

## Inventory of Relevant Measures of Program Proficiency Previously Used Under the USP<sup>1</sup>

### A. Programs to Improve Integration

1. Includes Attendance Boundaries, Feeder Patterns, Pairing and Clustering, Open Enrollment Outreach, Lottery, Magnet Schools
2. Primary Data Source:
  - a. II.K.1.a<sup>2</sup> TUSD Enrollment-40th day
  - b. II.K.1.b TUSD Enrollment-Attendance Status
  - c. II.K.1.I Student Transfers
  - d. II.K.1.I Decreases/Increases in student enrollment by school, grade, ethnicity, etc.
3. Measures of Program Proficiency: Using the definition of integration adopted by the Court for post-unitary operations (ECF 2615-1, p. 9):

A school is Integrated when no racial or ethnic group exceeds 70% of total enrollment; and when no single racial or ethnic group varies from the district average for the school's grade level (Elementary, Middle, K-8, High) by more than +/- 25 percentage points.

Progress towards integration. A school is making progress towards integration when the entry- grade enrollment is Integrated, and when the school maintains this integration through the next two grades.

- a. Is the number/proportion of integrated schools increasing and by how much?
- b. Is the number/proportion of students attending integrated schools increasing and by how much?
- c. For non-integrated schools, is there progress towards integration, and how much?

---

<sup>1</sup> This inventory is organized by substantive USP activities with common measures of proficiency, rather than by budget categories, which are helpful for budget purposes, but do not lend themselves to measurement of program proficiency. There is broad correlation to sections of the USP, but not exact. For example, activities under Sections I and X of the USP appear together, with common proficiency measures, in Section P.

<sup>2</sup> Data source references are to identified reports filed each year as appendices to the District Annual Report.

## B. Programs to Improve Overall Academic Performance

1. Includes Magnet Program, School Improvement Plans for Struggling Schools
2. Primary Data Sources:
  - a. State-Issued School Letter Grade
  - b. State tests in ELA and Math (AASA for grades 3 – 8, ACT Aspire for grade 9 and ACT for grade 11)
  - c. District benchmark testing quarterly in ELA and Math for grades 2 – 11<sup>3</sup>
3. Measures of Program Proficiency for Magnet Schools: As stated in Comprehensive Magnet Plan (ECF 2615-1, p. 9):

The academic student achievement goal for all magnet schools and programs shall be to attain a state letter grade “A” or “B” or a TUSD “MagnetMerit B” grade. A magnet school that receives a state letter grade “C” may still receive a MagnetMeritB grade if it reaches a minimum of 4 points based on the criteria below. A magnet school that receives a state letter grade “C” that does not reach a minimum of 4 points, or that receives a state letter grade of “D” or “F,” will be put on a targeted academic improvement plan.

**Proficiency: Criteria 1 = 2 Points.** Compare a C magnet school’s proficiency rate to the district’s lowest B school proficiency rate. If the C magnet school has a higher proficiency rate than the lowest B school proficiency rate of district schools, the C magnet school meets the criteria.

**Growth: Criteria 2 = 2 Points.** Compare a C magnet school’s growth rate to the district’s lowest B school growth rate (K-8 model for ES, K8, and MS and HS model for HS). If the C magnet school has a higher growth percent than the lowest B school growth percent, the C magnet school meets the criteria.

**Minimally Proficient (MP): Criteria 3 = 2 Points.** Compare the percent of MP students in C magnet schools with the district average MP for each school type (ES, K8, MS, and HS). If the percent of MP students is lower in the C magnet school than the district average, then the school meets the criteria. (1 point for ELA and 1 Point for Math).

**Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL): Criteria 4 = 1 Point.** If a magnet school has an FRL rate that is higher than the district average (2019-20 100<sup>th</sup> Day TUSD average K-12 = 62.40%), the school meets the criteria.

---

<sup>3</sup> These measures are recommended because they are valid, reliable, and comparable across schools/grades/ethnic groups and provide proficiency performance levels and/or the percent correct. Other assessments such as diagnostic assessments (e.g. DIBELS, mCLASS or intervention platforms) or tests for gifted education (e.g Raven, CogAT, ACT Mosaic) should not be used for student achievement assessments.

4. Measures of Program Proficiency for Struggling Schools
  - a. Is school's letter grade increasing?
  - b. Are prior year's SMART goals met, or has progress been made?
  - c. Are assessment scores increasing, and by how much?

**C. Programs to Improve Relative Academic Performance of Targeted Subgroups**

1. Includes Magnet Program, School Improvement Plans for Struggling Schools
2. Primary Data Sources:
  - a. State-Issued School Letter Grade
  - b. State tests in ELA and Math (AASA for grades 3 – 8, ACT Aspire for grade 9 and ACT for grade 11)
  - c. District benchmark testing quarterly in ELA and Math for grades 2 – 11
3. Measures of Program Proficiency for Magnet Schools: As stated in Comprehensive Magnet Plan (ECF 2615-1, p.10):

*Academic Performance (African American and Latino Students)*

1. Gaps, Compared to District Cohorts. Whether state test scores for African American and Latino students in a particular school exceed the average test scores of African American and Latino students in TUSD schools with similar grade structures.
2. Gaps, Compared to White Students. The size of the achievement gap in mathematics and English/Language Arts (ELA) comparing test scores of white students to those of African American and Latino students.
3. Narrowing or Eliminating Gaps. The extent to which the school has narrowed or eliminated achievement gaps.
4. Improving Performance. Improvement in proficiency rates for African American and Latino students.

4. Measures of Program Proficiency for Struggling Schools
  - a. Are prior year's SMART goals met, or has progress been made?
  - b. Are gaps in achievement between target subgroups and white student decreasing, and by how much?
  - c. Site level program implementation and impact (i.e., Reading Recovery, AVID, GATE, external consultants, IXL, Imagine Learning, etc.)

**D. Programs to Provide Transportation in Support of Other Programs**

1. Includes Transportation
2. Primary Data Sources:
  - a. III.C.1 (1) Ridership Report by School and Grade
  - b. III.C.1 (2) Ridership Report by Reason and Race/Ethnicity
  - c. III.C.1 (3) Ridership by District vs. Public Transportation
3. Measures of Program Proficiency:
  - a. Does the program continue to provide transportation to and from school for all students eligible under the District's Transportation Plan?
  - b. Does the District continue to provide transportation in support of the District's ALE and Extracurricular Activities programs?
  - c. Does the ridership of express and shuttle buses justify continued or expanded funding?

**E. Programs to Improve Diversity of Teaching and Administrative Staff**

1. Includes the Diversity Plan, including the Diversity Transfer Plan and the Grow Your Own Programs
2. Primary Data Sources:
  - a. IV.K.1.d.iii Site Certificated Staff and Administrators Table
  - b. IV.K.1.g (3) Assignment of Certificated Staff
  - c. IV.K.1.g (4) Site Administrative Teams
  - d. IV.K.1.g (1) Teacher Diversity Assignments
  - e. IV.K.1.g (7) DP Targeted Transfer Schools
3. Measures of Program Proficiency: The District compares the racial/ethnic distribution of teachers at each school against the racial/ethnic distribution of teachers at each applicable school level as its diversity measure. Schools that are within +/- 15% of the school level are considered "diverse."
  - a. Is the number/proportion of diverse schools increasing and by how much?
  - b. Is the number/proportion of students attending diverse schools increasing and by how much?
  - c. For non-diverse schools, is there progress towards integration, and how much?

**F. Programs for Placement and Support of New Teachers**

1. Includes the New Teacher Support Plan
2. Primary Data Sources:
  - a. IV.K.1.g (5) Assignment of First-Year Teachers
  - b. IV.K.1.g (6) Assignment of First-Year Principals
  - c. IV.K.1.g (8) Beginning Teacher Inventory
  - d. IV.K.1.h First-Year Teacher Plan
  - e. IV.K.1.n (1) New Teacher Induction
  - f. IV.K.1.n (2) Mentor Assignments by Ethnicity
3. Measures of Program Proficiency:
  - a. Is the District continuing to follow the plan?
  - b. Is the number and proportion of new teachers at racially concentrated and struggling schools minimized to the extent practicable?
  - c. Are appropriate sheltering and development mitigations provided to first year teachers at racially concentrated or struggling schools?

**G. Programs to Improve Access and Participation for Targeted Subgroups in Advanced Learning Experiences**

1. Includes the programs described in the ALE Policy Manual, including GATE, AACs, AP, Dual Credit, AVID, and UHS
2. Primary Data Sources:
  - a. V.G.1.a ALE 40th Day Enrollment
  - b. V.G.1.b (1) Appendix E - AAC
  - c. V.G.1.b (2) Appendix F - GATE
  - d. V.G.1.b (3) Appendix G – UHS
  - e. ALE Supplementary Goals Summary (AR Appendix)
  - f. V.G.1.g UHS Admissions Freshman Class
3. Measures of Program Proficiency:
  - a. 15% Rule: participation by each targeted subgroup should fall within 15 percentage points of the expected value based on the percentage of students at that school level within the target subgroup, for each type of ALE opportunity.

**H. Programs to Increase Graduation Rates and Lower Dropout Rates for Targeted Subgroups**

1. Includes the Dropout Prevention and Graduation Plan
2. Primary Data Sources:
  - a. Annual DPG Goals and Progress Monitoring (AR Appendix)
  - b. V.G.1.o Retention
  - b. V.G.1.u Students Receiving Ex Ed Services
  - c. Dropout Prevention Activities (AR Appendix)
  - d. V.G.1.b (3) Appendix G – UHS
  - e. ALE Supplementary Goals Summary (AR Appendix)
  - f. V.G.1.g UHS Admissions Freshman Class
3. Measures of Program Proficiency:
  - a. Have annual DPG Plan goals been met? Is there progress?
  - b. Dropout Rates for Targeted Subgroups:
    - i. Have dropout rates for targeted subgroups fallen?
    - ii. Have gaps in dropout rates among subgroups fallen?
    - iii. Are dropout rates for targeted subgroups better than state and national averages?
  - c. Graduation Rates for Targeted Subgroups:
    - i. Have graduation rates for targeted subgroups risen?
    - ii. Have gaps in graduation rates among subgroups fallen?
    - iii. Are dropout rates for targeted subgroups better than state and national averages?

**I. Programs to Improve English Language Acquisition For Targeted Subgroups**

1. Includes the Dual Language Plan and EL Action Plan programs
2. Primary Data Sources:
  - a. V.G.1.k OELAS Extension
  - b. V.G.1.l Dual Language Services by School and Grade
  - c. State tests in ELA and Math (AASA for grades 3 – 8, ACT Aspire for grade 9 and ACT for grade 11)
  - d. District benchmark testing quarterly in ELA and Math for grades 2 – 11

3. Measures of Program Proficiency:
  - a. For each plan, have plan goals and milestones been met? If not met, is there progress?
  - b. Has the Dual Language program expanded according to plan?
  - c. Is there credible evidence of impact on educational outcomes for students in the Dual Language program, using testing data?
  - d. Is there credible evidence of improvement in language acquisition for EL students over time in EL programs?
  - e. How does the percent of EL students who become English proficient compare to state and national averages?

**J. Programs to Improve Access and Participation in Culturally Relevant Courses**

1. Includes the CRPI Department 5 Year Plan and CRP Professional Learning Plan
2. Primary Data Sources:
  - a. 40<sup>th</sup>-Day CRC Student Enrollment by School Type
  - b. List of current CR course offerings by school
  - c. Individual student records in Synergy related to enrollment in CR courses, disciplinary consequences, attendance, grades, assessments.
3. Measures of Program Proficiency:
  - a. Have plan and program milestones been met (number of students enrolled in CR course, number of offerings in all schools at all levels, AP and advanced CR courses, amount and quality of professional learning for teachers of CR courses)?
  - b. Is there credible evidence of impact on educational outcomes, such as attendance, GPA, or mean benchmark proficiency?

**K. Programs to Improve Student Engagement for Targeted Subgroups**

1. Includes AASSD and MASSD Operating Plans (identify specific components of AASSD and MASSD Operating Plans that are relevant for the evaluation).
2. Primary Data Sources:
  - a. State-Issued School Letter Grade
  - b. State tests in ELA and Math (AASA for grades 3 – 8, ACT Aspire for grade 9 and ACT for grade 11)
  - c. District benchmark testing quarterly in ELA and Math for grades 2 – 11
3. Measures of Program Proficiency:
  - a. District-wide, are assessment scores for the targeted subgroup increasing, and by how much? How do assessment scores compare to students in the same subgroup in other districts?
  - b. District-wide, are gaps in assessment scores for targeted subgroups decreasing, and by how much? How do assessment scores compare to students in the same subgroup in other districts?

**L. Programs to Related to Discipline**

1. Programs to reduce the incidence of discipline (includes PBIS, Restorative Practices, ISI, the Code of Conduct, and Professional Learning Plans)
  - a. Primary Data Sources:
    - i. VI.G.1.b Discipline Data
    - ii. VI.G.1.d (1) Student Code of Conduct
    - iii. VI.G.1.d (2) Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS),
    - iv. VI.G.1.f Site-level Analyses Samples
  - b. Measures of Program Proficiency:
    - i. number of short and long term suspensions (all students), both total and average per student: falling trends, favorable comparisons to state and national averages for comparable districts;
    - ii. number of short and long term suspensions (by targeted subgroups), including totals, average per student and any disparity compared to other subgroups: falling trends,



- favorable comparisons to state and national averages for comparable districts;
  - iii. total days of exclusionary discipline (all students), both total and average per student: falling trends, favorable comparisons to state and national averages for comparable districts.
  - iv. total days of exclusionary discipline (by targeted subgroups), including totals, average per student and any disparity compared to other subgroups: falling trends, favorable comparisons to state and national averages for comparable districts;
  - v. recidivism rates (by targeted subgroups), average per student, and any disparity compared to other subgroups: falling trends, favorable comparisons to state and national averages for comparable districts;
  - vi. suspension categories (in school and out of school) are delineated by infraction, site, grade, ethnicity, and gender and tracked accordingly.
- 2. Programs to mitigate the educational consequences of long-term exclusionary discipline (DAEP, Abeyance Contracts)
  - a. Primary Data Sources:
    - i. Individual student records in Synergy related to incidents, disciplinary consequences, attendance, grades, and assessments.
    - ii. Program participation data, including attendance, length, and academic improvement noted during period of participation.
    - iii. School, ethnicity, grade, and gender of students who opt out of long term suspension mitigation options.
  - b. Measures of Program Proficiency:
    - i. Improved attendance for the program (year-over-year attendance rate);
    - ii. Measured academic improvement in individual students' academic assessments before and after participation;
    - iii. Reduced recidivism after the program measured before and after
    - iv. longer term measures such as increased attendance rates, increased performance on the standardized test, increased graduation rates, or decreased drop-out rates may not be appropriate to assess program impact.

**M. Programs to Improve Family and Community Engagement for Targeted Subgroups**

1. Includes the Family and Community Engagement Plan
2. Primary Data Sources:
  - a. VII.E.1.d Summary of Family Resource Center Services
  - b. VII.E.1.d(2) Family Engagement Survey Results
  - c. Table of Engagement Activities by Type and School (AR Table)
  - d. School Website Audits (AR Appendix)
  - e. Summary of FRC Services (AR Appendix)
  - f. FACE Community Partners (AR Appendix)
3. Measures of Program Proficiency:
  - a. Does the Annual Report show that the District continues to implement the Family and Community Engagement Plan?
  - b. Is the central district FACE department monitoring and following up on school site engagement activities, and reports of those activities?
  - c. Is the central district FACE department monitoring and following up on school websites?
  - c. Do the annual survey results indicate problems or issues that should be addressed?

**N. Programs to Improve Access and Participation in Extracurricular Activities**

1. Includes the Extracurricular Activities Plan.
2. Primary Data Sources:
  - a. VIII.C.1 Student Participation in Extracurricular Activities
  - b. Funding Sources for Extracurricular Activities
  - c. 21st CCLC Grant Participation
  - d. Extracurricular Participation by Activity at 10 Selected Sites
3. Measures of Program Proficiency:
  - a. 15% Rule: participation by each targeted subgroup should fall within 15 percentage points of the expected value based on the percentage of students at that school level within the target subgroup, for each group or type of extracurricular activities.

**O. Programs to Ensure Equitable Facilities and Technology Distribution**

1. Includes the Multiyear Facilities Plan, Technology Condition Index and Report, and Professional Learning Plan for Teacher Proficiency in Using Technology
2. Primary Data Sources:
  - a. IX.C.1.d Multi-Year Facilities Plan
  - b. IX.C.1.a (1) Facilities Condition Index
  - c. IX.C.1.a (2) Educational Suitability Score
  - d. IX.C.1.a (3) Final TCI Report
  - e. IX.C.1.b TCI Summary of Results
3. Measures of Program Proficiency:
  - a. Do the FCI, ESS and TCI continue to show that scores for each index are not correlated to the demographic population of the school?
  - b. Does the Annual Report show that the District continues follow the Professional Learning Plan for Teacher Proficiency in Using Technology?

**P. Compliance, Transparency, Accountability and Budgeting**

1. Includes the Post Unitary Status Reporting and Accountability Plan
2. Primary Data Sources:
  - a. District Desegregation webpages
3. Measures of Program Proficiency:
  - a. Does the website demonstrate that the District is following the Post Unitary Status Reporting and Accountability Plan, including budgeting, annual report, PIAs/DIAs, public notices and public hearings?
  - b. Are there opportunities for public input in addition to the webpage and public hearings?