

MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 25, 2016

TO: MEMBERS, State Board of Education

FROM: TOM TORLAKSON, State Superintendent of Public Instruction

SUBJECT: Proposed Percentile Cut Scores for State Indicators

Summary of Key Issues

At the May 2016 State Board of Education (SBE) meeting, the SBE approved the methodology for calculating performance for state indicators within California's accountability and continuous improvement system. This memorandum is a review of the recommended cut scores that will be used to determine a performance category for the five state indicators that were approved as part of the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) evaluation rubrics design.

Background

The California Model uses equally weighted percentile cut scores for "Status" and "Change" to make an overall determination for each of the indicators. Combining the five "Status" levels and five "Change" levels creates a five-by-five grid (producing 25 results). To provide the SBE and the California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG) with recommended cut scores for the California Model, California Department of Education (CDE) staff conducted multiple simulations using various methodologies to set cut scores for each state indicator with expert guidance from the Technical Design Group (TDG). The five state indicators, with proposed cut scores, discussed in this memorandum are:

1. Graduation Rate Indicator
2. Suspension Rate Indicator
3. Academic Indicator
4. College/Career Indicator (CCI)
5. English Learner Indicator (ELI)

Status Levels, Change Levels, and Performance Categories

A unique set of cut scores were determined separately for each indicator by using distributions based on local educational agency (LEA)-level data and applying the LEA cut scores to all schools, where appropriate. The two exceptions to this rule are the: (1) Suspension Rate Indicator and (2) Academic Indicator. Each set of cut scores will remain in place for a select number of years (e.g., three to five years), to be determined by the SBE.

- **Status** was determined using the current year performance (i.e., current year graduation rate). The results for all LEAs or schools were ordered from highest to lowest, and four cut scores were selected based on the distribution. These cut points created five “Status” levels which are:
 - Very High
 - High
 - Median
 - Low
 - Very Low

- **Change** is the difference between performance from the current year and the prior year, or the difference between the current year and a multi-year average (e.g., the difference between the current year graduation rate and the three-year average). The results for all LEAs or schools were ordered separately from highest to lowest for positive change and lowest to highest for negative change. Four cut scores were set, two for positive change and two for negative change, which created the following five “Change” levels:
 - Increased Significantly
 - Increased
 - Maintained
 - Declined
 - Declined Significantly

- **Performance Category:** The combination of an LEA’s or school’s “Status” and “Change” determines the performance category, which are represented by a color (i.e., red, orange, yellow, green, and blue).

The CDE presented the recommended “Status” and “Change” cut scores for each state indicator, along with the designated performance categories, to the CPAG in June 2016. The CPAG was supportive of the recommended cut scores and the approach to calculating “Status” and “Change.” At the time of the June 2016 CPAG meeting, the school-level cut scores for the Suspension Rate Indicator were presented, but cut scores for the LEA level were still being developed. Additionally, in light of the SBE decision made at their July 2016 meeting to move grade eleven assessment results to the CCI, the LEA-level cut scores for the Academic Indicator have since been revised.

The data simulations used to inform the proposed cut points for the CCI status and change were established by modeling former Early Assessment Program (EAP) results (i.e., enhanced STAR Program assessment) in the 2013–14 four-year graduation cohort (Attachment 4). Therefore, these simulations are **presented for illustrative purposes only** to demonstrate the performance categories and standards for the CCI. The September 2016 State Board of Education (SBE) item will provide an update on the CCI standards.

Similarly, the data simulations for the Academic Indicator are **presented for illustrative purposes only** to demonstrate the performance categories and standards for the

English language arts (ELA) and Mathematics Academic Indicator. The data simulations used to inform the proposed cut points for status on the Academic Indicator were established using the first year of the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments (Attachment 3). The Academic Indicator simulations will be revised to use the second year of Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment and the updated Academic Indicator standards will be presented to the SBE at its November 2016 meeting.

The cut scores for each of the five state indicators, including the new LEA-level cut scores for the Suspension Rate and Academic Indicators, will be presented for approval to the SBE at the September 2016 meeting.

The attachments in this memorandum separately reviews each state indicator and covers the following information:

- A brief description of the state indicator
- A table displaying the proposed cut scores and a distribution table for “Status”
- A table displaying the proposed cut scores and a distribution table for “Change”
- A five-by-five color chart and statewide summary tables, which display the number and percent of LEAs and schools in each of the five performance categories
- A set of tables displaying the number and percent of student groups in each of the five performance categories for LEAs and schools

Note: Because a separate accountability system is being developed for alternative schools, data from alternative schools were excluded from the analyses conducted for each measure.

Attachment(s)

Attachment 1: Graduation Rate Indicator (7 pages)

Attachment 2: Suspension Rate Indicator (15 pages)

Attachment 3: Academic Indicator (11 pages)

Attachment 4: College/Career Indicator (8 pages)

Attachment 5: English Learner Indicator (5 pages)

Graduation Rate Indicator

The Graduation Rate Indicator is based on the four-year cohort graduation rates. A graduation cohort is a group of high school students who could potentially graduate during a four-year time period (grade nine through grade twelve). The formula to calculate the four-year graduation cohort is provided in the example below:

2015 Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rate Formula

Number of students who earn a regular high school diploma by the end of 2014–15 cohort
divided by
Number of first-time grade nine students in 2011–12 plus students who transfer in, minus students who transfer out, emigrate, or die during school years 2011–12, 2012–13, 2013–14, and 2014–15.

Statewide, the graduating class of 2014–15 had a four-year cohort consisting of 488,612 students. Of those students, 401,957 graduated with a regular high school diploma by the end of 2014–15¹. The calculation of the graduation rate is:

$$401,957 \text{ divided by } 488,612 = \mathbf{82.3 \text{ percent Graduation Rate}}$$

Note: Students who earn a Special Education Certificate of Completion or a general equivalency diploma are not counted as high school graduates but are included in the denominator.

Status

For this indicator, “Status” is the current four-year cohort graduation rate (i.e., 2014–15). Because the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) requires states to identify high schools with a graduation rate of less than 67 percent for support, the cut score for the “Very Low” level was set at less than 67 percent. Table 1 displays the proposed cut scores for each “Status” level:

Table 1

Status Level	Status Cut Score
Very Low	Graduation rate is less than 67%.
Low	Graduation rate is 67% to less than 85%.
Median	Graduation rate is 85% to less than 90%.
High	Graduation rate is 90% to less than 95%.
Very High	Graduation rate is 95% or greater.

¹ Source: CDE DataQuest Web page (<http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>)

Table 2 displays the “Status” cut scores based on the statewide LEA-level distribution.

Table 2

Percentile	Graduation Rate	Status Level
5	61.8760	Very Low
6.2	67.0000	
10	77.1140	Low
15	81.8700	
20	84.7200	
20.2	85.0000	
25	86.8200	Median
30	88.2880	
35	89.4880	
37.1	90.0000	High
40	90.5800	
45	91.3240	
50	92.1500	
55	92.9100	
60	93.5240	
65	94.2000	
70	94.8020	
72	95.0000	Very High
75	95.3500	
80	96.0560	
85	96.7740	
90	97.3280	
95	98.0120	

Total number of LEAs = 515

Change

“Change” is the difference between the current four-year cohort graduation rate and a three-year average (e.g., 2011–12, 2012–13, and 2013–14). Table 3 displays the proposed cut scores for each “Change” level:

Table 3

Change Level	Change Cut Score
Declined Significantly	Graduation rate declined by more than 5%.
Declined	Graduation rate declined by 1% to 5%.
Maintained	Graduation rate is 95%, or declined or increased by less than 1%.
Increased	Graduation rate increased by 1% to less than 5%.
Increased Significantly	Graduation rate increased by 5% or more.

Table 4 displays the “Change” cut scores based on the statewide LEA-level distribution.

Table 4

Percentile	Graduation Rate Change	Change Level
5	-9.4200	Declined Significantly
10	-6.7400	
15	-5.3000	
16.5	-5.0000	Declined
20	-4.4000	
25	-3.6000	
30	-3.0000	
35	-2.4000	
40	-1.9000	
45	-1.6000	
50	-1.2000	
52	-1.0000	Maintained
55	-0.7000	
60	-0.3000	
65	0.4000	Increased
69.5	1.0000	
70	1.1000	
75	1.6000	
80	2.5800	
85	3.9000	Increased Significantly
89.5	5.0000	
90	5.3400	
95	8.3000	

Total number of LEAs = 515

Performance Categories for LEAs, Schools, and Student Groups

Table 5 identifies the “Status” and “Change” cut scores presented earlier. It also reflects the performance categories that LEAs and schools would earn based on their “Status” and “Change” results. Tables 6 through 10 reflect the number and percent of LEAs, schools, and student groups in each of the five performance categories.

Table 5

Graduation Change

Graduation Status	Level	Declined Significantly by more than 5%	Declined by 1% to 5%	Maintained Declined or improved by less than 1%	Increased by 1% to less than 5%	Increased Significantly by 5% or more
	Very High 95% or greater	Gray	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue
	High 90% to less than 95%	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green	Blue
	Median 85% to less than 90%	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green
	Low 67% to less than 85%	Red	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Yellow
	Very Low Less than 67%	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red

Gray colored cell=Not applicable

Table 6: Statewide LEAs’ Performance

# of LEAs	N/A	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
515	N/A	70 (13.6%)	122 (23.7%)	106 (20.6%)	81 (15.7%)	136 (26.4%)

Table 7: Statewide Schools’ Performance

# of Schools	N/A	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
1,221	N/A	99 (8.1%)	85 (7.0%)	186 (15.2%)	298 (24.4%)	553 (45.3%)

Table 8: Performance by School Type (Graduation Rate)

School Type	# of Schools	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
Non Charter	1,026	56 (5.5%)	69 (6.7%)	153 (14.9%)	263 (25.6%)	485 (47.3%)
Charter	195	43 (22.1%)	16 (8.2%)	33 (16.9%)	35 (17.9%)	68 (34.9%)
Small Schools*	19	9 (47.4%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (15.8%)	4 (21.1%)	3 (15.8%)
Non Small Schools	1,202	90 (7.5%)	85 (7.1%)	183 (15.2%)	294 (24.5%)	550 (45.8%)

*Small schools have 30 to 99 students enrolled.

Note:

- Red Performance Category:** The “Red Performance Category” is different for the Graduation Rate Indicator compared to the other indicators. All LEAs and schools with a graduation rate below 67 percent will be placed in the red performance category.
- Blue Performance Category:** Any LEA or school with a graduation rate at or above 95 percent will be categorized in the “Blue Performance Category” regardless of their “Change” results. For example, a school with a graduation rate of 98 percent in their prior year and a graduation rate of 96 percent in the current year will be placed in the blue performance category.

Table 9: Statewide LEAs' Student Group Performance (Graduation Rate)

Student Groups	Total*	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
All LEAs	515	70 (13.6%)	122 (23.7%)	106 (20.6%)	81 (15.7%)	136 (26.4%)
African American	160	46 (8.9%)	40 (7.8%)	28 (5.4%)	25 (4.9%)	21 (4.1%)
Asian	174	3 (0.6%)	16 (3.1%)	24 (4.7%)	31 (6.0%)	100 (19.4%)
Filipino	105	2 (0.4%)	10 (1.9%)	14 (2.7%)	13 (2.5%)	66 (12.8%)
Hispanic/Latino	431	80 (15.5%)	111 (21.6%)	82 (15.9%)	73 (14.2%)	85 (16.5%)
Native American	13	4 (0.8%)	2 (0.4%)	3 (0.6%)	2 (0.4%)	2 (0.4%)
Pacific Islander	17	4 (0.8%)	6 (1.2%)	1 (0.2%)	5 (1.0%)	1 (0.2%)
Two or More Races	93	8 (1.6%)	23 (4.5%)	17 (3.3%)	13 (2.5%)	32 (6.2%)
White	372	48 (9.3%)	74 (14.4%)	90 (17.5%)	51 (9.9%)	109 (21.2%)
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	492	106 (20.6%)	135 (26.2%)	83 (16.1%)	82 (15.9%)	86 (16.7%)
English Learners	308	73 (14.2%)	78 (15.1%)	75 (14.6%)	56 (10.9%)	26 (5.0%)
Students with Disabilities	268	133 (25.8%)	65 (12.6%)	44 (8.5%)	16 (3.1%)	10 (1.9%)

*Total = Number of LEAs with 30 or more students at the schoolwide level and student group level.

NOTE: For all percentages calculated above, the total number of LEAs (515) was used for the denominator.

Table 10: Statewide Schools' Student Group Performance (Graduation Rate)

Student Groups	Total*	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
All Schools	1,221	99 (8.1%)	85 (7.0%)	186 (15.2%)	298 (24.4%)	553 (45.3%)
African American	249	31 (2.5%)	34 (2.8%)	47 (3.9)	71 (5.8%)	66 (5.4%)
Asian	324	6 (0.5%)	19 (1.6%)	36 (2.9%)	33 (2.7%)	230 (18.8%)
Filipino	117	2 (0.2%)	3 (0.2%)	13 (1.1%)	18 (1.5%)	81 (6.6%)
Hispanic/Latino	1,017	87 (7.1%)	98 (8.0%)	170 (13.9%)	244 (20.0%)	418 (34.2%)
Native American	5	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.1%)	1 (0.1%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (0.2%)
Pacific Islander	1	1 (0.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Two or More Races	54	3 (0.2%)	7 (0.6%)	9 (0.7%)	5 (0.4%)	30 (2.5%)
White	764	50 (4.1%)	51 (4.2%)	103 (8.4%)	126 (10.3%)	434 (35.5%)
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	1,133	103 (8.4%)	128 (10.5%)	192 (15.6%)	307 (25.1%)	403 (33.0%)
English learners	710	131 (10.7%)	83 (6.8%)	173 (14.2%)	149 (12.2%)	176 (14.4%)
Students with Disabilities	648	223 (18.3%)	116 (9.5%)	172 (14.1%)	78 (6.4%)	59 (4.8%)

*Total = Number of schools with 30 or more students at the schoolwide level and student group level.

NOTE: For all percentages calculated above, the total number of schools (1,221) was used for the denominator.

Suspension Rate Indicator

The Suspension Rate Indicator is based on multiple distributions. The preference for setting the cut scores is to use local educational agency (LEA)-level distributions and apply the LEA cut points to all schools. However, the suspension data varies widely among LEA type (elementary, high, and unified) and school type (elementary, middle, and high). The Technical Design Group (TDG) reviewed multiple data simulations based on several methodologies and determined it was more appropriate to set multiple suspension cut scores based on LEA type distributions as well as school type distributions. Therefore, the suspension indicator has six different sets of cut points for “Status” and “Change”: (1) three sets based on LEA type distributions and (2) three sets based on school type distributions.

The school type cut scores were shared with California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG) at their June 2016 meeting. Unfortunately, the methodology for setting the LEA type cut scores was not finalized until the August 3, 2016, TDG meeting, which did not allow sufficient time to obtain feedback from the CPAG. This attachment contains all six sets of cut scores.

For the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP), charter schools are treated as LEAs. Under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), single school districts are treated as schools. Therefore, charter schools and single school districts will receive two accountability reports (LEA-level and school-level). Because distributions were set separately for LEAs and schools, charter schools and single school districts could potentially receive two inconsistent determinations, which is in conflict with the goal of developing one integrated local-state-federal accountability system. The California Department of Education (CDE) is recommending that charter schools and single school districts be held accountable for the cut scores established using the school-level distributions, and that both the LEA and school reports reflect the results based on the school-level cut scores, allowing for an integrated accountability system.

Suspension Rate Formula

The suspension rate calculations are based on the unduplicated number of students suspended in an academic year. The formula is:

Number of Students Suspended
divided by
Cumulative Enrollment Multiplied by 100

LEA-Level Status

“Status” is the current year suspension rate. Table 1 displays the proposed cut scores for each “Status” level by LEA type: elementary, high, and unified school districts.

Table 1

Status Level	Elementary School District	High School District	Unified School District
Very Low	Suspension rate is 0.5% or less.	Suspension rate is 1.5% or less.	Suspension rate is 1.0% or less.
Low	Suspension rate is greater than 0.5% to 1.5%.	Suspension rate is greater than 1.5% to 3.5%.	Suspension rate is greater than 1.0% to 2.5%.
Median	Suspension rate is greater than 1.5% to 3.0%.	Suspension rate is greater than 3.5% to 6.0%.	Suspension rate is greater than 2.5% to 4.5%.
High	Suspension rate is greater than 3.0% to 6.0%.	Suspension rate is greater than 6.0% to 9.0%.	Suspension rate is greater than 4.5% to 8.0%.
Very High	Suspension rate is greater than 6.0%.	Suspension rate is greater than 9.0%.	Suspension rate is greater than 8.0%.

Tables 2 through 4 display the “Status” cut scores based on the statewide LEA distributions.

Table 2: Elementary School Districts

Percentile	Suspension Rate	Status Level
5	8.8000	Very High
10	6.4000	
11.2	6.0000	High
15	5.3500	
20	4.6000	
25	4.0000	
30	3.5000	
35	3.1000	
36.1	3.0000	Median
40	2.8000	
45	2.6000	
50	2.1000	
55	1.9000	
60	1.6000	
61	1.5000	Low
65	1.3000	
70	1.1000	
75	0.7000	
80	0.5000	Very Low
85	0.3000	
90	0.0000	
95	0.0000	

Total number of elementary school districts = 349

Table 3: High School Districts

Percentile	Suspension Rate	Status Level
5	12.0	Very High
10	11.3	
15	9.5	
16	9.0	High
20	8.6	
25	7.9	
30	7.4	
35	7.0	
40	6.6	
44	6.0	Median
45	5.9	
50	5.6	
55	5.2	
60	4.7	
65	4.6	
70	4.2	Low
75	3.7	
80	3.5	
85	2.6	
90	1.8	Very Low
93.3	1.5	
95	1.4	

Total number of high school districts = 75

Table 4: Unified School Districts

Percentile	Suspension Rate	Status Level
5	9.5000	Very High
10	8.2000	
10.4	8.0000	High
15	7.2000	
20	6.5000	
25	5.9000	
30	5.6000	
35	5.1000	
40	4.7000	
42	4.5000	Median
45	4.3000	
50	4.000	
55	3.7000	
60	3.3000	
65	3.0000	
70	2.8000	
73.1	2.5000	Low
75	2.4000	
80	2.2000	
85	1.8000	
90	1.4000	
92.8	1.0000	Very Low
95	0.9000	

Total number of unified school districts = 337

LEA-Level Change

“Change” is the difference between the current year suspension rate and the prior year suspension rate. Table 5 displays the proposed cut scores for each “Change” level by LEA type:

Table 5

Change Level	Elementary School District	High School District	Unified School District
Declined Significantly	Suspension rate declined by 2% or greater.	Suspension rate declined by 3% or greater.	Suspension rate declined by 2% or greater.
Declined	Suspension rate declined by 0.3% to less than 2%.	Suspension rate declined by 0.5% to less than 3%.	Suspension rate declined by 0.3% to less than 2%
Maintained	Suspension rate declined or increased by less than 0.3%.	Suspension rate declined or increased by less than 0.5%.	Suspension rate declined or increased by less than 0.3%.
Increased	Suspension rate increased by 0.3% to 2%.	Suspension rate increased by 0.5% to 3%.	Suspension rate increased by 0.3% to 2%.
Increased Significantly	Suspension rate increased by greater than 2%.	Suspension rate increased by greater than 3%.	Suspension rate increased greater than 2%.

Tables 6 through 8 displays the “Change” cut scores based on the statewide LEA distributions by type.

**Table 6: Elementary School Districts
 (Suspension)**

Percentile	% Change from Prior Year to Current Year	Change Level
5	2.2500	Increased Significantly
6.7	2.0000	Increased
10	0.9000	
15	0.6000	
20	0.3000	
25	0.2000	Maintained
30	0.1000	
35	0.0000	
40	0.0000	
45	-0.1000	
50	-0.2000	
55	-0.3000	Declined
60	-0.4000	
65	-0.5000	
70	-0.8000	
75	-0.9000	
80	-1.1000	
85	-1.5000	
90	-2.0000	
95	-3.1500	Declined Significantly

Total number of elementary school districts = 349

**Table 7: High School Districts
 (Suspension)**

Percentile	% Change from Prior Year to Current Year	Change Level
5	4.2000	Increased Significantly
5.3	3.0000	Increased
10	0.9000	
15	0.6000	
16	0.5000	
20	0.3000	Maintained
25	0.1000	
30	-0.1000	
35	-0.1000	
40	-0.2000	
45	-0.5000	
50	-0.7000	Declined
55	-0.8000	
60	-1.0000	
65	-1.2000	
70	-1.4000	
75	-1.6000	
80	-1.9000	
85	-2.3000	
90	-2.6000	
92	-3.0000	Declined
95	-4.6000	Declined Significantly

Total number of high school districts = 75

Table 8: Unified School Districts (Suspension)

Percentile	% Change from Prior Year to Current Year	Change Level
3	2.1000	Increased Significantly
3.6	2.0000	Increased
5	1.4000	
10	0.9000	
15	0.5000	
20	0.3000	
25	0.1000	Maintained
30	0.0000	
35	-0.2000	
40	-0.2000	
40.2	-0.3000	Declined
45	-0.4000	
50	-0.5000	
55	-0.6000	
60	-0.9000	
65	-1.0000	
70	-1.2000	
75	-1.3000	
80	-1.7000	
83.7	-2.0000	Declined Significantly
85	-2.1000	
90	-2.5000	
95	-3.2000	

Total number of unified school districts = 337

School-Level Status

“Status” at the school-level uses the current year suspension rate. Table 9 displays the proposed cut scores for each “Status” level by school type (i.e., elementary, middle, and high schools):

Table 9

Status Level	Elementary School	Middle School	High School
Very Low	Suspension rate is 0.5% or less.	Suspension rate is 0.5% or less.	Suspension rate is 0.5% or less.
Low	Suspension rate is greater than 0.5% to 1.0%.	Suspension rate is greater than 0.5% to 2%.	Suspension rate is greater than 0.5% to 1.5%.
Median	Suspension rate is greater than 1% to 3%.	Suspension rate is greater than 2% to 8%.	Suspension rate is greater than 1.5% to 6%.
High	Suspension rate is greater than 3% to 6%.	Suspension rate is greater than 8% to 12%.	Suspension rate is greater than 6% to 10%.
Very High	Suspension rate is greater than 6%.	Suspension rate is greater than 12%.	Suspension rate is greater than 10%.

Tables 10 through 12 display the “Status” cut scores based on the statewide distributions for elementary, middle, and high schools.

Table 10: Elementary Schools

Percentile	Suspension Rate	Status Level
5	6.7000	Very High
6	6.0000	
10	4.7000	High
15	3.7000	
20	3.0000	
25	2.4000	Median
30	2.0000	
35	1.7000	
40	1.4000	
45	1.2000	
50	1.0000	Low
55	0.8000	
60	0.7000	
65	0.5000	Very Low
70	0.4000	
75	0.2000	
80	0.2000	
85	0.0000	
90	0.0000	
95	0.0000	

Total number of elementary schools = 5,776

Table 11: Middle Schools

Percentile	Suspension Rate	Status Level
5	18.3000	Very High
10	14.3400	
15	12.1000	
15.1	12.0000	High
20	10.6800	
25	9.5000	
30	8.6000	
32.9	8.0000	Median
35	7.6000	
40	6.9000	
45	6.1000	
50	5.5000	
55	4.8000	
60	4.3000	
65	3.7000	Low
70	3.1000	
75	2.6000	
80	2.0000	
85	1.5000	
90	0.9000	Very Low
93.3	0.5000	
95	0.3000	

Total number of middle schools = 1,335

Table 12: High Schools

Percentile	Suspension Rate	Status Level
5	14.1000	Very High
10	10.5800	
11.2	10.0000	High
15	8.7000	
20	7.3000	
25	6.5000	
27.8	6.0000	
30	5.7000	Median
35	5.0000	
40	4.4200	
45	3.8000	
50	3.3000	
54.6	2.8000	
60	2.4000	
65	1.9000	
68.4	1.5000	
70	1.4000	
75	0.9000	
80	0.5000	Very Low
85	0.1000	
90	0.0000	
95	0.0000	

Total number of high schools = 1,481

School-Level Change

“Change” at the school-level is the difference between the current year suspension rate and the prior year suspension rate. Table 13 displays the proposed cut scores for each “Change” level by school type:

Table 13

Change Level	Elementary School	Middle School	High School
Declined Significantly	Suspension rate declined by 1% or greater.	Suspension rate declined by 3% or greater.	Suspension rate declined by 2% or greater.
Declined	Suspension rate declined by 0.3% to less than 1%.	Suspension rate declined by 0.3% to less than 3%.	Suspension rate declined by 0.3% to less than 2%.
Maintained	Suspension rate declined or increased by less than 0.3%.	Suspension rate declined or increased by less than 0.3%.	Suspension rate declined or increased by less than 0.3%.
Increased	Suspension rate increased by 0.3% to less than 2%.	Suspension rate increased by 0.3% to less than 4%.	Suspension rate increased by 0.3% to less than 3%.
Increased Significantly	Suspension rate increased by more than 2%.	Suspension rate increased by more than 4%.	Suspension rate increased by more than 3%.

Tables 14 through 16 display the “Change” cut scores based on the statewide distributions for elementary, middle, and high schools.

**Table 14: Elementary Schools
(Suspension)**

Percentile	% Change from Prior Year to Current Year	Change Level
4	2.3000	Increased Significantly
5	2.0000	Increased
10	1.2000	
15	0.7000	
20	0.5000	
25	0.3000	
30	0.2000	Maintained
35	0.0000	
40	0.0000	
45	0.0000	
50	-0.1000	
55	-0.2000	Declined
60	-0.3000	
65	-0.5000	
70	-0.6000	
75	-0.8000	
76.9	-1.0000	Declined Significantly
80	-1.1000	
85	-1.5000	
90	-2.1000	
95	-3.0000	

Total number of elementary schools = 5,776

**Table 15: Middle Schools
(Suspension)**

Percentile	% Change from Prior Year to Current Year	Change Level
5	4.2200	Increased Significantly
5.5	4.0000	Increased
10	2.3000	
15	1.5000	
20	0.9000	
25	0.5000	
26.8	0.3000	Maintained
30	0.1000	
35	0.0000	
40	-0.2000	
40.4	-0.3000	
45	-0.5000	Declined
50	-0.8000	
55	-1.0000	
60	-1.3000	
65	-1.7000	
70	-2.2000	Declined Significantly
75	-2.7000	
77.6	-3.0000	
80	-3.2000	
85	-4.3000	
90	-5.2400	Declined Significantly
95	-7.6000	

Total number of middle schools = 1,335

Table 16: High Schools (Suspension)

Percentile	% Change from Prior Year to Current Year	Change Level
5	4.2900	Increased Significantly
6.7	3.0000	Increased
10	2.0000	
15	1.2000	
20	0.6600	
25	0.4000	
25.7	0.3000	
30	0.2000	Maintained
35	0.0000	
40	0.0000	
45	0.0000	
50	-0.2000	
51	-0.3000	
55	-0.4000	Declined
60	-0.6000	
65	-0.9000	
70	-1.2000	
75	-1.5000	
80	-1.9000	
80.6	-2.0000	Declined Significantly
85	-2.5000	
90	-3.4000	
95	-5.3900	

Total number of high schools = 1,481

Performance Categories for LEAs, Schools, and Student Groups

Although the cut scores determined for the Suspension Rate Indicator were different for LEAs and schools by type, the 25 grid performance categories are the same for all LEAs, schools, and student groups (see Table 17). Since low suspension rates are more desirable than high suspension rates, the scale for suspension is opposite from the other indicators (e.g., a significant increase in suspension rates will result in an overall performance category of red, yellow, or orange). Tables 18 through 22 display the number and percent of LEAs, schools, and student groups in each of the five performance categories.

Table 17

Suspension Change

	Level	Increased Significantly	Increased	Maintained	Declined	Declined Significantly
Suspension Status	Very Low	Gray	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue
	Low	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green	Blue
	Median	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green
	High	Red	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Yellow
	Very High	Red	Red	Red	Orange	Yellow

Gray colored cell=Not applicable

Table 18: Statewide LEAs' Performance (Suspension)

District Type	# of LEAs	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
Elementary School Districts	349	28 (8.0%)	59 (16.9%)	88 (25.2%)	97 (27.8%)	77 (22.1%)
Unified School Districts	337	24 (7.1%)	51 (15.1%)	108 (32.1%)	130 (38.6%)	24 (7.1%)
High School Districts	75	10 (13.3%)	9 (12.0%)	33 (44.0%)	17 (22.7%)	6 (8.0%)
All LEAs	761	61 (8.1%)	120 (15.8%)	223 (29.3%)	250 (32.9%)	107 (14.1%)

Table 19: Statewide Schools' Performance (Suspension)

School Type	# of Schools	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
Elementary	5,776	343 (5.9%)	982 (17.0%)	930 (16.1%)	1,345 (23.3%)	2,176 (37.7%)
Middle	1,335	115 (8.6%)	307 (23.0%)	286 (21.4%)	517 (38.7%)	110 (8.2%)
High	1,481	128 (8.6%)	287 (19.3%)	291 (19.6%)	461 (31.1%)	314 (21.2%)
All Schools	8,592	586 (6.8%)	1,576 (18.3%)	1,507 (17.5%)	2,323 (27.0%)	2,600 (30.3%)

Table 20: Performance by School Type (Suspension)

School Type	# of Schools	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
Non Charter	7,605	518 (6.8%)	1,412 (18.6%)	1,375 (18.1%)	2,107 (27.7%)	2,193 (28.8%)
Charter	987	68 (6.9%)	164 (16.6%)	132 (13.4%)	216 (21.9%)	407 (41.2%)
Small Schools*	278	34 (12.2%)	32 (11.5%)	30 (10.8%)	25 (9.0%)	157 (56.5%)
Non Small Schools	8,314	552 (6.6%)	1,544 (18.6%)	1,477 (17.8%)	2,298 (27.6%)	2,443 (29.4%)

*Small schools have 30 to 99 students enrolled.

Table 21: Statewide LEAs' Student Groups Performance (Suspension)

Student Groups	Total*	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
All LEAs	1,980	149 (7.9%)	307 (16.2%)	374 (19.8%)	495 (26.2%)	565 (29.9%)
African American	795	174 (8.8%)	137 (6.9%)	193 (9.7%)	95 (4.8%)	196 (9.9%)
Asian	692	16 (0.8%)	71 (3.6%)	66 (3.3%)	160 (8.1%)	379 (19.1%)
Filipino	454	13 (0.7%)	56 (2.8%)	66 (3.3%)	97 (4.9%)	222 (11.2%)
Hispanic/Latino	1,694	119 (6.0%)	325 (16.4%)	321 (16.2%)	414 (20.9%)	515 (26.0%)
Native American	335	92 (4.6%)	54 (2.7%)	87 (4.4%)	34 (1.7%)	68 (3.4%)
Pacific Islander	228	42 (2.1%)	41 (2.1%)	37 (1.9%)	46 (2.3%)	62 (3.1%)
Two or More Races	647	79 (4.0%)	105 (5.3%)	125 (6.3%)	142 (7.2%)	196 (9.9%)
White	1,490	128 (6.5%)	252 (12.7%)	263 (13.3%)	360 (18.2%)	487 (24.6%)
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	1,809	193 (9.7%)	351 (17.7%)	385 (19.4%)	365 (18.4%)	515 (26.0%)
English learners	1,280	122 (6.2%)	222 (11.2%)	240 (12.1%)	302 (15.3%)	394 (19.9%)
Students with Disabilities	1,287	304 (15.4%)	257 (13.0%)	291 (14.7%)	154 (7.8%)	281 (14.2%)

*Total = Number of schools with 30 or more students enrolled

Note: For all percentages calculated above, the total number of LEAs (1,980) includes single school districts and charter school and was used for the denominator.

Table 22: Statewide Schools' Student Groups Performance (Suspension)

Student Groups	Total*	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
All Schools	8,592	586 (6.8%)	1,576 (18.3%)	1,507 (17.5%)	2,323 (27.0%)	2,600 (30.3%)
African American	3,232	811 (9.4%)	469 (5.5%)	862 (10.0%)	407 (4.7%)	683 (7.9%)
Asian	3,389	85 (1.0%)	474 (5.5%)	319 (3.7%)	480 (5.6%)	2,031 (23.6%)
Filipino	1,467	62 (0.7%)	260 (3.0%)	92 (1.1%)	194 (2.3%)	859 (10.0%)
Hispanic/Latino	8,133	546 (6.4%)	1,577 (18.4%)	1,258 (14.6%)	2,044 (23.8%)	2,708 (31.5%)
Native American	158	45 (0.5%)	21 (0.2%)	38 (0.4%)	19 (0.2%)	35 (0.4%)
Pacific Islander	126	21 (0.2%)	24 (0.3%)	21 (0.2%)	23 (0.3%)	37 (0.4%)
Two or More Races	2,104	269 (3.1%)	355 (4.1%)	248 (2.9%)	282 (3.3%)	950 (11.1%)
White	6,349	673 (7.8%)	1,198 (13.9%)	1,028 (12.0%)	1,430 (16.6%)	2,020 (23.5%)
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	8,296	796 (9.3%)	1,668 (19.4%)	1,565 (18.2%)	1,944 (22.6%)	2,323 (27.0%)
English learners	7,078	638 (7.4%)	1,231 (14.3%)	1,082 (12.6%)	1,393 (16.2%)	2,734 (31.8%)
Students with Disabilities	7,259	1,749 (20.4%)	1,171 (13.6%)	1,601 (18.6%)	987 (11.5%)	1,751 (20.4%)

*Total = Number of schools with 30 or more students enrolled

Note: For all percentages calculated above, the total number of schools (8,592) includes single school districts and charter schools and was used for the denominator.

Academic Indicator

The Academic Indicator cut score determinations were made separately for English language arts/literacy (ELA) and mathematics proficiency results from the statewide assessments (Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments). Students who score “Standard Exceeded” and “Standard Met” are captured as “proficient.”

Because there is only one year of Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment results, decisions for the “Change” levels cannot be considered at this time. Only the “Status” levels will be used to determine the performance categories, based on 2015 assessment results.

Because the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment results varied significantly between grades three through eight and grade eleven, the TDG recommended setting separate cut scores for schools and separate cut scores for local educational agencies (LEAs). Therefore, at the June 2016 California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG) meeting, proposed cut scores set by school-level grade spans (i.e., elementary, middle, and high schools) by ELA and mathematics were presented. Also presented were the proposed ELA and mathematics cut scores set for all LEAs using the assessment results for grades three through eight and grade eleven.

At the July 2016 State Board of Education (SBE) meeting, the SBE made a decision to move the grade eleven assessment results from the Academic Indicator to the College/Career Indicator (CCI). As a result, the following three updates occurred:

1. High schools will not receive a determination on the Academic Indicator. The grade eleven assessment results for these schools will be captured in the CCI,
2. High school districts also will not receive a determination on the Academic Indicator. The grade eleven assessment results for these districts will be captured in the CCI, and
3. New LEA-level distributions were run using only grades three through eight assessment results and new LEA-level cut scores were established. The LEA-level cut scores reflected in this attachment will be used for elementary and unified school districts. Because changes to the construction of this indicator were made after the June 2016 CPAG meeting, the new LEA-level cut scores were not shared with the CPAG.

In addition, as with the Suspension Rate Indicator, because distributions were set separately for LEAs and schools, the California Department of Education is recommending that charter schools and single school districts be held accountable for the school-level cut scores.

LEA-Level Status for English Language Arts/Literacy

The ELA “Status” for LEAs is based on the 2015 Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment results. Table 1 displays the proposed LEA-level cut scores for each “Status” level:

Table 1

ELA Status Level	ELA Status Cut Points for LEAs
Very Low	Proficiency rate is less than 20%.
Low	Proficiency rate is 20% to less than 35%.
Median	Proficiency rate is 35% to less than 55%.
High	Proficiency rate is 55% to less than 75%.
Very High	Proficiency rate is 75% or greater.

School-Level Status for English Language Arts/Literacy

Parallel to the “Status” for LEAs, the ELA “Status” for schools uses the 2015 Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment results. Table 2 displays the proposed school-level cut scores (for elementary and middle schools) for each “Status” level:

Table 2

ELA Status Level	ELA Status Cut Points for Elementary and Middle Schools
Very Low	Proficiency rate is less than 15%.
Low	Proficiency rate is 15% to less than 35%.
Median	Proficiency rate is 35% to less than 60%.
High	Proficiency rate is 60% to less than 75%.
Very High	Proficiency rate is 75% or greater.

Tables 3 and 4 display the “Status” cut scores for ELA based on the statewide distributions for: (1) LEAs and (2) elementary and middle schools.

Table 3: LEAs (ELA)

Percentile	% Proficient	Status Level
5	19.2632	Very Low
6.3	20.0000	
10	22.9371	Low
15	25.7616	
20	27.3975	
25	29.9609	
30	32.0996	
35	33.9240	
37.4	35.0000	Median
40	36.3550	
45	38.5490	
50	40.4669	
55	42.0572	
60	44.7560	
65	47.1804	
70	49.3720	
75	53.3480	
77.8	55.0000	
80	56.4246	
85	60.7079	
90	67.9829	
94.5	75.0000	Very High
95	75.5198	

Total number of LEAs = 1,866

Table 4: Elementary and Middle Schools (ELA)

Percentile	% Proficient	Status Level
3	13.20	Very Low
5	15.10	
10	18.60	Low
15	21.10	
20	23.50	
25	25.70	
30	28.00	
35	30.50	
40	32.90	Median
44.2	35.00	
45	35.60	
50	38.50	
55	41.40	
60	44.70	
65	47.80	
70	51.50	
75	55.40	
80	59.90	
80.1	60.00	High
85	65.07	
90	70.90	
93.4	75.20	Very High
95	77.75	

Total number of schools = 7,068

LEA-Level Status for Mathematics

The mathematics “Status” for LEAs is based on the 2015 Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment results. Table 5 displays the proposed LEA-level cut scores for each “Status” level:

Table 5

Math Status Level	Math Status Cut Points for LEAs
Very Low	Proficiency rate is less than 15%.
Low	Proficiency rate is 15% to less than 25%.
Median	Proficiency rate is 25% to less than 45%.
High	Proficiency rate is 45% to less than 70%.
Very High	Proficiency rate is 70% or greater.

School-Level Status for Mathematics

The mathematics “Status” for schools is also based on the 2015 Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment results. Table 6 displays the proposed school-level cut scores (for elementary and middle schools) for each “Status” level:

Table 6

Math Status Level	Math Status Cut Points for Elementary and Middle Schools
Very Low	Proficiency rate is less than 10%.
Low	Proficiency rate is 10% to less than 25%.
Median	Proficiency rate is 25% to less than 55%.
High	Proficiency rate is 55% to less than 75%.
Very High	Proficiency rate is 75% or greater.

Tables 7 and 8 display the “Status” cut scores for mathematics based on the statewide distributions for: (1) LEAs and (2) elementary and middle schools.

**Table 7: LEAs
(Mathematics)**

Percentile	% Proficient	Status Level
5	12.8000	Very Low
9.5	15.0000	
10	15.3000	Low
15	17.8000	
20	19.8000	
25	21.3000	
30	22.9000	
35	24.6000	
36.6	25.0000	
40	26.4000	
45	28.6000	
50	30.7000	
55	33.4000	
60	35.5000	
65	37.6000	
70	40.5000	
75	43.9000	
76.2	45.0000	High
80	47.5000	
85	52.7000	
90	59.8000	
94.8	70.0000	
95	70.1000	

Total number of LEAs = 1,863

**Table 8: Elementary and Middle Schools
(Mathematics)**

Percentile	% Proficient	Status Level
5	9.80	Very Low
5.5	10.10	
10	12.60	Low
15	14.79	
20	16.70	
25	18.60	
30	20.50	
35	22.50	
40	24.70	
40.8	25.09	Median
45	27.20	
50	29.90	
55	32.70	
60	35.70	
65	38.90	
70	42.90	
75	47.40	
80	52.60	
82.2	55.00	
85	58.00	
90	64.80	
95	74.20	
95.4	75.10	Very High
98	82.50	

Total number of schools = 7,065

The data simulations used to inform the proposed cut points for status on the Academic Indicator were established using the first year of the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments. Therefore, these data simulations are **presented for illustrative purposes only** to demonstrate the performance categories and standards for the English language arts (ELA) and Mathematics Academic Indicator. The Academic Indicator simulations will be revised to use the second year of Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment and the updated Academic Indicator standards will be presented to the SBE at its November 2016 meeting.

Performance Categories for LEAs, Schools, and Student Groups for English Language Arts/Literacy

Tables 9 through 12 identify the number (and percent) of LEAs, schools, and student groups in each of the five performance categories.

Table 9: Statewide LEA and School Performance

STATUS ONLY (Reflects 2015 Assessment Results for Grades 3 through 8)

Type	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
LEAs (1,503)	57 (3.8%)	343 (22.8%)	711 (47.3%)	312 (20.8%)	80 (5.3%)
Schools (7,068)	347 (4.9%)	2,767 (39.1%)	2,543 (36.0%)	938 (13.3%)	473 (6.7%)

Table 10: Performance by School Type

School Type	# of Schools	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
Non Charter	6,359	313 (4.9%)	2,560 (40.3%)	2,230 (35.1%)	820 (12.9%)	436 (6.9%)
Charter	709	34 (4.8%)	207 (29.2%)	313 (44.2%)	118 (16.6%)	37 (5.2%)
Small Schools*	100	14 (14.0%)	27 (27.0%)	42 (42.0%)	9 (9.0%)	8 (8.0%)
Non Small Schools	6,968	333 (4.8%)	2,740 (39.3%)	2,501 (35.9%)	929 (13.3%)	465 (6.7%)

*Small schools have 30 to 99 students enrolled.

Table 11: Statewide LEAs' Student Group Performance (ELA Grades 3 through 8)

Student Groups	Total*	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
All LEAs	1,503	57 (3.8%)	343 (22.8%)	711 (47.3%)	312 (20.8%)	80 (5.3%)
African American	442	79 (5.3%)	186 (12.4%)	153 (10.2%)	22 (1.5%)	2 (0.1%)
Asian	424	3 (0.2%)	17 (1.1%)	83 (5.5%)	154 (10.2%)	167 (11.1%)
Filipino	250	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.1%)	44 (2.9%)	151 (10.0%)	54 (3.6%)
Hispanic/Latino	1,280	123 (8.2%)	634 (42.2%)	442 (29.4%)	69 (4.6%)	12 (0.8%)
Native American	95	28 (1.9%)	41 (2.7%)	22 (1.5%)	4 (0.3%)	0 (0.0%)
Pacific Islander	95	19 (1.3%)	37 (2.5%)	38 (2.5%)	1 (0.1%)	0 (0.0%)
Two or More Races	362	3 (0.2%)	34 (2.3%)	121 (8.1%)	136 (9.0%)	68 (4.5%)
White	1,141	13 (0.9%)	135 (9.0%)	497 (33.1%)	354 (23.6%)	142 (9.4%)
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	1,415	153 (10.2%)	741 (49.3%)	473 (31.5%)	39 (2.6%)	9 (0.6%)
English learners	1,042	357 (23.8%)	466 (31.0%)	173 (11.5%)	40 (2.7%)	6 (0.4%)
Students with Disabilities	859	574 (38.2%)	213 (14.2%)	62 (4.1%)	9 (0.6%)	1 (0.1%)

*Total=Number of LEAs with 30 or more students at the school level and student group level taking the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments.

Note: For all percentages calculated above, the total number of LEAs (1,503) includes single school districts and charter schools and was used for the denominator.

Table 12: Statewide Schools' Student Group Performance (ELA Grades 3 through 8)

Student Groups	Total*	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
All Schools	7,068	347 (4.9%)	2,767 (39.1%)	2,543 (36.0%)	938 (13.3%)	473 (6.7%)
African American	1,422	378 (5.4%)	699 (9.9%)	313 (4.4%)	29 (0.4%)	3 (0.04%)
Asian	1,781	11 (0.2%)	107 (1.5%)	363 (5.1%)	439 (6.2%)	861 (12.2%)
Filipino	503	0 (0.0%)	10 (0.1%)	172 (2.4%)	179 (2.5%)	142 (2.0%)
Hispanic/Latino	6,282	419 (5.9%)	3,453 (48.9%)	2,073 (29.3%)	291 (4.1%)	46 (0.7%)
Native American	33	12 (0.17%)	18 (0.3%)	3 (0.04%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Pacific Islander	14	3 (0.04%)	7 (0.1%)	4 (0.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Two or More Races	634	0 (0.0%)	32 (0.5%)	162 (2.3%)	216 (3.1%)	224 (3.2%)
White	4,152	32 (0.5%)	495 (7.0%)	1,698 (24.0%)	1,216 (17.2%)	711 (10.1%)
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	6,550	451 (6.4%)	3,734 (52.8%)	2,170 (30.7%)	172 (2.4%)	23 (0.3%)
English learners	5,686	1,341 (19.0%)	2,908 (41.1%)	1,100 (15.6%)	246 (3.5%)	91 (1.3%)
Students with Disabilities	4,282	2,729 (38.6%)	1,153 (16.3%)	356 (5.0%)	38 (0.5%)	6 (0.1%)

*Total=Number of schools with 30 or more students at the school level and student group level taking the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments.

Note: For all percentages calculated above, the total number of schools (7,068) includes single school districts and charter schools and was used for the denominator.

Performance Categories for LEAs, Schools, and Student Groups for Mathematics

Tables 13 through 16 identify the number (and percent) of LEAs, schools, and student groups in each of the five performance categories.

Table 13: Statewide LEA and School Performance

STATUS ONLY (Reflects 2015 Assessment Results Only for Grades 3 through 8)

Type	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
LEAs (1,503)	113 (7.5%)	416 (27.7%)	673 (44.8%)	244 (16.2%)	57 (3.8%)
Schools (7,065)	376 (5.3%)	2,476 (35.1%)	2,953 (41.8%)	930 (13.2%)	330 (4.7%)

Table 14: Performance by School Type

School Type	# of Schools	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
Non Charter	6,357	336 (5.3%)	2,283 (35.9%)	2,600 (40.9%)	828 (13.0%)	310 (4.9%)
Charter	708	40 (5.7%)	193 (27.3%)	353 (49.9%)	102 (14.4%)	20 (2.8%)
Small Schools*	98	13 (13.3%)	22 (22.5%)	53 (54.1%)	8 (8.2%)	2 (2.0%)
Non Small Schools	6,967	363 (5.2%)	2,454 (35.2%)	2,900 (41.6%)	922 (13.2%)	328 (4.7%)

*Small schools have 30 to 99 students enrolled.

Table 15: Statewide LEAs' Student Group Performance (Math Grades 3 through 8)

Student Groups	Total*	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
All LEAs	1,503	113 (7.5%)	416 (27.7%)	673 (44.8%)	244 (16.2%)	57 (3.8%)
African American	440	116 (7.7%)	174 (11.6%)	138 (9.2%)	12 (0.8%)	0 (0.0%)
Asian	424	3 (0.2%)	11 (0.7%)	75 (5.0%)	150 (10.0%)	185 (12.3%)
Filipino	249	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.1%)	51 (3.4%)	171 (11.4%)	25 (1.7%)
Hispanic/Latino	1,283	164 (10.9%)	569 (37.9%)	473 (31.5%)	72 (4.8%)	5 (0.3%)
Native American	96	32 (2.1%)	31 (2.1%)	29 (1.9%)	4 (0.3%)	0 (0.0%)
Pacific Islander	95	29 (1.9%)	34 (2.3%)	30 (2.0%)	2 (0.1%)	0 (0.0%)
Two or More Races	361	6 (0.4%)	26 (1.7%)	125 (8.3%)	147 (9.8%)	57 (3.8%)
White	1,139	16 (1.1%)	108 (7.2%)	566 (37.7%)	367 (24.4%)	82 (5.5%)
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	1,416	191 (12.7%)	643 (42.8%)	528 (35.1%)	48 (3.2%)	6 (0.4%)
English learners	1,043	336 (22.4%)	396 (26.3%)	248 (16.5%)	52 (3.5%)	11 (0.7%)
Students with Disabilities	859	500 (33.3%)	228 (15.2%)	112 (7.5%)	18 (1.2%)	1 (0.0%)

*Total=Number of LEAs with 30 or more students at the school level and student group level taking the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments.

Note: For all percentages calculated above, the total number of LEAs (1,503) includes single school districts and charter schools and was used for the denominator.

Table 16: Statewide Schools' Student Group Performance (Math Grades 3 through 8)

Student Groups	Total*	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
All Schools	7,065	376 (5.3%)	2,476 (35.1%)	2,953 (41.8%)	930 (13.2%)	330 (4.7%)
African American	1,415	472 (6.7%)	644 (9.1%)	293 (4.2%)	6 (0.1%)	0 (0.0%)
Asian	1,780	14 (0.2%)	84 (1.2%)	373 (5.3%)	526 (7.5%)	783 (11.1%)
Filipino	502	0 (0.0%)	9 (0.1%)	246 (3.5%)	203 (2.9%)	44 (0.6%)
Hispanic/Latino	6,279	492 (7.0%)	3,125 (44.2%)	2,454 (34.7%)	190 (2.7%)	18 (0.3%)
Native American	33	13 (0.2%)	14 (0.2%)	6 (0.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Pacific Islander	14	2 (0.03%)	8 (0.1%)	4 (0.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Two or More Races	631	4 (0.1%)	25 (0.4%)	219 (3.1%)	252 (3.6%)	131 (1.9%)
White	4,143	44 (0.6%)	437 (6.2%)	2,041 (28.9%)	1,268 (18.0%)	353 (5.0%)
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	6,544	508 (7.2%)	3,261 (46.2%)	2,615 (37.0%)	142 (2.0%)	18 (0.3%)
English learners	5,684	1,186 (16.8%)	2,587 (36.6%)	1,482 (21.0%)	302 (4.3%)	127 (1.8%)
Students with Disabilities	4,269	2,316 (32.8%)	1,273 (18.0%)	611 (8.7%)	62 (0.9%)	7 (0.1%)

*Total=Number of schools with 30 or more students at the school level and student group level taking the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments.

Note: For all percentages calculated above, the total number of schools (7,065) includes single school districts and charter schools and was used for the denominator.

College/Career Indicator

At the July 2016 State Board of Education (SBE) meeting, the SBE approved the College/Career Indicator (CCI) as a state indicator and requested California Department of Education (CDE) staff to prepare a recommendation for the September 2016 SBE meeting on the technical specifications for the CCI.

A February 2016 SBE Information Memorandum (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-dsib-amard-feb16item02.doc>) presented the initial feedback obtained from a variety of educational stakeholders as well as the Technical Design Group (TDG) on the CCI. The specific features of the CCI, along with recent stakeholder input and rationale, are detailed in an August 2016 SBE Memorandum.

Since the July 2016 SBE meeting, significant changes were made to the CCI and the CCI was re-calculated to incorporate the recommended changes. As a result, new distributions were run and new cut scores for “Status” and “Change” were selected. Because changes were made to the CCI after the August 3, 2016, TDG meeting, there was no opportunity to share the results of these new CCI cut scores with the TDG or the California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG).

The CCI indicator uses multiple college and/or career measures to evaluate a student’s preparedness for postsecondary. These measures range from the Early Assessment Program (EAP) as part of the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments; Career Technical Education (CTE) Pathway completion; a-g completion; and college-level courses/exams. Graduates in the four-year graduation cohort are placed in one of the following three CCI performance levels based on meeting the highest benchmark:

- Prepared
- Approaching Prepared
- Not Prepared

The following is the formula for the CCI:

<p>Graduates Who Meet the CCI Benchmark for “Prepared”</p> <p>divided by</p> <p>Current Graduation Cohort Minus Students Who Take the California Alternate Assessment</p>
--

Status

For this indicator, “Status” is the percent of graduates in the four-year graduation cohort who met the CCI benchmark for “Prepared.” Table 1 identifies the recommended cut scores for each of the “Status” levels.

Table 1

Status Level	Status Cut Score
Very Low	CCI is less than 10%.
Low	CCI is 10% to less than 25%.
Median	CCI is 25% to less than 45%.
High	CCI is 45% to less than 60%.
Very High	CCI is 60% or greater.

Table 2 displays the “Status” cut scores based on the statewide LEA distribution.

Table 2

Percentile	%Prepared For College or Career	Status Level
5	0.8	Very Low
10	2.8	
15	6.9	
17.3	10.0	Low
20	13.3	
22.3	15.0	
25	17.0	
30	20.2	
35	23.0	
40	24.8	
40.4	25.0	Median
45	27.3	
50	29.0	
55	31.0	
60	33.1	
65	34.8	
70	37.3	
75	41.1	
80	43.8	High
82.3	45.0	
85	47.1	
90	53.8	Very High
93.3	60.0	
95	63.4	

Total number of schools = 608

Change

“Change” is based on the difference in “Status” from current year to prior year. Table 3 displays the proposed cut scores for the “Change” levels:

Table 3

Change Level	Change Cut Score
Declined Significantly	CCI declined by more than 10%.
Declined	CCI declined 1.5% to 10%.
Maintained	CCI declined or increased by less than 1.5%.
Increased	CCI increased by 1.5% to less than 10%.
Increased Significantly	CCI increased by 10% or more.

The data simulations used to inform the proposed cut points for the CCI status and change were established by modeling former Early Assessment Program (EAP) results (i.e., enhanced STAR Program assessment) in the 2013–14 four-year graduation cohort. Therefore, these simulations are ***presented for illustrative purposes only*** to demonstrate the performance categories and standards for the CCI. The September 2016 State Board of Education (SBE) item will provide an update on the CCI standards.

Table 4 displays the CCI “Change” cut scores based on the statewide LEA distribution.

Table 4

Percentile	% Change from Prior Year to Current Year	Change Level
3	-18.1	Declined Significantly
5	-15.1	
7.2	-11.8	
9.5	-10.0	Declined
10	-9.7	
15	-6.1	
20	-4.2	
25	-3.1	
30	-1.9	
33.6	-1.5	
35	-1.2	
40	-0.6	
40.5	-0.5	
45	-0.1	
50	0.2	
55	0.7	
60	1.1	
62.5	1.5	Increased
65	1.8	
70	2.6	
75	3.8	
80	4.8	
85	6.4	
87.9	7.7	
90	8.8	Increased Significantly
92.4	10.0	
95	11.5	
98	17.1	

Total number of schools = 608

Performance Categories for LEAs, Schools, and Student Groups

Table 5 displays the “Status” and “Change” cut scores presented earlier and displays the criteria for the 25 performance categories based on “Status” and “Change.” Tables 6 through 8 reflect the number and percent of LEAs, schools, and student groups in each of the five performance categories.

Table 5

College/Career Change

College/Career Status	Level	Declined Significantly by more 10%	Declined by 1.5% to 10%	Maintained Declined or increased by less than 1.5%	Increased by 1.5% to less than 10%	Increased Significantly by 10% or more
	Very High 60% or more	Yellow	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue
	High 45% to less than 60%	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green	Blue
	Median 25% to less than 45%	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green
	Low 10% to less than 25%	Red	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Yellow
	Very Low Less than 10%	Red	Red	Red	Orange	Yellow

Table 6: Statewide Districts’ Performance

# of LEAs	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
608	102 (16.8%)	173 (28.5%)	148 (24.3%)	151 (24.8%)	34 (5.6%)

Table 7: Statewide Schools’ Performance

# of Schools	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
1,300	188 (14.5%)	382 (29.3%)	278 (21.4%)	368 (28.3%)	84 (6.5%)

Table 8: Performance by School Type (CCI)

School Type	# of Schools	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
Non Charter	1,074	102 (9.5%)	328 (30.5%)	241 (22.4%)	339 (31.6%)	64 (6.0%)
Charter	226	86 (38.1%)	54 (23.9%)	37 (16.4%)	29 (12.8%)	20 (8.8%)
Small Schools*	25	17 (68.0%)	8 (32.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Non Small Schools	1,275	171 (13.4%)	374 (29.3%)	278 (21.8%)	368 (28.9%)	84 (6.6%)

*Small schools have 30 to 99 students enrolled.

Table 9: Statewide LEAs' Student Group Performance (CCI)

Student Groups	Total*	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
All Districts	608	102 (16.8%)	173 (28.5%)	148 (24.3%)	151 (24.8%)	34 (5.6%)
African American	148	27 (4.4%)	56 (9.2%)	40 (6.6%)	22 (3.6%)	3 (0.5%)
Asian	169	1 (0.2%)	7 (1.2%)	23 (3.8%)	52 (8.6%)	86 (14.1%)
Filipino	90	0 (0.0%)	19 (3.1%)	16 (2.6%)	29 (4.8%)	26 (4.3%)
Hispanic/Latino	463	75 (12.3%)	168 (27.6%)	107 (17.6%)	97 (16.0%)	16 (2.6%)
Native American	7	1 (0.2%)	5 (0.8%)	1 (0.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Pacific Islander	14	4 (0.7%)	4 (0.7%)	3 (0.5%)	2 (0.3%)	1 (0.2%)
Two or More Races	54	1 (0.2%)	11 (1.8%)	10 (1.6%)	19 (3.1%)	13 (2.1%)
White	400	53 (8.7%)	98 (16.1%)	89 (14.6%)	121 (19.9%)	39 (6.4%)
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	545	104 (17.1%)	180 (29.6%)	138 (22.7%)	108 (17.8%)	15 (2.5%)
English Learners	289	101 (16.6%)	91 (15.0%)	72 (11.8%)	23 (3.8%)	2 (0.3%)
Students with Disabilities	236	166 (27.3%)	52 (8.6%)	16 (2.6%)	2 (0.3%)	0 (0.0%)

*Total = Number of LEAs with 30 or more students at the schoolwide level and student group level.

For all percentages calculated above, the total number of LEAs (608) includes single school districts and charter schools and was used for the denominator.

Table 10: Statewide Schools' Student Group Performance (CCI)

Student Groups	Total*	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
All Schools	1,300	188 (14.5%)	382 (29.4%)	278 (21.4%)	368 (28.3%)	84 (6.5%)
African American	228	56 (4.3%)	70 (5.4%)	66 (5.1%)	31 (2.4%)	5 (0.4%)
Asian	309	2 (0.2%)	25 (1.9%)	34 (2.6%)	104 (8.0%)	144 (11.1%)
Filipino	104	0 (0.0%)	24 (1.8%)	9 (0.7%)	37 (2.8%)	34 (2.6%)
Hispanic/Latino	1,041	125 (9.6%)	410 (31.5%)	229 (17.6%)	248 (19.1%)	29 (2.2%)
Native American	5	1 (0.1%)	2 (0.2 %)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.2%)
Pacific Islander	3	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.2%)	1 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Two or More Races	34	0 (0.0%)	6 (0.5%)	4 (0.3%)	15 (1.2%)	9 (0.7%)
White	772	90 (6.9%)	189 (14.5%)	141 (10.8%)	243 (18.7%)	109 (8.4%)
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	1,175	169 (13.0%)	405 (31.2%)	289 (22.2%)	276 (21.2%)	36 (2.8%)
English learners	662	243 (18.7%)	196 (15.1%)	165 (12.7%)	55 (4.2%)	3 (0.2%)
Students with Disabilities	530	319 (24.5%)	144 (11.1%)	61 (4.7%)	6 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)

*Total = Number of schools with 30 or more students at the schoolwide level and student group level.

For all percentages calculated above, the total number of schools (1,300) includes single school districts and charter schools and was used for the denominator.

English Learner Indicator

The Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) require English learners (ELs) to make progress towards English proficiency. As detailed in the July 2016 State Board of Education Memorandum (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr16/documents/jul16item02.doc>), progress is determined through the use of two data sources: (1) the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) and (2) reclassification data.

Status

For the English learner Indicator (ELI), “Status” is the percent of ELs that moved up at least one performance level on the CELDT from prior year to current year and the percent of EL students who were reclassified in the prior year. Table 1 displays the proposed cut scores for each of the “Status” levels.

Table 1

Status Level	Status Cut Score
Very Low	Less than 60% of EL students increased at least one CELDT level or were reclassified.
Low	60% to less than 67% of EL students increased at least one CELDT level or were reclassified.
Median	67% to less than 75%, of EL students increased at least one CELDT level or were reclassified.
High	75% to less than 85% EL students increased at least one CELDT level or were reclassified.
Very High	85% or more EL students increased at least one CELDT level or were reclassified.

Table 2 displays the ELI “Status” cut scores based on the statewide LEA distribution.

Table 2

Percentile	Moved Up at Least One Performance Level in Current Year Plus Reclassified in Prior Year	Status Level
5	52.81	Very Low
10	57.40	
14.6	60.00	Low
15	60.23	
20	62.30	
25	63.85	
30	65.40	
35	66.70	
37.3	67.00	Median
40	67.70	
45	68.60	
50	69.70	
55	70.70	
60	71.90	
65	73.10	
70	74.60	
71.7	75.00	High
75	76.05	
80	77.96	
85	80.17	
90	83.58	
91.5	85.00	Very High
95	88.28	

Total number of LEAs = 1,181

Change

“Change” is based on the difference in “Status” from current year to prior year. Table 3 displays the cut scores determined for the ELI “Change” levels:

Table 3

Change Level	Change Cut Score
Declined Significantly	ELI declined by more than 10%.
Declined	ELI declined 1.5% to 10%.
Maintained	ELI declined or increased by less than 1.5%.
Increased	ELI increased by 1.5% to less than 10%.
Increased Significantly	ELI increased by 10% or more.

Table 4 displays the ELI “Change” cut scores based on the statewide LEA distribution.

Table 4

Percentile	% Change from Prior Year to Current Year	Change Level
5	-18.88	Declined Significantly
10	-11.60	
12.4	-10.00	Declined
15	-8.54	
20	-6.20	
25	-4.75	
30	-3.54	
35	-2.40	
39.7	-1.50	Maintained
40	-1.42	
45	-0.70	
50	0.00	
55	0.71	
60	1.40	
62.3	1.50	Increased
65	2.30	
70	3.20	
75	4.70	
80	5.90	
85	8.40	
88.1	10.00	Increased Significantly
90	12.00	
95	18.30	

Total number of LEAs = 1,181

Performance Categories for LEAs and Schools

Table 5 identifies the “Status” and “Change” cut scores presented earlier. It also reflects the performance categories that LEAs and schools would earn based on their “Status” and “Change” results. Tables 6 through 8 reflect the number and percent of LEAs and schools in each of the five performance categories.

Table 5

**English Learner Change
 (Change in Percent Progressing Plus Reclassified Students)**

English Learner Status (Percent Progressing Plus Reclassified Students)	Level	Declined Significantly by more than 10%	Declined by 1.5% to 10%	Maintained Declined or improved by less than 1.5%	Increased by 1.5% to less than 10%	Increased Significantly by 10% or more
	Very High 85% or more	Yellow	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue
High 75% to less than 85%	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green	Blue	
Median 67% to less than 75%	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green	
Low 60% to less than 67%	Red	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Yellow	
Very Low Less than 60%	Red	Red	Red	Orange	Yellow	

Table 6: Statewide Districts’ Performance

# of LEAs	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
1,076	150 (13.9%)	314 (29.2%)	231 (21.5%)	283 (26.3%)	98 (9.1%)

Table 7: Statewide Schools’ Performance

# of Schools	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
6,598	1,057 (16.0%)	1,851 (28.1%)	1,262 (19.1%)	1,755 (26.6%)	673 (10.2%)

Table 8: Performance by School Type (ELI)

School Type	# of Schools	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
Non Charter	6,177	968 (15.7%)	1,748 (28.3%)	1,193 (19.3%)	1,655 (26.8%)	613 (9.9%)
Charter	421	89 (21.1%)	103 (24.5%)	69 (16.4%)	100 (23.8%)	60 (14.3%)
Small Schools*	7	3 (42.9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (42.9%)	1 (14.3%)
Non Small Schools	6,591	1,054 (16%)	1,851 (28.1%)	1,262 (19.1%)	1,752 (26.6%)	769 (11.7%)

*Small schools have 30 to 99 students enrolled.