

# Using the California School Dashboard and LCAP to Improve School Climate:

*An Analysis of 2017-18 LCAPs for  
California's 50 Largest School Districts*

## Acknowledgements

**Council for a Strong America** is a national, bipartisan nonprofit that unites five organizations comprised of law enforcement leaders, retired admirals and generals, business executives, pastors, and prominent coaches and athletes who promote solutions that ensure our next generation of Americans will be citizen-ready.

**Fight Crime: Invest in Kids** is a national, bipartisan, nonprofit, anti-crime organization. The organization has a membership of more than 5,000 police chiefs, sheriffs, district attorneys, other law enforcement leaders, and violence survivors, including close to 400 members in California. The members take a hard-nosed look at what approaches work—and what don't—to prevent crime and violence. They then recommend effective strategies to state and national policymakers. It operates under the umbrella of the Council for a Strong America.

*Supported by tax-deductible contributions from foundations, individuals, and corporations.*

### **Major funders:**

Major funding for the California office of Fight Crime: Invest in Kids is provided by: Afterschool Alliance; Louis Borick Foundation; The California Endowment; First 5 LA; Foundation for California Community Colleges; The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation; The Kresge Foundation; The David and Lucile Packard Foundation; Sierra Health Foundation; W. Clement and Jessie V. Stone Foundation; and The Zellerbach Family Foundation.

The views expressed here do not necessarily reflect the views of these foundations.

This guide was generously supported by The California Endowment.

### **Author:**

Brian Lee, California State Director at Fight Crime: Invest in Kids

### **Contributors:**

Thank you to Michael Klein, Sr. Research Associate at Fight Crime: Invest in Kids for support, Brad Strong, Sr. Director of Education Policy at Children Now, and the LCFF/LCAP Working Group of the Fix School Discipline Policy Coalition for their input.

Published: March 2018

©2018 Council For A Strong America. All Rights Reserved.

## Introduction

The new California School Dashboard is helping school districts better address the overuse of suspension, based on our review of the 2017-18 Local Control and Accountability Plans (LCAPs) of the state's largest 50 school districts,\* which enroll approximately 41% of all students statewide. Still, many districts should do more to effectively address school climate in their LCAPs and better incorporate the Dashboard to support continuous improvement and student success.

## Background

Through California's new state accountability system, the California School Dashboard, the State for the first time is assessing how well districts are doing at reducing suspensions, as well as providing guidance on what suspension rates and changes in rates districts should strive for. Suspension rates are one of five initial state indicators where performance—for individual subgroups—dictates whether or not a district will be targeted for technical assistance.

In previous LCAPs, districts were simply expected to set goals for reducing suspension rates and then assess their own progress at meeting those locally-identified goals. The State provided no guidance about what rates and progress districts should strive for when setting their goals, nor any consequences for high and/or increasing suspension rates.

The Dashboard assigns colors to each indicator, for both all students and a variety of student subgroups, based on a

combination of current performance (from “very low” to “very high”) and change compared to the prior year (from “improved significantly” to “declined significantly”). The colors range from blue (best) to green, yellow, orange, and red (lowest). The State adopted 5x5 grids to determine color-coded performance levels on each state indicator, and distinct 5x5 grids for each type of district and school are uniquely available for suspension rates, given varying performance across grade levels.<sup>1</sup> Applying the appropriate 5x5 grid, a unified district with a “high” suspension rate for all students (between 4.5% and 8%) that declined by 0.3% to less than 2% would receive a yellow designation for all students.

Generally, county assistance to districts is triggered where at least one student group gets a red on two or more indicators.<sup>2</sup> Dashboards are also available for every school.

## California Leading the Way on Accountability for Suspension Rates

California is one of only three states with a distinct state indicator for suspension rates, and it appears to have more ambitious goals for suspension rates than the other states, based on ESSA state plans submitted to the U.S. Department of Education.<sup>3</sup> For example, West Virginia has a state performance goal of a 5% to 10% out-of-school suspension rate, and Rhode Island appears to have a 3.7% out-of-school suspension rate goal.<sup>4</sup> While a comparable goal for California is not as clearly delineated (due in part to colors reflecting both rates and change in rates), generally it appears to be a 1.25% rate (including both

---

\* For a district-by-district list of general findings for 2017-18 LCAPs, see Appendix A on page 11.

in-school and out-of-school suspensions) for elementary school districts, 2.5% for unified school districts, and 3.5% for high school districts, which are the rates considered “low” in the 5x5 grids.<sup>5</sup> The fact that California’s indicator covers a broader set of suspensions, including in-school suspensions, makes its relatively low goals particularly noteworthy.

## Using the Dashboard to Address High and/or Increasing Suspension Rates

For the LCAP summary, districts must review the Dashboard and state if the district-wide suspension rate for all students is orange or red, and do the same for the other state indicators. Also, as with other state indicators, districts must identify any specific subgroups that have suspension rates two colors below the district’s rate for all students (i.e., if green for all students, a district must identify all subgroups that get an orange or red).<sup>6</sup>

Districts, with just two exceptions, are following these basic requirements. The five of the 50 largest districts (10%) that received an orange or red overall on suspension rates did include this fact in their summaries. And 29 of the 31 districts with subgroups performing two levels below the district average call out the low performance of those subgroups in their LCAP summaries. Two districts (San Bernardino City Unified and Moreno Valley Unified) failed to identify subgroups with reds on suspension rates, which were two below the districts’ yellow on suspension rates for all students.

But districts should go further. Following the lead of several districts, they should:

- **Establish distinct goals for targeted**

**subgroups.** More districts should establish distinct goals for reducing suspension rates by under-performing subgroups in order to help lay the groundwork for improvement. Just over 40% of the districts that call out subgroups for under-performance on suspension rates in their summaries actually provide distinct goals for those subgroups.<sup>7\*\*</sup> Simply pointing out that a subgroup is under-performing is not enough; districts should set goals for improvement for these subgroups to demonstrate their intent, and set a path forward, to improve subgroup performance.

Overall, identifying distinct goals for subgroups, while still not the norm, is on the rise—with slightly more than half (52%) of districts doing so, either for subgroups that are two colors below the all-student rate and/or other subgroups. This is a modest improvement from 36% in 2015-16 LCAPs, the most recent LCAPs that Fight Crime: Invest in Kids previously analyzed.

- **Identify low-performing subgroups that are not “two below.”** To better address subgroup under-performance, more districts should call out subgroups that are low-performing, even if not two levels below the overall district color. For example, while a district with a yellow on suspension rates is not required to identify orange subgroups, an orange is still cause for concern. In fact, 19 of 50 districts call out additional subgroups beyond what the summary requires, including 8 of the 29 that already identified subgroups two below, and

\* For a district-by-district list of identification of and goals for subgroups underperforming on suspension rates in 2017-18 LCAPs, see Appendix B on page 13.

## **Why is School Climate Important to Public Safety?**

*School climate and school discipline policies are important to public safety because students who are suspended or expelled are more likely to fall behind in school, drop out, and become involved in crime.<sup>8</sup> Suspensions and expulsions are sometimes necessary to prevent unsafe or violent student behavior. But especially when students are suspended or expelled for relatively minor incidents, the primary result is lost learning time and a missed opportunity to address any underlying issues contributing to the misbehavior. These students are more likely to fall behind. And putting troubled kids out on the streets without constructive adult supervision can be a recipe for greater misbehavior and crime.*

*Research confirms that students who are suspended or expelled are at greater risk of involvement in the juvenile and criminal justice systems. A 2011 Council of State Governments study of Texas students found that students who were suspended or expelled one or more times were nearly three times more likely to have contact with the juvenile justice system in the following year than similar students who were not suspended or expelled.<sup>9</sup> A study published in 2018 found that 12 years after being suspended, youth were 30% more likely to have been arrested once, 51% more likely to have been arrested multiple times, 23% more likely to have been in prison, and 49% more likely to have been placed on probation than similar youth who had not been suspended, after controlling for 60 variables.<sup>10</sup>*

*The best way to help students learn and to prevent later crime is to ensure students get the support they need so they can remain in school and off the streets.*

11 of the 20 that were not obliged to identify any subgroups.

- **Set goals using Dashboard colors.** More districts should incorporate Dashboard colors into their year-by-year goals, in addition to proposed numerical goals, to show if their numerical goals will actually lead to an improvement in color designation, i.e., from yellow to green. Currently 20% (10 of 50) include colors in their year-by-year suspension goals. For example, San Jose Unified provides annual numerical and color goals for suspension rates overall and for five subgroups. This information reveals that the district plans to continue earning

greens overall and for two subgroups, and by year 3 plans to upgrade one orange and one yellow subgroup to greens and upgrade another from orange to yellow.

However, it is important to accurately identify what color would be earned for intended rates, based on the combination of the intended rate and the intended change compared to the previous year. Some districts mistakenly identify the color that their proposed suspension rates would earn. For example, Corona-Norco Unified asserts that maintaining a 2.7% rate for three years would be considered green, when

## LCAP Requirements for School Climate Priority<sup>11</sup>

Annual goals, actions, and expenditures related to:

- Suspension rates
- Expulsion rates
- Surveys of pupils, parents, and teachers on the sense of safety and school connectedness
  - Surveys must be of pupils, parents and teachers
  - Goals, etc. must address sense of safety and connectedness, at a minimum

Goals must be **specific and measurable**.

it would actually be yellow. Pomona Unified asserts that, for the two or more races subgroup, a decline from 8.9% to 8.5% would change the color from orange to yellow, when actually it would remain orange.<sup>12</sup> Districts should closely examine the 5x5 grids for their respective type of district to identify the color that matches their expected rate and change in rate from the previous year.

- **Set color goals for schools.** More districts should set goals for the color performance of schools, not just district-wide goals. Just 20% (10 of 50) of districts include *any reference* to color performance for schools or subgroups within schools in their LCAPs, and only two of these districts actually provide goals for what color ratings schools

should receive. Montebello Unified sets a goal of 0.5% annual declines both district-wide and for each school. Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified's goal is that over three years the percentage of schools meeting or exceeding the state standard for suspension rates increase from 69% to 80%.

This is especially important given that California schools will be held accountable under the federal ESSA law, in addition to districts being accountable under the Local Control Funding Formula state law. It is not difficult to quantify school-level performance because the California Department of Education provides a summary 5x5 grid for each district showing the color for suspension rates for each school within the district.<sup>13</sup>

## More Positive News in LCAPs

### Increased Commitment to Evidence-Based Practices

Districts are becoming more committed to the evidence-based practices Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), Restorative Practices (also referred to as Restorative Justice), and Social Emotional Learning. The percentage of districts including these practices in their LCAPs increased from 70% in 2014-15 LCAPs to 84% in 2015-16 to 92% in 2017-18. Moreover, more than half of these districts (24 of 46) state in their LCAPs that they are expanding these practices, although it is often difficult to determine how much additional funding is planned.

Many districts already credit these strategies for improved outcomes. For example:

- Fontana Unified praised a “model that combines PBIS and restorative practices

that resulted in a drastic decrease in suspensions.”

- Mt. Diablo Unified stated that “Stakeholders and staff believe that extensive training on PBIS, restorative practices, and the addition of counselors has played a significant role in supporting the decrease [in suspensions] overall.”
- Oakland Unified explained that Restorative Practices and other approaches like PBIS are “dramatically reducing suspensions and increasing student time in class.”
- Santa Ana Unified stated that “Suspension and expulsions have been reduced significantly with the implementation of PBIS and Restorative Practices.”
- Stockton Unified explained that, “due to the rollout of PBIS, additional school counselors and various other programs/ initiatives [it has seen] the decrease in suspension and expulsion rates as students are more engaged and connected to school and teachers.”
- Temecula Valley Unified stated that PBIS has been “highly effective” and “positively contributed to the decline in suspension rates.”

### **More Specific Goals**

Districts are coming up with far more specific goals for reducing suspensions, increasing from 62% with specific measurable goals in 2015-16 to 88% in the latest LCAPs. This likely reflects a response both to the establishment of performance standards for suspension rates and to the improved LCAP template design, which requires baseline data and side-by-side proposed year-by-year improvements.

## **More Room for Improvement in LCAPs**

### **Dedicated funding for evidence-based practices**

The amount of funding planned for PBIS, Restorative Practices, and Social Emotional Learning is unclear in half of districts with these practices (23 of 46), due to bundling with other actions or failure to include any funding.<sup>14</sup> When districts bundle several actions together under one expenditure, it is difficult if not impossible to determine how much funding is intended for implementing these strategies. For LCAP annual updates, understanding specific funding levels for each individual action is essential to determine, consistent with the LCFF statute, what “changes to the specific actions the school district will make” if the actions are not leading to the intended goals.<sup>15</sup> This is a continuing problem; in 2015-16, the amount of funding for these practices was unclear in 22 districts.

While many districts expressly highlight plans to expand the strategies in their LCAPs, often it is not clear how much, if any, new funding is anticipated, due to bundling— although a few of these districts do dedicate modest funding increases for expansion.

In addition, even where funding levels are clear, funding for implementation of evidence-based practices varies widely, raising concern that funds in many districts (all of which are large) may be insufficient. Among the 30 districts with some funding dedicated to evidence-based practices, 10 dedicate \$100,000 or less annually, and 12 dedicate between \$100,000 and \$500,000. The remaining eight districts dedicate between \$922,000 and over \$14 million.



Another cause of concern is that districts often did not actually spend as much on evidence-based practices as planned in their previous LCAP. Where it was possible to ascertain thanks to clear dedicated funding, more than half of districts (13 of 24) reported in the update portion of their 2017-18 LCAPs that they spent less than planned on these evidence-based practices. Seven of these districts underspent by \$300,000 or more. 33% of these districts reported spending the same as planned, while a handful actually spent more than planned on these practices.

### **Current Year Suspension Data**

Districts should include updates on current year suspension rates, to enable them to better assess progress and effectiveness of their actions. Surprisingly, there was a significant reduction in districts providing current year data (i.e., 2016-17 data in 2017-18 LCAPs prepared in Spring 2017): down from 48% in 2015-16 LCAPs to 30% in 2017-18. Fourteen districts that had provided current year data in 2015-16 LCAPs failed to in the latest LCAPs. Districts may have believed it was sufficient to rely on data in the Dashboard. But, not only was that data outdated (from 2014-15), current year data is essential because LCAP updates are intended to assess current year actions and progress towards achieving current year goals. In future LCAPs, the Dashboard will provide districts with suspension data from the previous year, but not the current year that districts are assessing in the update section of the LCAP.<sup>16</sup>

### **Ambitious Suspension Rate Goals**

While some districts establish ambitious goals for reducing suspension rates, others do not. For example, some districts' goals, if

met, could actually lead to a downgrade in color. Five districts reporting in their LCAPs green suspension rate designations from the Dashboard, could end up falling to yellow even if they meet their goals. Among these, Clovis Unified proposes a 3.4% rate in Year 1, 3.2% in Year 2 and 3% in Year 3, and Garden Grove Unified proposes 3.5% or less each year. Under the Dashboard guidelines, however, rates that stay within the 2.5% to 4.5% "medium" range for unified school districts only receive a green if the rate declines at least 0.3% from the prior year, which neither of these districts proposes as a goal.

On the other hand, several districts are proposing relatively quick upgrades in their color-coded assessment for suspension rates. For example, half (8 of 16) of districts with a yellow on suspension rates for all students clearly propose suspension goals that would lead to a green color designation within one to three years.<sup>17</sup> This is promising given concerns that districts might not be motivated to improve yellow ratings, in light of the LCAP summary only requiring districts to highlight red and orange overall ratings.

Yet only one of the four districts with orange designations clearly proposes goals that would result in a change in color designation within three years.<sup>18</sup> One of the remaining orange districts, Stockton Unified, despite a "very high" suspension rate, sets the vague goal of "to decrease suspension rates," which fails to provide any sense of a district plan to move up from orange in the foreseeable future.

In addition, districts should expressly indicate in the update section of the LCAP whether they are meeting their goals, to assess if districts are on track with anticipated improvements. Only 28%



expressly say whether they are meeting their suspension rate goals.

### School Climate Survey Goals

20% (10 of 50) of districts still have no goals on climate survey outcomes, unchanged since 2015-16. Eight of these districts went backwards, shifting to no goals when they previously had some, including four districts that previously had goals on both safety and connectedness.

Only 50% of districts have goals on both safety and connectedness as the LCFF statute requires, although that at least is an increase from 36% in 2015-16. Only 38% have goals on *student safety* & connectedness; other safety and connectedness goals may be for parents, staff, or a combination of parents, staff and/or students.

24% of districts include survey outcome goals for all three groups identified in the LCFF statute: students, parents and staff (a slight improvement from 22% in 2015-16). Still, just half of those (12%) have both safety and connectedness goals for each group.

Two districts set goals simply to meet the new California School Dashboard requirement for the school climate local indicator: conducting a survey and reporting findings, rather than setting specific outcome goals. Both of these districts (Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified and West Contra Costa Unified) previously had goals on both safety and connectedness. This may suggest that some districts are misinterpreting the Dashboard local indicator as an excuse to avoid setting goals on climate survey outcomes, as the LCFF statute requires.

Districts generally include annual survey goals, consistent with the LCFF requirement

of annual updates. Only three districts indicate that they will only complete the surveys every other year.

### Conclusion

Thanks to the California School Dashboard, districts are now being held accountable for their suspension rates and are identifying subgroups that are facing high and/or declining suspension rates. To help improve suspension rates and student outcomes, however, more districts should establish distinct goals to improve rates for low-performing subgroups and incorporate Dashboard colors into their district goals.

Districts are increasingly recognizing the value of evidence-based alternatives to suspensions and continuing to increase their commitments to these strategies, but they need to be clear how much funding is actually going to those strategies and ensure that funding is sufficient to be effective. Districts also should make more progress at addressing safety and connectedness through school climate surveys.

Improving school climate and school discipline is crucial to help students succeed and stay away from crime. As they shine a spotlight on suspension rates, the California School Dashboard and LCAPs are helping districts make progress in reducing suspensions and improving school climate. Improved use of the Dashboard and LCAPs will help more students stay on track to graduate and make us all safer.

## Appendix A – General Findings for 2017-18 LCAPs

District	County	Current Year	Suspension Goal	Subgroup Suspension Goals	PBIS/RP/SEL	Funding for	School Climate Survey Goal
		(2016-17) Suspension Data				PBIS/RP/SEL	
Anaheim Union HSD	Orange	No	Specific	Yes	No c	N/A	No q
Antelope Valley Union HSD	Los Angeles	Yes	Specific	No	PBIS	Dedicated	Safety/Connectedness
					SEL	Bundled	
Bakersfield City SD	Kern	Yes	Specific	No	PBIS, RP, SEL	Dedicated	Safety/Connectedness
Capistrano USD	Orange	No	General	No	SEL d	N/A	No
Chaffey Joint Union HSD	San Bernardino	No	Specific	No	PBIS, RP	Dedicated	No
Chino Valley USD	San Bernardino	No	Specific	Yes	PBIS	Dedicated	Safety/Connectedness
Chula Vista EUSD	San Diego	No	Specific	No	No	N/A	Safety
Clovis USD	Fresno	No	Specific	No	PBIS	Dedicated	Safety
Corona-Norco USD	Riverside	Yes	Specific	No	PBIS e	Bundled	Safety/Connectedness
					SEL	Dedicated	
Desert Sands USD	Riverside	No	Specific	Yes	PBIS e	Dedicated	Safety/Connectedness
East Side Union HSD	Santa Clara	No	Specific	Yes	PBIS e	Dedicated	Connectedness
Elk Grove USD	Sacramento	No	Specific	Yes	PBIS, SEL f	Dedicated	Safety/Connectedness
Fontana USD	San Bernardino	Yes	Specific a	Yes	PBIS, RP, SEL	Dedicated	No r
Fremont USD	Alameda	No	Specific	Yes	RP	Bundled n	Connectedness s
Fresno USD	Fresno	No	Specific	Yes	RP	Bundled	Connectedness s
					SEL	Bundled	
Garden Grove USD	Orange	No	Specific	No	PBIS, RP, SEL	Bundled	Safety/Connectedness
Glendale USD	Los Angeles	Yes	Specific	No	PBIS, RP	Dedicated	Safety/Connectedness
Irvine USD	Orange	No	Specific	No	PBIS	Bundled	No t
Kern Union HSD	Kern	No	Specific	No	PBIS	Dedicated	Safety/Connectedness
					RP, SEL	Dedicated	

District	County	Current Year (2016-17) Suspension Data	Suspension Goal	Subgroup Suspension Goals	PBIS/RP/SEL	Funding for PBIS/RP/SEL	School Climate Survey Goal
Lodi USD	San Joaquin	No	Ambiguous b	No	PBIS g	N/A	Safety/Connectedness
Long Beach USD	Los Angeles	Yes	Specific	No	PBIS, RP	Dedicated	Safety/Connectedness
Los Angeles USD	Los Angeles	Yes	Specific	Yes	PBIS h	Dedicated	Safety/Connectedness
					RP	Dedicated	
Montebello USD	Los Angeles	No	Specific	No	No i	N/A	Safety/Connectedness
Moreno Valley USD	Riverside	Yes	Specific	Yes	PBIS	Dedicated	Safety/Connectedness
Mt Diablo USD	Contra Costa	No	Specific	No	PBIS & RP	Bundled	Connectedness s
Oakland USD	Alameda	Yes	Specific	Yes	PBIS & RP	Bundled	Safety/Connectedness
					SEL	Dedicated	
Orange USD	Orange	No	Specific	No	PBIS	Dedicated	No t
Placentia-Yorba Linda USD	Orange	No	Specific	Yes	PBIS	Bundled	No tu
Pomona USD	Los Angeles	No	Specific	Yes	PBIS	Bundled	Safety/Connectedness
Poway USD	San Diego	No	Specific	Yes	PBIS & RP	Bundled	Safety/Connectedness
Rialto USD	San Bernardino	No	Specific	No	PBIS j	Dedicated	Safety/Connectedness
Riverside USD	Riverside	Unclear	Specific	Yes	PBIS	Bundled	Connectedness
					RP	Dedicated	
Sacramento City USD	Sacramento	Yes	Specific	Yes	PBIS, RP, SEL	Dedicated	Safety/Connectedness
Saddleback Valley USD	Orange	No	General	Yes	No	N/A	Safety/Connectedness
San Bernardino City USD	San Bernardino	Yes	Specific	No	PBIS, RP, SEL	Dedicated	Connectedness
San Diego USD	San Diego	No	Specific	Yes	PBIS, RP, SEL	Bundled	Safety/Connectedness
San Francisco USD	San Francisco	No	Specific	Yes	PBIS, RP, SEL	Dedicated	Climate generally
San Jose USD	Santa Clara	Yes	Specific	Yes	PBIS	Dedicated	Connectedness v
San Juan USD	Sacramento	Yes	Specific	Yes	PBIS & RP	Dedicated	Safety/Connectedness
San Ramon Valley USD	Contra Costa	No	General	No	RP k	Dedicated	Safety/Connectedness
Santa Ana USD	Orange	No	Specific	No	PBIS & RP h	Bundled	Safety
Stockton USD	San Joaquin	No	General	Yes	PBIS & RP h	Bundled o	Connectedness s

District	County	Current Year (2016-17) Suspension Data	Suspension Goal	Subgroup Suspension Goals	PBIS/RP/SEL	Funding for PBIS/RP/SEL	School Climate Survey Goal
Sweetwater Union HSD	San Diego	No	Ambiguous b	No	RP k	Bundled	Safety/Connectedness
Temecula Valley USD	Riverside	No	Specific	Yes	PBIS	Dedicated	No w
Torrance USD	Los Angeles	Yes	Specific	No	PBIS	Bundled	Unclear x
Twin Rivers USD	Sacramento	No	Specific	No	RP h	Dedicated	Safety/Connectedness
Visalia USD	Tulare	No	Specific	Yes	PBIS	Bundled	No y
Vista USD	San Diego	No	Specific	No	RP	N/A p	Connectedness
West Contra Costa USD	Contra Costa	No	Specific	Yes	SEL l	Bundled	No z
William S Hart Union HSD	Los Angeles	Yes	Specific a	Yes	SEL m	N/A	Connectedness v

**Definition of Terms:**

PBIS	Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports
RP	Restorative Practices
SEL	Social Emotional Learning
Bundled	Funding for several actions listed under one expenditure, making it impossible to determine how much funding is intended for evidence-based practices
Dedicated	Funding level identified for evidence-based practices

**Coding Guide to Findings:**

**Bold** reflects change from Year 1

**Orange Shading** reflects improvements from Year 1

- a) Goal is for number of suspensions, not suspension rates as required
- b) Unclear if proposed reductions are one-time or annual
- c) PBIS, RP & SEL in Update only; 2015-16 LCAP included PBIS
- d) SEL in goals, PBIS/RP in Update, but none in Actions
- e) 2015-16 LCAP also included RP
- f) RP may be part of Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Action because referenced under MTSS in Update
- g) PBIS in Summary, PBIS & RP in Update, and RP in Update, but neither in Actions
- h) 2015-16 LCAP also included SEL
- i) 2015-16 LCAP included PBIS & RP
- j) RP in update only
- k) 2015-16 LCAP also included PBIS
- l) PBIS & RP referenced as permissible use for school site discretionary funds, but not clear planned action; 2015-16 LCAP included RP only
- m) 2015-16 LCAP included PBIS only
- n) Issue not addressed in Actions, but Update provides "The Local Control Accountability Committee (LCAAC) discussed and approved adding \$225,000 to next year's budget to expand Restorative Practices and provide a budget for the EEC to conduct training of all staff on equity issues"
- o) PBIS had dedicated funding in 2015-16 LCAP
- p) Not expressly in actions, but referenced in section on increased/improved services
- q) 2015-16 LCAP included goals on safety and climate generally
- r) Only includes parent survey goals on response rate and perception of clean and well- maintained facilities; 2015-16 LCAP included goals on climate generally
- s) 2015-16 LCAP also included goals on safety
- t) 2015-16 LCAP included goals on safety and connectedness
- u) Goal just "met" local indicator
- v) 2015-16 LCAP included goals on safety only
- w) Goal references use of surveys, but not outcomes; 2015-16 LCAP included goals on connectedness
- x) Will establish goals for Behavior Metrics and Student Engagement surveys; 2015-16 LCAP included goals on climate generally
- y) Surveys in goal, but no outcome goals (may be to be determined); 2015-16 LCAP included goals on climate generally
- z) Goal merely to report key survey findings; 2016-17 LCAP included safety/connectedness goals

## Appendix B – District Identification of and Goals for Subgroups Under-Performing on Suspension Rates in 2017-18 LCAPs

<b>District</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>CSD Color for Suspension Rates for All Students Spring 2017</b>	<b>Identified Subgroups 2 Below in Summary Needs/Gaps</b>	<b>Goals for Identified Subgroups</b>	<b>Other Subgroups Identified in Summary Needs/Gaps</b>	<b>Goals for Other Identified Subgroups</b>
Anaheim Union HSD	Orange	Yellow	AA, SWD	AA, SWD	EL	EL
Antelope Valley Union HSD	Los Angeles	Orange	N/A	N/A	No	N/A
Bakersfield City ES	Kern	Yellow	N/A	N/A	FIL	No iv
Capistrano USD	Orange	Green	AA	No	No	N/A
Chaffey Joint Union HSD	San Bernardino	Yellow	AI, SWD	No	AA, EL, PI, 2+	No
Chino Valley USD	San Bernardino	Green	AA, SWD	AA, SWD	EL, LI	EL, LI
Chula Vista EUSD	San Diego	Green	N/A	N/A	No	N/A
Clovis USD	Fresno	Green	AA, AI, PI	No	No	N/A
Corona-Norco	Riverside	Green	N/A	N/A	EL, LI	No
Desert Sands USD	Riverside	Yellow	N/A	N/A	EL, SWD	EL, SWD
East Side Union HSD	Santa Clara	Green	SWD, PI	SWD	AA, EL	EL
Elk Grove USD	Sacramento	Yellow	N/A	N/A	No	N/A
Fontana USD	San Bernardino	Yellow	AA	AA	No	N/A
Fremont USD	Alameda	Green	N/A	N/A	No	N/A
Fresno USD	Fresno	Yellow	N/A	N/A	AA, SWD	No
Garden Grove USD	Orange	Green	PI	No	No	N/A
Glendale USD	Los Angeles	Green	N/A	N/A	AI, EL, SWD	No
Irvine USD	Orange	Green	AA, LI, PI, SWD	No	No	N/A
Kern Union HSD	Kern	Red	N/A	N/A	All except Asian, FIL	No v
Lodi USD	San Joaquin	Yellow	N/A	N/A	No	N/A
Long Beach USD	Los Angeles	Green	AA, EL, SWD	No	No	N/A
Los Angeles USD	Los Angeles	Blue	N/A	N/A	No	N/A
Montebello USD	Los Angeles	Green	FIL, SWD	No	No	N/A
Moreno Valley USD	Riverside	Yellow	Not identified (AI)	N/A	AA iii	AA
Mt Diablo USD	Contra Costa	Green	AA	No	SWD iii	No
Oakland USD	Alameda	Green	AA, AI	AA, AI	No	N/A
Orange USD	Orange	Green	N/A	N/A	No	N/A
Placentia-Yorba Linda USD	Orange	Green	AA	No	No	N/A
Pomona USD	Los Angeles	Green	AA, 2+	AA, 2+	No	N/A

<u>District</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>CSD Color for Suspension Rates for All Students Spring 2017</u>	<u>Identified Subgroups 2 Below in Summary Needs/Gaps</u>	<u>Goals for Identified Subgroups</u>	<u>Other Subgroups Identified in Summary Needs/Gaps</u>	<u>Goals for Other Identified Subgroups</u>
Poway USD	San Diego	Green	AI, PI	AI, PI	No	N/A
Rialto USD	San Bernardino	Yellow	AI, Fil, 2+	No	No	N/A
Riverside USD	Riverside	Yellow	AA, SWD	AA, SWD	No	N/A
Sacramento City USD	Sacramento	Orange	N/A	N/A	AA, EL, H, SWD	AA, H, SWD
Saddleback Valley USD	Orange	Green	AI	No	No	N/A
San Bernardino City USD	San Bernardino	Yellow	Not identified (AI, PI)	N/A	AA	No
San Diego USD	San Diego	Green	EL	No	No	N/A
San Francisco USD	San Francisco	Green	PI, SWD	No	No	N/A
San Jose USD	Santa Clara	Green	EL, SWD	EL, SWD	No	N/A
San Juan USD	Sacramento	Yellow	2+	No i	No	N/A
San Ramon Valley USD	Contra Costa	Green	EL, SWD	EL, SWD	No	N/A
Santa Ana USD	Orange	Green	AA, AI	No	No	N/A
Stockton USD	San Joaquin	Orange	N/A	N/A	No	N/A
Sweetwater Union HSD	San Diego	Yellow	EL, SWD	SWD ii	LI	LI
Temecula Valley USD	Riverside	Blue	AA	AA	No	N/A
Torrance USD	Los Angeles	Green	AI	No	SWD	No
Twin Rivers USD	Sacramento	Orange	N/A	N/A	No	N/A
Visalia USD	Tulare	Yellow	AI	AI	AA, EL	AA, EL
Vista USD	San Diego	Green	N/A	N/A	No	N/A
West Contra Costa USD	Contra Costa	Yellow	N/A	N/A	AA, SWD	AA, SWD
William S Hart Union HSD	Los Angeles	Green	N/A	N/A	LI, SWD	No

**Definition of Terms:**

- AA African-American
- AI American Indian
- CSD California School Dashboard
- EL English Learner
- Fil Filipino
- H Hispanic
- LI Low Income
- PI Pacific Islander
- SWD Students with Disabilities
- 2+ Two or More Races

**Coding Guide to Findings:**

- i) But goals for 9 other subgroups
- ii) Likely a goal for SWD because goal is to reduce the gap between the lowest and the highest performing student groups and SWD has highest rate
- iii) Misidentified as orange, when actually yellow
- iv) Indicated that number of Filipino suspensions was extremely low
- v) LCAP indicates plan to establish subgroup goals

## Endnotes

1. 5x5 grids by district type are available at: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/cm/documents/quickguidefall17.doc>.
2. To be more precise, to qualify for required assistance, generally a district must have a subgroup that receives a red across two state priorities, such as pupil achievement, pupil engagement, or school climate. So, for example, when chronic absence is added as an indicator, county assistance would not be triggered just by reds for a subgroup on both chronic absence and graduation rates, because both are in the pupil engagement priority. But if the subgroup has a red in another state priority, such as school climate, then county assistance will be triggered.
3. Education Commission of the States. (2017, December). 50-state comparison—Accountability and reporting: ESSA plans. Retrieved from <http://ecs.force.com/mbdata/mbQuest5E?rep=SA172>.
4. A West Virginia school that has 90 to 95% of students without any out-of-school suspensions—or not considered chronically absent—is considered “accomplished,” which “indicates that a school’s performance on a particular indicator is within the range of expected performance set by the State.” West Virginia’s Consolidated State Plan (2017, Sept. 11). Retrieved from [https://wvde.state.wv.us/essa/WV\\_consolidatedStateplan\\_revision-1.pdf](https://wvde.state.wv.us/essa/WV_consolidatedStateplan_revision-1.pdf).

While it is not entirely clear what the state performance standard is for out-of-school suspension rates in Rhode Island, the plan identifies 3.7% as the 25th lowest percentile, implying that is the state performance standard. Rhode Island’s Every Student Succeeds Act State Plan For Submission to U.S. Department of Education. (2017, Sept. 14). Retrieved from <http://www.ride.ri.gov/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/Information-and-Accountability-User-Friendly-Data/ESSA/RhodeIsland-ESSA-State-Plan-Sept2017-FINAL-9-18.pdf>.

Of note, Louisiana establishes that a school will be targeted for support for certain high suspension rates, but does not appear to set a performance goal for suspension rates. Louisiana believes: Louisiana’s elementary & secondary education plan pursuant to the Federal Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). (2017, Aug. 8) (“elementary/middle schools with three consecutive years of out-of-school suspension rates above five percent and high schools with three consecutive years of out-of-school suspension rates above 20 percent will be identified”). Retrieved from <https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/louisiana-believes/louisianas-essa-state-plan.pdf?sfvrsn=23>.
5. A green color is considered the target performance level for each indicator and subgroup. While it is possible to reach green with a medium rate (i.e., between 2.5% and 4.5% for unified districts), as long as the rate declined by at least 0.3% (for unified district), the only way to maintain a green over the long term, without continuing declines, is to reach and maintain the low rate.
6. In preparing their 2017-18 LCAPs, districts relied on the first California School Dashboard, released in Spring 2017. That Dashboard included relatively outdated suspension data, just through the 2014-15 school year. As a result, the colors reflecting performance on suspension rates for districts and district subgroups did not take into account performance in 2015-16 or 2016-17. Those two years of data were included in the Dashboards released in Fall 2017, which will help inform LCAP updates that districts must submit to their county offices of education by July 1, 2018. Future Dashboards are expected to continue to provide suspension data for the most recently completed school year (i.e., Fall 2018 Dashboards will provide color assessment based on comparison between 2016-17 and 2017-18 data).
7. 17 of 40 districts that called out subgroups included distinct goals for those subgroups, including several districts that called out subgroups that were not two below the overall color.
8. Fabelo, T., Thompson, M., Plotkin, M., Carmichael, D., Marchbanks, M.P., & Booth, E.A. (2011). *Breaking Schools’ Rules: A Statewide Study of How School Discipline Relates to Students’ Success and Juvenile Justice Involvement*. Council of State Governments Justice Center.
9. Id.
10. Rosenbaum, Janet. (2018). Educational and criminal justice outcomes 12 years after school suspension. *Youth & Society* 1-33. Retrieved from <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0044118X17752208?journalCode=yasa>.
11. Cal. Ed. Code 52060(c) provides that “A local control and accountability plan adopted by a governing board of a school district shall include, for the school district and each school within the school district, both of the following: (1) A description of the annual goals, for all pupils and each subgroup of pupils identified pursuant to Section 52052, to be achieved for each of the state priorities identified ... and for any additional local priorities identified by the governing board of the school district. (2) A description of the specific actions the school district will take during each year of the local control and accountability plan to achieve the goals identified ....” The instructions to the revised LCAP template provide “LEAs must include a description of the annual goals, for all students and each LCFF identified group of students, to be achieved for each state priority as applicable to type of LEA. An LEA may also include additional local priorities. This section shall also include a description of the specific planned actions an LEA will take to meet the identified goals, and a description of the



expenditures required to implement the specific actions.” The instructions also provide that “at minimum an LEA must use the applicable required metrics for the related state priorities.” The LCAP template requires “expected annual measurable outcomes” for each metric. The guiding questions in the LCAP template include, “What are the specific expected measurable outcomes associated with each of the goals annually and over the term of the LCAP?”

12. 8.5 is “very high” and with a 0.4% decline would yield an orange rating. With a very high rate, only a “decline significantly” of 2% could result in a yellow.
13. California Department of Education. (n.d.). California Model Five-by-Five Placement Reports & Data. Retrieved from <https://www6.cde.ca.gov/californiamodel/>. Enter school district and suspension rate to find breakdown of schools by color.
14. The 23 districts include districts that may have dedicated funding for some evidence-based practices, but only provide bundled funding for at least one of these three evidence-based practices.
15. Cal. Ed. Code 52061.
16. For example, during the current 2017-18 school year, districts are working on their 2018-19 LCAPs that will provide updates on what happened during 2017-18. The Fall 2017 Dashboard they are relying on for color designations includes 2016-17 suspension rate data.
17. Of the remaining eight districts starting with yellow, four propose goals that would result in a continuing yellow designation for Year 3 (although one mistakenly asserts that it would reach green), and for the other four districts, it is unclear what color designation they would receive in Year 3.
18. Even the one, Antelope Valley High School District, appears to mistakenly assert that it will move to green by Year 3, when it appears that its goal of 0.5% annual declines would merely change orange to yellow. With a 9.2% baseline, a fall to 7.7% by Year 3 would still be considered a High rate, which with a “Decline” of 0.5% results in a yellow, not a green.



**Fight Crime: Invest in Kids**

Thousands of police chiefs, sheriffs, prosecutors and violence survivors protecting public safety by promoting solutions that steer kids away from crime

**Council for a Strong America** is a national, bipartisan nonprofit that unites five organizations comprised of law enforcement leaders, retired admirals and generals, business executives, pastors, and prominent coaches and athletes who promote solutions that ensure our next generation of Americans will be citizen-ready.

201 Mission Street / 12th Floor / San Francisco, CA 94105 / 415.762.8270



COUNCIL FOR A  
**STRONG AMERICA**

[StrongNation.org](http://StrongNation.org)