th>State Indicator</th>
<th>Local Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority 1</td>
<td>Basics Conditions at School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 2</td>
<td>Implementation of State Academic Standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 3</td>
<td>Parent Engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 4</td>
<td>Academic Indicator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 5</td>
<td>Chronic Absence Indicator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 6</td>
<td>Suspension Rate Indicator</td>
<td>Local Climate Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 7</td>
<td>College/Career Indicator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 8</td>
<td>College/Career Indicator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 9</td>
<td>Coordination of Services for Expelled Students**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 10</td>
<td>Coordination of Services for Foster Youth**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# State Indicators v. Local Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Indicators</th>
<th>Local Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-populated</strong> for LEAs by State with already existing data</td>
<td><strong>LEAs Populate</strong> with analysis of progress from local data &amp; report performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most recently certified CALPADS Data</strong> (from 14-15 or 15-16)</td>
<td><strong>Current or Prior Year Data</strong> (15-16 or 16-17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantitative Data:</strong> Matrix of Status and Change</td>
<td><strong>Mix of</strong> Qualitative, Perception, &amp; Quantitative Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 Performance Categories</strong> (Blue, Green, Yellow, Orange, Red)</td>
<td><strong>3 Performance Categories</strong> (Met, Not Met, Not Met for 2+yrs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Statutory Purposes of the LCFF Rubrics

Support LEAs in Identifying Strengths & Weaknesses

Assist in Determining Eligibility for Technical Assistance

Assist the SSPI in Determining Eligibility for Intensive Interventions

Considerations for Local Indicators

In parts 2 and 3 we’ll discuss the use of tools for planning

We’ll address how to meet the standard for local measures
Meeting standard on the local indicators is **NOT** about the **RESULTS** of a survey nor the **LEVEL** of progress on a tool... Meeting standard is about **engagement in the process**, analysis for **continuous improvement**, transparent reporting of **results**, and subsequent incorporation into the plan.
Vocabulary

Local performance indicators for LCFF Rubric

**Standard:** Describes the expectation for self-assessment in that priority

**Evidence:** Describes relevant data instruments for self-assessing & reporting progress relative to the standard

**Criteria:** The performance indicators for LEAs to describe progress toward standard

- **MET**
- **Not MET**
- **Not MET For 2 or more years**
Priority 1 - Basic Conditions at School

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

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

All of this is already in place at your schools and districts.
What are the Standard, Evidence and Criteria asking us to do?

- Frequency
- Indicator Content
- Accountability/Transparency
  - School Board
  - Stakeholders and Public
- Tool
  - State provided, Local Option, Choice
Local Performance Indicator
Priority 2: Implementation of State Academic Standards

Standard:
LEA annually measures its progress implementing state academic standards 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 evaluation rubrics (California School Dashboard).

Accountability and Transparency of Results
- English Language Arts
- English Language Development
- Mathematics
- NGSS
- History-Social Science
- Career Technical Education
- Health Education Content Standards
- Physical Education Model Content Standards
- Visual and Performing Arts
- World Language
Local Performance Indicator
Priority 2: Implementation of State Academic Standards

Evidence:

Define how progress will be determined

Local Educational Agency (LEA) measures its progress using the self-reflection tool included in the evaluation rubrics web-based user interface, and reports the results to its local governing board at a regularly scheduled meeting and through the local data selection option in the evaluation rubrics web-based system (California School Dashboard).

Met
Local Performance Indicator
Priority 2: Implementation of State Academic Standards

Standard:
LEA annually measures its progress implementing state academic standards 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 evaluation rubrics.

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

Evidence:
LEA measures its progress using the self-reflection tool included in the evaluation rubrics web-based user interface, and reports the results to its local governing board at a regularly scheduled meeting and through the local data selection option in the evaluation rubrics web-based system.
Getting to Met for Priority 2

**Frequency:** Annually

**Indicator:** Measures progress implementing state academic standards

**Accountability: Reporting to Board** Reports results to governing board at a regularly scheduled public meeting

**Accountability: Reporting to Stakeholders** Reports results to stakeholders and public through evaluation rubrics (dashboard)

**Tool:** Option 1 (Narrative Summary); Option 2 (Reflection Tool)
OPTION 1: Narrative Summary
In the narrative box, 1. identify the locally selected measures or tools that the LEA is using to track its progress in implementing the state academic standards adopted by the state board and 2. briefly describe why the LEA chose the selected measures or tools.

Additionally, 3. summarize the LEA’s progress in implementing the academic standards, based on the locally selected measures or tools. This summary shall address the LEA’s progress in implementing all adopted academic standards are:

- English Language Arts
- English Language Development
- Mathematics
- NGSS
- History-Social Science
- Career Technical Education
- Health Education Content Standards
- Physical Education Model Content Standards
- Visual and Performing Arts
- World Language
Key Elements in Local Indicators - Priority 2: Option 1 Example

Option 1: Tool Requirements
1. Identify locally selected measure or tool
2. Briefly describe why the LEA chose the selected measures or tool
3. Summarize LEA’s progress in implementing the academic standards
Option 1: Tool Requirements

1. Identify locally selected measure or tool
2. Briefly describe why the LEA chose the selected measures or tool
3. Summarize LEA’s progress in implementing the academic standards

Sample Narrative Summary

1. Identify local measure: District reached the Stars used CASS Implementation Metric for measuring the implementation of ELA and Math state standards. We used a modified version of the state given metric to measure the implementation of the other state standards.

2. Describe why we chose this measure or tool: We chose this metric to ensure our district is making decisions based on the reflective survey tool given to teachers and that our analysis reflects the implementation happening in our classrooms. Principals at each site were able to gather surveys from their instructional staff and summarized the level of implementation of the new ELA and Math standards at their sites.

3. Summarize Progress:
   a. ELA: After gathering data from all schools in our district, the majority of our staff have identified that they are either still developing awareness (2) of the new standards or working in the full awareness (3) of the new CA ELA standards. Evidence includes: newly adopted aligned curriculum, PD on new curriculum implementation, systematic summative assessments being used district-wide to monitor mastery of standards, and collaborative teaching teams developing well-planned units with clear learning goals and success criteria for each lesson.
   b. Math: After gathering data from all schools in our district, the majority of our staff have identified that they are at level 3 (full awareness) according to the implementation survey. The majority of our teachers have well-planned units and lessons with explicit learning targets and success criteria aligned to the new standards. They have formative and summative assessments to monitor individual student progress toward mastery and their students engage in mathematical practices (creating models, using precision, communicating their understanding). Our goal is to get a greater percent of our teachers working fluently with the new Math standards and begin to have students take ownership of their learning targets and progress toward mastery.
Priority 2: Option 2 Self-Reflection Tool

Option 2: Reflection Tool Requirements

- LEA rates itself on 1-5
- LEAs that choose to complete the optional reflection tool, would not need to provide a separate narrative summary of progress. (Question 6 is an optional narrative.)
Local Indicator for Priority 2
Reflection- In groups of two, three or four:

● Read and compare the two options carefully.

● Discuss the benefits and challenges for each option.

● Can you describe a situation where you might encourage the use of option 1? Use of option 2?

● How might you encourage the use of a reflective tool that helps gather authentic feedback around the implementation of state standards?
Local Performance Indicator
Priority 3: Parental Involvement

What are the Standard, Evidence and Criteria asking us to do?

- Frequency
- Indicator Content
- Accountability/Transparency
  - School Board
  - Stakeholders and Public
- Tool
  - State provided, Local Option, Choice
Local Performance Indicator
Priority 3 : Parental Involvement

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

**Evidence:**
Evidence: LEA measures its progress using the self-reflection tool included in the evaluation rubrics web-based user interface, and reports these results to its local governing board at a regularly scheduled meeting and through the local data selection option in the evaluation rubrics (dashboard) web-based system.

Accountability and transparency of results
Getting to Met for Priority 3

**Frequency:** Annually

**Indicator:** Measures its progress in: (1) seeking input from parents in decision making; and (2) promoting parental participation in programs

**Accountability: Reporting to Board**
Reports results to governing board at a regularly scheduled public meeting

**Accountability: Reporting to Stakeholders**
Narrative summary and analysis of climate survey; reports results to stakeholders and public through evaluation rubrics (dashboard)

**Tool:** Option 1 (Survey); Option 2 (Local Measures)
Key Elements in Local Indicators for Priority 3: Option 1

OPTION 1: Survey
If the LEA administers a local survey to parents/guardians in at least one grade within each grade span that the LEA serves (e.g., K–5, 6–8, 9–12), summarize:

(1) the key findings from the survey related to seeking input from parents/guardians in school and district decision making;

(2) the key findings from the survey related to promoting parental participation in programs; and

(3) why the LEA chose the selected survey and whether the findings relate to the goals established for other LCFF priorities in the LCAP.
Key Elements in Local Indicators - Priority 3: Option 1 Example

Option 1 Survey Requirements
Administer to parents/guardians in at least one grade within each grade span (K-5, 6-8, 9-12).

1. Key findings related to seeking input for decisions
2. Key findings related to promoting parental participation in programs
3. Briefly describe why the LEA chose the selected measures or tool

Sample District, Family Involvement Survey

I strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree. Don’t apply.

I’ll be given input from parents and guardians in school and district decisions.

My involvement in my child’s education is valued at my school.

I am involved in the district’s decision-making process, including at the site or district level. (School Site Council, governance, board meetings, parent advisory group, English language advisory council, etc.)

I am invited to meetings at the school or district and asked to contribute to the group discussions. I believe my voice matters to the decisions made.

I am invited to help plan family involvement activities.

My child’s school is good at keeping in touch with me.

Participation in Programs:

7. When I volunteer at the school, I am given training and resources to do my tasks, if needed.
8. Parent meetings and activities at the school or district always have translation services so I don’t miss out on the information or discussion being delivered.
9. I am invited to meetings so that I can learn about what is going on in the school.
10. I receive information on what I can do at home to help my child improve or succeed.
11. When my child’s school communicates with me, it is easy for me to read or understand.
12. I have been given different options, or ways that I can be involved with the school, either at the school site, at home, or in the community.

Sample: At Shanty for the Stars District:

- 54% of our parents indicate they agree or strongly agree that the district or school adequately seeks input from parents and guardians in decision making committees.

- 72% of our parents indicate they agree or strongly agree that their school adequately promotes participation in programs.

Why was survey chosen: Shoot for the Stars District uses our “Sample District Family Involvement Survey” to gather parent/guardian feedback across the community in order to get a unfiltered feedback from our community.

Additional from CCSESA: Building the Participatory Learning Agenda, Districts, Families, and Communities.
OPTION 2: Local Measures

Summarize:
(1) the LEA's progress on **at least one measure related to seeking input from parents/guardians** in school and district decision making;
(2) the LEA's **progress on at least one measure related to promoting parental participation** in programs; and
(3) **why the LEA chose the selected measures** and whether the findings relate to the goals established for other LCFF priorities in the LCAP.
Key Elements in Local Indicators - Priority 3: Option 2 Example

Option 2 Survey Requirements

- At least one measure related to seeking input from parents/guardians
- Progress on at least one measure related to promoting parental participation

Briefly describe why the LEA chose the selected measures or tool

Purple Handout

White Handout

National Standards for Family-School Partnership Assessment Guide

Santa Clara County Office of Education

CCSESA - January 2017
Local Indicator for Priority 3
Reflection - In groups of of two, three or four:

- Read and compare the two options carefully.
- Discuss similarities and differences of each option.
- Can you describe a situation where you might encourage the use of option 1? use of option 2?
- How might you respond to the prompt: “Describe how the findings of Priority 3 relate to the goals established for other LCFF priorities in the LCAP”?

Share thoughts and suggestions on Padlet:
https://padlet.com/jspencer14/papfusr14vmj
Getting to Met for Priority 6

**Frequency:**
Minimum of every other year to one grade in grade span

**Indicator:**
Measures perceptions of school safety and connectedness

**Accountability: Reporting to Board**
Reports results to governing board at a regularly scheduled public meeting

**Accountability: Reporting to Stakeholders**
Narrative summary and analysis of climate survey
Reports results to stakeholders and public through evaluation rubrics

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

Evidence:
LEA administers a survey as specified and reports the results to its local governing board and through the local data selection option in the evaluation rubrics.
Local Data Reporting Interface:
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). 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.
Continuous Improvement
State Board and Providing Tools: A Careful Balance

Inherent Tension

- Support LEAs
- Common language
- Desire to provide tools

- Limited validation
- Keep the local, local
- Avoid “compliance”

California Way: Tools for Local Performance Indicators- intended to support
The LCFF Evaluation Rubric

The California Accountability Dashboard

Incorporating your results into the LCAP
Targeting your actions and services to improve the outcomes for all students

(Part 3)
Identifying Student Needs

Problem-focused
Process Using Principles of Improvement Science

Based upon previous analysis of data from Rubric you’ve identified a focused area to dive deeper into

1. Deeper dive to **understand why** we are getting the current results that we are getting for this group of students.

2. Once we understand the why, then we will think about **what we need to do as a system** to improve student outcomes

3. Then we will **make revisions in the LCAP** that bring together strategic resourcing with the changes that we believe will improve student outcomes for this group
**Annual Update**

**Goal 1**

Complete a copy of the following table for each of the LEA’s goals from the prior year LCAP. Duplicate the table as needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State and/or Local Priorities Addressed by this goal:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANNUAL MEASURABLE OUTCOMES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPECTED</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACTIONS / SERVICES**

Duplicate the Actions/Services from the prior year LCAP and complete a copy of the following table for each. Duplicate the table as needed.

**Action 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions/Services</th>
<th>PLANNED</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>BUDGETED</td>
<td>ESTIMATED ACTUAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal 1
Support Academic Progress and Behavior
Provide interventions and enrichment to address students’ academic, behavioral and attendance needs to reduce the achievement gap, increase English proficiency for ELL students and provide differentiated instruction for all students.

State and/or Local Priorities Addressed by this goal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCE</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL</td>
<td>__________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANNUAL MEASURABLE OUTCOMES

EXPECTED
Decrease suspensions for all students by 1.5% from baseline to 5.4%.
Maintain number of expulsions below 15.
Increase attendance rate by 9% to 97%.
Maintain chronic absenteeism below 7.4%.

ACTUAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>Met/Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suspensions for all students</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Attendance Rate</td>
<td>96.1%</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school cohort drop-out rate</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACTIONS / SERVICES
Duplicate the Actions/Services from the prior year LCAP and complete a copy of the following table for each. Duplicate the table as needed.

Action 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions/Services</th>
<th>PLANNED</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendance Specialist</td>
<td>Hire Attendance Specialist for early outreach to increase attendance and decrease chronic absenteeism.</td>
<td>An Attendance Specialist was hired to in December to monitor attendance processes at schools and provide parent meetings focused on the importance of regular school attendance. The Attendance Specialist met with each school to analyze attendance practices and will hold 8 parent meetings by June, 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>$193,600 Certified Salaries (1000) $24,150 Benefits (3000) LCFF Base funds (Attendance Specialist), $10,000 Instructional Materials (4300) Professional Development, LCFF Supplemental and Concentration funds</td>
<td>$67,325 certificated salaries (1000) $15,584 benefits (3000) LCFF Base funds (Attendance Specialist) $0 professional development, materials LCFF Supplemental and Concentration funds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Identify Needs of Professional Practice

Attend to Variability
### Goals, Actions, & Services

**Strategic Planning Details and Accountability**

Complete a copy of the following table for each of the LEA's goals. Duplicate the table as needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Unchanged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Goal 1**

**State and/or Local Priorities Addressed by this goal:**

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td>[ ] 5</td>
<td>[ ] 6</td>
<td>[ ] 7</td>
<td>[ ] 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COE</td>
<td>[ ] 9</td>
<td>[ ] 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Identify Needs of System**

**See the System**

---

## EXPECTED ANNUAL MEASURABLE OUTCOMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metrics/Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
<th>2019-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Separate locations to include information
Identify Needs of System

See the System
### Goals, Actions, and Services Example

#### Goal 1

All students will receive high quality instruction in California English language arts, mathematics and Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) from highly qualified teachers in 21st Century classrooms at safe clean and welcoming facilities to prepare them to be college and career ready upon graduation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual William/SARC report on teacher credential</th>
<th>94% of staff fully credentialed in area taught</th>
<th>96% of staff fully credentialed in area taught</th>
<th>98% of staff fully credentialed in area taught</th>
<th>100% of staff fully credentialed in area taught</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SBAC Math % Standard Met/Exceeded</td>
<td>District 60% LI 41% EL 29%</td>
<td>District 63% LI 46% EL 37%</td>
<td>District 65% LI 50% EL 45%</td>
<td>District 73% LI 64% EL 53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBAC ELA % Standard Met/Exceeded</td>
<td>District 71% LI 46% EL 19%</td>
<td>District 74% LI 52% EL 27%</td>
<td>District 77% LI 58% EL 38%</td>
<td>District 80% LI 64% EL 43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District professional development needs survey</td>
<td>73% of teachers self-report mastery of California Standards Curriculum</td>
<td>85% of teachers will self-report mastery of California Standards Curriculum</td>
<td>90% of teachers will self-report mastery of California Standards Curriculum</td>
<td>95% of teachers will self-report mastery of California Standards Curriculum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Use of state and local metrics and inclusion of needs as identified by a variety of stakeholders**

**Measures include closing of the gap**

**This goal covers basic services, teachers, curriculum, and facilities**

1. The School Accountability Report Card (SARC) indicates 94% of staff are fully credentialed in the area taught. High school science, high school mathematics, content ELD support, and special education teachers are needed.
2. Statewide summative (CAASPP) student achievement data, teacher survey data, observational walk-through data all indicate the need for continued professional development on California Math, English Language Arts and NGSS curriculum and pedagogy.
3. The district technology survey demonstrates the need to upgrade classroom technology access in grades 3-5 and parent/student survey indicates the need to improve student access to online course materials.
Engage in Learning to Determine Actions & Services

Engage in Learning to determine Actions & Services
- What is the learning that we need to engage in to support our development of high-leverage actions & services that inform revisions to LCAP in addressing goal/priority area?
- Based upon the learning, what are the high leverage actions and services that we believe will result in improvement?
The LCFF Evaluation Rubric

The California School Dashboard

Sharing your results
Engaging your community
How will we know we are moving needle?

Embrace Measurement
### GOAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Related to Goal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Results and Updates | Guiding Questions |

Community Forum Handouts and Posters

CCSESA - December 2016
"Chalk Talk"
Stakeholder Engagement Activity

1. No one may talk at all and anyone may add to the chalk talk as they please.
2. The facilitator writes a relevant question in a circle on the board.
3. The facilitator either hands a piece of chalk to everyone, or places many pieces of chalk at the board and hands several pieces to people at random.
4. People write as they feel moved.
5. How the facilitator chooses to interact with the Chalk Talk influences its outcome.
Designing an Executive Summary or Plan Summary in Alternative Format

Eight tips to keep it simple

1. Translate everyday activities into meaningful results for your community
2. Frame it: what do you want them to remember?
3. Let real people tell the story instead of the district doing the talking
4. Photos, captions, and headlines can tell the story
5. Humanize stats with personal stories
6. Financials tell the story too. Decide what level of detail to share and make it really easy to understand
7. Remember to thank the stakeholders for making the plan meaningful
8. Call to action – now what?
The LCAP Summary

2017-20 Plan Summary

THE STORY
Briefly describe the students and community and how the LEA serves them.

LCAP HIGHLIGHTS
Identify and briefly summarize the key features of this year’s LCAP.
Plan Summary: Summary of Progress (Rubric Link)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVIEW OF PERFORMANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Based on a review of performance on the state indicators and local performance indicators included in the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics, progress toward LCAP goals, local self-assessment tools, stakeholder input, or other information, what progress is the LEA most proud of and how does the LEA plan to maintain or build upon that success? This may include identifying any specific examples of how past increases or improvements in services for low-income students, English learners, and foster youth have led to improved performance for these students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GREATEST PROGRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referring to the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics, identify any state indicator or local performance indicator for which overall performance was in the &quot;Red&quot; or &quot;Orange&quot; performance category or where the LEA received a &quot;Not Met&quot; or &quot;Not Met for Two or More Years&quot; rating. Additionally, identify any areas that the LEA has determined need significant improvement based on review of local performance indicators or other local indicators. What steps is the LEA planning to take to address these areas with the greatest need for improvement?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GREATEST NEEDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referring to the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics, identify any state indicator for which performance for any student group was two or more performance levels below the &quot;all student&quot; performance. What steps is the LEA planning to take to address these performance gaps?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE GAPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on a review of state and local indicators of student performance included in the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics, local self-assessment tools, stakeholder input, or other information, what progress is the LEA most proud of and how does the LEA plan to maintain or build upon that success?

**Greatest Progress**

This year the percentage of students that scored a 3 or above on the Advanced Placement (AP) tests rose 5.6% to 61.4%. Additionally the percentage of historically under-represented subgroups enrolled in AP classes and attempting the AP exams rose enough to reflect the demographics of the district, Hispanic/Latino participation rose 18%, and African American participation rose 14%.

Stakeholder input from parents, staff, and students made further reducing class size at high school a priority to support our continued improvement in serving underrepresented students in AP courses. The addition of the Naviance college planning software to our high schools and the growth of our Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) program in our middle schools has helped focus students on college readiness. This year we will expand Naviance to middle school to assist students and their families in planning for high school success. See: Goal 1 (pg. 18), Goal 2 (pg. 25), Goal 3 (pg. 31)

See also: “Increased or Improved Services”
Referring to the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics, address any state or local performance indicator where overall performance was in the “Red” or “Orange” performance category or received a “Not Met” or “Not Met for Two or More Years” rating. What steps is the LEA planning to take to address these areas with the greatest need for improvement?

The district rubric indicator was “yellow” for “all students” based on the 2016 CAASPP Mathematics results. 53% of the district scored standard met or standard exceeded in mathematics. Scores for our unduplicated populations were two performance levels below the below the Asian and White student groups in this measure.

Research is overwhelming that instructor effectiveness is the key to improving outcomes for all students, so the JAUHSD LCAP invests heavily in instructional coaching in content and culturally relevant pedagogy to improve academic outcomes for all students.

**LCAP Goal 1 (pg. 14, 15) ($2.1 M)**

We are also continuing to invest in professional development for teachers regarding implementation of common core curricula and pedagogy.

**LCAP Goal 1 (pg.15,16) ($875,000)**

We also continue to invest in targeted support and intervention programs to meet the instructional needs of at-risk students at all grade levels.

**LCAP Goal 1 (pg. 17,18) ($4.1 M)**
Referring to the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics, address any state indicator for which performance performance of any group was two or more levels below the “all student” performance. What steps is the LEA planning to take to address these performance gaps.

English learner achievement on CAASPP mathematics and English language arts is two levels below the “all student” performance. To address the gap, JAUSD LCAP includes the following actions and services:

- Professional development to improve ELD in content area subjects  \textit{LCAP Goal 1 (pg. 15)}
- Adding classes of ELD content support at middle and high school for EL Level 1 and EL level 2 students  \textit{LCAP Goal 1 (pg. 17)}
- Summer School program with targeted classrooms  \textit{LCAP Goal 2 (pg. 24)}

Suspension Rate data show that African American and Hispanic/Latino students are two levels below the “all student” performance. To address the gap the following actions and services are included:

- Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports will be implemented at all sites  \textit{LCAP Goal 2 (pg. 25)}
- 2 Coaches to provide professional development and model an “equity emphasis” and culturally relevant pedagogy  \textit{LCAP Goal 1 (pg. 18)}
Increased or Improved Services

If not previously addressed, identify two or three most significant ways the LEA will increase or improve services for low income, English learner, or foster youth.

In many districts this is a section that will be a focal area.

Based on staff and stakeholder feedback and research on effective practices we are implementing more than 20 LCAP Action/Services to improve services for the low income, English learner and foster youth including using a portion of the LCFF Supplemental dollars for site allocations based on the number of unduplicated youth served to allow sites to implement site specific solutions based on unique site needs, and site stakeholder input. Three significant actions to improve services are:

• Providing additional ELD and sheltered content class supports for ELD 1 and 2 students at all middle and high schools. See LCAP Goal 1 (pg.15)
• Additional college and career counseling for the lowest performing schools as well as to meet the needs of English learner, migrant, low income, foster youth and African American students. See LCAP Goal 2 (pg. 21)
• Community Specialist support at all schools with high concentrations of Latino, English learner, and African American youth. See Goal 3 (pg. 28)
Next Session

**Session 3:**
Drafting your plan: Making coherency out of your metrics

March 16, 2017  [http://santaclara.k12oms.org/201-126014](http://santaclara.k12oms.org/201-126014)

March 28, 2017  [http://santaclara.k12oms.org/201-126015](http://santaclara.k12oms.org/201-126015)
Thank You! Hope to see you for Session 3

- Please complete an evaluation
- Session 3 (Drafting your plan: Making coherency out of your metrics)
  - March 16 (Thursday) or
  - March 28 (Tuesday)
- Contact Michael Bachicha, Ed.D. with any questions
  michael_bachicha@sccoe.org
  (408) 453-6899