

Evaluation of California's Standards-Based Accountability System

Final Report

November 1999



Gloria J. A. Guth
Deborah J. Holtzman
Steven A. Schneider
Lisa Carlos



James R. Smith
Gerald C. Hayward
Naomi Calvo

California Department of Education

Delaine Eastin, State Superintendent of Public Instruction
William Padia, Director, Office of Policy and Evaluation
Jan Volkoff, Contract Monitor, Office of Policy and Evaluation
<http://www.cde.ca.gov/ope/>

Research Team

WestEd

Gloria J.A. Guth
Deborah J. Holtzman
Steven A. Schneider
Lisa Carlos

935 El Camino Real
Menlo Park, CA 94025
(650) 470-0400
<http://www.wested.org/>

Management Analysis and Planning, Inc.

James R. Smith
Gerald C. Hayward
Naomi Calvo

508 2nd Street, Suite 205
Davis, CA 95616
(530) 753-3270
<http://www.edconsultants.com/>

Advisory Group

Ted Bartell
Program Evaluation and Research Branch
Los Angeles Unified School District
(formerly with the Ventura County Office of Education)

Mary Alice Callahan
President, Morgan Hill Federation of Teachers

Kelvin Lee
Superintendent, Dry Creek Joint Elementary School District

Suzanne Tacheny
Policy Director, California Business for Education Excellence
(formerly with the Los Angeles Unified School District)

The research reported in this document was supported by a contract to WestEd from the California Department of Education, Office of Policy and Evaluation (Contract #7405, "Evaluation of California's Standards-Based Accountability System"). The views expressed in this report are those of its authors and are not necessarily shared by the California Department of Education.

Table of Contents

List of Figures	v
Executive Summary	vii
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: Context for This Evaluation	5
Chapter 3: Conceptual Framework	15
Chapter 4: Methodology	21
Chapter 5: The Status of Local Accountability Systems	29
Chapter 6: Content Standards	43
Chapter 7: Assessment Measures	61
Chapter 8: Use of Data	81
Chapter 9: Consequences and Incentives	97
Chapter 10: Impact of Standards-Based Accountability Systems	119
Chapter 11: Challenges and Assistance	129
Chapter 12: Recommendations and Conclusions	161
References	173
Appendix	A1
<i>1998–99 Consolidated Application for Funding Categorical Aid Programs,</i> <i>Part II, pp. 33–35 (with instructions)</i>	
<i>District Accountability Survey</i>	
<i>Interview Protocol: State Policy Makers</i>	
<i>Interview Protocol: State Implementers</i>	
<i>Interview Protocol: District Administrators</i>	
<i>Interview Protocol: Principals</i>	
<i>Interview Protocol: Teachers</i>	
<i>Local Accountability Plan Comment Summary (CDE)</i>	
<i>Accountability Plan Rating Form (CDE)</i>	
<i>Accountability Plan Review Form (project)</i>	

(This page intentionally left blank.)

List of Figures

Figure 1.1: Table Linking Study Questions to Report Chapters	3
Figure 2.1: Timeline of Accountability in California	6
Figure 3.1: Conceptual Framework for Standards-Based Accountability Systems: Criteria and Indicators.....	17
Figure 3.2: Components of the Conceptual Framework for Accountability Systems.....	18
Figure 4.1: Sample for District Survey	22
Figure 4.2: Illustrative Comparison of Three Weighting Schemes	23
Figure 5.1: District Reporting of Implementation of Content Standards and Assessments	31
Figure 5.2: District Reporting of Implementation of School Performance Accountability Components	32
Figure 6.1: Reported Years Districts Adopted Content Standards for English/Language Arts and Mathematics	45
Figure 6.2: Matrix Examining Mathematics and Language Arts Standards Across Five Districts at Four Grade Levels	49
Figure 6.3: District Reporting of Estimated Percentage of Teachers Whose Classroom Teaching Reflects District Content Standards.....	53
Figure 6.4: District Reporting of Alignment of Instructional Materials to Content Standards for English/Language Arts and Mathematics	57
Figure 7.1: District Reporting of the Extent to Which District Assessments are Aligned with District Content Standards for English/Language Arts and Mathematics	75
Figure 8.1: Pyramid of Use of Student Assessment Data.....	83
Figure 8.2: District Reporting of the Extent to Which Groups Examine and Analyze Student Assessment Data.....	84
Figure 8.3: District Ratings of the Technical Capacity at Three Levels within the District to Analyze Student Assessment Data	85
Figure 8.4: District Reporting of Categories and Levels by Which They Disaggregate Student Assessment Data.....	86
Figure 8.5: District Reporting of Reasons the District Collects and Analyzes Student Assessment Data.....	89
Figure 8.6: District Reporting of Reasons Their Schools Collect and Analyze Student Assessment Data.....	92
Figure 9.1: District Reporting of Performance Targets for Schools	100

Figure 10.1: District Opinion About the Effects of Accountability on Measures of Student Achievement	122
Figure 10.2: District Opinion About the Effects of Accountability on Curriculum and Instruction and Assessment	123
Figure 10.3: District Opinion About the Effects of Accountability on Teacher Morale.....	124
Figure 10.4: District Opinion About the Effects of Accountability on Other Factors	127
Figure 11.1: District Reporting of Sources of Accountability Help	131
Figure 11.2: District Rankings of Challenges for Developing and Implementing a Standards-Based Accountability System	140
Figure 11.3: District Reporting of Desired Additional Resources to Help Analyze Student Assessment Data.....	155