



SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF EDUCATION

Agenda Item 9.1

Meeting Date: October 18, 2018

Subject: California School Dashboard Local Indicator Update

- Information Item Only
- Approval on Consent Agenda
- Conference (for discussion only)
- Conference/First Reading (Action Anticipated: _____)
- Conference/Action
- Action
- Public Hearing

Division: Superintendent's Office and Continuous Improvement and Accountability Office

context of the state's priorities. The Dashboard consists of both State and Local Indicators. The district has completed the self-assessment measures on the state's Local Indicators to be included in the Fall 2018 release of the California School Dashboard. Per the California Department of Education, the rating must be reported to the governing board in a public session prior to posting the results online. The Local Indicators data will be linked to the web page

Board of Education Executive Summary

Superintendent's Office and
Continuous Improvement and Accountability Office
California School Dashboard Local Indicator Update
October 18, 2018



I. Overview/History of Department or Program

In July 2013, the state Legislature approved a new funding system for all California public schools. This new funding system, Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), requires that every Local Education Agency develop a Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP). The 2018-

Board of Education Executive Summary

Superintendent's Office and
Continuous Improvement and Accountability Office
California School Dashboard Local Indicator Update
October 18, 2018



IV. Goals, Objectives and Measures:

The Equity, Access, and Social Justice Guiding Principle states “all students are given an equal opportunity to graduate with the greatest number of postsecondary choices from the widest array of options.” This guiding principle demands that data be used to transparently assess students by name, by need, and by inequities, and it serves as the moral call to action to build on the district’s foundation while striving for continuous improvement.

The California School Dashboard represents a common tool that stakeholders may use to understand student progress and achievement in the context of the state’s priorities. Every LEA and all public schools in California are represented by a Dashboard.

The following measures are included in the Dashboard:

State Indicators	Local Indicators
Graduation Rate Suspension Rate English Learner Progress Indicator Student Achievement (ELA/Math) College-Career Indicator Chronic Absenteeism	Basic Services Implementation of State Standards Parent Involvement School Climate Course Access (new – fall 2018)

The State Indicators are reported through established channels such as the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS). The state does not collect data for Local Indicators.

Local Indicators only appear on the district level Dashboard. School Dashboards do not include Local Indicators, except for the district’s dependent (locally-funded) charter schools. All charter schools in the state are regarded as a Local Educational Agency.


Unlike the State Indicators, which provide a color-based performance rating based on status and change, the rating system for Local Indicators consists of these three terms: “Met,” “Not Met,” or “Not Met for Two Years.” To receive the rating of “Met,” an LEA must do the following:

- Measure progress based on locally available information;
- Use the self-assessment tools provided by the State Bebe.ab .abtate Bt

t

Board of Education Executive Summary

Superintendent's Office and
Continuous Improvement and Accountability Office
California School Dashboard Local Indicator Update
October 18, 2018



To determine the rating for each Local Indicator, the district used the following methodology:

LCFF Priority 1: Basic

The district used data already collected in 2017-18 reported through the School Accountability Report Card to affirm sufficiency of instructional materials, the condition of school facilities, and teacher misassignments and vacancies.

LCFF Priority 2: Implementation of State Academic Standards


The district used the California Department of Education's Self-Reflection Tool to survey district administrators in spring 2018 on progress in areas of professional learning, instructional materials, and policies and programs that support improvement.

LCFF Priority 3: Parent Engagement

The district chose to measure progress in Parent Engagement (defined as seeking input in decision-making and promoting participation in programs) by reporting on the local measures

Board of Education Executive Summary

Superintendent's Office and
Continuous Improvement and Accountability Office
California School Dashboard Local Indicator Update
October 18, 2018



the Strategic Plan. To increase coherence throughout the system, the budget, School Plan for Student Achievement, and LCAP processes are increasingly aligned and integrated.

VI. Results:

Based on the criteria stipulated by the State Board of Education, the results for the Local Indicator rating is below. The district affirms with confidence that it has followed the steps

Performance Standards

The performance standards for the local performance indicators are:

OPTION 2: Reflection Tool

Recently Adopted Academic Standards and/or Curriculum Frameworks

1. 5 DWH WKH / (\$ ¶ V SURJUHVV LQ SURYLGLQJ SURIHVVLRQ

recently adopted academic standards and/or curriculum frameworks identified below.

Rating Scale (lowest to highest): 1 Exploration and Research Phase; 2 Beginning Development; 3 Initial Implementation; 4 Full Implementation; 5 Full Implementation and Sustainability

Academic Standards	1	2	3	4	5
ELA Common Core State Standards for ELA					
ELD (Aligned to ELA Standards)					
Mathematics Common Core State Standards for Mathematics					
Next Generation Science Standards					
History/Social Science					

2. 5 DWH WKH / (\$ ¶ V SURJUHVV LQ PDNLQJ LQVWUXFWLRQ

recently adopted academic standards and/or curriculum frameworks identified below available in all classrooms where the subject is taught.

Rating Scale (lowest to highest): 1 Exploration and Research Phase; 2 Beginning Development; 3 Initial Implementation; 4 Full Implementation; 5 Full Implementation and Sustainability

Academic Standards	1	2	3	4	5
ELA Common Core State Standards for ELA					
ELD (Aligned to ELA Standards)					
Mathematics Common Core State Standards for Mathematics					
Next Generation Science Standards					
History/Social Science					

3. 5 DWH WKH / (\$ ¶ V SURJUHVV LQ LPSOHPHQWLQJ SROLFLH

identifying areas where they can improve in delivering instruction aligned to the recently adopted academic standards and/or curriculum frameworks identified below (e.g., collaborative time, focused classroom walkthroughs, teacher pairing).

Rating Scale (lowest to highest): 1 Exploration and Research Phase; 2 Beginning Development; 3 Initial Implementation; 4 Full Implementation; 5 Full Implementation and Sustainability

Academic Standards	1	2	3	4	5
ELA Common Core State Standards for ELA					
ELD (Aligned to ELA Standards)					
Mathematics Common Core State Standards for Mathematics					

Other Adopted Academic Standards

4.

Parent Engagement (LCFF Priority 3)

Access to a Broad Course of Study (LCFF Priority 7)

LEAs provide a narrative summary of the extent to which all students have access to and are enrolled in a broad course of study by addressing, at a minimum, the following four prompts:

1. Briefly identify the locally selected measures or tools that the LEA is using to track the extent to which all students have access to, and are enrolled in, a broad course of study, based on grade spans, unduplicated student groups, and individuals with exceptional needs served.
2. Using the locally selected measures or tools, summarize the extent to which all students have access to, and are enrolled in, a broad course of study. The summary should identify any differences across school sites and student groups in access to, and enrollment in, a broad course of study, and may describe progress over time in the extent to which all students have access to, and are enrolled in, a broad course of study.
3. Given the results of the tool or locally selected measures, identify the barriers preventing the LEA from providing access to a broad course of study for all students.
4. In response to the results of the tool or locally selected measures, what revisions, decisions, or new actions will the LEA implement, or has the LEA implemented, to ensure access to a broad course of study for all students?