New statewide tests were administered in 2015

- First set of Smarter Balanced (SBAC) test results under the Common Core State Standards
- Common Core standards are more rigorous
  - English language arts (ELA) is more challenging
  - Math requires more ELA skills
- Education agencies “can’t compare” SBAC and the California Standards Test (CST)
Why compare new and old test results?

- Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) and Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) require informed decision-making
- The LCFF and LCAP target high-need students
  - Economically disadvantaged
  - English Learner (EL)
- Districts and schools need to know how students are faring
  - New accountability measures are being developed
  - Closing achievement gaps is a major state goal
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As expected, fewer students “met the standard”

4th-grade ELA test results

CST 2012–13

SBAC 2014–15

Percent scoring “proficient” and above
Achievement gaps are larger on the SBAC

4th-grade ELA assessment

- CST (2012–13)
- Smarter Balanced (2014–15)

Percentage gap in proficient, relative to white students
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In districts with more high-need students, smaller shares meet or exceed test standards
In districts with top-50 SBAC scores for economically disadvantaged students, results varied on other tests.
Test results also varied for English Learners in top-50 SBAC districts

- Top performer CST ELA only: 14%
- Top performer both CST ELA and SBAC math: 44%
- Top performer SBAC math only: 28%
- Not top performer on CST ELA or SBAC math: 14%
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Economically disadvantaged students’ test scores decline as school share increases
## Schools where ELs most exceed expectations on SBAC and CST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Met Standard (%)</th>
<th>Expected to Meet Standard (%)</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Met Standard (%)</th>
<th>Expected to Meet Standard (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Newhall Elementary</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>Pacific Union Elementary</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Sherman Elementary</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Robert L. Stevens Elementary</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>Sanchez (David J.) Elementary</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>Montalvin Manor Elementary</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Finley Elementary</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>Martin Van Buren Elementary</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Jessie Hayden Elementary</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Lauderbach (J. Calvin) Elementary</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At hundreds of schools, no 4th-grade ELs met the ELA standard
Fewer 4th-grade ELs met district reclassification standards on the SBAC ELA.
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Implications

- Some districts and schools have had success with EL and economically disadvantaged students
  - Some on both SBAC and CST
- In many schools and some districts, no ELs “met the standard”
  - Potential for huge impact on EL population
  - Time to rethink reclassification standards
- State could provide guidance to districts
  - Technical assistance from county offices, California Collaborative for Educational Excellence
  - CORE as an example
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San Diego and other districts are expanding access to college prep coursework

- President Obama has called for US high schools to prepare all students for college and career
- In California, the ACLU has urged many large districts to expand access to “a–g” coursework needed to apply to CSU and UC
- San Diego Unified School District (SDUSD) decided in 2012 to make a–g coursework a graduation requirement
- Several other major districts have adopted similar policies
  - Los Angeles, San Francisco, Oakland, San Jose
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The a–g course sequence

- 15 year-long courses in 7 subject areas
  - a: History/Social studies (2 years)
  - b: English Language Arts (4 years)
  - c: Mathematics (3 years)
  - d: Laboratory sciences (2 years)
  - e: World languages (2 years)
  - f: Visual and performing arts (1 year)
  - g: College-preparatory elective (1 year)
In San Diego and other districts, students with grades of D or higher on a–g coursework can graduate. UC and CSU require grades of C or higher on a–g coursework. The districts’ goal is to expose all students to college prep without creating undue barriers to graduation.
Some districts allow students to opt out

- San Jose Unified implemented a–g in 2002 but students could opt out
  - Very little change a decade later in share of graduates completing a–g with grades of C or higher
- Oakland Unified also has an opt-out provision
- San Francisco and Los Angeles are closer to San Diego in making a–g a grad requirement
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More a–g courses are being taken by the end of grade 9.
a–g course-taking by end of grade 11 has also risen
Course-taking has increased most among students whose parents have less education.

- **Graduate school**
- **College graduate**
- **Some college**
- **High school diploma**
- **Less than high school diploma**

Number of additional a–g courses:

- Less than high school diploma: **
- High school diploma: **
- Some college: **
- College graduate: 
- Graduate school: *
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More SDUSD students are on track to meet UC/CSU course requirements . . .

- 59% of students in the class of 2016 are on track to complete the a–g requirements with grades of C or higher
- Could be a 10 percentage point gain in eligibility for UC/CSU
If all SDUSD students take and pass all a–g courses in 2015–16, 73% will complete a–g with D or higher

- An additional 1% may complete a–g but not have the required cumulative GPA of 2.0

Represents a 15.5% drop from June 2014
Some students are more than a year behind in two or more a–g subject areas
English, math, and world languages are the greatest barriers

[Bar chart showing the distribution of semester courses across various subjects and electives, with categories indicating 0-2, 3, 4, 5, or 6 or more students.]

Semester courses:
- 0-2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6 or more
For the class of 2016, a–g completion varies across groups

- Hispanic
- Asian/Pacific Islander
- African American
- White
- Parental education
  - Graduate school
  - College graduate
  - Some college
  - High school graduate
  - Less than high school
- Special Education
- Not in Special Education
- English Learner
- Not English Learner
LAUSD graduation rates are also likely to fall; SFUSD fared better

- In LAUSD, the graduation rate is likely to drop from 74% to 63% or lower
  - As of fall 2015, only 54% of seniors were on track to graduate
- In SFUSD, the graduation rate was 83.9% for the first class subject to the new requirements; it was 81.7% the year before
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Districts supports can help

- SDUSD has implemented two remedial tools
  - Summer school
  - Online credit recovery classes that are a–g certified
- SDUSD has also implemented a preventive tool
  - Ensuring access to world language courses at all middle schools
- SFUSD has made extensive use of credit recovery courses
- LAUSD has invested in online credit recovery courses and other supports
Intervention and early support are key

- An aggressive program to re-enroll non-graduating seniors for fall 2016 would be useful
- More preventive programs are probably needed
  - Schools can identify and support at-risk students in middle school or even earlier
  - Early supports for English Learners in both English and math are crucial
College prep for all is a worthy but difficult goal

- Watershed moment for San Diego Unified
- Policy was designed to increase equality of opportunity but...
- An a–g graduation requirement can hurt at least as many students as it helps
- Districts need to marshal resources to provide student support in high school—and also much earlier
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