1. All stakeholders – defined by LCAP. LCAP rubric- dashboard to look at different metrics; e.g., absence rate; has categories such as by grade span and ratings using scores and colors and progress rating such as “not making progress”. Will include ability to identify local measures, but not clear how will be reported. Could be overwhelming. Needs to be simple with the ability to dig deeper if interested; versions for audiences? Grouped by large LCAP priority groupings.

**Growth model, non punitive, progress toward goal.**

See the value of a dashboard- clear, transparent, easy to use, can be “drilled down” , growth model with target, includes significant subgoups; should include some statewide data sets; focus on closing the achievement gap and may include identifying those who need assistance in a non-punitive way.

Who already has developed a good model dashboard- CalPassPlus; Conley model; Alberta model; Colorado model; Great Schools; Just for Kids;

Comparing local school to the statewide, county, district, school levels may be important to parent stakeholders.

1. We suggest multiple indicators rather than one number such as the current API. Category 1- each priority has indicator, but how do we look at overall? How do we measure (and compare) areas like Parent involvement (soft measures)?

Do we identify several potential indicators that districts can use for the “soft” measures? Does that interfere with local control? Where does the research base fit into this process?

Multiple measures, concern about soft measures, respectful of local control. Local measures could address ASAM schools; student-level growth could be powerful in this area. Do not recommend a separate accountability model.

1. Does a statewide goal and or performance target interfere with local control? How do we define these? Do we look at trends? Growth will be important but what if you meet target? Are you done expecting some growth?

Need some early indicators pre-K – 3 to ensure that we can graduate students with college and career readiness. What about identifying “critical” grade level and performance indicators? 3rd grade too late to determine reading ability.

Local goals good but need a statewide expectation of excellence; helps to determine if our local goals are reasonable.

Some level of performance target important. Targets could be non-punitive and just used to compare progress to see if you are on the right track or need to intervene or if you are really successful can you replicate?

1. See above
2. Planned rollout – grow into the system. At least one year to see base scores plus another year to see growth to determine appropriate target and establish the system.

Needs to be aligned with evaluation rubric. (October 2015) Will be measuring CCSS implementation which will not be fully implemented for all students in the system.

Baseline for 16-17. Need to be clear to districts what the targets are in the fall so districts can embed in LCAPs for 16-17.

Final notes: Systems must align!