



**officers**

**president** Ralph Gómez Porras, Ed.D. **president-elect** Lisa Gonzales, Ed.D. **vice president** Holly Edds, Ed.D.

**vice president for legislative action** Linda Kaminski, Ed.D. **past president** Tom Armelino **executive director** Wesley Smith, Ed.D.

March 3, 2017

Dr. Michael Kirst, President  
Members of the State Board of Education  
1430 N Street, Suite 5111  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**Re: ACSA Comments Regarding March 8-9, 2017 Agenda Items 2, 4, and 8**

Dear Dr. Kirst and Members of the State Board of Education,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on behalf of the Association of California School Administrators (ACSA) and our more than 18,000 California education leaders.

We commend the State Board of Education (Board) and California Department of Education (CDE) staff for the behind-the-scenes and around-the-clock monumental work involved to launching the first phase of the new accountability and continuous improvement system. This has been a collaborative effort over the past two years, and we are grateful for the many opportunities afforded to administrators and other stakeholders to provide input. Now that we have the entire system in place, we have solicited input from our members, our various councils and committees, and asked ACSA's Accountability and Continuous Improvement Task Force to begin analyzing the system in its entirety with the goal of informing the Board's work moving forward. Our feedback reflected on this letter is our preliminary assessment of issues that the Board may want to consider addressing in the second phase.

ACSA stands ready to collaborate with the Board, CDE and other stakeholders as we strive towards supporting a successful implementation of the new system with the goal of improving student opportunities and outcomes.

**ITEM 2: UPDATE ON CONTINUING DEVELOPMENTAL WORK AND PRESENTATION ON THE EVALUATION RUBRICS; PRESENTATION ON ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS; AND UPDATE ON LOCAL INDICATORS**

As our members have become more familiar with the technical aspects of each of the state indicators, there have been several issues raised regarding the performance standards and the underlying data being reported. We encourage the Board to make the years of data as consistent as possible, since each of the state indicators reported in the Dashboard does not use the same time period or years. This is causing confusion amongst the field as it will become harder to explain to parents and other stakeholders which indicator is reliant on what particular year(s).

---

**office locations**

**sacramento**

1029 J Street, Suite 500, Sacramento, CA 95814  
Tel 916.444.3216 • 800.608.2272  
Fax 916.444.3739

**burlingame**

1575 Bayshore Highway, Burlingame, CA 94010  
Tel 650.692.4300 • 800.608.2272  
Educational Services Fax: 650.692.6858  
Financial Services Fax: 650.259.1029  
Member Services Fax: 650.437.9189

**ontario**

3602 Inland Empire Blvd., Suite A-230, Ontario, CA 91764  
Tel 909.484.7503 • 800.608.2272  
Fax 909.484.7504

**web site**

[www.acsa.org](http://www.acsa.org)

➤ **Academic Indicator**

While ACSA is pleased with the Board's decision to adopt performance standards for the Academic Indicator using scale scores, our members have expressed concerns that the methodology for establishing cut points for English Language Arts (ELA) and math did not follow the same standard methodology as the other indicators. To the field, it appears that these performance standards were established based on aspirational goals, instead of relying on evidence-based information. As a result, the lowest performing 5 percent of schools is a larger number of schools, while the median group is much smaller. We encourage the Board to re-examine this issue more closely as it could have unintended consequences when determining local educational agencies who need technical assistance and support.

Furthermore, there is resounding support for a growth measure for students that is cohort based, rather than just growth from one year to the next. If there is an opportunity to revisit this issue, we would urge the Board to adopt a methodology for "Change" that is measured across the three year span (cohort span growth versus a grade level growth).

Regarding the issue whether the Academic Indicator should include the results of the Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBAC) in ELA and math for 11th grade students, ACSA would support the Board's decision if it were to move in this direction. However, if this were to occur, we would strongly urge the Board that 11th grade test scores not be included in the CCI since there are plenty of other academic-related metrics already incorporated in the composite (Advanced Placement courses, SAT/ACT, IB, A-G courses, dual enrollment, middle college high school courses, etc.). Because this is meant to be a multi-measures system, we would be concerned if 11th grade test scores were counted in two different state indicators as this could be perceived an overreliance and double counting on single assessments. We believe that this decision of whether to remove the 11th grade test scores from the CCI should be made after thoughtful consideration of additional components of the CCI. To reiterate, ACSA's position is that 11th grade SBAC should only be in either the CCI or the Academic Indicator, but not both.

➤ **Growth Model**

Our members are encouraged by the proposed timeline to implement a student-level growth model by spring 2018. After closely discussing the kind of information we want the growth model to provide, our members consider the most important question for accountability purposes to be how a student's distance to level 3 change from the prior year. For purposes of statewide reporting, it would be most helpful for educators to know how a change in score compared to that of other students who had the same prior score, and what is the minimum a student needs to score to reach a future standard. We caution the Board from moving in a direction that use prediction questions as the basis for this growth model, as there are many external factors that could impact the probability of a student reaching a desired goal or score.

In the interim, we encourage the state to provide LEAs with additional information and guidance on analyzing individual student growth to enable administrators and teachers to better support students' needs.

➤ **Suspension Rates**

During this annual review of the state indicators, we encourage the Board to once again take a closer look at the underlying data for suspension rates. During the preview of the Dashboard, our members have pointed out that if there was an increase in suspension rates from one year to the

next, the performance standard is red. We recommend that the state establish a benchmark before it starts measuring suspension rates. Without doing so, an unintended consequence is that administrators may not suspend students that warrant suspensions for fear of the indicator showing up as red or lowest performance category.

This is a particularly sensitive issue for small districts who are susceptible to skewed data given their small student populations. In one anecdote from a small district in Northern California, last year they had 1 suspension, and this year they had 3. As a result, one of their schools is showing up as an orange category. This performance category seems drastic compared to the realities of what is actually happening at school sites. It is imperative that the Technical Design Group models the impact of decisions by statewide data, but also re-evaluate how it affects small, rural, K-5 and K-8 districts, among others, to help make decisions more comprehensive and better than just looking at statewide results. **If the issue for small districts/schools is based on small number of students affecting the "change" indicator, we recommend the Board adopt a minimum number of students before a change indicator is included.**

➤ **English Learner Progress Indicator and English Learner Definitions**

Similar to past practice with the expected performance growth on the California English Language Development Test, we encourage the Board to consider differentiating the expected annual performance level growth for English learner students who are at an intermediate (level 3) or higher language development acquisition. Once students reach intermediate language level, it sometimes takes these students more than two years to reach the next level because vocabulary and reading comprehension becomes progressively more difficult in the higher performance levels. It could be potentially unrealistic to expect year-over-year growth for every student at that level.

Our members are concerned there are currently three different definitions for English Learners in the new accountability system, and caution that this inconsistency will result in confusion with teachers and parents. When districts have multiple definitions, it makes it more difficult to have discussions and to determine needs because they are talking about different things at different times. Inconsistent definitions also create challenges for schools to track data and make the system much more complex. ACSA has received anecdotes that principals have had hard time reviewing data to understand their Dashboard data. To minimize the inconsistencies, the Board could consider making the academic-related state indicators the same definition. Until the Board considers taking this action, one immediate change to the Dashboard display is to include the different English learner definitions so that they are very clearly reported on each indicator page in the online reports.

Also, while the Board has not made a determination whether the EL Progress Indicator will incorporate long-term English learner students, we would like to provide a preliminary suggestion that this information only become available as a reporting tool for districts to use at the local level, but that it not be a part of the accountability system. We agree that long term English learner information is important that could trigger a closer analysis of other needs students may have in addition to English language development that need to be addressed. Shedding a light on long-term English learners is an important discussion about how to support the students using the data. However, we believe there is already accountability embedded in the EL Progress Indicator since it captures reclassification rates, and as a result, the performance on this metric will depend largely whether English learners are being reclassified in a timely fashion.

March 3, 2017

**Re: ACSA Comments Regarding March 8-9, 2017 Agenda Items 2, 4, and 8**

Page 4

➤ **College and Career Indicator**

We support the Board's continued efforts to make the College and Career Indicator (CCI) a more robust metric that truly captures students' preparedness to enter the workforce or a postsecondary institution. Our students are fortunate to have dedicated administrators throughout the state who have been thinking of how to strengthen this measure so that the activities listed below be considered as metrics in the CCI and highlighted on the Dashboard. As Board members have previously acknowledged, the "career" portion of the CCI necessitates additional work to capture various opportunities students may currently be participating in.

**One of the biggest challenges of the career indicators is that school districts will need funding to change their existing data systems to capture this additional data. The other challenge is how districts will manage the variety of data so they can monitor their progress before CalPADS data gets certified.** For example, districts have run into the problem of how to capture dual enrollment data in their existing databases. Without the proper funding infusion to support the development of this infrastructure, administrators will continue to be expected to enter the data manually at the school sites.

One element that could improve the quality of the data collected specific to CTE pathways and the validation of access to broad course of study will be to allow Joint Power Authorities (JPAs) Regional Occupational Programs (ROPs) to report directly into CALPADS. JPA ROPs were previously reporting directly. The 2015-2016 school year was the last year of access to CALPADS reporting for JPA ROPs. The CDE is constantly updating CBEDs codes for CTE and ROPs are uniquely positioned to understand the importance and rationale behind CTE CBEDs code changes. As districts report CTE pathway information, if the codes are wrong, the data is wrong.

In response to the questions posed to the CCI Work Group, **Appendix A includes specific recommendations on behalf of our members related career readiness measures currently included in the Work-Based Learning (WBL) continuum of awareness, exploration, and preparation.** At the student level, they could participate in one of these three options as a way for more students to contribute to the CCI. These activities include guest speakers in the classroom, site tours, job shadowing experiences and internships (with a presentation component), or any activity that exposures the student to a local industry partner or the work place. At the same time, it is important that the Board seek input from different parts of the state in order to find a balanced approach that avoids penalizing students who are unable to access community college courses, Career Technical Education Pathways, or internships where there are not sufficient spaces for all students.

Some methods that could enhance preparedness for college and career readiness are Senior Projects that often times are incorporated as a graduation requirement. Some districts document all activities in Aeries and in their National Academy Foundation (NAF) portal. It may be possible that if an activity is tagged in Aeries, it can be uploaded to CalPADS.

We urge the Board to include data to **allow Industry Certifications (third party, approved list, etc.) to indicate "Well Prepared"** in order to provide students with an opportunity to, at least, achieve "Prepared" through a third party test (i.e. precision Exams 21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills, etc.). The CDE limitation of itself to only supporting research that is linked to college success prevents the Department from identifying career readiness indicators. An example of this is the absence of Industry Certifications as indicators of readiness in the existing CCI model. If the State Fire Marshall indicates that a Basic Firefighter Certificate (earned through over 300 hours of class

and passage of over six exams) makes a student ready to be a firefighter, then the Board should consider accepting that as sufficient “research” to qualify as “Well Prepared” for a career. Other examples include Cisco certifying a student as “ready” to be a Network Administrator, the State Department of Health Services certifying a student “ready” to be a Nurse Assistant, or the Automotive Service Excellence or the National Automotive Technicians Education Foundation certifying a student as “ready” to be an Automotive Technician. Each of these examples cited require over 300 hours of class time and the passage of an industry or government approved exam.

Lastly, the Board also needs to revisit the inclusion of AP and IB exams and the corresponding minimum scores to be deemed “Prepared.” There is a difference in rigor between both exams that are currently not recognized in the CCI. Two AP courses are not the same as two IB courses because they are not comparable. We suggest the CCI Work Group look at additional data and evidence to make a determination what is the appropriate level of expectation for students to be deemed “Prepared.”

➤ **Alternative Accountability**

ACSA is encouraged that the Board’s agenda item will include a panel of alternative education researcher and practitioners, including one of our members of ACSA’s Educational Options Council. Our members are still evaluating Dr. Ruiz de Velasco’s recent report highlighting potential approaches to the inclusion of unique metrics in an accountability system. It will be imperative that any proposal takes into account the variations among alternative schools given the transient student population they serve and their unique needs. ACSA stands ready to help facilitate focused discussions with our members with experience in alternative education settings. We look forward to being part of this work.

➤ **Students with Disabilities**

As part of the annual review process to review the state indicators, we encourage the Board to request staff to take a closer analysis on students with disabilities and how their performance fits within the larger single, coherent system. **While growth should be expected for students with disabilities for all of the indicators, it is important that the rate be in smaller increments for the cut points. This would permit the scaffolding or differentiation based on severity of needs.**

When it comes to reporting data, the Board may wish to disaggregate data for students with disabilities in the following categories: students with Section 504 Plans, students with an Individual Education Plan who spend more than 50 percent of their day in general education, and students with disabilities who spend less than 50 percent of their day in general education. Disaggregating this numerically significant group would go a long way toward helping schools and LEAs target their support and resources appropriately. Keeping them as one large group can cause schools and LEAs to make erroneous assumptions regarding the causes of underachievement.

Another consideration is for the measures to be strictly growth-based. For example, the percentage of students with disabilities moving up one band, or increasing their scaled score on the California Alternate Assessments rather than reaching a certain performance level. For students with disabilities, IEP and 504 teams evaluate to what extent the student is moving toward Meets Standard in order to consider fading and/or exiting the student from special education services. This could also be applied to non-cognitive factors such as attendance and suspensions.

➤ **Small School Districts**

ACSA is continuing to solicit input from administrators at small school districts to better understand their experience with the Dashboard and the reported student data. We have heard over and over that very small districts do not have a performance category for two or more of the state indicators because they do not have the numerically significant groups. One suggestion we have received is for CDE to develop a tool that allows small districts to populate their data in case they wanted to show a more complete report to their communities.

As the Board is aware, the percentage of growth or change can show smaller or larger as a result of the smaller student populations. For example, for a district with only 150 students, a 2 percent change is only reflective of 3 students. The percentage amount gets lost in how many students it represents when looking at very small school districts' Dashboards. There have been positive responses to the Dashboard, as it appears to be an easy tool to navigate.

We have also heard how the self-reflection tools are placing additional time requirements that their small staff may have a challenge with completing. Combined with the LCAP stakeholder requirements, for small districts without sufficient staff the amount of hours (anecdotally in the 100's) to revise and complete the LCAP and the associated self-reflection tools will become a monumental task.

➤ **School Conditions and Climate Measures**

ACSA supports the inclusion of school climate measures as local indicators informing the accountability system. While the state may wish to collect data on a statewide basis, we urge the Board to keep this as a local indicator and continue to allow districts the flexibility to use a variety of local measures for those that do not use the California Healthy Kids Survey. We want to ensure districts continue to have the autonomy to ask the questions they deem most relevant to their local circumstances and that they are given the opportunity to experiment with surveys that work for them. If the state were to move in the direction of collecting data statewide beyond the current requirement of districts' uploading to the Dashboard, it would be problematic since erroneous assumptions could be made about the meaning of the data. ACSA continues to believe that the purpose of the school climate measures is an opportunity for district's self-reflection to drive continuous improvement, so that local communities monitor their progress over time. However, this data should not be standardized as it would become subjective, and therefore we do not believe it would be meaningful for accountability purposes to compare one district to another.

**ITEM 4: UPDATE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE PLAN FOR THE EVERY STUDENT SUCCEEDS ACT**

We commend the extraordinary work of CDE and SBE staff in keeping stakeholders apprised of the evolving work with the ESSA State Plan, and consider the recent stakeholder input sessions to be a great opportunity for the public to provide preliminary input. The information provided on this agenda item is particularly helpful for the field to better understand the issues that California will address in its State Plan. Below are ACSA's preliminary comments and we look forward to providing more comprehensive input when the full draft plan becomes available in May 2017.

➤ **Identification of Lowest Performing Schools**

Since it is anticipated that a draft ESSA State Plan will be made available at the Board's May meeting, we urge the Board to seek information and request CDE staff to provide data simulations to the public in order for stakeholders to have a comprehensive view and

understanding of LEA or school performance across all of the state indicators. There has not been any information or data shared that identifies how many LEAs would be triggered into technical assistance within the first year based on their aggregate performance on all of the indicators. Stakeholders have seen the technical details for each of the state indicators and the distribution for each of the performance categories, however, there has not been information shared to determine if there are disproportionate number of LEAs or schools who are in the two lowest performance categories. It is imperative that the Board and the public have this aggregate information now that

➤ **Weighting State Indicators**

As part of this multiple-measures system, our members feel strongly about giving equal weight to each of the state indicators in order to convey the importance of a holistic review of student progress on various metrics that will ensure their success in postsecondary education or the workforce. If the state were to provide a greater weight to the academic indicator, we would be concerned that stakeholders would not pay attention to other measures, which would undermine the multidimensional system. The equal weighting would also place greater emphasis on the interrelatedness of the indicators and reinforces the importance of each metric. Each of the indicators contributes to overall student success and preparedness. When you weight some over others, those weighted less may not be addressed appropriately.

➤ **Educator Equity**

ACSA looks forward to being part of the stakeholder conversations around the definition of “ineffective/effective teacher” and how to best collect and report this data. With equity in mind, we understand the importance of disaggregating data to support LEAs who’s low-income and minority students experience disproportionate rates of access to ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers. It is important that assumptions not be made that inexperienced teachers equates to “ineffective” educators, as they are sometimes the best teachers and bring innovative strategies to the classroom. Furthermore, as a result of California’s diverse student population, it is imperative that teachers and administrators have access to cultural proficiency training or best practices that a district can use and give to teaches for their classrooms. We encourage the Board and the CDE to work with the CCEE to identify exemplars of cultural proficiency trainings or resources that could be made available for LEAs’ use through the LCFF Resource Library or the Statement of Model Practices.

➤ **Reclassification of English Learners**

ACSA supports legislative efforts to develop standardized reclassification criteria, an action that should prompt the Board to review and revise the indicators and performance standards, as appropriate. However, our members have indicated there is outdated guidance on how LEAs should consider reclassification policies and procedures. Because there is uncertainty on when legislative would go into effect to potentially establish standardized exit criteria, and because the English Language Proficiency Assessment will not be fully operational until 2018-19, we suggest the state update the current Board-approved guidelines and propose revisions to be implemented in 2017-18.

➤ **Title I Required Seven Percent Set-Aside**

In an effort to support and embrace continuous improvement, it is important that all school districts receive a share of Title I funding to support school improvement activities. **ACSA supports a formula grant that will ensure equitable distribution of funding since many**

**districts do not have the staffing or the resources to apply for a competitive grant.**

Adding an application requirement would be very taxing on personnel for our small districts. We support the use of a formula grant directly to school district to "own" the work that must happen to improve schools. Sometimes outside entities are not familiar with the culture and climate of the LEA. One of the challenges with school support in Program Improvement was the inconsistency of and level of the support agencies used in each county, so **LEAs would be in the best position to leverage these funds instead of redirecting funds to service agencies.** This approach is aligned to the spirit of local control while districts consider their goals, actions and services in the LCAP and the new LCAP Addendum.

We urge the Board to allocate the funding directly to school districts so that they can tailor support systems according to their individualized needs. Through the work of the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence, the California Department of Education, or partnerships with County Offices of Education, school districts could choose to seek support and guidance in leveraging these funds in effective strategies and support systems.

➤ **Title II Optional Three Percent Set-Aside**

It is well documented and known that the overall impact of professional learning on school improvement and increased student learning is enhanced and improved by including administrators in training opportunities so they can better serve and work with their staff for the benefit of students. Earlier this week, the Learning Policy Institute (LPI) released a comprehensive analysis, "Supporting Principals' Learning: Key Features of Effective Programs." The reports highlights the essential aspects of high-quality in-serving professional learning that allows school leaders to learn together on the job while being supported by individualized coaching.<sup>1</sup>

If the Board chooses to appropriate Title II funding to support school leaders, ACSA recommends the components of any professional learning opportunities be grounded on well-designed, research-based practices, including those referenced in the LPI report. More specifically, ACSA encourages the Board to invest in professional learning opportunities that are aligned to the Administrative Services Credential Clear Induction Program Standards adopted by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing in February 2014, the individualized work targeted in the California Professional Standards for Education Leaders (CPSEL), and the Quality Professional Learning Standards (QPLS) approved by Superintendent Torlakson in December 2013.<sup>2</sup>

These standards and the induction requirement that includes job-embedded professional learning, coaching and assessment provide a "strategy for novice principals that not only support individual transition and growth but also enable the district to validate the quality of novice school principals. When novice [administrators] are able to improve and broaden their portfolio of skills, they are on a path to make a difference, stay in the job, and become highly accomplished leaders who use their expertise to affect successful teaching and learning."<sup>3</sup>

Our administrators have emphasized the importance of ensuring high-quality providers and those who serve as coaches are capable of focusing on principals' performance on-the-job, in real-time,

---

<sup>1</sup> Sutchter, L., Podolsky, A., & Espinoza, D. (2017). *Supporting principals' learning: Key features of effective programs*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute.

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.cde.ca.gov/pd/ps/qpls.asp>

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.cde.ca.gov/pd/ps/documents/caqpls.pdf>



March 3, 2017

**Re: ACSA Comments Regarding March 8-9, 2017 Agenda Items 2, 4, and 8**

Page 9

and have the ability to contextualize and tailor the support according to their unique school circumstances.

Should the state pursue this optional set-aside, ACSA stands ready to support these statewide efforts and we would like to lend our expertise as part of the planning process. As the largest umbrella organization in the country that provides professional learning opportunities for aspiring and seasoned school administrators, ACSA has over fourteen years of experience with supporting the pipeline of novice principals. We currently have approximately 985 principals who are either in their first or second year of the Clear Administrative Credentialing Program. We are pleased to support this work, and estimate that between 25 and 33 percent of administrators seeking this credential are participating through ACSA's program. We stand ready to help the Board and Department of Education think through a model that is sustainable and one which builds capacity statewide.

To complement the use of Title II funds, state funding to support for strengthening school leadership could also be considered as part of the work the CCEE and county offices of education will undertake through technical assistance and support, including ongoing professional development, a cohort model, establishing Professional Learning Communities, or job alike networks for our school and district leaders across the state. This work by the CCEE could focus on shared problems of practice statewide, such as addressing the needs of long-term English learners and African American and Latino student performance.

#### **ITEM 8: NONCLASSROOM-BASED CHARTER SCHOOL RESOURCE CENTER LOCATION WAIVER POLICY**

ACSA commends the Board staff for their thoughtful approach in developing this waiver policy, and we understand the Board may wish to adopt the staff's recommended evaluation guidelines in order to minimize disruption to students and the educational program. School districts and administrators have the same desired outcome, which is to support student learning in the best possible learning environments where there is proper oversight and accountability on behalf of students. The proposed Board action raises concerns that the courts have settled any uncertainty with the interpretation of the applicable Education Code provisions, and this waiver process could be perceived to be a major change to policy with very little discussion and input from those who may be affected.

School districts did not have an earlier opportunity to provide input in the development of these guidelines for charter schools operating noncompliant resource centers, as determined by the courts. **ACSA respectfully requests that the Board delay taking action until its next meeting in May 2017, and postpone taking action on any corresponding waivers pending Board consideration for approval.** Stakeholders impacted by the *Anderson* decision deserve to have additional time to analyze the merits or concerns with the proposal, and to inform the Board of any potential unintended consequences before taking action. We do not believe there is an eminent crisis that justifies action at this time or that necessitates the Board taking action on March 9<sup>th</sup>. School districts need time to provide input in this process.

Should the Board find a pressing need to adopt the policy; below are several suggested revisions to the guidelines for the Board's consideration:

March 3, 2017

**Re: ACSA Comments Regarding March 8-9, 2017 Agenda Items 2, 4, and 8**

Page 10

- While it is reasonable to allow time for transition to ensure that any disruption to students is as limited as possible, the courts have determined that these resource centers are illegally placed and they should move swiftly to come into compliance. Any waiver should require evidence that supports the need for transition time and should not exceed one year from the date that the waiver is granted.
- While we understand that most of the waivers have been submitted already, and have gone through a local process, the policy does not provide an opportunity for any modification, discussion, or input from the local educational agency where these resource centers are located. Providing an opportunity for such input is essential to making certain the SBE has a complete understanding of each waiver request, and should be considered in this policy discussion.
- All transition plans should not only be sent to the authorizer as proposed, but to any district or county where the resource center is located so there is a clear understanding of the plan and timelines.
- Finally, the Board should also consider a course of action if the conditions of the waiver are not met.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the items pending before the Board and to join with you in the implementation of California's new accountability and continuous improvement system. ACSA looks forward to continuing to be a partner in this endeavor as we continue to inform practitioners and other stakeholders of your work.

If you should have any questions regarding our positions or recommendations, please contact Martha Alvarez, ACSA Legislative Advocate, at (916) 329-3861 or [malvarez@acsa.org](mailto:malvarez@acsa.org).

Yours truly,



Wesley Smith  
Executive Director  
Association of California School Administrators

cc: Tom Torlakson, State Superintendent of Public Instruction  
Glen Price, Chief Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction, California Department of Education  
Debra Brown, Governmental Affairs Division, California Department of Education  
Karen Stapf Walters, Executive Director, California State Board of Education  
Judy Cias, Chief Counsel, California State Board of Education  
David Sapp, Deputy Policy Director and Assistant Legal Counsel, California State Board of Education  
Leilani Aguinaldo, Director of Policy, California State Board of Education  
Jeff Bell, Program Budget Manager, Education, Department of Finance  
Jannelle Kubinec, Director of National, State and Special Projects, WestEd  
Carl Cohn, Executive Director, California Collaborative for Educational Excellence

## **APPENDIX A**

### **ACSA's Recommendations for Inclusion of Additional Career Readiness Measures in the College and Career Indicator**

#### **QUESTION 1) WHAT ADDITIONAL VALID AND RELIABLE MEASURES FOR CAREER PREPAREDNESS ARE CURRENTLY AVAILABLE AND WHAT MEASURES NEED TO BE COLLECTED IN CALPADS?**

- CDE has paid memberships for Career Readiness Assessments including NOCTI (<http://www.nocti.org/>) and CTECS (<https://www.ctecs.org/>)
  - CTECS is a 60 minute assessment
  - NOCTI is a 3 hour assessment that must be administered by an outside proctor (not the teacher)
- Currently CDE is conducting a pilot project utilizing NOCTI assessments. Initial results indicate an overall 64% pass rate.
- Work Keys National Career Readiness Certificate (NCRC) is another option.
  - Some overlap with Smarter Balance Summative Assessment results with this assessment, as it contains academic elements in the context of work readiness.

#### **QUESTION 2) WHAT ADDITIONAL REPORTS SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE DASHBOARD THAT WOULD PROVIDE LEAS AND SCHOOLS WITH ACTIONABLE DATA TO IMPROVE THEIR CCI PERFORMANCE LEVEL?**

- Inventory of CTE courses available per site/district (including CTE courses that may be offered by ROP)
- Inventory of CTE pathways available per site/district (including CTE courses that may be offered by ROP)
- Inventory of all courses approved for UC A-G subject requirements per site/district (including CTE courses that may be offered by ROP)
- Inventory of Dual Enrollment courses per site/district (including CTE courses that may be offered by ROP)
- **Possible additional measures & reports that could provide data to drive improvement:**
  - **Inventory of courses approved for community college articulation credit per site/district (including CTE courses that may be offered by ROP)**
  - **Inventory of work-based learning options available for all students per site/district**
  - **Inventory of industry certifications available per site/district (including certifications that may be offered by ROP)**
  - **Inventory of Career Technical Student Organization (CTSO) membership per site/district (including CTOSs that may be sponsored by ROP)**

#### **QUESTION 3) ARE THERE METHODOLOGIES THAT WOULD ENSURE THAT ALL GRADUATES, NOT JUST STUDENTS WHO ARE PREPARED, CONTRIBUTE TO THE CCI PERFORMANCE LEVEL?**

- To allow for more students to contribute the CCI performance, we recommend the Board utilize and/or “count” methodologies related the array of work-based learning options identified on a continuum from career awareness to career exploration to career preparation, such as the examples listed below.

- Career Awareness- (through 9<sup>th</sup> grade)
  - Online career related programs (Road Trip Nation, Career Builder, Career Connect)
  - Classroom speakers
  - Field trips
  - College visits
  - Industry themed class projects
  - Career fairs
  - Accompany parents to work
  - Aptitude and interest assessments
- Career Exploration- (through 10<sup>th</sup> grade)
  - College research
  - College visits
  - Career fairs
  - Classroom speakers and team teaching with industry representatives
  - Job shadow
  - Industry based projects
  - Community planning projects
  - Community resource mapping
- Career Preparation- (through 11<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> grade)
  - College research
  - College visits
  - California Partnership Academy recruitment presentations
  - College & Career fairs
  - Community job fairs
  - School-based enterprises
  - Virtual enterprises
  - Job shadow
  - Community speaking presentations
  - Mock interviews
  - Resume development
  - Informational interviews
  - Community Resource mapping
  - College applications
  - Leadership development opportunities
  - Industry certifications
  - Unpaid/paid internships
  - Laboratory and simulated work experiences
- Furthermore, we recommend the Board align the array of work-based learning options to the language as identified in Education Code Section 51760.1. In the Education Code, work-based learning means an educational approach or instructional methodology that uses the workplace or real work to provide pupils with the knowledge and skills that will help them connect school experiences to real-life work activities and future career opportunities. When feasible, work-based learning should be an integral part of a more comprehensive program that integrates academic courses and career technical education. Work-based learning may include any of the following:

- (1) Emphasis on learning in the workplace.
- (2) Exposure to a wide range of career areas and worksites in order to help youth make informed choices about education, training options, and career pursuits.
- (3) Thoughtful placement of pupils into opportunities that are evaluated for their safety, qualified supervision, and learning opportunities.
- (4) Appropriate sequencing of experiences based upon the pupil's age and maturity, ranging from site visits and tours, job shadowing, unpaid and paid internships, and paid work experience.
- (5) Explicit aim to supplement, or systematically reinforce, classroom instruction in technical courses, academic courses, or both.
- (6) Systematic attention to the development of 21st century skills, such as communication, problem solving, teamwork, project planning, and critical thinking.
- (7) A trained mentor who structures the learning at the worksite.
- (8) Coordination between the classroom teacher and the workplace mentor or supervisor.
- (9) Built-in regular assessment and feedback.
- (10) Involvement of youth in choosing and structuring the experience.
- (11) Clear and measurable learning outcomes.

**QUESTION 4) CAN STUDENT COURSE-TAKING INFORMATION CURRENTLY COLLECTED IN CALPADS BE USED TO MEASURE ACCESS TO A BROAD COURSE OF STUDY (PRIORITY 7) IN THE CCI?**

- Administrators believe that course information is currently collected via CalPADS. Additional information that can be gathered in CALPADS and used to validate access to a broad course of study may include:
  - Student Articulation
  - Student Internships
  - Student level data gathered and aligned regionally to validate access to programs across district boundaries and/or outside of the traditional period day (as offered by an ROP)
  - **Allow JPA ROPs to report directly to CALPADS**
  - Student enrollment in Online course options

**QUESTION 5) WHAT IS REQUIRED TO IMPROVE THE COURSE-TAKING INFORMATION?**

- Clear understanding by districts of the importance of CBEDS coding structures
- Annual updates to CBEDS codes at the district level to align with CDE changes
- **Allow JPA ROPs to report directly to CALPADS**