Proposed Standards for Graduation Rate, Scores on the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress, Suspension Rates, Progress of English Learners Toward English Proficiency, and College and Career Readiness

At the May 2016 State Board of Education (SBE) meeting, the Board approved the methodology for calculating performance for state indicators within California's accountability and continuous improvement system. The adopted methodology uses equally weighted percentile cut scores for status and change to determine a performance category for each state indicator. It applies to all local educational agencies (LEAs), including charter schools and county offices of education, and to individual school sites, as required by federal law, and presents performance data disaggregated by student subgroups.

This methodology will support local improvement efforts, in conjunction with the annual Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) and Annual Update process, by providing clear and transparent information for decision makers and stakeholders. The performance categories will assist county superintendents, the Superintendent of Public Instruction/California Department of Education and/or the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence in determining which LEAs and schools are eligible for assistance, support, and more intensive state intervention as provided under the Local Control Funding Formula and the federal Every Student Succeeds Act.

Methodology

"Status" is determined using the current year performance (i.e., current year graduation rate) and "Change" is the difference between performance from the current year and the prior year, or between the current year and a multi-year average (i.e., the difference between the current year graduation rate and the three-year average). To determine the percentile cut scores for "Status" for each state indicator, LEAs and schools were categorized from highest to lowest, and four cut points within the distribution were selected. These cut points created five "Status Levels" (very high, high, median, low, and very low).

For "Change" cut scores, LEAs and schools were categorized into two different distributions, one where there was positive change and one where there was negative change. Four cuts points were selected to create five "Change Levels" (improved significantly, improved, maintained, decreased, and decreased significantly). Combining the results of both "Status" and "Change" results in a "Performance Category," represented by a color (e.g., red, orange, yellow, green, or blue).

More detail about the methodology is available from materials presented at the June 22, 2016 meeting of the California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG):
* http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/cc/cp/documents/memo-cpag-jun16item01.doc;
* http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/cc/cp/documents/memo-cpag-jun16item01slides1.pdf.

State Indicators

At the May 2016 SBE meeting, the Board approved the following state indicators:

- Graduation Rate
- Academic Indicator (initially based on student test scores on English Language Arts (ELA) and Math for grades 3-8 and grade 11)
- Suspension Rate by Grade Span
- Progress of English Learners Toward Proficiency

The Board directed California Department of Education (CDE) staff to consider a composite measure for English learner progress that would include English language acquisition, reclassification rates, and long-term English learner (LTEL) rates. In addition, the Board requested that CDE staff explore options for a College and Career Indicator (CCI). CDE staff identified a composite English Learner Indicator (ELI) and CCI, which are valid and reliable and can be analyzed using the approved methodology.

English Learner Indicator (ELI). The CDE received input from the Bilingual Coordinator's Network (BCN) and the Technical Design Group (TDG) to develop the proposed ELI. The BCN and TDG support having the new accountability measure hold LEAs and schools accountable for moving students up one performance level each year on the English language test. Additionally, the BCN and TDG support dividing the current language test into six performance levels (instead of the five levels) for accountability purposes only. Using six performance levels acknowledges the substantial growth students make due to the large range of scores in the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) intermediate level. When the new English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) becomes operational, the ELI will continue to have six performance levels using scale scores, if deemed appropriate. Because this approach works for both the CELDT and the ELPAC, it will support continuity for accountability purposes as the state shifts from using the CELDT to the ELPAC in 2018-19.

The TDG also recommended the incorporation of reclassification rates in the proposed ELI, and limit LTEL data to the LEA level, when the data becomes available. (Note: In 2015, legislation substantially changed the definition of LTEL. Therefore, the 2015–16 LTEL data is not comparable to the prior two years of data.) The CDE, in partnership with the California Comprehensive Center at WestEd, will convene a work group of experts to discuss options for reporting this data for accountability purposes.

College and Career Readiness. In 2014, in response to legislation that required additional indicators be included to the Academic Performance Index (API), the CDE began discussions of various measures to incorporate in a CCI with the TDG and the Public Schools Accountability Act (PSAA) Advisory Committee. Based on CDE simulations, it was determined that a single universal measure was not adequate to determine if students were ready for postsecondary success in a manner that fairly compares all schools and still allows students to pursue various options. As a result, the

PSAA Advisory Committee and the TDG recommended that the CCI should contain multiple measures.

To assist in determining which measures to include in the CCI, in 2014 the CDE held one statewide Webinar and six regional meetings. Approximately 500 people attended the meetings and 146 attendees provided public comment. Based on the regional meeting feedback, the CDE conducted a statewide survey to obtain feedback on the CCI methodology and measures and received 1,768 responses.

Additionally, in 2014 and 2015 the CDE contracted with the Educational Policy Improvement Center (EPIC), with Dr. David Conley as the project lead, to conduct a literature review of the most valid and reliable measures for determining whether or not students were prepared for postsecondary. Dr. Conley presented six papers to the PSAA Advisory Committee and presented the final paper at the May 2015 SBE meeting (http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr15/documents/may15item10.doc). The information obtained from the literature reviews and feedback from the regional meetings and statewide survey informed the current proposed measures in the CCI, which are described below.

Proposed Performance Categories for State Indicators

The CDE conducted multiple simulations on various approaches to setting the "Status" and "Change" cut scores for each state indicator and obtained feedback from the TDG. The TDG recommended that cut scores be set separately for each indicator (i.e., each indicator will have its own unique set of cut points) to reflect the differences in performance levels among the indicators. For example, the range of graduation rates differs significantly from the range of proficiency rates on the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) mathematics assessment, which differ significantly from the range of suspension rates. The TDG also recommended using the second highest performance category (green) to serve as the state's long-term goal, a requirement in the ESSA. (Note: Because a separate accountability system is being developed for alternative schools, their data were excluded from these simulations.)

CDE staff presented the methodology and recommended cut points for "Status" and "Change" for each indicator at the California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG) meeting on June 22, 2016. The following are links to the presented materials from the CPAG agenda for each indicator:

1. Graduation Rate Indicator
   http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/cc/cp/documents/cpagjun16item02slides1rev.pdf

2. Academic Indicator
   http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/cc/cp/documents/cpagjun16item02slides3.pdf

3. English Learner Indicator
   http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/cc/cp/documents/cpagjun16item02slides4.pdf

4. Suspension Rate Indicator
   http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/cc/cp/documents/cpagjun16item02slides5.pdf

5. College and Career Indicator
   http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/cc/cp/documents/cpagjun16item02slides2revised.pdf

The CPAG was supportive of the recommended cut points for all the above indicators. The members were also supportive of the approach to calculating "Status" and "Change" for the ELI, and the inclusion of the reclassification data as part of the ELI. They also requested the incorporation of LTEL data when it becomes available, but stressed the need to revisit the cut points for "Status" and "Change" when the ELPAC becomes operational.

The CPAG supported the approach for calculating the CCI and including the CCI as a state indicator and discussed the importance of using multiple measures; however, members voiced a concern regarding the ability for special education students to demonstrate progress, specifically those with the most severe cognitive disabilities. They also recommended a review of the specific criteria for the four performance levels.

Although the CDE completed a significant amount of work on researching the proposed CCI measures, work still needs to be completed on the criteria that would set the postsecondary preparedness level for each measure.

Since the CDE will be completing additional work on the CCI, additional considerations for a grade eight indicator that assesses high school readiness will also be explored. Measures that may be reviewed include, but are not limited to, attendance, grade eight course grades in ELA or mathematics courses, or performance on grade 8 assessments in ELA and/or mathematics.

CDE staff will present the final recommended cut scores for each of the state indicators at the September 2016 Board meeting. Based on the TDG and CPAG feedback, the CDE recommends the SBE take the following action at the July 2016 Board meeting:

- Adopt the CCI as a state indicator;
- Use the CCI to establish standards for Priority 7 (Access to Board Course of Study) and Priority 8 (Outcomes in a Broad Course of Study) based on the approved methodology of calculating performance for state indicators;
- Modify the state indicator for student test scores on ELA and Math (Priority 4 – Pupil Achievement), approved at the May 2016 Board meeting, to remove the Grade 11 scores, in order to avoid double-counting those test scores in two state indicators; and
- Direct staff to prepare a recommendation for the September 2016 Board meeting on the final technical specifications for the CCI.

2016–17 College and Career Indicator Model[1]

WELL PREPARED **Does the student meet at least 1 measure below?**
• Career technical education (CTE) pathway completion with "C" or better • Scored "Ready" on both math and ELA EAP[2] • 3 or more Advanced Placement (AP) exams (score 3 or higher) • 3 or more years of dual enrollment • International Baccalaureate (IB) Diploma
PREPARED **Does the student meet at least 1 measure below?**
• A-G completion with a "C" or better plus one other CCI measure • Articulated CTE Pathway completion with "C" or better • Scored "Ready" and "Conditionally Ready" on EAP • CTE concentrator plus one year of dual enrollment • 2 years of dual enrollment • 2 AP exams (score 3 or higher) • At least 4 IB exams (score 4 or higher)
APPROACHING PREPARED **Does the student meet at least 1 measure below?**
• A-G completion with "C" or better • 1 or more non-articulated CTE pathway completion • CTE Concentrator (2 courses in the same pathway) • Scored "Conditionally Ready" on both the ELA and math EAP • Scored "Ready" and "Not Ready" on the EAP • 1 year of dual enrollment • 1 AP exam (score 3 or higher) • 2-3 IB exams (score 4 or higher)
NOT YET PREPARED **The student did not meet any of the measures above.** **The student has not yet demonstrated readiness for college and career**

---

[1] Based on student data from the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) four-year graduation cohort (i.e., original ninth grade class plus data from CSAC)

[2] "Ready" requires a SBAC Score of 4/Standard Exceeded. "Conditionally Ready" requires a SBAC score of 3/Standard Met. "Not Yet Ready" requires a SBAC score of 2/Standard Nearly Met.

Elements to be Added in the 2017–18 School Year
- State Seal of Biliteracy
- Golden State Seal of Merit Diploma

Elements that Need Further Data Analysis
- California Student Aid Commission (CSAC) Grade Point Average (GPA) of 3.0 or higher[3] (Prepared)
- CSAC GPA of 2.0 or higheri (Approaching Prepared)[4]
- Completing A-G courses without maintaining an average grade of C or better
- Completion of state-approved portfolio (requires development of a state approval process for well-developed instruments like student portfolio)
- Industry credential and/or career assessment

Local Elements
LEAs may possibly include local data on college and career to augment the CCI model.

7-1-16 [California Department of Education and State Board of Education]

---

[3] CSAC uses two cut points for senior GPA (which is unweighted and excludes PE, ROTC, and remedial courses): A minimum 3.00 high school GPA is required for Cal Grant A; a minimum 2.00 GPA is required for Cal Grant B.
[4] CSAC uses two cut points for senior GPA (which is unweighted and excludes PE, ROTC, and remedial courses): A minimum 3.00 high school GPA is required for Cal Grant A; a minimum 2.00 GPA is required for Cal Grant B.