

BERKELEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

TO: Donald Evans, Ed.D, Superintendent
FROM: Pasquale Scuderi, Assistant Superintendent, Ed Services
DATE: February 22, 2017
SUBJECT: California Accountability Model and School Dashboard System

Background

In 2013, Governor Brown signed the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) into law, along with a new accountability system based on two principles: (1) provide resources more equitably to students with learning and socio-economic barriers, and (2) provide greater flexibility for educators to serve and respond to their students' needs. LCFF required the State Board of Education (SBE) to develop an accountability tool known as the Evaluation Rubrics. The Evaluation Rubrics must include a concise set of state and local indicators that reflect performance on the LCFF priorities and performance standards for each indicator to assist local educational agencies (LEAs) and schools in identifying their strengths, weaknesses, and areas in need of improvement.

In 2015, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) was signed into federal law, and replaced the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. One of the requirements under this new law is for states to have a new multiple measures accountability system in effect by the 2017-18 school year based on the following five areas: (1) achievement as measured by proficiency based on annual state assessments, (2) four-year cohort graduation rates for high schools, (3) another academic indicator for elementary and middle schools (e.g. growth measure), progress in English language proficiency for EL's and (5) at least one other indicator of school quality or student success that is valid, reliable, comparable and statewide (e.g. postsecondary readiness or student engagement).

Rather than developing two accountability systems, the system has been designed to meet the state requirements of LCFF and the federal requirements of Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). California's new integrated accountability system provides a more complete picture of how schools are meeting the needs of the students. The new system measures school and district progress using multiple measures that contribute to a quality education, including high school graduation rates, career/college preparedness, student assessment results in English language arts/literacy (ELA) and mathematics, English Learner (EL) progress, suspension rates, parent engagement, and school climate.

The components of the new Evaluation Rubrics will be reported to the public through the California School Dashboard (i.e., Dashboard), which is

a new Web site that educators and the public can use to see how LEAs and schools are meeting the needs of California’s diverse student population. State Indicators were established using the following criteria: (1) being valid and reliable measures, (2) having comparable, state-level data, and (3) the ability to disaggregate data by student groups. These criteria ensure a common and comparable way of measuring performance on the indicators across the state. The indicators apply to all local education agencies, schools and student groups (e.g. race/ethnicity, socioeconomically disadvantaged, EL’s and students with disabilities, with progress being reported on the Dashboard. These performance standards will be used to support LEAs in identifying strengths, weaknesses, and areas for improvement; to assist in determining whether LEAs are eligible for assistance; and to assist the State Superintendent of Public Instruction in determining whether LEAs are eligible for more intensive state support/intervention.

State and Local Indicators Listed by Priority Area

Priority Areas	State Indicator	Local Indicator
Priority 1: Basic Services Or Basic Condition at schools	N/A	Text books availability, adequate facilities, and correctly assigned teachers
Priority 2: Implementation Of State Academic Standards	N/A	Annually report on progress in implementing the standards for all content areas
Priority 3: Parent Engagement	N/A	Annually report progress toward: (1) seeking input from parents/guardians in decision making; and (2) promoting parental participation in programs
Priority 4: Student Achievement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Indicator (Grades 3-8) • English Learners Progress Indicator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade 11 Distance from Level 3 Report
Priority 5: Student Engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graduation Rate Indicator • Chronic Absenteeism Indicator (not available until fall 2018) 	N/A

Priority 6: School Climate	Suspension Rate Indicator	Administer a Local Climate Survey every other year
Priority 7: Access to a Broad Course of Study	N/A	College/Career Indicator (A local indicator for the initial release of the Dashboard)
Priority 8: Outcomes in a Broad Course of Study	N/A	College/Career Indicator (A local indicator for the initial release of the Dashboard)
Priority 9: (COEs only) Coordination of Services for Expelled Students		Annual survey that measures progress in coordinating instruction for expelled students
Priority 10: (COEs Only) Coordination of Services for Foster Youth		Annual survey that measures progress in coordinating services for foster youth

The State Indicators:

- Chronic Absence
- Suspension Rate
- English Learner Progress Indicator
- Graduation Rate
- College/Career Indicator
- Academic Indicator (ELA and mathematics assessments)

The Local Indicators:

- Basic Conditions
- Implementation of Academic Standards
- School Climate
- Parent Engagement

Methodology for Measuring Performance

The SBE approved a way to measure performance for state indicators as a combination of current performance (Status) and improvement over time (Change), resulting in five color-coded performance levels for each indicator.

The adopted methodology, known as the “California Model” uses:

- Five levels of current performance, called **Status levels**, which range from “Very High” to “Very Low.” Status is based on the most current year performance data.
- Five levels of change in performance, called **Change levels**, which range from “Increased Significantly” to “Declined Significantly.” Change is based on a weighted average of multiple years of prior data, when available.
- Five color-coded **performance levels**, which are established using a five-by-five color table that combines the five Status levels and five Change levels. The model provides equal weight to both Status and Change. From lowest to highest the performance levels are: Red, Orange, Yellow, Green, and Blue.

The approved performance levels serve as the **performance standards** for the state indicators. The performance standards were based on the current distribution of Status and Change for each indicator (much like grading on a curve). Therefore, the performance standards vary by indicator and will generally remain fixed for several years, until the SBE decides to update the standards.

LEAs, schools, and student groups will be assigned a performance level annually for each state indicator that applies. By statute, LEAs, schools, and student groups do not receive performance levels if there are fewer than 30 students (15 students for foster youth and homeless for LEAs) with performance data for any indicator. The student groups that must be included in the accountability system are:

- English Learner
- Socioeconomically Disadvantaged
- Foster Youth
- Homeless
- Students with Disabilities
- Race/ethnic groups, include:
 - American Indian/Alaskan Native
 - Asian
 - Black/African-American
 - Filipino
 - Hispanic/Latino
 - Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
 - Two or more races
 - White

LEA, school, and student group performance levels are determined annually based on the most recent year of data available to determine Status and up to three prior years of data, if available, to determine Change.

Table 1 provides an example of how the five-by-five color table can be used to identify the performance level for an LEA, school, or student group. In this example, a “High” **Status** and an “Increased” **Change** results in an overall performance category of **Green**.

Table 1. Example Five-by-Five Colored Table

		Change				
		Declined Significantly	Declined	Maintained	Increased	Increased Significantly
Status	Very High	Yellow	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue
	High	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green	Blue
	Medium	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green
	Low	Red	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Yellow
	Very Low	Red	Red	Red	Orange	Yellow

Chronic Absence

The SBE has not yet approved performance standards for Chronic Absence. State data on chronic absence will be available for the first time in fall 2017.

Suspension Rate

Definition. The suspension rate calculations are based on the unduplicated number of students suspended in an academic year. The formula to calculate suspension rate is:

$$\frac{\text{The Number of Students Suspended}}{\text{The Cumulative Enrollment Multiplied by 100}}$$

Years of Data Used to Establish Performance Standards. As shown in Table 2, the SBE approved performance standards for Suspension Rate based on 2014–15 suspension rates for Status and Change is based on the difference between Status and the prior year (2013–14).

Table 2. Data Used for Setting Performance Standards for Suspension Rate

Levels	Suspension Data Used
Status	2014–15 suspension rate
Change	Status (2014–15 suspension rate) <i>minus</i> 2013–14 suspension rate

Performance Standards. Suspension data varies widely among LEA type (elementary, high, and unified) and school type (elementary, middle, and high). For example, suspension rates were higher at the middle school level than the elementary school level. Therefore, rather than a single set of performance levels, there are different performance levels for both LEAs and schools, based on their type. This resulted in six different sets of performance levels: (1) three sets based on LEA type distributions and (2) three sets based on school type distributions.

Another difference between this indicator and the other state indicators is that the goal is reversed. For the other state indicators (except chronic absence), the desired outcome and goal is to achieve a high percent in “Status” and “Change.” For Suspension Rate, the desired outcome and goal is to have a low suspension rate and, thus, a low percent for “Status” and negative percentage/decline for “Change.”

Table 3. Elementary School District

		Suspension Change				
Suspension Status	Level	Increased Significantly by greater than 2.0%	Increased by 0.3% to 2.0%	Maintained Declined or increased by less than 0.3%	Declined by 0.3% to less than 2.0%	Declined Significantly by 2.0% or greater
	Very Low 0.5% or less	N/A	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue
	Low Greater than 0.5% to 1.5%	N/A	Yellow	Green	Green	Blue
	Medium Greater than 1.5% to 3.0%	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green
	High Greater than 3.0% to 6.0%	Red	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Yellow
	Very High Greater than 6.0%	Red	Red	Red	Orange	Yellow

*Gray colored cell = Not Applicable

Table 4. High School District

		Suspension Change				
Suspension Status	Level	Increased Significantly by greater than 3.0%	Increased by 0.5% to 3.0%	Maintained Declined or increased by less than 0.5%	Declined by 0.5% to less than 3.0%	Declined Significantly by 3.0% or greater
	Very Low 1.5% or less	N/A	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue
	Low Greater than 1.5% to 3.5%	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green	Blue
	Medium Greater than 3.5% to 6.0%	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green
	High Greater than 6.0% to 9.0%	Red	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Yellow
	Very High Greater than 9.0%	Red	Red	Red	Orange	Yellow

Table 5. Unified School District

		Suspension Change				
Suspension Status	Level	Increased Significantly by greater than 2.0%	Increased by 0.3% to 2.0%	Maintained Declined or increased by less than 0.3%	Declined by 0.3% to less than 2.0%	Declined Significantly by 2.0% or greater
	Very Low 1.0% or less	N/A	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue
	Low Greater than 1.0% to 2.5%	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green	Blue
	Medium Greater than 2.5% to 4.5%	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green
	High Greater than 4.5% to 8.0%	Red	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Yellow
	Very High Greater than 8.0%	Red	Red	Red	Orange	Yellow

Table 6. Elementary School

		Suspension Change				
Suspension Status	Level	Increased Significantly by greater than 2.0%	Increased by 0.3% to 2.0%	Maintained Declined or increased by less than 0.3%	Declined by 0.3% to less than 1.0%	Declined Significantly by 1.0% or greater
	Very Low 0.5% or less	N/A	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue
	Low Greater than 0.5% to 1.0%	N/A	Yellow	Green	Green	Blue
	Medium Greater than 1.0% to 3.0%	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green
	High Greater than 3.0% to 6.0%	Red	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Yellow
	Very High Greater than 6.0%	Red	Red	Red	Orange	Yellow

Table 7. Middle School

		Suspension Change				
Suspension Status	Level	Increased Significantly by greater than 4.0%	Increased by 0.3% to 4.0%	Maintained Declined or increased by less than 0.3%	Declined by 0.3% to less than 3.0%	Declined Significantly by 3.0% or greater
	Very Low 0.5% or less	N/A	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue
	Low Greater than 0.5% to 2.0%	N/A	Yellow	Green	Green	Blue
	Medium Greater than 2.0% to 8.0%	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green
	High Greater than 8.0% to 12.0%	Red	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Yellow
	Very High Greater than 12.0%	Red	Red	Red	Orange	Yellow

Table 8. High School

		Suspension Change				
Suspension Status	Level	Increased Significantly by greater than 3.0%	Increased by 0.3% to 3.0%	Maintained Declined or increased by less than 0.3%	Declined by 0.3% to less than 2.0%	Declined Significantly by 2.0% or greater
	Very Low 0.5% or less	N/A	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue
	Low Greater than 0.5% to 1.5%	N/A	Yellow	Green	Green	Blue
	Medium Greater than 1.5% to 6.0%	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green
	High Greater than 6.0% to 10.0%	Red	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Yellow
	Very High Greater than 10.0%	Red	Red	Red	Orange	Yellow

English Learner Progress Indicator

Definition. The SBE approved an EL Progress Indicator that measures the percent of ELs who are making progress toward language proficiency. The current EL Progress Indicator combines the number of ELs who make progress from year to year on the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) and the number of ELs who were reclassified in the prior year.

The formula to calculate the EL Progress Indicator is below:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{Annual CELDT Test Takers Who Increased at least 1 CELDT Level} \\ \textbf{Plus} \\ \text{Annual CELDT Test Takers Who Maintained Early Advanced/ Advanced} \\ \text{English Proficient on the CELDT} \\ \textbf{Plus} \\ \text{ELs Who Were Reclassified in the Prior Year} \\ \textbf{Divided by} \\ \text{Total Number of Annual CELDT Test Takers in the Current Year} \\ \textbf{Plus} \\ \text{ELs Who Were Reclassified in the Prior Year} \end{array}$$

Note: The CELDT has five overall performance levels: Beginning, Early Intermediate, Intermediate, Early Advanced, and Advanced. For purposes of the EL Progress Indicator, however, the Intermediate performance level is divided into two levels, Intermediate and High Intermediate, for a total of six possible levels.

ELs who advance at least one level from prior year to current year are included in the numerator of the EL Progress Indicator calculation. ELs who performed Early Advanced/Advanced English Proficient in the prior year and score Early Advanced/Advanced English Proficient in the current year will also be included in the numerator of the EL Progress Indicator calculation. ELs who were reclassified (or Reclassified Fluent English Proficient [RFEP]) in the prior year will also be included in the numerator of the EL Progress Indicator calculation.

Years of Data Used to Establish Performance Standards. As shown in Table 9, the performance standards for the EL Progress Indicator uses the most current data available for Status and the difference from current year to prior year of data for Change.

Table 9. Data Used for Setting Performance Standards for EL Progress Indicator

Levels	EL Progress Indicator Data Used
Status	<p>Annual CELDT Test Takers Who Increased at least 1 CELDT Level Between the 2014 and 2015 CELDT <i>plus</i></p> <p>Annual CELDT Test Takers Who Maintained Early Advanced/Advanced English Proficient Between the 2014 and 2015 CELDT <i>plus</i></p> <p>ELs Who Were Reclassified in 2013–14</p> <p>divided by</p> <p>Total Number of 2015 Annual CELDT Test Takers <i>plus</i> ELs Who Were Reclassified in 2013–14</p>
Change	Difference in Status from Current Year to Prior Year

Performance Standards. The performance standards for this indicator are shown in Table 10. The performance standards are based on the statewide distribution of LEA performance.

Table 10. English Learner Progress Indicator Performance Standards

English Learner Progress Change (Change in Percent Progressing and Reclassified)

Level	Declined Significantly	Declined	Maintained	Increased	Increased Significantly
	by greater than 10.0%	by 1.5% to 10.0%	Declined or increased by less than 1.5%	by 1.5% to less than 10.0%	by 10.0% or greater
Very High 85.0% or greater	Yellow	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue
High 75.0% to less than 85.0%	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green	Blue
Medium 67.0% to less than 75.0%	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green
Low 60.0% to less than 67.0%	Red	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Yellow
Very Low Less than 60.0%	Red	Red	Red	Orange	Yellow

English Learner Progress Status
(Percent Progressing Plus Reclassified)

Graduation Rate

Definition. The Graduation Rate Indicator is based on the four-year cohort graduation rate. It applies only to LEAs and schools that have 30 or more students in the four-year graduation cohort. A graduation cohort is a group of high school students who could potentially graduate during a four-year time period (grade nine through grade twelve).

The formula to calculate the four-year graduation cohort for the class of 2015 is below:

Number of students who earn a regular high school diploma by the end of
2014–15 cohort

Divided by

Number of first-time grade nine students in 2011–12 plus students who
transfer in,
minus students who transfer out, emigrate, or die during school years
2011–12, 2012–13, 2013–14, and 2014–15.

Students who earn a Special Education Certificate of Completion or a general equivalency diploma are not counted as high school graduates but are included in the denominator.

Years of Data Used to Establish Performance Standards. The performance standards for Graduation Rate, based on the Class of 2015 cohort rate for Status, and a weighted average for the Class of 2012, 2013 and 2014 cohort rates for Change.

Performance Standards. The performance standards for this indicator are shown in Table 11. The performance standards are based on the statewide distribution of LEA performance.

Table 11. Graduation Rate Performance Standards

		Graduation Rate Change				
Level		Declined Significantly by greater than 5.0%	Declined by 1.0% to 5.0%	Maintained Declined or increased by less than 1.0%	Increased by 1.0% to less than 5.0%	Increased Significantly by 5.0% or greater
Graduation Rate Status	Very High 95.0% or greater	N/A	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue
	High 90.0% to less than 95.0%	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green	Blue
	Medium 85.0% to less than 90.0%	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green
	Low 67.0% to less than 85.0%	Red	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Yellow
	Very Low Less than 67.0%	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red

*Gray colored cell = Not Applicable

College/Career Indicator

Definition. The SBE approved a College/Career Indicator (CCI) model, which is shown in Table 12. LEA, school, and student group performance on the CCI is measured as the percentage of graduates in the four-year graduation cohort who are “Prepared,” “Approaching Prepared,” and “Not Prepared.”

The model includes four levels of readiness, but only three levels are currently defined, due to the absence of valid and reliable career criteria for the “Well Prepared” performance level. The criteria for the “Well Prepared” performance level will be developed when additional data on career readiness becomes available.

Table 12. College/Career Indicator Model

All students in the four-year graduation cohort minus students who take the California Alternate Assessment.

WELL PREPARED – To Be Determined
The College/Career Indicator (CCI) measures for “Well Prepared” will be determined following further review of potential state and local CCI measures as statewide data becomes available. ¹ California Department of Education staff, with input from education researchers, practitioners, and stakeholders, will evaluate the CCI model through the first phase of the Local Control Funding Formula Dashboard and will propose a revised CCI model for implementation in 2017–18.
PREPARED Does the graduate meet at least 1 measure below?
High School Diploma and any one of the following: A. Career Technical Education (CTE) Pathway Completion plus one of the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments: At least a Level 3 “Standard Met” on English language arts/literacy (ELA) or Mathematics and at least a Level 2 “Standard Nearly Met” in the other subject area - One semester/two quarters of Dual Enrollment with passing grade (Academic/CTE subjects) B. At least a Level 3 “Standard Met” on both ELA and Mathematics on Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments C. Completion of two semesters/three quarters of Dual Enrollment with a passing grade (Academic and/or CTE subjects) D. Passing Score on two Advanced Placement (AP) Exams or two International Baccalaureate (IB) Exams E. Completion of courses that meet the University of California (UC) a-g criteria plus one of the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CTE Pathway completion - Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments: At least a Level 3 “Standard Met” on ELA or Mathematics and at least a Level 2 “Standard Nearly Met” in the other subject area - One semester/two quarters of Dual Enrollment with passing grade (Academic/CTE subjects) - Passing score on one AP Exam OR on one IB Exam
APPROACHING PREPARED Does the graduate meet at least 1 measure below?
High School Diploma and any one of the following: A. CTE Pathway completion B. Scored at least Level 2 “Standard Nearly Met” on one or both ELA and Mathematics Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments C. Completion of one semester/two quarters of Dual Enrollment with passing grade (Academic/CTE subjects) D. Completion of courses that meet the UC a-g criteria
NOT PREPARED Student did not meet any measures above, so considered NOT PREPARED

¹Future Local and State CCI Measures

Note: The following measures will be explored as statewide data becomes available:

- Articulated CTE Pathway
- Work Experience/Career Internship
- AP/IB Career Program

Further Exploration on the following:

- Course Information
- Industry Certificate
- Additional career related data elements (e.g., Career Pathways Trust and CTE Incentive Grant)

- State Seal of Biliiteracy
- Golden State Seal Merit Diploma
- Pilot career ready assessments (i.e., National Occupational Competency Testing Institute)

Years of Data Used to Establish Performance Standards. Data for the initial cohort of graduates who took the grade eleven Smarter Balanced assessments (the 2015–16 cohort) will be available in Spring 2017. Accordingly, the first year of performance data based on the approved CCI model will be incorporated into the Dashboard for the fall 2017 release of performance data.

Performance Standards. There will be only one year of data available in fall 2017, so LEA, school, and student group performance will be calculated based on “Status” only for Fall 2017. Accordingly, the SBE approved an initial set of performance standards that is based on Status only, as shown in Table 13 below.

Table 13. College/Career Indicator Performance Standards

College/Career Indicator: Status Only Cut Scores

Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Very High
Less than 10.0%	10.0% to less than 25.0%	25.0% to less than 45.0%	45.0% to less than 60.0%	60.0% or greater

When the second year of CCI data that include Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment results becomes available in 2018, the SBE will update the performance standards to include both Status and Change.

Additionally, the SBE may adjust the performance standards prior to Fall 2017 based on the initial year of CCI data based on Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment results because the simulations used to establish the performance standards do not reflect performance based on the approved measures in the CCI model. The most current graduation cohort data file available for the data simulations was the 2013–14 cohort. Those students had the *option* of taking the Early Assessment Program (EAP), which was based on the former Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program, in Spring 2013.

There are two key differences between the former EAP and the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments. First, the Smarter Balanced Summative assessments are aligned to the new Common Core State Standards and is therefore more rigorous than the former STAR Program. Second, all grade eleven students take the Smarter Balanced assessments, while participation in the EAP under the STAR Program was optional. Simulations,

nonetheless, provided the most accurate baseline from which to establish performance standards, based on currently available information.

The approved performance standards are not based on the exact criteria in the approved CCI model. Although these standards provide the most accurate baseline for LEAs to use as they become familiar with the new measure, given the data limitations, LEAs should be aware of those limitations and consider locally available data as they assess how they are likely to perform when the state data for the approved CCI model are released in Fall 2017.

Academic Indicator

Definition. The Academic Indicator measures student progress on statewide assessments using the scale score for all students in grades three through eight with valid scores.

California's new assessment system uses vertically aligned scale scores. Students who take the assessment receive a scale score, which falls between the lowest and highest scores available on the scale for that grade level. Vertical alignment is the practice of placing all of the possible test scores on a common scale across grade levels. This provides a basis for describing individual student progress over time, setting goals, and ultimately determining whether students are on track for college and career readiness.

The Academic Indicator is based on the average Distance from Level 3 on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment results for ELA and mathematics. For example, if one student is 20 points below the lowest possible scale score that receives Level 3, and a second student is 30 points above the lowest possible scale scores that receives Level 3, the average Distance from Level 3 would be 5 points above Level 3 (i.e., $-20 + 30 = 10$ divided by 2 equals 5).

For the initial phase of the Dashboard, the Academic Indicator includes results only for the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment results for ELA and mathematics. The Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) assessment will have its first operational administration no earlier than spring 2018. The SBE will consider the options for incorporating the NGSS assessment results into the Academic Indicator in the future.

Performance will be calculated and reported separately for each assessment, including the NGSS assessment when it becomes available. However, performance on each of the assessments is considered together when determining overall performance on the Academic Indicator.

Years of Data Used to Establish Performance Standards. Only two years of Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment results for ELA and mathematics are available. The performance standards are based on the 2016 results as Status and the difference between 2016 results and the 2015 results as Change.

Additionally, staff are reviewing options for incorporating a measure of student growth as the “Change” component of performance on ELA and mathematics by fall 2018. The performance standards may be updated at that time, as appropriate.

Performance Standards. The performance standards for this indicator are shown in Tables 14 and 15. The performance standards are based on the statewide distribution of LEA performance.

Table 14. ELA Academic Indicator Performance Standards

		Change in Average Distance from Level 3				
Level		Declined Significantly by more than 15 points	Declined by 1 to 15 Points	Maintained Declined by less than 1 point or increased by less than 7 points	Increased by 7 to less than 20 points	Increased Significantly by 20 points or more
Average Distance from Level 3	Very High 45 or more points above	Yellow	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue
	High 10 points above to less than 45 points above	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green	Blue
	Medium 5 points below to less than 10 points above	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green
	Low More than 5 points below to 70 points below	Red	Orange	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
	Very Low More than 70 points below	Red	Red	Red	Orange	Yellow

Table 15. Math Academic Indicator Performance Standards

		Average Distance from Level 3				
Level		Declined Significantly by more than 10 points	Declined by 1 to 10 Points	Maintained Declined by less than 1 point or increased by less than 5 points	Increased by 5 to less than 15 points	Increased Significantly by 15 points or more
Average Distance from Level 3	Very High 35 or more points above	Yellow	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue
	High 5 points below to less than 35 points above	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green	Blue
	Medium More than 5 points below to 25 points below	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green
	Low More than 25 points below to 95 points below	Red	Orange	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
	Very Low More than 95 points below	Red	Red	Red	Orange	Yellow

Definition of English Learner Student Group. For this indicator, the English Learner student group includes ELs and students who were RFEP within the past four years. The Dashboard will include a report with performance data on this indicator for ELs only and RFEPs only.

Local Performance Indicators:

A) Methodology for Measuring Performance

The SBE approved standards for the local performance indicators that support LEAs in measuring and reporting their progress within the relevant LCFF priority. For each local performance indicator, the approved standard involves:

- (1) measuring LEA progress on the local performance indicator based on locally available information, and
- (2) reporting the results to the LEA's local governing board at a regularly scheduled meeting of the local governing board and to stakeholders and the public through the Dashboard.

LEAs determine whether they have [*Met, Not Met, or Not Met for More than Two Years*] the standard for each applicable local performance indicator. LEAs make this determination by using self-reflection tools included in the Dashboard, which will allow them to measure and report their progress through the Dashboard user interface. LEAs will collect and reflect on locally available information relevant to progress on that LCFF priority, which will support local planning and improvement efforts.

B) Approved Performance Standards

The SBE approved performance standards for all local performance indicators. The approved standards are below.

Appropriately Assigned Teachers, Access to Curriculum-Aligned Instructional Materials, and Safe, Clean and Functional School Facilities (Priority 1)

Standard: LEA annually measures its progress in meeting the *Williams* settlement requirements at 100 percent 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 at a regularly scheduled meeting of the local governing board and to stakeholders and the public through the Dashboard.

Implementation of State Academic Standards (Priority 2)

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 Dashboard.

Parent Engagement (Priority 3)

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 Dashboard.

School Climate (Priority 6)

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 Dashboard.

Coordination of Services for Expelled Students – County Office of Education (COE) Only (Priority 9)

Standard: COE annually measures its progress in coordinating instruction as required by California *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 Dashboard.

Coordination of Services for Foster Youth – COE Only (Priority 10)

Standard: COE annually measures its progress in coordinating services for foster youth and reports the results to its local governing board at a regularly scheduled meeting of the local governing board and to stakeholders and the public through the Dashboard.

DISTRICT GOAL

Accountability

FISCAL IMPACT

N/A