Looking Back on Year 2, 2017-2018

Seven Next Generation Learning Challenge (NGLC) in Oakland launch schools implemented Year 2 of their plans during 2017-2018, with formal support ending in June 2018. For more background on NGLC in Oakland, please visit NGLCinOakland.org, and for more information on Year 1 of implementation please review the Year 1 Evaluation. The Year 1 Evaluation also provides more background information about the California Dashboard (Dashboard). This document serves to follow up with additional outcomes data from Year 2. In addition to the Dashboard, for Year 2 we are grateful to receive information on school performance and growth via the Oakland CORE Data Collaborative. These data systems combine to give us a reasonable way of framing outcomes to date at these school sites. And (Good News!) there are exciting stories in the data for every school. This report begins with a cohort-level scan of outcomes data, and then narrows in near the end for school-by-school analysis.

As previously acknowledged, NGLC in Oakland would not have been possible without the generous support from a collection of local and national funders, and the national NGLC team at EDUCAUSE. Special thanks to Stacey Wang and also the team at the Mastery Design Collaborative for their guidance and technical assistance in support of Oakland’s students and school leaders. We invite readers to share thoughts and critical feedback after reading this report. Success and progress stem from the courage and leadership of the educators on the ground in Oakland’s schools. Where we did not meet expectations, those of us outside of schools need to continue to listen and bolster our supports for innovation in public education. Comments and questions can be shared publicly by including @NGLCinOakland on Twitter. The Rogers Family Foundation values direct feedback, and invites you to share thoughts with Senior Director Greg Klein by email, gklein@rogersfoundation.org. There remains much work to do. NGLC in Oakland has merely crossed the threshold of a long journey, and the initiative remains focused on quality as our goal, and personalizing learning as our means. We are grateful for the students, families, teachers, and leaders who all work each day for better outcomes. Onward!
Percent Proficient

Looking at the percent of students reaching (or exceeding) proficiency is the most long-standing method used by California to understand the quality of schools. The Dashboard has come a long way from this simplistic view, but we can still start a school review using percent proficiency as a beginning reference point. Not too long ago this was the standard for understanding school quality, so it can be familiar data to absorb as we seek to deepen our understanding of newer, more multi-dimensional data.

With the first two charts below, we can see quickly that no local school or school system is helping the vast majority of their students to meet grade-level expectations. Within CORE\(^1\) (representative of most of California, and explained in depth on Page 6), fewer than 50% of students are proficient in ELA and fewer than 40% are proficient in Math. These values fall lower for Oakland Unified School District (OUSD), where fewer than 40% of students are proficient in ELA, and fewer than 30% are proficient in Math. For both ELA and Math, the same three NGLC in Oakland launch schools fall below these system benchmarks, and four meet or exceed them. As the rest of this report shows, these data slices alone do not tell the whole story of quality at these schools. Significant unanswerable-from-these-charts-alone questions remain, such as, how has the achievement in schools changed over time? Are the below-benchmark schools improving and narrowing the gap to benchmark? These are just a small sample of the types of school quality questions we can ask and answer with the help of the CA Dashboard and CORE; and we can ask them for indicators beyond ELA and Math and include Suspension, Chronic Absence, and (soon) English Learner Reclassification.

---

1 In charts throughout this document, “CORE: K-12,” “CORE: ES,” and “CORE: MS” refers to the CORE Data Collaborative. The Data Collaborative Network Dashboard includes several of the eight original CORE Districts—Fresno, Garden Grove, Long Beach, Oakland, Sacramento, San Francisco, and Santa Ana—and many county offices of education, districts, and charter schools across the state. Together, the Data Collaborative includes over 2 million students from across 80 school districts, six county offices of education, and two charter management organizations.
California Dashboard

For the 2018 Dashboard reports there are 28 possible indicators across the seven schools on which to show improvement or hit the state’s goal for “all students.” NGLC in Oakland schools improved or hit the goal on 14 indicators across the cohort. This matches the 50% mark from the prior year (11 of 22 indicators). Lodestar, Roosevelt, and Redwood Heights each showed improvement or hit the state’s goal on 3 of their 4 indicators for this year.

The reportable dashboard results from the cohort of NGLC in Oakland schools for “All Students” in 2018 include:

- In English Language Arts three schools increased or hit the goal. (Same as prior Dashboard report.)
- In Mathematics five schools increased or hit the goal. (Only one school did so in the prior Dashboard report.)
- In Suspension three schools decreased or hit the goal. (One fewer school from the prior Dashboard report.)
- In Chronic Absence three schools decreased or hit the goal. (This indicator was not available last year.)

Tying together the previous percent proficient information with this first slice of Dashboard information starts to make clear, for example, that while Roosevelt Middle School remains below the benchmark systems of CORE and OUSD, it showed marked improvement or positive status across nearly all indicators.

Distance from Standard and Status vs. Change

In addition to the information above from the Dashboard’s Five-By-Five reports, we can place schools on scatter plot charts by indicator to view them in additional context. When looking at achievement in English Language Arts (ELA) and math, the Dashboard focuses on Distance from Standard (DFS) instead of the percentage of students proficient or above. This means instead of looking at the percentage of students meeting or exceeding grade-level standard, we now look at how many scale score points on average students are away from meeting the grade-level expectation. A school’s “status” on DFS can be above (a positive number) or below (a negative number) the standard (which is expressed as zero, since this point is, by definition, zero scale points away from itself, or no “distance” away from itself). The Dashboard also looks at how the school’s DFS “changed” from the prior year to the most recent year. It is important to note that this year-over-year comparison is not comparing the same cohort of students. Given this and the fact that all students and grades are combined in the average, DFS remains a broad measure of school achievement. The combination of DFS and change in DFS, though, gives a window into whether or not the school is broadly supporting students to move towards meeting grade-level expectations.

How Are We Defining “Hit the Goal?”

In California’s Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) plan, the state lays out goals for English Language Arts, math, high school graduation, and English Learner Progress. For each of these goals, the state is looking for schools to meet these goals for all students and every significant student group.

---

2 California transitioned to a new English proficiency assessment: the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC). Because the ELPAC is a new test, and Dashboard indicators require two years of outcomes, this indicator was not reported in the Fall 2018 Dashboard.
English Language Arts

The chart below shows DFS in English Language Arts for 2017-2018 along with the year-over-year DFS change for the seven launch schools, Oakland Unified School District (OUSD) overall, and statewide CORE participants overall. EBIA, UMCS, and Redwood Heights had positive DFS (and are “at/above” the y-axis on the chart), and Redwood Heights also had a positive change in DFS. Next, though below standard on average and lagging CORE statewide, Lodestar and ASCEND more closely approximated standard than OUSD. Finally, UPA and Roosevelt each had a lower average DFS than OUSD and CORE, though UPA showed the largest significant positive change in DFS from the prior year.

Sources: California School Dashboard and CORE Insights Dashboard. Colors reflect Performance Levels from the Dashboard.
Math

One fact stands out very quickly in the chart below: none of the seven launch schools, nor OUSD or CORE, are supporting students on average to meet grade-level standard in math. This is a trend that we have seen in Oakland for years, albeit through the lens of proficiency.

At the same time, data show all seven schools either closer to standard than OUSD and CORE (higher up on the chart), or changing more positively than either of the larger systems (further to the right on the chart). UPA’s change in DFS of over 35 scale score points more than doubles California’s “significant improvement” definition of 15 average scale score points, and Lodestar’s change of over 45 scale score points is more than triple. Roosevelt’s intensive focus on mathematics improvement with New Classrooms’ Teach to One program shows positive changes that have now persisted for years; though, without a scaled solution within OUSD, it will be difficult for the school to continue to afford the program.

Sources: California School Dashboard and CORE Insights Dashboard. Colors reflect Performance Levels from the Dashboard.
What is CORE?

California’s largest school districts joined together in 2010 to form CORE and successfully sought a waiver from the Federal Department of Education’s No Child Left Behind accountability system in 2013. Following the new federal law—the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)—the state board of California adopted a federally-approved accountability plan that each Local Education Agency (LEA) must follow. The CORE districts, despite no longer being joined by a waiver, have chosen to continue to voluntarily associate with one another, and the community, now the **CORE Data Collaborative**, has grown to represent school systems serving nearly two million students, which is approximately one-third of California’s six million public school students, and is mostly representative of California. Recently, a handful of charter-run systems became members of CORE as well. Through CORE we can see school outcomes as they appear on the Dashboard plus a few additional key pieces of data: Indices and Growth. First, Indices place an indicator’s data in context with the rest of the schools represented in CORE. For example, an Index Level of 8 of 10 means the school ranked in the top 80% of all schools in CORE for that indicator. This kind of contextualized information is not available in the public views of the Dashboard. Second, Growth adds a valuable addition beyond “status” and “change” that are already found in the Dashboard. Growth measures progress for the same sets of students from one year to the next. It is a much more accurate measure of a school’s effectiveness than subtracting this year’s test scores from last year’s scores which compares two different sets of students.

What is the CORE Growth Model?

One of the main benefits of working with the CORE Data Collaborative is gaining access to CORE’s growth model. The model looks at how students in a particular school performed in relation to peers in comparable schools. This comparison can help understand the “school effect” for students—did students do the same, better, or worse than similar students in a similar school? Access to this data brings in an important lens to school quality.

- **High academic growth is a reflection of school effectiveness**
- **Growth is key to understanding student progress.**
- **Growth considers improvement in scores for each student.**
- **Schools with high growth are making a strong contribution to student achievement.**

How is Academic Growth calculated by CORE?

A mathematical model is used to calculate academic growth that compares test scores while taking into account students’ unique circumstances. The CORE Growth model considers whether each student’s progress is less or greater than could be expected for other students who are similar and who started off with the same score in the previous year. Adding in student demographic factors gives a more accurate reading of each school’s impact on student progress. Unlike the Dashboard that groups data from grades 3-8 together, CORE separates out Growth for Elementary School 3-5th grade (ES) and Middle School 6-8th grade (MS). “Average Growth” for the CORE system is the 50th percentile, by definition.

In spring 2019 CORE recognized schools with one- to three-years of high growth in ELA and/or math, see image to the right. For a complete list of schools, including a number of NGLC in Oakland schools visit: [https://bit.ly/2F2Wq3u](https://bit.ly/2F2Wq3u)
English Language Arts with Growth

Similar to the previous ELA chart with the same y-axis, we again see the schools distributed vertically with 0 as “at standard.” The x-axis is now different showing Growth instead of the change in DFS. With this view, we see that each school level overall except Roosevelt lands on the chart as either higher achieving based on DFS (UMCS, EBIA, and Redwood) or saw higher growth (ASCEND, Lodestar MS, and UPA) than both OUSD and CORE. It is particularly exciting to see a number of schools hitting growth above the 90th growth percentile, including Lodestar Middle School (94th) and Urban Montessori Middle School (99th). For students in these schools, there was virtually no better place for them across California to learn and make progress in English Language Arts. Also note that CORE’s two dots land squarely on the 50th percentile.

In CORE, K-8s and 6-12s are split out by Elementary School (ES) and Middle School (MS) whenever possible. Lodestar Elementary does not yet have two years of data so growth will not be calculated until after the 2018-19 school year.
Mathematics with Growth

Perhaps the most impressive data from last school year for NGLC in Oakland grantees is growth in math. Similar to the previous Math chart with the same y-axis, we see the schools distributed vertically with 0 as “at standard.” Like with ELA, the x-axis is again different and now shows Growth instead of the change in DFS. This view shows that all but UMCS Elementary now land on the chart as either higher achieving based on DFS (EBIA and Redwood) or saw higher growth (ASCEND, Lodestar MS, Roosevelt, UMCS Middle, and UPA) than both OUSD and CORE. Historically, when looking at math through a measure of percent proficient and even with the newer lens of Distance from Standard, achievement is abysmal. Through this lens of growth, we can start to see the hard work of so many dedicated teachers and students coming through in the data, including five schools with student growth percentiles of 89% or higher. We do not ignore that all schools, CORE, and OUSD are on average still below standard, but nor are schools or OUSD likely to hit standard in one single-year jump. Sustained year-after-year growth is the pathway for a school to ultimately reach standard.

Source: CORE Insights Dashboard. Colors reflect performance bands from CORE (from Red: Weakest Performance or Change to Blue: Strongest Performance or Change.)
Culture and Climate Data

The Dashboard and CORE include culture and climate data to help assess school quality, primarily through chronic absence and suspension. While not comprehensive measures of a school’s culture and climate, these data points again provide starting points for further interrogation. Though not included in this evaluation, it is worth noting that CORE also developed a set of standard survey questions on culture, climate, and social and emotional learning from the perspectives of students, families, and staff. These surveys are not universally deployed across schools. It is also important to note that when looking at the following quadrant charts, we now hope to see schools in “low / decreasing” quadrants, as lower and decreasing rates of chronic absence and suspension are better for kids, as opposed to “high / increasing” rates of proficiency or growth.

For more information on these surveys please see the School Culture/Climate section of CORE’s Improvement Measures webpage: https://coredistricts.org/our-data-research/improvement-measures/
Suspension

In the chart below, we focus on suspension rates as defined by California, which includes out-of-school suspensions and expulsions, as well as out of class in-school suspensions. Similar to how we looked at ELA and math DFS data previously, the chart below plots a school’s current suspension rate on the Y-axis with change from the prior year on the X-axis. Four NGLC in Oakland schools—including Roosevelt, Redwood Heights, East Bay Innovation Academy, and UMCS—show suspension rates lower than CORE and OUSD. UPA, ASCEND, and Lodestar had higher and increased suspension rates. Via CORE for ASCEND (not shown in the chart below), we know that 1% of students were suspended outside of school, so much of ASCEND’s gap from CORE and OUSD must be attributable to in-school-and-out-of-class suspensions. Similarly, via CORE we can learn that Lodestar’s out-of-school suspension rate is closer to 8%, though the single year significant increase remains. As viewable in the CORE data, UPA does not leverage in-school-and-out-of-class suspensions nearly as much as ASCEND and Lodestar, and as such, the suspension rate in the chart is nearly entirely reflective of out-of-school suspensions. It will be important to continue to monitor to see how quickly these schools can make adjustments. Suspension data overall supports schools to monitor their culture or climate trends, take action, and improve.

Sources: California School Dashboard. Colors reflect Performance Levels from the Dashboard.
Chronic Absence

Chronic absence is one of the newest data points that California tracks for schools. We finally have a statewide definition of chronic absence, which is missing 10% or more of school days (so, generally, missing 18 or more days by the end of the school year). The impact of chronic absence on student outcomes has been thoroughly researched and needs to be taken seriously. Simply stated, and beyond the financial impact to schools and systems, students aren’t likely to learn standards if they are not in school. As with suspension, ideally schools will have a low and/or declining rate of chronic absence. We want to see schools hovering around 0 on both the Y- and the X-axes. We also know that, more than any other indicator, schools are still very much building their understanding of this new data and how to leverage it to improve. While none of our school grantees are yet below even a 3% chronic absence threshold, all but UMCS are currently lower than CORE or OUSD, with Lodestar and Roosevelt leading the way in dramatically decreasing their rates of chronic absence. As with suspension, schools like UPA and ASCEND with “low / increasing” rates of chronic absence can use this data as an early warning to more closely monitor and adjust internal systems before absolute rates creep up further.

Sources: California School Dashboard. Colors reflect Performance Levels from the Dashboard.
Launch School Stories

Before sharing school-by-school updates, we remember that growth is different than tools used by the California Dashboard (again, see page 6). CORE—and many researchers—would argue that everything impacts a child’s learning and development: their family life and structure; their family’s income and educational levels; home language status; prior academic achievement; the prior academic achievement of their school; trauma; access to health care; etc. For CORE, Growth is a measure that seeks to isolate the pedagogical impact of teaching and learning at a school. CORE’s Growth model may be the closest single data point we have for isolating the impact of a student’s school experience. Everywhere below where we speak of Index Levels at 7 or higher, or Growth percentiles 75 and higher, we mean to signal clear in-the-data wins in terms of various student outcomes.

ASCEND’s middle school performed very well for the last two school years. Most recently, middle schoolers had growth in the 99th percentile in mathematics (Index Level 10 of 10) and the 67th percentile in English Language Arts (ELA) (Index Level 7 of 10). ASCEND’s middle schoolers saw enough of a drop in the rate of chronic absence to move up two Index Levels to 8 of 10. Suspension remains low, but slightly trended in the wrong direction last year. ASCEND’s middle school outperforms all other Education for Change (EFC) middle schools in ELA, math, chronic absence, and suspension. The main emphasis of NGLC in Oakland in ASCEND’s middle grades was their implementation of New Classroom’s Teach to One model of mathematics, and the growth results are top notch. Indeed, CORE recently awarded ASCEND a Three Year High Growth Badge in both ELA and Math.

In the elementary grades, the most recent scores show improvement in the ELA and math performance Index Levels, and ELA growth. Math growth was steady, but only average in the elementary grades. Rates of chronic absence and suspension decreased, improving both Index Levels. ASCEND’s elementary school outperformed all other EFC elementary schools in suspension and chronic absence, and are roughly equal in performance on ELA and math. Even with this progress and performance, the Foundation expects new site leadership will be in place at ASCEND for 2019-2020.

Since East Bay Innovation Academy (EBIA) High School is still growing grade levels, they do not yet have 11th grade state test scores to report. As of Spring 2018, the much larger and established middle school is high performing with Index Levels of 8 of 10 in both ELA and math. Growth in ELA was below average and growth in math was average. The school excelled in both chronic absence (Index Level 8 of 10) and suspension (Index Level 10 of 10). EBIA middle schoolers responded to the CORE Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) survey, which included a Growth Mindset Index Level 9 of 10. On the other end of the spectrum, students reported at Index Level 1 of 10 for Climate and Culture. Students are clearly self-reporting something very disconnected from the otherwise strong outcomes in academics, chronic absence, and suspension. This is a particularly fascinating example of the data made possible via participation in CORE; the questions that arise; and the further investigation needed to more completely understand the layers of quality at a school, and what work may come next.

Lodestar’s middle schoolers grew in the 94th percentile in ELA and the 90th percentile in math, with corresponding Index Levels of 9 and 10, respectively. Absolute performance remains average, but Lodestar has only served these middle schoolers for one to two years. Chronic absence is not a concern, but suspension rates need to be reduced, as they are currently above 10%. The only other school in the same charter management organization (CMO), Lighthouse’s middle school outperforms Lodestar’s middle school.

From the California Dashboard:

- **Status**: How a school achieved on an indicator in the most recently completed year.
- **Change**: How a school’s achievement on an indicator changed in the most recently completed year compared to the prior year. I.e., this year’s status minus the prior year’s status.
- **Performance**: The color resulting from the combination of viewing a school’s status and change simultaneously on a Dashboard Five-by-Five report.
In elementary grades, Lodestar and Lighthouse compare very similarly in terms of ELA and math performance. This past spring, Lodestar’s 3rd graders were their oldest elementary students and the only ones to sit for the state tests—which means Growth data cannot be generated, as Growth requires a baseline score from the prior year from which to start. Elementary students scored “average” within CORE with Index Levels of 4 of 10 in both ELA and math for the percentage of students meeting or exceeding standard. We anticipate that future Growth percentile calculations will show that the pedagogical value-add from Lodestar’s model results in their students greatly out-growing their peers among CORE’s two million statewide students—this requires at least one more year’s wait. The school expects to onboard a new school leader starting fall 2019. Lodestar’s accomplishments to date at both elementary and middle school levels shows the importance of investing in great teams to do deep work well before they enroll students. Finally, Lodestar, reflecting its growth in middle school, was also awarded the One Year High Growth Badge in both ELA and Math by CORE.

Redwood Heights performs at Index Level 8 of 10 in both ELA and math. At the same time, this past spring saw a significant drop in Growth in both areas. One mitigating factor was the leave of absence of a key instructional leader at the school (who has since returned), and is charged with a great deal of the professional learning and on-site data analysis. The prior year’s growth was much stronger, so it will be important to see if this school year’s data marks a bounce back or a serious trend worthy of concern. Redwood Heights ranks at Index Level 9 of 10 in rates of chronic absence and suspension. Redwood Heights always outperformed Oakland Unified School District (OUSD) in ELA and math, but the most recent data shows that the gap is even larger—that is, the rate of improvement at Redwood Heights is greater than it is for OUSD overall. The original investment in Redwood Heights was also deeply tied to their desire and capacity to impact the results of African American students. Unfortunately, significant gaps remain across indicators. The data clearly show that this goal for Team Redwood Heights remains unaccomplished, though the team’s enthusiasm and commitment continue.
The metric on which Roosevelt Middle School shines most brightly is their **89th growth percentile in math**, with a corresponding **Index Level of 9 of 10**. Performance also increased enough to bump up that Index Level to **6 of 10**. This tremendous growth powered Roosevelt to earn CORE’s One Year High Growth Badge in Math. ELA growth and performance are lower and flat over two years, with performance Index Level at 3 and growth Index Level at 4. Again, as with ASCEND above, the impact of Teach to One in mathematics is undeniable, and was also the single biggest change brought on by NGLC in Oakland at the school. Roosevelt’s 7 of 10 Index Levels for both rates of chronic absence and suspension are considered average within CORE, and are trending in the correct directions over time. Roosevelt also reached Index Level 7 of 10 on the High School Readiness indicator. The school greatly outperforms OUSD in math, chronic absence, suspension, and High School Readiness, and underperforms the district in ELA. As the data has shown for a few years now, Roosevelt remains an excellent example of a school greatly adding value for its students—helping them grow more than three years’ worth of skills and knowledge during their three years at the school—even as overall performance is below standard as the incoming student body on average enters Roosevelt well below grade level. Roosevelt continues to receive robust financial support from Salesforce, and is in the Educate78 School Design Lab, which includes participation in OUSD’s Autonomies Working Group.

**Urban Montessori’s** new and now-grown middle school program performed very well this past year. **ELA and math performance ranked at Index Levels 8 of 10**, with Growth in math at 60th percentile (Index Level 6 of 10) and **Growth in ELA at the 99th percentile (Index Level 10 of 10)**. Not surprisingly, with 99% growth, CORE awarded the One Year High Growth Badge in ELA to UMCS. Along with EBIA, UMCS was one of the few Oakland schools to complete CORE’s SEL survey for students, families, and staff. With that data, we can see that students’ self-reported perceptions of **Growth Mindset at Index Level 10 of 10**—an area the school has explicitly emphasized over the years. An area for the school to further delve into is the current **Index Level 1 of 10 on students’ self-perceptions of “self-management.”** This, at first glance, seems to be an area where the Montessori model of school would excel. Urban Montessori’s suspension rates are very low and trending further downward, but rates of chronic absence are high, with an Index Level of only 3 of 10. Attendance is one of the top three priorities of the new Head of School, for both academic and financial reasons. Overall, UMCS outperforms CORE in ELA, math, and Suspension, but lags in Chronic Absence. The importance of CORE’s separation of K-8 performance into elementary and middle school shines clearly when looking at a K-8 public Montessori school. Montessori pedagogy focuses on longer three- and six-year cycles of learning—as opposed to California’s test-every-year accountability system. While some of UMCS’s elementary scores lag, we can see the beginnings of the model’s promise coming to fruition with how the middle school and older students perform.

The most recent data shows **Urban Promise Academy** (UPA) moved up Index Levels in ELA and math for performance and growth. Though 29% of students performed at grade level in ELA (up an Index Level’s worth of improvement from the prior year), students grew in the **77th percentile in ELA**, with a corresponding **Index Level 8 of 10**. Math performance increased two Index Levels, and students were in the **89th percentile for Growth**, with an Index Level of 9 of 10. These growth rates earned UPA the One Year High Growth Award in both ELA and Math from CORE. UPA scores an Index of 6 of 10 in High School Readiness, with an average 49% of students hitting that bar. UPA’s Chronic absence was Index Level 5 of 10 and flat year over year; and suspension increased, which in turn decreased the corresponding Index Level to 4 of 10. UPA continues to receive robust financial support from Salesforce, and is in the Educate78 School Design Lab, which includes participation in OUSD’s Autonomies Working Group.

---

6 The High School Readiness indicator includes the percentage of 8th graders with: a GPA of 2.5 or better; no Ds or Fs in English language arts or math; attendance of 96 percent or better; and no suspensions.
Looking across Data Platforms

While individual school’s data stories are shared above, the included results still remain at a relatively high “elevation,” and are only a start. Schools themselves need to dig deeper to understand results for each grade and reportable subgroup, and get clear on which instructional moves contributed to any gains.

In general, the public can now access longitudinal school data across multiple data platforms to triangulate school quality of California public schools:

- California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress, which emphasizes percent proficient;
- California School Dashboard, which emphasizes average Distance From Standard, and includes Suspension and Chronic Absence; and
- DataQuest, which includes the above along with enrollment, truancy, staffing, and other data.

Schools participating in the Oakland CORE Data Collaborative can see their Growth model, and hopefully these participants will make this data more available over time to the public.

We still have big questions remaining to interrogate about how we take a consistent approach to school quality review. Triangulating school quality across platforms remains on-going work. With great enthusiasm, never have we had more opportunity and data to more sharply aim toward the many targets on which we need our public schools to excel on behalf of students, particularly those students who are historically and frequently marginalized, who cannot wait for improvements to come decades in the future, and who plainly need our public schools to be excellent right now.

Thank you for reading and for your continued support!

For more information, contact:
Greg Klein, Senior Director | Innovation and Learning, gklein@rogersfoundation.org

Photographs of ASCEND, Redwood Heights, Roosevelt, Urban Montessori, and Urban Promise Academy by Stephanie Secrest, stephaniesecrest.com