

Evaluation Rubrics Design Input Session

Regional Stakeholder Input Summary, September 2014

On behalf of the State Board of Education (SBE), WestEd organized a series of regionally-based input sessions (September 15, Sacramento; September 16, Redwood Shores; September 22, Fresno and Los Angeles) to gather insights to inform the development of evaluation rubrics related to the new state Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF). These sessions provided district, county, charter, and school leaders; teachers; students; parents; and community members with an opportunity to offer local insights to the evaluation rubric development process.

The evaluation rubrics are an integral part of the LCFF performance and accountability system. Once developed, the rubrics will serve as tools to ensure LEAs are able to align resources to implement strategies that result in meaningful student outcomes. The rubrics will also direct attention to areas in need of additional support to meet standards for school district and individual school site performance and expectation for improvement in regard to each of the state priorities.

Overview of Input Sessions

A total of 137 individuals attended an input session. Participants included district, county, charter, and school leaders; teachers; students; parents; representatives from community advocacy groups, education management groups, and employee bargaining units. At each session, participants were broken up into small discussion groups, consisting of approximately 6-10 individuals. Students actively participated in both Redwood Shores and Fresno locations.

Location	Number Attending	Number of Small Group Discussions
Sacramento County Office of Education	22	5
San Mateo County Office of Education	34	5
Fresno County Office of Education	46	8
Los Angeles County Office of Education	35	4
Total	137	22

The objectives for the small group discussions were to:

- Review and confirm common understanding of evaluation rubrics based on statute.
- Provide participants with an opportunity to share specific ideas about expectations and value for the evaluation rubrics from their unique perspectives.

Facilitators guided the groups through each of the following questions:

- Keeping in mind the law about the evaluation rubrics, from your perspective how would you describe the purpose of the evaluation rubrics?*
- From your perspective, what do you expect the evaluation rubric to include (e.g., content, format ideas) or support in terms of process when it's completed?*

- C. *From your perspective, what do you expect to be able to do or know once the evaluation rubric is created? In other words, how will the evaluation rubric be helpful or useful to your district, school, community?*
- D. *Is there anything else that you want to share that will help inform the work ahead at this early stage in the evaluation rubric development process?*

The following summary provides a comprehensive list of themes identified and comments received from the small group discussions at each location.

Input Session Summary

A. *Keeping in mind the law about the evaluation rubrics, from your perspective how would you describe the purpose of the evaluation rubrics?*

Participants indicated that the purpose of the evaluation rubric is to:

- *Improve accountability (20)*
 - Programmatic accountability – assess how well LEAs are meeting local needs and priorities (15)
 - Funding accountability – ensure LCAPs align with the 8 State Priorities and LCFF funding (12)
 - Financial accountability – assess whether allocations and expenditures align with local needs and priorities (3)
 - Validate a LEA’s ability to serve students according to the 8 State Priorities.
- *Identify best practices and guide continuous improvement (19)*
- *Provide transparency and accessibility (12)*
 - Common language around achievement and effectiveness
- *Provide an infrastructure for developing quality LCAPs (12)*
 - Transparent guide on what should be present in an LCAP (i.e., WASC rubric/guidance)
 - Technical assistance to improve LCAPs (2)
 - Avoid being too prescriptive
- *Identify and clarify indicators of quality and performance (metrics) (11)*
- *Help LEAs focus on the targeted subgroups (7)*
- *Help LEAs focus on community engagement (5)*
- *Provide consistency in oversight and LCAP review (3)*
- *Show growth over time in the areas of the 8 State Priorities (2)*
 - Provide clarity on which services were already in place, which services are new, and which services increased over a period of time
- *Provide guidance to the County Office of Education (COE) on how to evaluate an LCAP (2)*
- *Help identify gaps in services that can lead to improved outcomes for students (2)*
- *Identify what to include in the COE plan (2)*
- *Simplify the LCAP process*
- *Establish expectations for those new to LCFF/LCAP*

B. *From your perspective, what do you expect the evaluation rubric to include (e.g., content, format ideas) or support in terms of process when it’s completed?*

The following summarizes what participants expect to see in a useful *evaluation rubric* as well as from a useful *evaluation process*.

EVALUATION GOALS

Participants indicated that evaluation efforts should not be punitive or compliance-oriented. Instead, evaluation efforts should strive to do the following:

- Evaluate the quality of the LCAP
- Evaluate LCAP implementation
- Evaluate outcomes from the LCAP

SPECIFIC EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Participants indicated that a rubric should address the following evaluation questions:

Quality of the LCAP

- *Did the LEA meet the 8 State Priorities? (9)*
- *Did the LEA do what it set out to do to? (7)*
- *Are actions and services appropriate and research-based? (2)*
- *Are actions and services equitable and reasonable?*
- *How well does the LCAP address the priorities of SEA, COE, LEA?*
- *How well does the LCAP address local needs?*

LCAP Implementation

- *Did the LEA spend appropriately? (5)*
 - Did the LEA align expenditures with LCFF funding?
- *How well did the LEA engage stakeholders? (4)*
 - How did the LEA use engagement to define services?
 - Whose input is being included and whose input is not?
 - Did stakeholder engagement appropriately impact the LCAP?
 - How do you measure engagement? How do you measure the quality of engagement? (percent of unduplicated families, repeat engagement, standing committees)
- *How does the LEA's LCAP intersect with other programs and plans (e.g., Title I, ELA School Plan, Strategic Plans)*

Outcomes

- *Did the meet its goals for student outcomes? (21)*

METRICS

Participants indicated that the evaluation rubric should utilize metrics that establish baselines and common standards, provide valid measurements, and be flexible enough to account for local customization. Specifically, metrics should include:

- *Student achievement (14)*
 - How do we measure student growth: duplicated and unduplicated?
 - Outcomes must be measurable
 - Outcome should be analyzed by all subgroups, in addition to targeted subgroups
 - 3rd grade reading assessment
 - Students: choose meaningful indicators. Graduation rates don't matter. A-G completion and getting into college matter.
- *Engagement of parents and students (8)*
 - Metrics must be measurable and meaningful
 - Use qualitative measures
- *Outcomes for targeted subgroups (7)*
 - Establish baselines and measurable targets
 - Determine how to best measure outcomes for students with special needs
 - Determine how to best measure outcomes for foster youth students:

- School stability
- Timely enrollment
- Education rights
- Parent/guardian/advocate engagement
- Partial credit policy
- Funding
- IEPs
- Include metrics that aren't tied to schools: non-academic needs, counselors
- For EL students, outcomes should be further analyzed by subgroup:
 - Newcomers
 - Long-time EL
 - Proficiency levels
 - Standard EL students
- *School environment (4)*
- *Alignment of the LCAP and budget (4)*
 - Baseline and targets
 - Practices and services
 - Transparency
- *Students' perception of LCAP's impact (2)*
- *Professional development*
 - Quality and quantity: How do you measure the quantity of resources dedicated to professional development?

OUTPUT FROM EVALUATION PROCESS

Participants indicated that outputs from the LCAP evaluation process should:

- *Be accessible to multiple audiences (parents, students, teachers, community members, etc.) (19)*
 - Post all LCAPs online for easy access (3)
 - Translate and post outputs online and at schools
 - Present output at after-school meetings
- *Be transparent and easy to navigate (17)*
 - Rankings on the 8 State Priorities
 - Report card with minimal point-rankings (Yes/No; 3 point (met/needs improvement/not met); red, green blue or red, yellow, green (needs intervention, needs assistance, meeting targets); 5 point)
 - Use accessible language: no acronyms or jargon
 - Keep it brief, but don't "dumb it down"
 - Visual imagery: pathways, infographics, charts, especially graphics that are easy for non-English speakers to understand
 - Do not place schools of lists
 - Align the rubrics to the LCAP template to make it easier to navigate
- *Allow for comparability between districts (17)*
 - Means to compare value added: which districts are adding the most value based on where they started (baseline)? (2)
 - A common vocabulary
 - Discussion points that apply across the State
 - Highlight LEAs that are going above and beyond to serve students
- *Provide best and innovative practices, tools, and guidelines for future LCAPs (10)*
- *Allow stakeholders to become better informed about an LCAP and its quality (10)*

- A qualitative summary in addition to a grade, score, or checkmark (4)
- A description of the “what and the how”: what an LEA was trying to accomplish, the degree to which they succeeded, and how they got there (2)
- *Provide accountability (5)*
 - Assess whether the actions and services outlined in the LCAP are delivered (3)
 - Assess how things have improved as a result of the LCAP
 - Assess whether 8 State Priorities are being met
- *Identify what LEAs are doing for all students and each subgroup (3)*
- *Identify actions and services that are not successful so that they can be eliminated or altered (3)*
- *Provide mid-cycle benchmarks (4)*
 - Annual “report cards” or “progress reports” to assess progress on LCAP
- Identify LEAs and sites that are in need of technical assistance or intervention.
- Provide a portrait of how all the subgroups are doing
- Identify the impact of all funding sources in meeting LEA goals

C. *From your perspective, what do you expect to be able to do or know once the evaluation rubric is created? In other words, how will the evaluation rubric be helpful or useful to your district, school, community?*

Participants indicated that they expected the evaluation rubric to be informative and provide a better understanding of LCAPs in general. They also expected the rubric to serve as a tool in creating improved plans, but noted the tensions between state- and district-level expectations. Specifically, they expected to have a better understanding of:

- *A process for continuous improvement (17)*
 - Focused and simplified guidance for future LCAPs (12)
 - Common LCAP vocabulary- an understanding of concepts from across the State (2)
 - How to report on LCAP progress and impacts (2)
 - How to refine goals (2)
 - Data to use as indicators
 - How to link outcomes to services
 - How to best allocate resources
 - Intermediate and long-term program indicators
 - Examples of high-quality LCAPs (3)
 - Where a district stands relative to other districts
- *Best practices (7)*
 - In particular, best practices for effective engagement (4)
- *What quality in education means (6)*
 - at the State-level
 - at the LEA-level
 - at the site-level
 - Validated instructional strategies
 - Richer discussions about the LCAP and how to best meet students’ needs
- *How funding is used to impact students (4)*
- *How well individual LCAPs address the 8 State priorities (3)*
 - Is the LEA moving in the right direction?
 - Is the LEA appropriately servicing students?
 - Are the targeted student groups making progress?

- Are the targeted subgroups making progress in a school or LEA that is not high-need?
- *The cycle of planning, inquiry, and reporting (2)*
- *What districts are doing, and how the feedback from students and parents affect what they do.*

They also expected the evaluation rubric to as an accountability tool (5)

- For COEs: guidance on how to maintain transparency and accountability
- For LEAs: a means to hold COEs accountable for plan approval

D. Is there anything else that you want to share that will help inform the work ahead at this early stage in the evaluation rubric development process?

The evaluation rubric must be a fit for all LEAs

- *Be mindful of variations in LEA size (9)*
 - Consider weighting metrics for location
- *Allow LEAs to emphasize local needs and priorities in plans (4)*
- *Be realistic about setting achievable goals (2)*
- *Provide LCAP development guidelines that are aligned with the evaluation rubrics*
 - Specificity - provide clear direction on the LCAP: how much detail, length, budget information to include
 - Allow for customization

Be mindful of smaller LEAs' capacity and needs

- *When establishing metrics, be especially mindful of variations in LEA size (9)*
- *Consider having rubric adjustments and weights for LEAs of different configurations (grade levels services, LEA size, site size)*
- *Continue outreach during the evaluation process, especially to smaller districts*

Give LEAs and COEs the time and resources needed to plan and adapt

- *LCFF evaluation timeline does not work for LEAs (6)*
 - The field has not had enough time to learn about the 8 State priorities and what drives them
 - LEAs need more information on the metrics for the 8 State priorities and more grounding in them
 - LEAs need more time to be effective, efficient, collaborative, and comprehensive in developing and implementing LCAPs
 - Sync timelines: planning should precede spending and implementation
- *The COE should provide technical support to LEAs in developing LCAPs (3)*
- *Consider mid-cycle assessments to establish benchmarks (3)*
- *The evaluation should be a multi-year process. (2)*
 - Lay out multi-year targets and benchmarks. (2)
 - Be flexible in what you evaluate each year.
 - 2014-15 and 2015-16: focus on LCAP implementation
 - 2016-17 : LCAP begins with rigor and alignment to rubrics
- *The COEs should receive funding for LCFF oversight*
- *Simplify the evaluation timeline: LCAPS due by June, LCAPS evaluated by January*
- *Rubric shouldn't necessitate a change in the current plan; Allow Districts to finish what they set out to do, allow it to be an evolving plan*
- *LCFF is a work in progress and we are at the beginning at that process*
- *Simplify the LCAP process; LCAP is too complex and takes a great deal of work; LEAs should focus on the goals, actions and services; not on the task of completion*

Develop multiple rubrics

Compliance and evaluation are two different issues. Consider creating multiple rubrics:

- Compliance with 8 State Priorities (2)
- Process monitoring (2)
- Outcomes (2)
- Outputs
- Curriculum and assessment
- Rubrics based on LEA size/site size
- A rubric for each priority will be easier to read and allow users to focus on an area of interest/priority
- The old Distinguished School rubric was good and should be considered as a model

The evaluation rubric should be user-friendly and accessible

- Accessible to parents
- Aligned with the LCAPs for easy readability
- Easy to read, and shorter in length
- Outside agencies should be able to use the rubric to align their work with that of LEAs.

Include stakeholders in the rubric design process

- Educate stakeholder on the rubrics
- Once designed, the rubric should be refined with community input
- Consider referring to the rubric with a term other than “evaluation rubric.” Use a term that is more accessible and in-line with stakeholders’ experiences. Provide handouts and translation services as needed

LCAPs should include ambitious and equitable goals that address targeted subgroups

- Goals should be accompanied by an explanation and rationale
- The evaluation process and rubric should encourage ambitious goals, and not penalize LEAs for stating ambitious goals

In choosing metrics, be mindful of data availability

- The State should produce reports with the required metrics. Data should be easy to access and use.
- Rely on data that is readily available
- Local assessments vary across LEAs
- There is a one-year lag in data availability
- Data needs to be disaggregated so that LEAs and outside agencies can identify where the most help is needed

Make this input process accessible and meaningful for students

- Reach out to a diverse population of students (especially subgroups)
- Provide transportation and be sensitive in choosing location
- Consider whether involvement is worth the students’ time
- Prove to students that they are valued - acknowledge and implement their feedback
- Provide training to students on their role in the LCAP

Make this input process accessible and meaningful for everyone

- Don’t let the LCAP process get shoved on a shelf

Provide accountability checks for LEAs (or not)

- Identify who stakeholders can go to if the LEA is not being responsive
- LEAs should have been given the responsibility of the complete LCAP review

Plan for more meaningful stakeholder engagement

- Engage feedback around concrete LCAP drafts