Name:	
<ul><li>Considerations</li><li>Concerns</li><li>Questions</li></ul>	Comments or Feedback
ould we keep chronic absenteeism as an SQSS indicator?	
<ul> <li>◇ Various studies point to strong relationships between measures of attendance and student performance outcomes</li> <li>◇ Chronic absenteeism counts are already collected by CDE, and allow for disaggregated student group reporting</li> <li>Not currently disaggregated by grade span (2019-20 earliest)</li> <li>Variability in inclusion/exclusion rules applied         <ul> <li>Inclusion of PK students</li> </ul> </li> <li>In some cases, chronic absenteeism counts exceed total enrollment counts</li> <li>Can impact schools with students that have legitimate reasons (e.g., medical leave) for having an excused absence</li> <li>Siven the concerns with Chronic Absenteeism data to date, should we ontinue to keep it as an SQSS indicator?</li> <li>f so, what suggestions do you have for helping improve the quality of he data?         <ul> <li>We could revisit it in a year to see how data looks then.</li> </ul> </li> <li>f not, do you recommend using the long-term plans to find a eplacement? Get rid of completely?</li> </ul>	

<ul><li>Considerations</li><li>Questions</li></ul>	Comments or Feedback	
What should our process be for finalizing our long-term plans for the SQSS indicator?		
<ul> <li>The indicator must be valid, reliable and comparable across districts.</li> <li>The indicator must be the same for all schools at each level (elementary, middle, and high), but may vary across grade levels.</li> <li>The indicator must be disaggregated by student groups.</li> <li>The indicator is supported by research that high performance or improvement on such measures is likely to increase student learning.</li> <li>Developing clear definitions for each indicator selected</li> <li>Establishing a timeline and evaluation plan to evaluate the impact and efficacy of selected indicators</li> <li>Previous recommendations</li> <li>PWR – workforce readiness indicators, course data, and "keep as is"</li> <li>Student engagement – attendance, participation in extracurricular and leadership activities</li> </ul>	— Brainstorming on Own	
We need to pick this work back up. How should we proceed? What process would you recommend for finalizing our long-term plans for SQSS indicator?	— Final Recommendation	

<ul><li>Considerations</li><li>Questions</li></ul>	Comments or Feedback	
Process for districts to notify CDE of the timeline and exit criteria for TS/ATS schools		
<ul> <li>❖ What would be the reporting burden for LEAs?</li> <li>❖ What is the least burdensome way to report this information?</li> <li>❖ How frequently should this data be reported to CDE? Once?</li></ul>	— Brainstorming on Own  — Final Recommendation	
What process should CDE use to collect districts' timeline and criteria for exiting TS schools?		
Should CDE use an existing system (e.g., Consolidated Application for capturing this information? Or have a separate process?		
Should CDE have a recommended timeline and exit criteria for TS/ATS schools?		
<ul> <li>❖ What are the consequences if a district exits schools every year, setting exit criteria as "no longer identified by CDE"?</li> <li>❖ What is the impact on schools' eligibility to receive supports and services (1003 funds, etc.)?</li> <li>❖ How does the timeline selected impact the time available for districts to review and approve improvement plans?</li> <li>❖ How long do districts need to review and approve plans?</li> <li>Should CDE have a recommended timeline and exit criteria for TS/ATS schools? If so</li> <li>❖ What should the recommended timeline be?</li> </ul>		
❖ What should the recommended exit criteria be? ❖ How and when should that be communicated to LEAs? If not, what guidelines could be shared with LEAs in developing their exit criteria and timelines?		