

State Priority 2: Implementation of State Academic Standards

On January 17, 2017, the State Board of Education established a process for measuring implementation of state academic standards, one of the local measures in the new state accountability system. This report is a narrative summary of our progress in the implementation of state academic standards based on a locally selected measure or tool.

Selection of Measurement Tool

Districts were offered a choice between using a state reflection tool or a locally selected measure or tool. The state tool is focused on a variety of inputs, including training, policies, and classroom walkthroughs, and the information from that tool is a sampling of many aspects of standards implementation. We had a different interest.

The purpose of this measure is to provide information to help us evaluate the effectiveness of actions and services in the LCAP related to standards implementation, and we believe the best way to find out where we are in relation to standards implementation is to ask our teachers. They have the most useful knowledge about where standards are fully implemented and where additional training, materials, and/or support are needed.

To make the process as simple as possible, we developed a rating scale which teachers used to let us know where they are in the process of implementing California standards in various subject areas. The areas of strength and areas that need additional support show up clearly in the data we received through the use of this tool.

1—Exploration and Research Phase	2—Beginning Development	3—Initial Implementation of Some Standards	4—Full Implementation	5—Full Implementation including Aligned Intervention or Real-World Experiences
You may be aware there are new standards and a new Framework, but have not necessarily read them, nor implemented anything new in your classroom.	You have read the new standards and Framework and compared them to the old standards. You are starting to think about making changes to instruction.	You are aware of the new standards and are beginning to teach some standards-aligned lessons, <u>but you do not have aligned materials and have not made major changes.</u>	You have a pacing guide that supports the new standards, and you have <u>aligned instructional materials.</u> You are <u>teaching the new standards,</u> and student <u>assessment is aligned.</u>	You are <u>teaching and assessing</u> the new standards and using <u>intervention and support systems</u> that have also been aligned. For courses outside the academic core, the program includes real-world experiences, either brought into the classroom or outside the school (authentic practice).

What are standards?

Content standards define the knowledge, concepts, and skills that students should acquire at each grade level or in each secondary course.

What are frameworks?

Curriculum frameworks provide guidance for implementing the standards. They include detailed descriptions of how the standards are to be implemented at different levels, and include best practices in assessment, instructional strategies, equity and access, and instructional materials selection.

How long should it take teachers to implement changes to standards as outlined in California frameworks?

It takes the state between one and two years to revise frameworks after new standards have been adopted. Usually the framework is adopted in late fall, and instructional materials begin to be available for review in late fall of the following year. We would plan to select materials that spring and implement the materials the following year. It takes teachers about three years after the adoption of the framework to fully implement new standards.

We will consider our district to have met the requirement to implement new standards if teachers rate implementation in the full implementation range (4.0 to 5.0) within three years of the release of a new framework and instructional materials.

Data from Elementary Schools

We surveyed teachers about implementation of the following standards using the five-point scale on the previous page. We had 123 total respondents.

- English Language Arts, *English Language Arts/English Language Development Framework*, 2014
- English Language Development, *English Language Arts/English Language Development Framework*, 2014
- Mathematics, *Mathematics Framework*, 2013
- Next Generation Science Standards, *California Science Framework*, 2016; instructional materials 2018
- History-Social Science Standards, *History-Social Science Framework*, 2016

English Language Arts (ELA)

Teachers have been working on the new ELA standards by participating in training and working collaboratively to implement the new standards, and we have adopted new aligned materials. Last year, the average rating for implementation was **4.6** for classroom teachers, **4.3** for Special Education teachers, and **4.6** for Intervention Specialists, all in the full implementation range. This year, the average rating was **4.5**. Although we will continue to refine implementation of instructional materials, ELA standards do not need to be a primary focus.

English Language Development (ELD)

Only a small number of our students are English learners, and many teachers marked that they are not implementing ELD standards in their classrooms because they do not have any English learners. Intervention Specialists do work with English learners, and last year they rated their implementation at **4.6**, which is in the full implementation range. Teachers rated this year **3.8** this year overall, but that is likely because many teachers have no English learners in their classes. At this time, ELD standards do not need to be a primary focus for most teachers. Data shows our designated ELD program continues to be effective.

Mathematics

Classroom teachers rated their implementation at **4.4**, and Special Education teachers rated their implementation at **4.0** last year. This year, teachers rated math **4.4** overall. Although this is in the full implementation range, scores on assessments are lower than for ELA, and math should remain an area of focus. The new standards and instructional shifts are complex and take multiple years of work to master.

Next Generation Science Standards

The new *California Science Framework* was just approved in the fall of 2016, and most teachers have not yet begun to consider implementation. The average rating last year was **1.8** for classroom teachers and **1.6** for Special Education teachers, who focus on reading, writing, and math skills. This year, teachers rated NGSS implementation **2.8** on average, probably because some teachers have been working on their own to try to bring science instruction up to date. The new science standards should be an area of focus for the next three years because they are very different from previous standards in the way concepts are organized and in the integration of engineering concepts starting in Kindergarten. We have met to develop an interim plan to put in place until we are able to adopt.

History-Social Science Standards

Rated at **1.9** by classroom teachers and **1.2** by Special Education teachers last year, the framework adopted in 2016 is new to most staff members. We will need to work on the implementation of these standards for the next three years. The rating was **2.7** this year. We are using *Studies Weekly*, an aligned newspaper-style consumable, to fill the gap until we have funds available to purchase aligned textbooks. *Studies Weekly* was approved by the state as an aligned instructional material, but it would not be the teachers' choice for an adoption.

Data from Middle School

For middle school, we had only nine respondents, with six being from core subject areas. It will be important to increase the response rate to this survey next spring so that we have better data for decision-making.

English Language Arts

Last year, teachers rated their implementation of the new standards between **3** and **4**. This year, there were only two respondents, who rated implementation at a **4** and a **5**. The Golden West English team began using new instructional materials last year. It appears standards alignment has increased, but the low survey response rate makes it difficult to be sure.

English Language Development

Last year teachers rated implementation of these standards as being very close to **4** and progressing nicely. This year, three teachers rated implementation at a **4**, but two rated it as a **1**. We need to explore further to understand whether the 1 means the teacher did not have English learners last year, or whether they need support in providing integrated ELD. Assessment results for English learners indicate they are continuing to make strong progress through designated ELD.

Mathematics

Last year, teachers selected **4**, full implementation, and this year, the two respondents also rated implementation at a **4**. They continue to work on refining placement assessments and intervention, but the core courses are well aligned.

Science

The rating selected was a **2**, moving to a **3** last year, and this year the two respondents rated alignment at a **5**. The Science Department is to be commended for their hard work last year in implementing Amplify Science, which is well-aligned to the NGSS. The NGSS represent a major change, with content shifting between grade levels and the instructional approach changing. In addition to implementing new curriculum, the number of students enrolled in core science classes who need modified curriculum increased, and a retired teacher with a strong background in inclusion was hired to modify the very rigorous NGSS-aligned curriculum so that it is accessible to all students. Science, because it deals with the observable physical universe and emphasizes hands-on experiences, is an excellent subject area for mainstreaming students, who not only learn science but also have the opportunity to interact with typically developing peers in lab groups. Work on Universal Design for Learning will continue this year.

Social Science

Last year, teachers rated their implementation of the 1998 standards as a **5**, and the 2016 standards as a **1** because they were recently released. There were no respondents to this year's survey from the social science department. Last spring, the Golden West social studies teachers selected new standards-aligned instructional materials, and this year, they are using them for the first time. We expect implementation ratings for the 2016 standards to increase significantly this spring (2019) with the new materials available to support instruction.

Data from Travis Education Center and Travis Community Day School

We had a strong response from TEC and TCDS, with five teachers responding. English standards implementation was rated at a **5**, with math and social studies rated at a **4**. Observational evidence shows teachers in alternative education plan creative lessons that are highly engaging to students, emphasizing real-world application of the standards. Their lessons also include instruction and practice in foundational skills students may have missed. The result is high motivation and a high graduation rate.

Data from Vanden High School

We had 26 respondents from classroom teachers at Vanden High.

English Language Arts

Teachers rated their implementation at a **4** last year. This year, two teachers rated implementation at a **4** and two at a **5**. They continue to use the new standards-aligned materials they received last year, supplemented with carefully chosen novels and other materials. CAASPP testing results continue to be strong, and observations show instruction is rigorous (at the level of the standards) and engaging.

Mathematics

Teachers rated their implementation of standards at a **4**. This year the two respondents rated implementation at **4** and **5**. They have been using their new materials for three years.

Science

Science has new standards, but instructional materials are not yet available. The teachers have met to develop standards-aligned lessons for their classrooms, and rated their implementation last year at a **3**, and this year at a **3.2**. They are looking forward to new instructional materials. In the survey, multiple teachers mentioned they need increased access to technology to fully implement the NGSS, which require the incorporation of instrumentation and engineering, as well as the use of electronic tools for data analysis.

Social Science

The Social Science teachers rated their implementation of the new standards last year at a **2.8** or **3**, which is appropriate because the new framework had just been released, and they did not yet have aligned materials. Last spring, the rating was a **4**. Selection last year and implementation this fall of new materials in U.S. History and AP U.S. History completed replacement of high school social studies instructional materials, and now all classes have aligned materials.

Other Standards

- World Language: Rated a **3** last year, and the single respondent rated implementation a **4** this year. Our world language textbooks are old, and the state is anticipating new framework in 2020, with materials available for adoption in 2021.
- Career Technical Education: Rated a **5** last year, with standards fully implemented in the eight pathways. This year, there was not enough data to provide a rating. Teachers continue to align curriculum to pathways, with significant progress being made each year.
- Health: Rated a **5** last year, no respondent this year.
- Physical Education: Rated a **4**, full implementation, last year, and a **4** again this year.
- Visual and Performing Arts: Ratings varied according to discipline. Music rated implementation a **3** last year, Drama a **3.5**, and Art a **4**. This year, we did not have ratings for those areas.

Areas of Focus for 2018-19

From this data, three key areas of focus emerged:

1. Elementary Science
Science standards implementation was rated at a 2.8 by elementary teachers. We have not yet begun whole staff training in the NGSS. Teachers want training and new materials.
2. Elementary Social Studies
Implementation was rated a 2.7 by elementary teachers, and they are looking forward to being able to select new instructional materials as soon as funding is available.
3. High School Science
Our high school science teachers are to be commended for their hard work to move toward the new standards, but they are in need increased access to technology and aligned materials. They rated implementation at 3.2 on a 5-point scale, but probably cannot move much further without additional resources.

Impact on LCAP for 2018-19

1. STEM programs outside of the school day
 - Provide after school Arts Adventures and STEM programs that allow unduplicated students to experience success and build academic skills in a highly engaging context. Provide priority enrollment for unduplicated students. [1.5.03]
 - Continue to provide STEM and robotics experiences through after school programs and participation in C-STEM activities. [1.5.04]
 - Provide STEM-themed summer programs that use a highly engaging context to provide unduplicated students with the opportunity to improve academic skills. Provide priority enrollment for unduplicated students. [1.5.05]
2. Elementary Social Science
 - Provide *Studies Weekly* standards-aligned social studies materials for K-5 students. [4.2.02] (This is our temporary measure until we have funds to adopt new social science materials.)
3. Science materials
 - Explore elementary and high school science materials after State Board of Education adoption in November, 2018. [4.2.04]
4. Technology for science
 - Continue to maintain technology and replace computers and other technology as needed; focus technology expenditures on high priority learning needs and increase access to technology as funds are available. [4.3.01]