

MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 26, 2016

TO: MEMBERS, California Practitioners Advisory Group

FROM: STAFF, California Department of Education, WestEd and State Board of Education

SUBJECT: Proposed Approaches to Determine Progress on the Local Control Funding Formula Evaluation Rubrics Local Performance Indicators

Summary of Key Issues

The purpose of this memorandum is to present the California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG) with an overview of the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) evaluation rubrics local performance indicators. The State Board of Education (SBE) took action at its September 2016 meeting to adopt the LCFF evaluation rubrics <http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr16/documents/sep16item01.doc>.

The initial phase of the evaluation rubrics includes local performance indicators for the following LCFF priorities:

- Appropriately Assigned Teachers, Access to Curriculum-Aligned Instructional Materials, and Safe, Clean and Functional School Facilities (Priority 1)
- Implementation of State Academic Standards (Priority 2)
- Parent Engagement (Priority 3)
- School Climate – Local Climate Surveys (Priority 6)
- Coordination of Services for Expelled Students – County Offices of Education (COEs) Only (Priority 9)
- Coordination of Services for Foster Youth – COEs Only (Priority 10)

Local Educational Agencies (LEA) are responsible for measuring progress on these priorities relative to performance standards and criteria adopted by the SBE. To provide evidence of progress on the local performance indicators, LEAs will be provided with options to complete self-assessment tools and/or select from a menu of local measures, and report these results to local governing boards, stakeholders and members of the public.

Following the completion of the self-assessment/local measure options and reporting of progress, LEAs will use the following criteria to assess its performance:

- Met (green)
- Not Met (orange)
- Not Met for Two or More Years (red)

Similar to the state indicators, the local performance indicators will be reported through the LCFF evaluation rubrics. For example, information on Priority 1 (availability of text books, adequate facilities and correctly assigned teachers), is already collected through the School Accountability Report Card (SARC). LEAs would use locally available information, including data reported through the SARC, to provide evidence of progress on the local performance indicator. The web-based user interface system for the evaluation rubrics is being developed based on the same data system that supports the SARC template, therefore, the rubrics system could auto-populate the necessary SARC data to report progress on Priority 1. Because LEAs have a consistent way to report data for Priority 1, this priority will not be reviewed in detail with the CPAG.

For the remaining LCFF priorities (e.g., priorities 2, 3, 6, 9, and 10), the web-based user interface system for the evaluation rubrics will provide options for LEAs to complete self-assessment tools using web-based forms in the rubrics system. A second option is for LEAs to select from a menu of evidence-based measures that LEAs could use to demonstrate their progress on these local performance indicators. In addition to the self-assessment tools and menu of local measures, LEAs will have the opportunity to summarize their progress on local performance indicators using a narrative text box embedded in the web-based user interface system. This will allow LEAs to summarize locally held information and provide additional context to their performance on local indicators to support continuous improvement. Additional details on the proposed approach to measure progress on the local performance indicators is outlined in Attachments 1-5. The CPAG review these examples to provide input (e.g., shorten the length of the self-assessment tool).

The examples presented in this memorandum represent a short-term strategy for the initial phase of the evaluation rubrics. The California Department of Education (CDE) is convening work groups, technical experts, and stakeholders to provide input on the local indicators to provide the SBE with recommendations. The initial phase of the web-based system will launch in early 2017, and the accountability system will take effect in the 2017-18 school year. (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-sbe-aug16item01.doc>).

Discussion Questions

As part of this item, staff will provide an overview of previous SBE and stakeholder discussions on the LCFF evaluation rubrics design and the proposal to include self-assessment tools and menu of local measures to report progress on the local performance indicators. The CPAG will review these options and participate in a small group activity and larger group discussion to provide recommendations to staff regarding how performance ratings for local indicators, based on LEAs tracking and reporting their progress using local data could be incorporated into the evaluation rubrics to advance continuous improvement.

Specifically, CPAG members will be asked to review the proposed options for LEAs to use self-assessment and/or local measures to evaluate their progress on the local

performance indicators and report that information through the web-based evaluation rubrics system relative to the following questions:

- What are the areas of strengths with the current proposed approaches to measure performance? What are the areas in need of improvement?
- What are some additional ways LEAs may collect and report this information? Is anything missing from the list of examples?
- At what point during the LCFF evaluation rubrics cycle should these data be collected?
- In what ways does the inclusion of the local performance assessment contribute to the local reflective processes to support continuous improvement?

Conclusion

Following the small group activity and larger group discussion, CPAG members will discuss recommendations for the SBE related to the proposed approaches for LEAs to assess progress on the local performance indicators.

A summary of the discussion and recommendations from the CPAG, as appropriate, will be presented to the SBE as part of the November 2016 SBE Item on accountability and continuous improvement.

ATTACHMENT(S)

- Attachment 1: Draft Self-Assessment Tool for Priority 2, the Implementation of State Academic Standards (5 Pages)
- Attachment 2: Draft Self-Assessment Tool and Menu Options of Local Measures for Priority 3, Parent Engagement (3 Pages)
- Attachment 3: Draft Self-Assessment Tool and Menu Options of Local Measures for Priority 6, School Climate (1 Page)
- Attachment 4: Draft Self-Assessment Tool and Menu Options of Local Measures for Priority 9, Coordination of Services for Expelled Students (1 Page)
- Attachment 5: Draft Self-Assessment Tool and Menu Options of Local Measures for Priority 10, Coordination of Services for Foster Youth (2 Pages)

Draft Self-Assessment Tool for Priority 2, the Implementation of State Academic Standards – District*

Standard: LEA annually measures its progress implementing state academic standards and reports the results to its local governing board and to stakeholders and the public through the evaluation rubrics.

Evidence: LEA would determine whether it annually measured its progress, which may include use of a self-assessment tool or selection from a menu of local measures that will be included in the evaluation rubrics web-based user interface, and reported the results to its local governing board and through the local data selection option in the evaluation rubrics.

Criteria: LEA would assess its performance on a [Met / Not Met / Not Met for Two or More Years] scale.

The example self-assessment tool is based on select questions from a 2015 survey that WestEd administered to teachers and administrators to assess the implementation of standards. (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr16/documents/mar16item19.doc>) The initial pool of items present an example of the self-assessment tool that could be featured in the evaluation rubrics as a web-based form. The CPAG will review these items and provide recommendations on revising the self-assessment tool (e.g., reducing the number of questions and prompts in the survey tool).

A designated representative would complete the self-assessment tool on behalf of the LEA to populate the results in the evaluation rubrics system. These results would then be presented to the local governing board, stakeholders, and members of the public. Following the completion of this reporting cycle, the designated representative would then make the determination of LEA performance on the met, not met, not met for two years scale and report this determination in the evaluation rubrics. A narrative text box will provide the opportunity to summarize the determination, providing additional context to LEA performance.

Draft Self-Assessment Tool- Priority 2

1. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about the capacity of your district to effectively implement California’s content standards. Select one response per row.

	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree
a. The district provides adequate resources to schools to successfully implement California standards.					
b. The district provides adequate time to successfully implement California standards.					
c. The district provides adequate professional development to support schools’ successful implementation and instruction of California standards.					
d. The district has sufficient expertise, or access to expertise, to help principals and teachers successfully implement California standards.					

2. How would you rate the strength of your district’s progress in implementing California’s new standards in the following areas? Select one response per row.

	Poor	Good	Excellent	NA
a. Providing professional development for teaching to California’s English Language Arts standards				
b. Implementing California’s English Language Arts standards in classrooms				
c. Providing professional development for teaching to California’s new English Language Arts/English Language Development Framework				
d. Implementing California’s new English Language Development standards in classrooms				
f. Providing professional development for teaching to California’s new mathematics standards				
g. Implementing California’s new mathematics standards in classrooms				
h. Aligning instructional materials to California’s new standards				
i. Providing professional development for teaching California’s new science standards				
j. Implementing California’s new science standards in classrooms				
k. Implementing other student content standards				
l. Using computer-based/computer-adaptive assessments				
m. Integrating technology into classroom instruction				
n. Integrating language development and subject matter learning				
o. Addressing the needs of special populations in a successful way				

3. Has your district used any of the following resources to align instructional materials to California’s new standards? Select one response per row.

	Yes	No			
a. state adopted instructional materials					
b. Smarter Balanced sample items					
c. Mathematics Curriculum Framework					
d. English Language Arts/English Language Development Framework					
f. Draft Science Framework					
g. Other					

4. How would you rate the preparedness of the following district and school staff to implement California’s new English Language Arts and mathematics standards? Select one response per row.

	Not Very Prepared	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Very Prepared	NA
a. District superintendent and board					
b. District curriculum staff					
c. District English Learner staff					
d. District research staff					
e. District special education staff					
f. District technology staff					
g. Principals					

h. Other district administrators					
----------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

5. In your opinion, how much of a barrier are each of the following to providing effective professional development to teachers in your district? Select one response per row.

	Major Barrier	Minor Barrier	Not a Barrier		
a. Teachers' lack of sufficient time for teacher professional development					
b. Lack of professional development providers with skills teachers need					
c. Lack of funding dedicated specifically for teacher professional development					
d. Other (please specify)					

6. Are teachers in the district offered any of the following to encourage their participation in professional development activities? Select one response per row.

	Yes	No	Don't Know		
a. Release time from teaching (such as regular teaching responsibilities temporarily assigned to someone else)					
b. Scheduled time in the contract for professional development					
c. Stipend for professional development activities that take place outside regular work hours					
d. Full or partial reimbursement of college tuition, conference or workshop fees					
e. Reimbursement for travel and/or expenses to attend conferences or workshops??					

7. During the 2015-16 school year (including summer 2015), how successful do you feel your district was at engaging in the following activities with teachers and school administrators?

	Not at all successful	Somewhat Unsuccessful	Somewhat Successful	Very Successful	Don't Know
a. Identifying the professional development needs of groups of teachers or staff as a whole					
b. Identifying the professional development needs of individual teachers					
c. Ensuring that teachers receive support for the California standards they have not yet mastered					

8. How often are the following California Standards topics evident in the district's professional development for implementing state standards? Select one response per row.

	Not Evident	Rarely Evident	Sometimes Evident	Often Evident	Don't Know
a. Building a shared understanding of the instructional shifts in English Language Arts required by California's new standards					
b. Building students' evidence-based reading and					

writing skills					
c. Building students' background knowledge through content-rich nonfiction texts					
d. Teaching reading and writing across content areas, disciplinary literacy expectations in all content areas					
e. Building students' academic vocabulary					
f. Building students' ability to engage in academic discourse					
g. Addressing language demands of text from various disciplines					
h. Building a shared understanding of the instructional shifts in math required by California's new standards					
i. Building students' deep understanding of math concepts					
j. Building content knowledge in math to teach California's new standards					
k. Linking math topics within grades for coherence					
l. Developing students' ability to justify their solutions to math items					
m. Building a shared understanding of instructional practice in math to teach California's new standards					
n. Ensuring that teachers know the content focus of their grade level					
o. Understanding the progressions of math concepts across grade levels					
p. Building a shared understanding of the instructional shifts in science required by California's new standards					
q. Building students' deep understanding of science concepts and cross-cutting themes					
r. Building content knowledge in science to teach California's new standards					
s. Linking science topics within grades for coherence					
t. Developing benchmark tests aligned to California's new standards					
u. Analyzing student work samples based on grade-level expectations of California's new standards					
v. Integrating technology into classroom instruction					

9. To what extent are the following topics related to technology evident in the district's professional development? Select one response per row.

	Not at all	Small extent	Moderate Extent	Large Extent	
a. Using technology to enable students to interact and collaborate with other students					
b. Using technology strategically for graphing, modeling, and analyzing mathematical problems					
c. Enabling students to evaluate information presented in					

different media formats					
d. Ensuring that students can strategically use technological tools and mediums to best suit their communication goals					
e. Using technology to enable students to produce and publish writing					
f. Ensuring students are familiar with the strengths and limitations of various technological tools and mediums					
g. Using computer-adaptive assessments to monitor student progress					
h. Integrating computer-based assessments in the classroom					
i. Using technology to enable students to interact and collaborate with other students					
j. Using technology strategically for graphing, modeling, and analyzing mathematical problems					
k. Enabling students to evaluate information presented in different media formats					

10. How often do district and school staff participate in the following activities to support the implementation of California’s new standards? Select one response per row.

[Response options: *Not At All, Annually, Quarterly, Monthly, Daily/Weekly*]

	Not at all	Small extent	Moderate Extent	Large Extent	
a. Teachers and principals meeting in professional learning communities					
b. Principals scheduling common planning time for teachers					
c. Teachers using online professional development resources aligned to California’s new standards					
d. District leadership convening key stakeholder groups (community leaders, business leaders, etc.)					
e. Teachers discussing California’s new standards during parent meetings					
f. Principals conducting faculty meetings exclusively focused on California’s new standards					
g. Teachers and principals meeting in professional learning communities					

Draft Self-Assessment Tool and Menu Options of Local Measures for Priority 3, Parent Engagement

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 and to stakeholders and the public through the evaluation rubrics.

Evidence: LEA would determine whether it annually measured its progress, which may include use of a self-assessment tool and/or selection from a menu of local measures that will be included in the evaluation rubrics web-based user interface, and reported the results to its local governing board and through the local data selection option in the evaluation rubrics.

Criteria: LEA would assess its performance on a [Met / Not Met / Not Met for Two or More Years] scale.

The example menu of local measures presented below is based on extensive stakeholder input on possible evidence-based measures to assess parent engagement. These measures were generated from a group of statewide parent and community based organizations with input from students, parents, and community members. A designated representative would select one or two of these measures, both within Involvement in School/District Decision making and Participation in Programs, and report the progress in the evaluation rubrics, using the narrative text box option. These results will be presented to the local governing board and members of the public. Following the completion of the reporting on progress on the local performance indicator, the LEA representative will then make the determination of meeting the criteria on the met, not met, not met for two years scale and report this determination in the evaluation rubrics.

In addition to the draft menu of local measures, an example self-assessment tool is presented below. This provides another option for LEAs to measure progress on the local performance indicator for Priority 3, parent engagement.

Draft Menu of Local Measures

Involvement in School/District Decision Making

Representation

1. Percent of parents on required school/district committees, excluding those who are also school/district staff.
2. Percent of parent/caregivers of pupils identified in Local Control Funding Formula statute (English language learners, low-income students, and foster youth) who participated in LCAP development and state-required school/district committees.

Training

3. Percent of teachers and administrators who have participated in one or more professional development opportunities related to engaging parents/caregivers as decision makers.

4. Percent of representatives on school/district committees who have participated in cross-trainings to support dual capacity building.

Experience of parents/caregivers

5. Percent of parents/caregivers who report feeling they have a meaningful role in successful implementation and assessment of school and district plans.
6. Percent of parent/caregivers who report that meetings were accessible, including materials and discussions in their primary language, times, and locations of meetings.

Participation in Programs

Collaboration to Support Student Outcomes

1. Schools and districts have systems and structures in place to provide parents/caregivers with the interpretation and translation services they need to be full partners and participants.

Training

2. Percent of schools in the district that provide workshops for parents/caregivers that are linked to learning and/or students' social-emotional development and growth.
3. Percent of school and district staff (teachers, administrators, support staff) who have completed professional development on effective parent/caregiver engagement in the last two years.

Experience of Parents/Caregivers

4. Percent of parents/caregivers who believe their school provides a welcoming and culturally responsive learning environment.
5. Percent of parents/caregivers who report having access to high-quality oral or written translation when needed.

Draft Self-Assessment Tool

Goal 1: Strengthening the Family's Voice in Shared Decision Making: Are all families full partners in making decisions that affect their children at school and in the community?

Indicators	Level 3 Excelling Highly functioning level of development and implementation	Level 2 Progressing Functioning level of development and implementation	Level 1 Emerging Limited level of development and implementation	Your current level
Having a voice in all decisions that affect children	<p>The school has established policy to ensure that parents have a meaningful contribution in all major decisions that affect children, such as budget allocation.</p> <p><i>For example, 50% of the School Improvement Team is made up of parents. The parent group leader holds a permanent seat and makes recommendations for additional parent members.</i></p>	<p>The parent group and school host dialogues with families and school personnel about issues and policies to gain their ideas and insights.</p> <p><i>For example, proposed changes in the grading system are discussed at the school and in neighborhood settings during the day and evening, with interpreters as needed.</i></p>	<p>The school informs families about issues or proposed changes, and gives them an opportunity to respond.</p> <p><i>For example, the school informs families in advance about changes in the school schedule or building renovations, and offers contact information in case families have questions.</i></p>	Level 3 Level 2 Level 1 Not here yet
Addressing equity issues	<p>Parent group leaders work with the school leadership team to adopt effective strategies to engage families in reducing achievement gaps between groups of students.</p> <p><i>For example, families, faculty, and community members join in open dialogue with the school improvement team about root causes of the achievement gap, and identifies strategies to close that gap.</i></p>	<p>Parent group leaders work with school staff to address barriers to family involvement and student success that are related to diversity in race, income, and culture.</p> <p><i>For example, van pools are established for families whose students are bused from distant neighborhoods so they can take part in math and science nights.</i></p>	<p>The parent group identifies barriers to working with school staff on issues such as low attendance that affect student achievement.</p> <p><i>For example, parents and faculty work on shared strategies and jointly determine best practices in raising student attendance.</i></p>	Level 3 Level 2 Level 1 Not here yet

Draft Self-Assessment Tool and Menu Options of Local Measures for Priority 6, School Climate

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 and to stakeholders and the public through the evaluation rubrics.

Evidence: LEA would determine whether it administered a survey as specified and reported the results to its local governing board and through the local data selection option in the evaluation rubrics.

Criteria: LEA would assess its performance on a [Met / Not Met / Not Met for Two or More Years] scale.

Examples of the type of information that LEAs could provide through the local data selection option in the evaluation rubrics include:

- Brief narrative description of key findings, including differences in results among student groups.
- For surveys that provide an overall score, such as the School Climate Index for the California Healthy Kids Survey, report of overall score for all student and student groups.
- Analysis of a subset of specific items on survey that are particularly relevant to student safety and connectedness.

For Priority 6, School Climate, there are a variety of self-assessment tools that LEAs would use to measure their progress. A designated representative would complete a narrative summary of LEA performance, for example, report the School Climate Index Score, and explain these results. This summary can be uploaded into the evaluation rubrics and reported out to local governing boards, stakeholders, and members of the public. Following the reporting out of these results, the LEA representative would make the determination on the met, not met, not met for two years and report this determination in the evaluation rubrics.

Draft Self-Assessment Tool and Menu Options of Local Measures for Priority 9, Coordination of Services for Expelled Students

Standard: COE annually measures its progress in coordinating instruction as required by Education Code Section 48926 and reports the results to its local governing board and to stakeholders and the public through the evaluation rubrics.

Evidence: COE would determine whether it annually measured its progress, which may include use of a self-assessment tool or selection from a menu of local measures that will be included in the evaluation rubrics web-based user interface, and reported the results to its local governing board and through the local data selection option in the evaluation rubrics.

Criteria: LEA would assess its performance on a [Met / Not Met / Not Met for Two or More Years] scale.

Examples of prompts that could be included in a self-assessment instrument for this LCFF priority are included below:

- Assess the status of required plan for providing education services to all expelled pupils in that county, including most recent triennial update and required outcome data.
- Assess extent of coordination on plan development and implementation with each school district within the county.
- Assess progress in identifying: existing educational alternatives for expelled pupils, gaps in educational services to expelled pupils, and strategies for filling those service gaps.

A designated representative for the COE would complete a narrative summary of COE performance through the evaluation rubrics. This summary would be reported out to local governing boards, stakeholders, and members of the public. Following the reporting out of these results, the COE representative would make the determination on the met, not met, not met for two years and report this determination in the evaluation rubrics.

**Draft Self-Assessment Tool and Menu Options of Local Measures for
 Priority 10, Coordination of Services for Foster Youth**

Standard: COE annually measures its progress in coordinating services for foster youth and reports the results to its local governing board and to stakeholders and the public through the evaluation rubrics.

Evidence: COE would determine whether it annually measures its progress, which may include use of a self-assessment tool or selection from a menu of local measures that will be included in the evaluation rubrics web-based user interface, and reported the results to its local governing board and through the local data selection option in the evaluation rubrics.

Criteria: LEA would assess its performance on a [Met / Not Met / Not Met for Two or More Years] scale.

An example self-assessment tool is presented below. This tool was developed by foster youth service providers to present an example of the items that may be used to measure progress on the local performance indicator for Priority 10. A designated representative from a COE would complete this survey on behalf of the county and upload the results into the evaluation rubrics system. These results would then be reported out to the local governing board, stakeholders, and members of the public. Following the reporting out of these results, the designated representative would make the determination on a met, not met, not met for two years scale. A summary of the results would be presented through the evaluation rubrics to explain COE progress on the local performance indicator.

Assess the degree of implementation of a coordinated service program components for foster youth in your county?

	Exploration and Research Phase	Beginning Development	Initial Implementation	Full Implementation	Full Implementation and Sustainability
1. Establishing ongoing collaboration and policy development, including establishing formalized information sharing agreements with child welfare, probation, Local Education Agency (LEAs), the courts, and other organizations to determine the proper educational placement of foster youth.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Building capacity with LEA, probation, child welfare, and other organizations for purposes of implementing school-based support infrastructure for foster youth intended to improve educational outcomes.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Providing information and assistance to LEAs regarding the educational needs of foster youth in order to improve educational outcomes.	1	2	3	4	5

	Exploration and Research Phase	Beginning Development	Initial Implementation	Full Implementation	Full Implementation and Sustainability
4. Providing direct educational services for foster youth in LEA or county-operated programs provided the school district has certified that specified services cannot be provided or funded using other sources, including, but not limited to, Local Control Funding Formula, federal, state or local funding.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Establishing policies and procedures that ensure the timely and appropriate educational placement, the establishment of individualized education plans (IEP) and the expeditious transfer of records, transcripts, and other relevant educational information.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Facilitating the coordination with local post-secondary institutions, including, but not limited to, community colleges or universities.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Developing strategies to prioritize the needs of foster youth in the community, including age group, geographical areas, and high needs groups, including academic needs and placement type.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Engaging in the process of reviewing plan deliverables and of collecting and analyzing LEA and COE level outcome data for purposes of evaluating effectiveness of support services for foster youth and whether the investment in services contributes to improved educational outcomes for foster youth.	1	2	3	4	5