Background

The use of data enhances the district's ability to create a culture of accountability, focus, and coherence, with clear and intentional expectations of learning among all stakeholders. In order to accomplish this, we must review data in a way that challenges assumptions and beliefs, to change behaviors and practices that stifle student success. Strategic use of data to influence behavior and practice requires specific organization and narration of the data that is digestible, specific, and intentional.

Staff will present achievement and climate data to the board and community four times this year (labeled Quarter 1, Quarter 2, Quarter 3, and Quarter 4). Staff will also distinguish the data to be presented as Lag or Lead metrics. Lag metrics are indicators of an outcome – a measure of what *has happened*. Lead metrics are levers that influence *how* the outcome will be achieved. They are oriented in the present, predictive and provide evidence of the impact of strategies implemented by School and District Leadership Teams during the course of the school year. Please note that this is the pilot year of organizing data in this manner, and we hope to learn and improve this process to build the shared culture of accountability, focus, coherence, and clear and intentional expectations of learning.

Tonight's presentation will focus on the lead data from Quarter 3, all of which has been collected since the beginning of the 2017-18 school year. The data include measures of student academic achievement for LCAP goals 1 and 2, such as the district's FASTbridge universal literacy screening assessments for elementary grades and the rates of non-passing grades (Ds, Fs) among students in secondary math courses. It will also include some preliminary results and participation rates in the district's interim assessments for English Language Arts/English Language Development and Math in all grades. The LCAP goal 3 will be reflected through measures of student engagement, including student attendance data and suspension rates since the beginning of the school year.

The presentation will identify why these lead data metrics were chosen, based on Simon Sinek's "Golden Circle" model; how they are being used by school and district leaders to identify successes and challenges; and what promising practices school and district staff have identified as contributing to successes as well as what is being done to address the challenges. The data is disaggregated by the significant student groups of reported race, socioeconomic status, English Learners, and students with disabilities.

Goal 1 and 2 Data Review Findings

Review of the lead indicators for Goals 1 and 2 by principals and the District Leadership Team (DLT) revealed the following areas of growth:
- An improved performance on aReading for all race/ethnicity sub-groups
- A significant decrease in Special Education students at "high risk" on aReading
- A decrease in Ds and Fs across all groups and courses in math

The data review also revealed the following areas of need:
- An increase in the percentage of Kindergarten students at "some risk" or "high risk" from fall to winter
- An increase of English Learners at "high risk" on both earlyReading and aReading

- A minimal change in the percentage of Latino and Black or African American students moving from the "high risk" category
- A significant percentage of socio-economically disadvantaged student, special education students and English Learners receiving a D or F in math

Goal 1 and 2 Promising Practices and Further Considerations

Among the promising practices that principals and DLT members noted in contributing to the successes were:

- Use of protocols to analyze evidence of student learning across all levels
- Site-based data meetings to plan instruction based on learning needs
- Interventionists providing additional targeted instruction for specific students at elementary level
- Blended learning to provide small-group targeted instruction

School and district leadership team members identified the following considerations for next steps to address challenges:

- An increased focus on ensuring access to core curriculum for English Learners and Special Education students
- An emphasis on culturally relevant content and instruction
- An increase in behavioral supports for students
- A renewed focus on strengthening relationships and improving communication with families to provide support for target students
- Providing targeted professional development in the implementation of academic-language-development strategies and differentiated instruction

Goal 1 and 2 Lead Indicator Details

The lead indicators for Goals 1 and 2 for grades K-5, are the district's universal screeners, FASTbridge earlyReading (K-1) and aReading (2-5). Originally known as FAST -- Formative Assessment System for Teachers -- these formative assessments provide teachers, literacy support staff and administrators with a snapshot of a student's literacy skills and assess the potential risk for a student falling behind grade level in reading – a situation that impacts a student's trajectory long before they get to high school. The results of these assessments drive individual interventions at each of our elementary schools and help administrators allocate additional resources.

These assessments are administered three times annually, and they provide school, district and nationally normed benchmarks for students' risk levels in fall, winter and spring. Students below the 15th percentile nationally are considered to be at "high risk." Students who score below the 40th percentile nationally are considered to be at "some risk." The earlyReading tool is administered one-on-one by teachers in Kindergarten and First Grade. It is a measure of foundational reading skills. There are multiple sub-tests that measure the components of foundational reading, such as letter naming, letter sounds, word segmenting, etc.. Four sub-tests are administered in each window, and the results are used to provide a composite score. The aReading assessment is an adaptive, online assessment that takes about 20 minutes to administer. It is very predictive of performance on state achievement tests and received the highest possible rating for validity, reliability, and diagnostic

accuracy from the National Center for Response to Intervention.

For grades 6 through 12, the lead indicator of student performance is the percentage of students at risk of failing their secondary math courses as measured by Ds and Fs on the final grading period of the fall semester. Grades are considered to be highly predictive of post-secondary success. Failing marks in math are predictive of students' likelihood of completing the UC/CSU a-g requirements as well as enrolling in AP or dual enrollment courses. Success in middle school math is the gateway to higher level math, and of particular importance for success beyond school in a world in which work requires more and more quantitative ability.

The third lead indicator for Q3 includes both the participation rates and the preliminary results of the district-wide interim assessments for English Language Arts/English Language Development and Mathematics. The purpose of the interim assessments, and the process for developing or selecting them through a collaborative effort of teachers and district support staff, is to measure student proficiency on the California standards in the sequence that is outlined in the district's curriculum guides. In time, and through ongoing feedback from teachers and analysis of results, these assessments are expected to provide teachers and schools a meaningful measure of students' understanding of the guaranteed and viable curriculum, which is vital to ensuring equity across all classrooms.

For the Winter Interims, teacher-led curriculum teams in grades 3 through 8 and grade 11 English selected to use the CAASPP Interim Assessment Blocks (IAB), part of the assessment system designed to provided teachers with feedback about students' knowledge and skills that will be assessed on the summative assessments. These assessments are provided to all school districts in California. The teacher teams reviewed the available assessments and selected those which they felt best reflected their winter curricular units. Among the advantages identified in using the CAASPP IABs were the alignment with the summative assessments, the opportunity for students to use the official secure browser for taking an assessment, and the ability to provide the same student accommodations and supports that will be available on the summative assessments.

The preliminary results of these IABs will be reported to the board. The results are reported in one of three categories: Below Standard, Near Standard, and Above Standard. The three performance levels, and the Near Standard, in particular, reflect the limited scope of the assessment. Because the assessment is designed to be administered quickly and is focused on a limited amount of content, it does not provide a definitive performance level for many students. Among the students performing Near Standard are many who will receive the Meets Standard level on the summative assessment, when more responses can provide a more accurate measure. However, teachers are able to perform an item analysis and a distractor analysis on the results to better understand their students' gaps.

The limited number of scored ELA assessments reflects the fact that the selected IABs required additional hand-scoring from teachers of constructed response items. This process is ongoing.

For grades K-2 and high school math (Algebra, Geometry and Algebra II), the teacher-led curriculum teams decided to develop their own interim assessments using items that are included in our Inspect Itembank as well as teacher-developed items. For these teams, the CAASPP IABs were determined not to provide the best measure of their content. The English teachers for grades 9 and 10 determined that the curriculum guides were not sufficiently developed to identify a common assessment and requested to defer the selection or development of an interim until next fall.

Within a system of shared accountability, teachers need to believe that the results of the assessment are representative of student learning, and these initial interim assessments require revision to meet that need. In lieu of student performance results, the participation rate will be provided as a measure of progress toward this system of shared accountability.

Goal 3 Data Review Findings

Review of the lead indicators for Goals 1 and 2 by principals and the District Leadership Team (DLT) revealed the following areas of growth:

- Increase in Satisfactory and Excellent Attendance for SED, Special Education, and EL students
- Chronic absence rate for all race/ethnicities is below the final rate posted last year
- The overall suspension rate, and the rate for most groups, is in the low category as defined by the California School Dashboard

The data review also revealed the following areas of need:

- An increase in the percentage of chronic absentees in all races/ethnicities
- Percent of chronic absentees in Special Education is still high and increased from Q2
- Suspension rate for Black/African American and Special Education students moved into Moderate category since Q2

Goal 3 Promising Practices and Further Considerations
Among the promising practices that principals and DLT members noted in contributing to the successes were:

- Attendance meetings with families occurring more regularly
- Use of existing processes to build relationships and develop a wrap around plans
- Implementation of Restorative Justice strategies and/or Responsive Classroom practices

School and district leadership team members identified the following considerations for next steps to address challenges:

- Increase positive interaction with families to set behavior expectations for school
- Review classroom design and management systems to ensure that students remain engaged
- Increase supports for teachers to address challenging behavior proactively
- Review board policy for drug-related suspensions and consider alternatives for first offense
- Additional professional development for teachers to deepen understanding and implementation of Restorative Justice

Goal 3 Lead Indicator Details

The first lead indicator for Goal 3 is student attendance; and, more specifically, absence rates. Of critical concern are those students who fall into the "Chronic Absence" category by missing ten percent or more of enrolled school days. This lead indicator was selected because attendance at school is a measure of student engagement and, for some students, can be a predictor of academic challenges.

One of the factors in school success is regular attendance. Absent students miss critical learning experiences that could help them master academic material. Consistent attendance also allows students to develop strong relationships with their peers and school staff. Students simply cannot benefit from their education if they are not in school. School absence rates are determined by dividing the total number of days absent, both excused and unexcused, by the total number of days enrolled.

The final lead indicator is the rate of student suspensions. Similar to attendance, suspensions can be a reflection of student engagement and school climate, and they can also be a red flag for student learning and performance. As with chronic absences, missing school for suspensions means that students miss critical learning experiences. The suspension rate is unique in that it likely to only increase throughout the year, as the number of students suspended is likely to grow faster than new enrollment. The rate of suspensions is determined by dividing the number of suspended students (a student with multiple suspensions is counted only once) by the cumulative number of enrolled students for the year within a group or program.

Summary

Although this is only the second reporting of the district's lead indicators, the evaluation of the data by school and district leadership teams has provided substantial insights as well as questions for further consideration. There are obvious areas of growth and challenges revealed in the data. For example, it is clear from the disaggregation of the data by student subgroup that we must provide additional support for English Learners and Special Education students. As noted, the goal is to continue to improve both student outcomes and the process for reviewing data to build a meaningful system of shared accountability, focus, coherence, and clear and intentional expectations of learning.

teachers in the work of the curriculum guides and the accompanying assessments. Without increased ownership of this work among teachers, the district will continue to struggle to provide a guaranteed, viable curriculum consistently across all classrooms. Finally, the district, with the help of the community and parents, must evaluate and address some of the forces that are driving suspensions in our schools, some of which reflect the changing culture around us.