

ESSA Accountability Issues: Summary of Impact on California School Dashboard

Below is a summary of the proposed revisions to the ESSA Title I accountability sections and their impact on the Dashboard and our overall approach to accountability under LCFF. More detail on the issues and rationale for the proposed revisions was included in the March 2018 ESSA item, beginning on page 2 through page 5 (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/mar18item04.docx>).

Issue	Impact on Dashboard
<p>Status and Change (Long-Term Goals & Indicators) – See p.2 For the Academic Achievement, Graduation Rate, and English Learner Progress indicators, report Status and Change as distinct indicators and set the long-term goals based on Status for federal reporting purposes.</p>	None
<p>College/Career Indicator Incorporate Grade 11 SBAC results into the Academic Achievement indicator for ELA and math, and retain Grade 11 SBAC results in the CCI, which will be an indicator of student success.</p>	Only if SBE elects to include Grade 11 SBAC as state indicator for 2018 Dashboard
<p>English Language Proficiency Indicator Modify the English language proficiency indicator to be based solely on progress on the annual assessments (i.e., remove reclassified students and weighting factor for LTELs).</p>	The SBE has the option of seeking a waiver on this issue. If a waiver is not sought, the SBE may elect to modify the indicator on Dashboard
<p>Weighting of indicators For federal reporting purposes, update language to reflect reporting of Status and Change as distinct indicators and inclusion of Grade 11 assessment results.</p>	None
<p>School identification –See p. 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish performance criteria based on Dashboard colors using both Status and Change to identify at least the lowest 5% performing Title I schools for comprehensive support. • Identify high schools with an average graduation rate below 67% over three years for comprehensive support. • Identify schools for targeted support if they have a student group that meets criteria for lowest performing Title I schools for three out of four consecutive years. 	None
<p>Exit Criteria Clarify that schools meet the exit criteria from federal identification only if their Status has improved on the relevant indicators.</p>	None
<p>Measurements of interim progress – See p. 4 For Academic Achievement, Graduation Rate, and English Learner Progress, report for all students and student groups the average annual progress needed to meet the long-term goal and approximate Status on the indicator at the mid-point if on track to meet the goal.</p>	None
<p>N-size</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe the ongoing support and programmatic oversight provided to small schools with student populations too small to calculate a color-coded performance levels for any indicators on the Dashboard. • Remove reference to the alternative school model, which is under development and subject to final SBE action. 	None

Status and Change (Long-Term Goals & Indicators). The 5x5 grid (Graduation Rate) below illustrates why the proposed revisions to these sections of the State Plan do not materially impact our accountability system or require any modifications to the Dashboard.

Table. High School Graduation Rate Indicator

Levels		Graduation Change				
		Declined Significantly Declined by greater than 5%	Declined Declined by 1% to 5%	Maintained Declined or increased by less than 1%	Increased Increased by 1% to 5%	Increased Significantly Increased by 5% or greater
Graduation Status	Very High 95% or more	N/A	39 (2.9%) Blue	203 (14.9%) Blue	224 (16.4%) Blue	54 (4.0%) Blue
	High 90% to less than 95%	5 (0.4%) Orange	65 (4.8%) Yellow	71 (5.2%) Green	142 (10.4%) Green	71 (5.2%) Blue
	Medium 85% to less than 90%	6 (0.4%) Orange	29 (2.1%) Orange	28 (2.1%) Yellow	55 (4.0%) Green	46 (3.4%) Green
	Low 67% to less than 85%	28 (2.1%) Red	33 (2.4%) Orange	21 (1.5%) Orange	52 (3.8%) Yellow	70 (5.1%) Yellow
	Very Low Less than 67%	34 (2.5%) Red	24 (1.8%) Red	10 (0.7%) Red	20 (1.5%) Red	34 (2.5%) Red

The 5x5 grid above has identical cut-scores for Status and Change and identical colors for the cells as the 5x5 approved by the SBE as part of the Dashboard. That grid is still the basis for reporting school performance under the proposed revisions to the ESSA plan:

- Under the proposed revisions to the ESSA plan, the Status axis (vertical axis) is the required graduation rate indicator for federal reporting purposes.
- The Change axis (horizontal axis) is an additional indicator; in this example a measure of student success.
- The cut scores for Status and Change are unaltered.
- The two “indicators” combine to yield a color-coded performance level within the 5x5 grid, which is reported on the Dashboard along with the specific data for Status and Change.
- The color-coded performance level produced by combining Status and Change is used to differentiate performance in the school identification process.
- Identification of schools is **NOT** based on Status only.
- The long-term goal is set relative to Status, with the goal of achieving the High status (graduation rate 90% or higher). Under the prior version, the goal was to reach the cell for High (Status)/Maintained (Change), which required being in the High or Very High Status to meet the goal).

School identification. California’s proposed plan will use performance on the Dashboard (using the color-coded performance levels on Dashboard indicators that include Status and Change) to determine which schools receive additional support.

- Comprehensive Support. Prior SBE discussions centered on how to align school-level identification under ESSA with LEA assistance under the LCFF.
 - Some SBE members had argued that our LEA identification, which encompasses nearly 50% of Title I school statewide, more than meets ESSA’s school identification requirements.
- ED, however, interpreted the relevant statutory provision to require states to identify individual schools based on specific performance criteria.
 - As a result, identification of LEAs for support cannot itself address these requirements.
- To meet ED’s interpretation of the provisions, the revised State Plan proposes to use the color-coded performance levels on Dashboard indicators to identify at least the lowest performing 5 percent of Title I schools statewide.
- The proposed selection process is a criterion-based approach (specified performance levels lead to selection).
 - This criterion-based approach is similar to the approach under LCFF, where LEAs are identified for assistance if they meet SBE-adopted criteria based on Dashboard indicators.
 - One critique of these ESSA provisions is the “arbitrary” 5% number. The proposed criteria will likely lead to slight over-selection (data simulations show roughly 6.2% of Title I schools would be selected).
- This can be implemented in a meaningful manner within the existing LCAP process by pointing LEAs to schools that require extra support *from the LEA* based on objective performance criteria, rather than some arbitrary ranking of performance.
 - It will allow California to maintain the LEA as the locus of responsibility for improvement in how we implement ESSA’s school improvement provisions.
 - It will also ensure that the school planning process is not a burdensome compliance exercise; LEAs should already be considering the needs of very low performing schools within the LCAP process.
- Targeted Support. The proposed revisions also include modifying the criteria for targeted support (student group) so that a school is not identified unless the student group meets the specified criteria in three out of four consecutive years.
 - At the January 2018 meeting, SBE members were concerned about data simulations showing the more than 3000 schools would meet the criteria that were initially proposed.
 - The revisions will help focus this identification only on schools with persistent student group performance challenges.
 - The three-out-of-four-year timeline aligns with an existing timeline under LCFF for LEA assistance and/or intervention.

Measurements of interim progress. The table below (Graduation Rate) with the two new highlighted columns illustrates why the proposed revisions to these sections of the State Plan do not materially impact our accountability system or require any modifications to the Dashboard. This is the same table included in Attachment 2 of the March 2018 ESSA item on pages 40-41

(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/mar18item04a2.docx>), which shows the proposed measurements of interim progress.

Table. State Level Graduation Rate by Student Group

Student Group	Grade Rate (Status)	Change	Color	Average Annual Improvement to Meet Goal	Approximate Status After Year 3
All Students	88.4	1.7	Green	0.2%	89.0
American Indian	82.9	0.6	Orange	1.0%	85.9
Asian	94.1	0.6	Green	Increased from Baseline	94.2
Black or African American	81.5	3.1	Yellow	1.2%	85.1
Filipino	94.7	1.2	Green	Increased from Baseline	94.8
Hispanic or Latino	86.3	2.6	Green	0.5%	87.8
Pacific Islander	88.8	2.9	Green	0.2%	89.4
Two or More Races	90.6	0.6	Green	Increased from Baseline	90.7
White	92.0	0.5	Green	Increased from Baseline	92.1
English Learner	77.7	5.5	Yellow	1.8%	83.1
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	85.3	2.5	Green	0.7%	87.4
Students with Disabilities	69.0	2.3	Yellow	3.0%	78.0

The table displays statewide baseline data for all students and each student group, the approximate annual improvement necessary over the seven-year period for each student group to meet the long-term goal, and an estimated status at the mid-way point if on track to reach the goal (which is 90% for graduation rate).

- The two highlighted columns are the only new information included in the proposed revisions, compared to the revised plan that the SBE approved for resubmission at its January 2018 meeting (see Attachment 3 of the January 2018 ESSA item on page 39: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/jan18item05a3.docx>).
- Those two new columns reflect arithmetic using information already included in the State Plan: for the first, subtracting the Status column from the long-term goal (in this case 90% for graduation rate) and dividing by 7; for the second, multiplying the first new column by 3 and adding it to the Status.
- The measurements of interim progress are **NOT** relevant to whether a school is in the overall lowest 5 percent of performance statewide.
- Since its enactment, ESSA has required states to ensure that LEAs produce annual LEA report cards that show specified information, including the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for all students and student groups. ESSA, Section 1111(h)(2).
- The LEA report card is simply a reporting requirement: it must be posted on a website. The measurements of interim progress can reported using the same arithmetic used to create the table above.