

## **Proposed Standards for the Local Performance Indicators**

This Attachment proposes standards for the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) priorities that are not addressed by the state indicators (referred to as “local performance indicators” throughout the rest of this Attachment). Staff recommend that the State Board of Education (SBE) approve the proposed local performance indicators as part of its action to adopt the initial phase of the LCFF evaluation rubrics.

### **Background**

As a result of SBE action at its May and July 2016 meetings, the evaluation rubrics design includes: (1) a concise set of state indicators and (2) a methodology for establishing local performance indicators.

Under the approved approach, local performance indicators are based on collecting and reporting locally held information, which is likely to enhance local decision making for the relevant LCFF priority. Local educational agencies (LEAs) will assess their progress on these indicators on a *[Met / Not Met / Not Met for Two or More Years]* scale.

Based on the SBE’s action at its July 2016 meeting, there will be local performance indicators in the initial phase of the evaluation rubrics 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)

In addition to the state indicators and local performance indicators, the evaluation rubrics will include other local indicators. As discussed in prior SBE materials, the evaluation rubrics web-based system will include a feature that allows LEA users to upload local data to provide a more complete picture of student performance. The proposed local performance indicators are intended to compliment the other local indicators.

### **Proposed Local Performance Indicators**

This Attachment identifies the proposed standard for each local performance indicator. Staff recommend that the SBE approve the proposed standard for the local performance indicators as part of adopting the initial phase of the evaluation rubrics at its September 2016 meeting.

This Attachment also provides information about how LEAs would use self-assessments and/or local measures to evaluate their progress on the local performance indicators and report that information through the web-based evaluation rubrics system.

The rest of this Attachment is organized by LCFF priority. It identifies, for each LCFF priority with a local performance indicator:

- The proposed standard;
- Information about the evidence that LEAs would use to demonstrate progress in meeting the standard; and
- The criteria for assessing progress based on that evidence.

The Attachment also provides prompts that could be included in a self-assessment instrument and/or local measures that LEAs could use to demonstrate progress on the local performance indicator. Use of the web-based system will support LEAs in demonstrating their progress on these local performance indicators. The web-based setting makes it possible for some functions to be automated, which will reduce the time needed to input the information that LEA users have collected to determine progress on the local performance indicators.

For example, where a self-assessment is included as a way to demonstrate progress on the local performance indicator, the web-based system could include a web form that allows LEA users to complete prompts included in the assessment, with the summary results automatically generated from the web form. Similarly, where LEAs track and report their progress on local measures, the web-based system could include a drop-down menu of possible options from which LEA users could select and then input the relevant data, which would be incorporated into a standard report automatically.

If the SBE approves the proposed standards at its September 2016 meeting, staff will consult with stakeholders to develop specific approaches for supporting LEAs in determining progress on the local performance indicators by including self-assessments and/or a menu of local measures and provide an update at the November 2016 SBE meeting.

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

- *Standard:* LEA annually measures its progress in meeting the *Williams* settlement requirements at 100% at all of its school sites, as applicable, and promptly addresses any complaints or other deficiencies identified throughout the academic year, as applicable; and provides information annually on progress meeting this standard to its local governing board and to stakeholders and the public through the evaluation rubrics.
- *Evidence:* LEA would use locally available information, including data currently reported through the School Accountability Report Card (SARC), and determine whether it 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 measures that could be included within the local data selection option in the evaluation rubrics to support LEAs in reporting progress are:

- Number/percentage of misassignments of teachers of English learners, total teacher misassignments, and vacant teacher positions.
- Number/percentage of students without access to their own copies of standards-aligned instructional materials for use at school and at home.
- Number of identified instances where facilities do not meet the “good repair” standard (including deficiencies and extreme deficiencies).

The examples above are all data elements that are currently required as part of the SARC. The web-based user interface system for the evaluation rubrics is being developed based on the same data system that supports the California Department of Education’s SARC template. Accordingly, the evaluation rubrics system could auto-populate this data for LEAs that use the SARC template by aggregating the information from all schools within the LEA.

### **Implementation of State Academic Standards (Priority 2)**

- *Standard:* LEA annually measures its progress implementing state academic standards and reports the results to its local governing board 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.

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

- How would you rate the strength of your district's progress in implementing California's new standards in the following areas?
- How would you rate the preparedness of the following district and school staff to implement California's English Language Arts, English language development, mathematics, and science standards?

### **Parent Engagement (Priority 3)**

- *Standard:* LEA annually measures its progress in (1) seeking input from parents in decision making and (2) promoting parental participation in programs, and reports the results to its local governing board 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.

Examples of measures that could be included in a self-assessment tool or tracked and reported through the local data selection option of the evaluation rubrics include:

- 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.
- Percent of teachers and administrators who have participated in one or more professional development opportunities related to engaging parents/caregivers in decision making.
- Percent of parents/caregivers serving on school/district committees who report feeling that their input is respected and valued and reflected in school/district plans.

### **School Climate – Local Climate Surveys (Priority 6)**

- *Standard:* LEA administers a local climate survey at least every other year that provides a valid measure of perceptions of school safety and connectedness, such as the California Healthy Kids Survey, to students in at least one grade within the grade span(s) that the LEA serves (e.g., K-5, 6-8, 9-12), and reports the results to its local governing board 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.

### **Coordination of Services for Expelled Students – COE Only (Priority 9)**

- *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:* COE 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.

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

- *Standard:* COE annually measures its progress in coordinating services for foster youth and reports the results to its local governing board 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:* COE 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. The COE would be able to rate its progress on the

prompts using a rating scale, e.g., 1 to 5 scale corresponding to different levels of progress or implementation.

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

- Establishing ongoing collaboration and policy development, including establishing formalized information sharing agreements with child welfare, probation, LEAs, the courts, and other organizations to determine the proper educational placement of foster youth.
- 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.
- Providing information and assistance to LEAs regarding the educational needs of foster youth in order to improve educational outcomes.

8-29-16 [California Department of Education and State Board of Education]

