STATE OF HAWAI'I
BOARD OF EDUCATION
P.O. BOX 2360
HONOLULU, HAWAI'I 96804

October 15, 2020

TO: Board of Education

FROM: Catherine Payne
               Chairperson, Board of Education

AGENDA ITEM: Board Action on metrics to monitor and evaluate the Department of
               Education's comprehensive plan for reopening schools for the
               2020-2021 School Year: revisions to metrics, new metrics, and new
               metric categories (Personnel; Student Transportation and Food
               Service; and Confidence, Communications, and Guidance)

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- On July 23, 2020, the Board approved a set of metrics to monitor and evaluate
  the Department's plan for reopening schools for the 2020-2021 school year.

- I am proposing revisions to the current metrics to: (1) convert existing metrics
  into a gap structure; (2) disaggregate existing metrics; and (3) add metrics to
  cover areas of concern that have been raised over the past couple of months.

- I am also proposing adding metric categories for Personnel; Student
  Transportation and Food Service; and Confidence, Communications, and
  Guidance.

II. BACKGROUND

On June 18, 2020 the Board adopted a resolution directing the Department to
prepare for the reopening of schools for the 2020-2021 school year amid the global
COVID-19 pandemic ("Reopening Resolution").[1] Among other things, the

---

[1] Resolution of the Board of Education directing the Department of Education to Prepare for the
Reopening of Schools for the 2020-2021 school year amid the Global COVID-19 Pandemic; urging
School Communities to Give Hope, Act with Kindness, and Work Toward Togetherness; and Authorizing
Board Members to Represent the Board of Education in Mid-Term Bargaining of Collective Bargaining
Agreements, available at:

Reopening Resolution directed Superintendent Kishimoto to provide the Board with "reasonable and helpful metrics by which the [Department's school reopening] plan can be monitored and evaluated, which should include, at a minimum, metrics that relate to student access to devices and connectivity, personal protective equipment and sanitation supply needs, student attendance, and student academic status and progress[.]" Reopening Resolution, lines 382-385. The Reopening Resolution also directed Superintendent Kishimoto to provide monthly, detailed reports on these metrics. Reopening Resolution, lines 387-390.

On July 23, 2020, Superintendent Kishimoto proposed a set of metrics to monitor and evaluate the Department's plan for reopening schools for the 2020-2021 school year in accordance with the Board's Reopening Resolution, which the Board approved.[2] The Department organized twelve metrics around the four Board priorities in the Reopening Resolution (health and safety of students and staff, students most vulnerable to school closures and disruptions to learning, in-person instruction, and student access to devices and connectivity. Superintendent Kishimoto stated that that these metrics are "vital sign metrics that are intended to be actionable, information, and clearly communicate needs and concerns. The metrics provide opportunities to understand various types of learning models and needed resources."[3]

On August 20, 2020, Board Member Dwight Takeno requested that the Superintendent review the descriptors and vital sign metrics in her July 23, 2020 memorandum and determine whether any of the descriptors or metrics should be updated given the testimony submitted, discussions at recent Board meetings, and the concerns contained in Board Chairperson Catherine Payne's August 20, 2020 memorandum.[4]

---

http://boe.hawaii.gov/Documents/2020%20School%20Reopening%20Resolution%20%28executed%29.pdf

[2] July 23, 2020 minutes are available at:
https://alala1.k12.hi.us/STATE/BOE/Minutes.nsf/a15fa9df11029fd70a2565cb0065b6b7/8767541e6beb2e200a2585d6007da970?OpenDocument

[3] July 23, 2020 minutes available at:
https://alala1.k12.hi.us/STATE/BOE/Minutes.nsf/a15fa9df11029fd70a2565cb0065b6b7/8767541e6beb2e200a2585d6007da970?OpenDocument

[4] August 20, 2020 minutes are available at:
https://alala1.k12.hi.us/STATE/BOE/Minutes.nsf/a15fa9df11029fd70a2565cb0065b6b7/d1e5ff9f2a767d470a2585e0007ade35?OpenDocument

III. __PROPOSED METRIC CHANGES__

The changes that I am proposing to the current metrics fall into three main categories: (1) converting existing metrics into a gap structure; (2) disaggregating existing metrics; and (3) adding metrics to cover areas of concern.

Board members have expressed their interest in looking at metrics from a gap perspective. Shifting all of the metrics to measure gaps requires the collection of data establishing current status and data establishing overall need, both of which are essential to understand where we are and where we need to be, respectively. The current metrics do not provide the entire necessary context to provide this level of understanding. If the Department is going to focus on addressing concerns, it should focus on closing the gaps in its system. Metrics that focus on closing gaps will also make it easier for the Board and the public to understand why these metrics are important and how they inform the Board's decision-making. The goal will always be to close the gaps, so if we are successful, the numbers should be getting smaller as we go through the school year.

Board Members have also expressed dissatisfaction with single statewide numbers that do not clearly communicate what is happening on specific islands, complex areas, or complexes. The metrics provided also did not differentiate between the different levels of schools (elementary, middle, or high), each of which has different situations and issues. The proposed changes would require disaggregation of data by level or subject. Disaggregation by level means that the Department would divide the data by elementary, middle, or high school. Disaggregation by subject means that there would be separate metrics for each core subject, English language arts ("ELA"), math, or science. There are some suggestions for disaggregation by student subgroup (special needs, English learners ("EL"), or students receiving free or reduced lunch ("FRL")), but no explicit metrics.

Each metric will also have a "Reporting" field that will specify the area as well as the frequency of the reporting. Reporting by area includes reporting by school, complex, complex area, or statewide. There are 15 complex areas, which are comprised of smaller complexes. A complex contains one high school and the elementary and middle schools that feed into it. A complex area is a larger geographical area that usually contains several high schools and its feeder schools. There are times when reporting by complex area does not provide a clear enough picture because the complexes within the complex area are very different. For example, one complex area includes the Farrington, Kaiser, and Kalani complexes. While geographically close to one another the complexes serve very different student populations and communities that have very different needs.

Since the Board adopted the metrics on July 23, 2020, the Board has received a great deal of public input regarding concerns that the metrics do not cover. The largest number of concerns were relating to Department personnel, school food service, student transportation, communications, and guidance documents. There was an overall sentiment about the lack of confidence in the public education system, which is a way to measure how successfully the public education system is performing as a whole, so I am proposing metrics to try to measure this as well.

I do not believe that the descriptors were particularly helpful in understanding the purpose of the metrics, so I am proposing that the Board delete them entirely.

This section is divided into these major categories: (1) Health and Safety; (2) Students Most Vulnerable to School Closures and Disruptions to Learning; (3) In-Person Instruction; (4) Access to Connectivity and Devices; (5) Personnel; (6) Student Transportation and Food Service; and (7) Confidence, Communications, and Guidance.

When I reference the current metrics, I will use the numbers that they were assigned when adopted by the Board, which are as follows:

1. Percent of schools that are adequately equipped with personal protective equipment ("PPE"), sanitation supplies, equipment and training to ensure a safe and healthy environment.
2. Percent of schools offering face-to-face in-person, blended learning, hybrid, exception (methods of learning).
3. Percent of elementary students receiving Developing Proficiency ("DP") or Well Below ("WB") marks in ELA or Math at the end of the quarter.
4. Percent of secondary students receiving "F" mark in a core course (ELA, Math, Science, Social Studies) at the end of the quarter.
5. Percent of vulnerable students who have high-risk attendance (missed 8.3% or more of the school year).
6. Number of elementary and middle/intermediate students not meeting grade level using universal screened (ELA and Math) results /number of high school students needing credits (off-track) to graduate (to be confirmed).
7. Percent of average daily attendance per month by school model (based on instructional delivery).
8. Percent of students enrolled at a school who choose to remain at home rather than attending in-person school instruction.
9. Percent of schools that have provided professional development to staff on how to support distance learning.
10. Percent of students with devices at home to engage in remote learning.

11. Percent of vulnerable students with internet connectivity at home.
12. Percent of schools whose vulnerable students are adequately equipped to support distance learning.

Each metric has a data source and a reporting schedule. The data source is where the data can be obtained. The reporting schedule specifies how frequently the reporting will be done (monthly, quarterly, annually) and the level at which the data will be pulled (for example, school level, complex, complex area, statewide). The reporting schedule does not specify who will pull the data. I expect that schools will be inconvenienced as little as possible by these metrics and as much as possible data will be pulled and assembled by state or complex area level staff. A clean copy of the proposed changes are attached as **Exhibit A**.

A. Health and Safety

There are two current metrics for the Health and Safety category. Current Metric 1 measures the "[p]ercent of schools that are adequately equipped with PPEs, sanitation supplies, equipment and training to ensure a safe and healthy environment." Understanding whether our schools have enough PPE and cleaning supplies is important, but it is unclear whether this metric would provide this information. I converted this metric into the gap structure to determine how many schools did not have enough PPE. I also amended the language to clarify certain terms. In previous meetings, Board members asked the Department what it considered "adequately equipped with PPE." From the responses provided, it appears that a school with a three-month supply of PPE can be considered adequately equipped. In addition, the Board received testimony alleging that Department staff were not receiving PPE differentiated for the jobs they performed. For example, Department staff who work with students with the greatest special needs have to assist students with things like toileting, and these staff regularly come into contact with bodily fluids. Their PPE needs will be greater and different from staff in a general education classroom setting. In order to clarify, I included language specifying that schools would need to have a three-month supply of differentiated PPE and sanitation supplies. The revised metric, which is expressed as a formula, reads as follows:

(Total number of schools) – (Number of schools whose CAS have certified that they are adequately equipped with a three month supply of differentiated PPE and sanitation supplies to ensure a safe and healthy environment) = PPE gap.

Data Source: Complex Areas/Schools
Reporting: Monthly reporting by school, complex area, and statewide.

Current Metric 2 measures the "[p]ercent of schools offering face-to-face in-person, blended learning, exception (methods of learning)." It is unclear to me how tracking this measure is helpful in determining whether the Department is addressing health and safety. There should be, however, a single location where families can go to determine what learning mode a school is in at any particular time instead of having to check each school's website. See Reopening Resolution, lines 130-133: "Collecting, aggregating, and analyzing data from the tri-level system and sharing these data with the Board, parents and guardians, education stakeholders, and the public is essential for strategic decision-making and building community support for public education[.]" I proposed that the Board delete this metric, but that the Department aggregate information on each school's current learning mode in a single, easy to access, and timely updated location.

I am proposing two new metrics regarding social distancing and classroom ventilation. In addition to mandatory and consistent mask use, adequate distance between individuals and good ventilation are important mitigation strategies. Ensuring students and staff are socially distanced during the time they spend in classrooms is an important way to mitigate COVID-19 spread in schools. It is important to have an understanding of whether our school buildings and grounds have the necessary capacity to safely bring all students back to campus. Ideally, we would want to have school spaces that have adequate learning space to accommodate all students with at least a six-foot distance between individuals. We know that we do not have this in every school, but I believe that we need a better understanding of where this is an issue and how much of an issue this is. For example, I have heard that many elementary schools can bring back all of their students and comply with social distancing requirements, but that this is a challenge for middle and high schools. However, we do not have the data that supports this anecdotal evidence. Collecting this data should prove whether this hypothesis is correct or not and allow the Department and Board to focus any available capital improvement resources or mitigation efforts on schools that need more learning spaces to safely accommodate their student populations. The new metric, which is expressed as a formula, reads as follows:

> (Total number of students enrolled) – (Number of students whose school could provide full-time in-person instruction with a minimum of a six-foot distance between students and staff) = social distance gap.
>
> Data Source: Complex Areas/Schools
> Reporting: Monthly reporting by school, complex area, and statewide.

The second new metric is focused on classroom ventilation. As we learn more about COVID-19 and how it is transmitted, ventilation is becoming more of a concern. Several years ago, the Department worked on Governor David Ige's initiative to air condition 1,000 classrooms. A part of this effort was to inventory the classrooms without air conditioning. The Department should use a similar process to assess classroom ventilation. The Department should develop business rules for what constitutes a "properly ventilated classroom," based on guidance from the Department of Health, and then inventory school classrooms to determine how many classrooms are properly ventilated. I believed that we learned a few lessons from the exercise in air conditioning classrooms that the Department can apply here. While the Department is performing this inventory, it should provide schools with immediate ways to address ventilation concerns if there is no large-scale project on the immediate horizon. These options to mitigate ventilation concerns should take into account issues like dust, noise, smell, heat, and other distractions that would hamper the ability of students to learn in the space. The goal is to create safe learning spaces, so any effort to make the space safe must still ensure students can learn in that space. The new metric, which is expressed as a formula, reads as follows:

> (Total number of classrooms) – (Number of classrooms that are properly ventilated) = classroom ventilation gap.
>
> Data Source: Complex Areas/Schools
> Reporting: Monthly reporting by school, complex area, and statewide.

Since it will take time to complete this inventory, the Department should provide timely reports on any inventory it has taken, the total number of classrooms, and the number of classrooms it has inventoried.[5]

B. Students Most Vulnerable to School Closures and Disruptions to Learning

There are four metrics currently associated with this category: (1) elementary student quarterly grades, (2) secondary student quarterly grades (both middle and high school), (3) high risk attendance or chronic absenteeism (being absent for 15 or more days in a school year), and (4) elementary and middle school performance on universal screeners and whether high school students are on-track to graduate.

---

[5] Note that the social distance gap is measured at the student level while the classroom ventilation gap is measured by classroom. I believe that measuring these gaps using these different units is appropriate because with the social distancing gap we want to know how many students each school can provide in-person instruction to in accordance with social distancing rules. However, ventilation should be looked at on a classroom-by-classroom basis.

Elementary Quarterly Grades. Current Metric 3 measures the "[p]ercent of elementary students receiving Developing Proficiency ("DP") or Well Below ("WB") marks in ELA or Math at the end of the quarter." On a standards-based report card, which is only used for elementary students, a student who is not yet meeting the standard would get a Developing Proficiency (DP) or Well Below Proficiency (WB). Students who are meeting the standard would get a Meets with Excellence ("ME") or Meets with Proficiency ("MP). Whether a student is meeting the standard or not is an important metric to track, but the data would be much informative if the Department disaggregated the data by subject. I am proposing that this metric be disaggregated so that one metric would show math proficiency and the other would show ELA proficiency for elementary students. This should help to better track student performance during the school year and can also help to inform planning and policy making. Looking at each subject individually could help us to understand whether there is a need to place more focus on how to effectively deliver ELA instruction during distance learning, focus Response to Intervention ("RTI") on ELA, or plan to provide supplemental ELA opportunities during summer school. I am also proposing that the metric be converted to a gap structure, so we can see what the elementary school ELA and math gap looks like. The revised metrics, which are expressed as formulas, reads as follows:

> (Total number of elementary students) - (Number of elementary students meeting proficiency (receiving Meets with Excellence (ME) or Meets with Proficiency (MP) in ELA at the end of each quarter) = Elementary ELA gap.
>
> (Total number of elementary students) - (Number of elementary students meeting proficiency (receiving Meets with Excellence (ME) or Meets with Proficiency (MP) in Math at the end of each quarter) = Elementary Math gap.
>
> Data Source: Longitudinal Data System (LDS)
> Reporting: Quarterly reporting by school, complex, complex area, and statewide.

Secondary Quarterly Grades. Similarly, the Current Metric 4 lumps middle school and high school students together and measures "[p]ercent of secondary students receiving "F" mark in a core course (ELA, math, science, social studies) at the end of the quarter. There are significant differences between these groups of students, so it makes more sense to separate them out. For the same reasons as stated above for elementary school students, the metrics were disaggregated so there is a metric for each subject. I am also proposing that the metrics be converted to a gap structure so that we can see what the high school ELA, math, science, and

social studies gaps look like. The revised metrics for middle school, which are expressed as formulas, reads as follows:

(Total number of middle school students enrolled in ELA) – (number of middle school students receiving a passing grade (A-D) in ELA at the end of each quarter) = Middle School ELA gap.

(Total number of middle school students enrolled in Math) – (number of middle school students receiving a passing grade (A-D) in Math at the end of each quarter) = Middle School Math gap.

(Total number of middle school students enrolled in Science) – (number of middle school students receiving a passing grade (A-D) in Science at the end of each quarter) = Middle School Science gap.

Middle School Social Studies Gap Formula: (Total number of middle school students enrolled in Social Studies) – (number of middle school students receiving a passing grade (A-D) in Social Studies at the end of each quarter) = Middle School Social Studies gap.

Data Source: Longitudinal Data System (LDS)
Reporting: Quarterly reporting by school, complex, complex area, and statewide.

The revised metrics for high school, which are expressed as formulas, reads as follows:

(Total number of high school students enrolled in ELA) – (number of high school students receiving a passing grade (A-D) in ELA at the end of each quarter) = High School ELA gap.

(Total number of high school students enrolled in Math) – (number of high school students receiving a passing grade (A-D) in Math at the end of each quarter) = High School Math gap.

(Total number of high school students enrolled in Science) – (number of high school students receiving a passing grade (A-D) in Science at the end of each quarter) = High School Science gap.

(Total number of high school students enrolled in Social Studies) – (number of high school students receiving a passing grade (A-D) in Social Studies at the end of each quarter) = High School Social Studies gap.

Data Source: Longitudinal Data System (LDS)
Reporting: Quarterly reporting by school, complex, complex area, and statewide.

Note that these first two metrics focus on students who are not performing well, but it does not disaggregate data to show how different student subgroups (special needs, EL, students receiving FRL) are performing. This data would be helpful for the Department to understand and analyze and can be presented to the Board if the Department's analysis shows that specific subgroups are experiencing larger gaps than the general student population.

High Risk Attendance or Chronic Absenteeism. Current Metric 5 measures the "[p]ercent of vulnerable students who have high risk attendance (missed 8.3% or more of the school year." It appears that a percentage was selected in part because it is still unclear how many instructional days we will have this school year.[6] Using a percentage also allows tracking on a monthly basis to see whether a student is at high risk of being chronically absent by the end of the year.

Usually the Department tracks chronic absenteeism, which is defined as missing 15 or more days in a school year. The current metric appears to be an attempt to use the chronic absenteeism standard, but to convert it to a percentage so students can be tracked on a monthly basis and schools can determine whether a student is likely to end up being chronically absent by the end of the year. The current school calendar has 171 instructional days. 8.3% of 171 days[7] would result in 14.193 days absent. There is no explanation in the Department's July 23, 2020 memorandum[8] and no explanation was requested or provided during the discussion of the metrics at the Board's meeting, so it is unclear why the Department is using this specific percentage, but I incorporated it into the proposed metric.

---

[6] At the July 30, 2020 Special Meeting, the Board approved a revised 2020-2021 School Calendar that added nine teacher and staff training days at the beginning of the school year, but removed nine student instructional days. At this meeting, Superintendent Kishimoto stated that "unions agreed to return to negotiate adding three instructional days[,]" so the total number of instructional days may still change before the end of this school year. July 30, 2020 Special Meeting minutes available at: https://alala1.k12.hi.us/STATE/BOE/Minutes.nsf/a15fa9df11029fd70a2565cb0065b6b7/827310bdb876b7af0a2585de00740ea6?OpenDocument

[7] The 2020-2021 revised calendar is available here: http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/DOE%20Forms/2020-21calendar.pdf. The number of instructional days are listed in gray in the second column from the left.

[8] The Department's July 23, 2020 memorandum is available here: http://boe.hawaii.gov/Meetings/Notices/Meeting%20Material%20Library/GBM_07232020_Board%20Action%20on%20Metrics%20for%20reopening%20of%20schools.pdf

I am proposing a new metric that measures whether all students are at high risk of being chronically absent and revising Current Metric 5 to focus on the most vulnerable students. The new metric, which is expressed as a formula, reads as follows:

> (Total number of students) – (number of students who have missed less than 8.3% of the instructional days that have passed in the school year) = High-risk attendance gap.

> Data Source: Infinite Campus
> Reporting: Monthly reporting by school, complex, complex area, and statewide.

I am also proposing revising Current Metric 5 to determine whether the most vulnerable students are experiencing more significant attendance issues than the overall student population. This metric focuses on whether vulnerable students are at particular risk because they are not attending school. Although not explicitly listed here, the Department should analyze disaggregated data by student subgroup, such as EL, socioeconomically disadvantaged, and special needs students. Because many students with special needs who had individual education programs ("IEPs") were brought back to campus at the first opportunity, chronic absenteeism may be less prevalent for this student group. A lower level of chronic absenteeism for one group, however, should not mask issues with greater absenteeism in other groups, such as EL or socioeconomically disadvantaged students. This data would be helpful for the Department to understand and analyze and can be presented to the Board if the Department's analysis shows that specific subgroups are experiencing larger gaps than the general student population. The revised metric, which is expressed as a formula, reads as follows:

> (Total number of vulnerable students) – (number of vulnerable students who have missed less than 8.3% of the instructional days that have passed in the school year) = Vulnerable Student High-Risk Attendance Gap.

> Data Source: Infinite Campus
> Reporting: Monthly reporting by school, complex, complex area, and statewide.

Universal Screeners and On-Track Graduation. Current Metric 6 measures the "[n]umber of elementary and middle/intermediate students not meeting grade level using universally screened (ELA and Math) results/number of high school students needing credits (off track) to graduate." It is unclear why universal screeners are being used to track student progress and whether the Department intended for this metric to be reported on monthly. Ordinarily schools would not be administering

universal screeners every month for every elementary and middle school student or determining whether high school students are on track to graduate It would make sense if the universal screening of elementary and middle school students was to determine student readiness at the beginning of the 2020-2021 school year or to try to assess the extent of learning loss over the fourth quarter of the 2019-2020 school year and summer. However, if that is what the universal screener metric intends to measure then it would be reported once, a few months into 2020-2021 school year. Similarly, the determination of whether students were on track to graduate from high school would be assessed once a year. I believe that the Board needs a better understanding of what the Department intends to measure with this metric. If the Board were to keep this metric, I would suggest disaggregating the metric into different levels (elementary, middle, and high), by subject (where applicable) and by grade for high school. I would also suggest reducing the frequency of reporting to annually. The revised metrics, which are expressed as formulas, reads as follows:

(Total number of elementary students who have taken an ELA universal screener) – (number of elementary students meeting grade level using universal screened ELA results) = ELA Elementary Grade Level Gap.

(Total number of elementary students who have taken a Math universal screener) – (number of elementary students meeting grade level using universal screened Math results) = Math Elementary Grade Level Gap.

(Total number of middle school students who have taken an ELA universal screener) – (number of middle school students meeting grade level using universal screened ELA results) = ELA Middle School Grade Level Gap.

(Total number of middle school students who have taken a Math universal screener) – (number of middle school students meeting grade level using universal screened Math results) = Math Middle School Grade Level Gap.

(Total number of high school students) – (Total number of high school students on-track to graduate) = High School Graduation Gap.

(Total number of 9th graders) – (Total number of 9th graders on-track to graduate) = 10th grade Graduation Gap.

(Total number of 10th graders) – (Total number of 10th graders on-track to graduate) = 10th grade Graduation Gap.

(Total number of 11th graders) – (Total number of 11th graders on-track to graduate) = 11th grade Graduation Gap.

(Total number of 12th graders) – (Total number of 12th graders on-track to graduate) = 12th grade Graduation Gap.

Data Source: Longitudinal Data System (LDS)
Reporting: Reporting annually by school, complex, complex area, and statewide.

C. In-Person Instruction

There are two current metrics for in-person learning. Current Metric 7 measures the percentage of daily attendance by instructional delivery method and Current Metric 8 measures the percentage of students who have opted for full distance learning. I propose deleting Current Metric 7 and replacing it with one that measures the number of students who are not in in-person learning mode and revising Current Metric 8 to reflect a gap structure.

Current Metric 7 measures the "[p]ercent of average daily attendance per month by school model (based on instructional delivery). While this information is important, it is not clear how this information would help the Board understand how many students in total are receiving instruction in-person.[9] I am proposing that the current metric be deleted and replaced with the following:

(Total number of students) – (Number of students in in-person learning mode) = In-Person Learning gap

(Total number of elementary students) – (Number of elementary students in in-person learning mode) = Elementary In-Person Learning Gap.

(Total number of middle school students) – (Number of middle school students in in-person learning mode) = Middle School In-Person Learning Gap.

---

[9] Note that this metric does not measure the number of students in hybrid instructional mode, only full in-person.

(Total number of high school students) – (Number of high school students in in-person learning mode) = High School In-Person Learning Gap.

Data Source: Infinite Campus
Reporting: Monthly reporting by school, complex, complex area, and statewide.

The first metric reflects the overall number of students receiving in-person instruction. The sub-metrics are to show the number of students receiving in-person instruction at the various levels. All of these sub-metrics should be added up and result in the overall number of students receiving in-person instruction. The Board has made in-person instruction a high priority, but it has also made health and safety a priority, so schools should not be bringing students back for in-person instruction unless they can do so safely.

While I believe that it is important to track this metric, I do not think that this gap is necessarily one that we need to push to close above everything else. When the Board adopted the Reopening Resolution, it was during the summer before any of us had any real experience with widespread distance learning. In-person learning was our only reference point. I think we have learned a lot over the past couple of months and we will continue to learn. We should use what we are learning to have conversations about whether it makes sense to set in-person learning as the "gold standard" and to push to get every student into a physical classroom. Some students are thriving in distance learning. Others may find their strengths as schools move into a hybrid learning environment. I believe that we need to start looking at ensuring the best learning opportunities and environment for every student, whatever that looks like.

Current Metric 8 measures the "[p]ercent of students enrolled at a school who choose to remain at home rather than attending in-person school instruction." This metric places specific emphasis on those students who have opted out of the hybrid or in-person models of their schools because these students are not planning to return to physical campuses this year. While not explicitly listed here, it will be important to track not only the number of students who have elected for full distance learning, but also their academic progress and social-emotional wellbeing. This data will help to inform decisions about full distance learning in the future and tell us more about who benefits the most and least from full distance learning. While there have been studies and research regarding distance learning, we have the opportunity to learn from our own experiences if we collect and use the data being generated. I propose revising this metric to reflect the gap structure. The revised metric, which is expressed as a formula, reads as follows:

(Total number of students) – (Total number of students who have elected to return to campus for in-person or hybrid learning) = Full Distance Learning Gap.

Data Source: Infinite Campus
Reporting: Monthly reporting by school, complex, complex area, and statewide.

D. Access to Connectivity and Devices

There are four metrics associated with this priority: (1) staff professional development to support distance learning, (2) students with devices, (3) students with connectivity, and (4) schools that can support vulnerable students with distance learning. I recommend deleting the metric regarding staff professional development because it is irrelevant at this point. The other metrics are appropriate, but need some clarification. All of the metrics need to be converted to a gap structure to provide sufficient context.

Distance Learning Training. Current Metric 9 measures the "[p]ercent of schools that have provided professional development to staff on how to support distance learning." I propose deleting Current Metric 9. At the beginning of this school year, the school calendar was revised to allow for nine training days for teachers and staff. This training was supposed to include training on distance learning. Consequently, all schools should have provided distance learning training to staff. Moreover, professional development on distance learning should be incorporated into the Department's professional development structure. It is something that all staff should be trained on since schools may need to shift into distance learning mode at any time. I also expect that the Department will incorporate ongoing and high quality professional development distance learning opportunities to ensure that staff can maintain and further develop knowledge and skills in this area.

Devices. Current Metric 10 measures the "[p]ercent of students with devices at home to engage in remote learning." I believe that there should be clarification that the device should be one that can be used by students to effectively engage in synchronous (for example, live Google Meets or Zoom meetings with their teachers) or asynchronous (recorded instructional videos) distance learning. There are many kinds of devices like cell phones or tablets, but not all of these devices allow a student to effectively engage in distance learning. The kinds of devices that should be counted are laptop or desktop computers or tablets with sufficient capabilities to do everything expected of students during distance learning. The revised metric, which is expressed as a formula, reads as follows:

15

(Total student population) – (How many how many students currently have a device, personal or school issued, that can be used to effectively engage in synchronous or asynchronous distance learning) = Device gap.

Data Source: Infinite Campus
Reporting: Monthly reporting by school, complex, complex area, and statewide.

Connectivity. The current metric measures the "[p]ercent of vulnerable students with internet connectivity at home." It is unclear why the current device metric looks at the total student population, but the current connectivity metric focuses on vulnerable students. All students need to have both a device and connectivity to engage in distance learning. If vulnerable students do not have a device or connectivity, then schools need to make additional efforts to provide instruction to these students. I believe that a school's ability to make these additional efforts are covered by the last metric in this section. I believe that there should be clarification that the internet connection needs to be sufficient for the student to engage in synchronous or asynchronous learning. Intermittent or slow internet connections will not be able to support this kind of learning. The revised metric, which is expressed as a formula, reads as follows:

(Total student population) – (How many students currently have internet connectivity sufficient for synchronous or asynchronous distance learning) = Connectivity Gap.

Data Source: Infinite Campus
Reporting: Monthly reporting by school, complex, complex area, and statewide.

School support of vulnerable students. The current metric measures the "[p]ercent of schools whose vulnerable students are adequately equipped to support distance learning." This metric appears to prioritize vulnerable students for devices and connectivity, although it is not clear. I believe that this metric should be clarified to measure the number of schools that can support distance learning for its vulnerable student population. If a school does not have enough devices or these students do not have sufficient internet connections at home, the school must find ways to serve these students. This can include mobile learning hubs or setting up safe spaces on campus with devices and connectivity so these students can engage in learning. The revised metric, which is expressed as a formula, reads as follows:

(Total number of schools) – (number of schools that can support distance learning for their entire vulnerable student population) = Distance Learning for Vulnerable Student Gap.

Data Source: Infinite Campus

Reporting: Monthly reporting by school, complex, complex area, and statewide.

E. Personnel

The next three categories (Personnel; Student Transportation and Food Service; and Confidence, Communication, and Guidance) are new. They are largely the result of the numerous testimonies the Board has received over the last several months. They are issues that were contemplated in the resolution, but they had not risen to the level of priorities. However, it has become clear that these are concerns that should be prioritized and that there should be metrics to track them.

Employee Satisfaction. The ability of Department employees to telework has been a big issue recently with most of the schools in distance learning mode. At the last meeting, the Board issued directives on telework to try to address concerns. However, I still believe that telework is not the main issue. The main issue is that the Department needs to support its employees, so employee satisfaction is extremely important. I believe that the best way to collect this feedback is through a confidential survey of all Department employees run by Board Office regarding whether employees feel that they are supported by the Department. While the Board does not regularly issue surveys, I believe that a survey is a natural extension of the engagement and outreach the Board already does. The Board needs to get more direct feedback from a broader segment of employees. We have been receiving more testimony than we ever have in the past and that has provided valuable insight, but it is unclear whether the testimony is reflective of the experiences of most employees. A survey would help the Board to understand the breadth of the concerns being raised. The new metric, which is expressed as a formula, reads as follows:

(Total number of employees) – (number of employee who feel they are supported by the Department) = Employee Support Gap.

Data Source: Confidential survey run by Board Office regarding whether employees feel that they are supported by the Department.
Reporting: Semi-annual reporting by role group statewide.

F. Student Transportation and Food Service

Getting students to and from campus safely and ensuring they have food are two essentials that must be addressed. There have been a lot of concerns about how student transportation was going to work with social distancing and mask requirements. It is clear that students cannot be transported in the same way and

in the same numbers as before, but it is not clear whether there is a shortfall in this area and, if so, how much of a shortfall. I am proposing a new metric, which is expressed as a formula and reads as follows:

> (How many students need to take the bus to get to and from school campuses when the system is in an in-person instructional mode) – (How many students have safe bus transport in accordance with modified school schedules) = Transportation Gap
>
> Data Source: TBD
> Reporting: Quarterly reporting by school, complex area, and statewide.

The food provided by schools were an essential safety net for many students during fourth quarter and summer. Hawaii's economy has not begun to recover and many furloughs are turning into permanent layoffs. Because of this, the school food service will continue to play a large role in sustaining our families and it is essential that we track its effectiveness. I am proposing a metric that would look at how many students are eligible for FRL and compare that number to how many meals are actually being served. The hope would be that all students eligible for FRL are getting served meals because any student that is not being served is potentially going hungry. If students eligible for FRL are not being served, the Department needs to understand why and make efforts to reach these students. This new metric, which is expressed as a formula and reads as follows:

> (How many students are eligible for free or reduced lunch) – (How many free and reduced lunches are actually served) = Food Service Gap
>
> Data Source: TBD
> Reporting: Quarterly reporting by school, complex area, and statewide.

G. Confidence, Communications, and Guidance

The categories of Confidence, Communication, and Guidance are a little different from the preceding areas because the ultimate goal of these three things is to increase both external and internal confidence in the overall system, so the "what" actually being measured is how much confidence the public (external) and school-level personnel (internal) have in the system. Consequently, these metrics do not follow the same gap structure as the ones above.

<u>Public Confidence</u>. When the public is confident in the public school system, families will enroll their children in public school, so I believe that looking at

enrollment changes and how many families are exiting their children from the public school system are ways to measure public confidence.

Enrollment Changes. Comparing projected enrollment to the actual enrollment helps us understand how much has changed from what we were expecting. While this information is helpful to make resources allocation and budget decisions, it can also help us to understand whether the public is confident in the public school system and whether that confidence has changed compared to previous years. This new metric reads as follows:

(Projected Enrollment) – (Actual Enrollment) = Enrollment Difference. Convert Enrollment Difference into a change rate and compare it to change rates from previous years.

Data Source: TBD
Reporting: Monthly reporting by school, complex area, and statewide.

Exiting Public School System. While the enrollment numbers measure the number of students overall compared to the numbers that were expected to enroll, it does not necessarily measure the number of students who are still in the state, but whose parents have elected to remove them from the public school system to either homeschool them or place them in a private school in Hawaii. This new metric would be designed to track students withdrawn from the public school system, but who are still in Hawaii and could re-enter the public school system. I believe that this metric will help us to gauge public confidence in our public school system. This metric would track the number of the withdrawals quarterly and also provide a running total of the total number of withdrawals for the year. These numbers should then be compared to previous years, both the quarterly and annual total. This new metric reads as follows:

Total number of students that were withdrawn to homeschool or to attend private school in Hawaii every quarter together with a running tally of total withdrawals to homeschool or attend private school in Hawaii for the year. Compare to previous years both quarterly and annual total.

Data Source: Infinite Campus
Reporting: Quarterly reporting by school, complex area, and statewide.

The enrollment changes and withdrawal data points should be analyzed together. Overall enrollment may be impacted by the exit of a large percentage of the population from this state because of the impact COVID-19 has had on the economy, so this difference cannot be attributed entirely to confidence in the public school system, but it is important to track because it tells the Board how different things are from what was originally planned. Tracking withdrawals should provide a

better idea of parent confidence in the public school system. Parents who choose to exit the public school system entirely likely have little confidence that the system can provide their child with a quality education.

Communications. Clear and timely communications with the public and internally with the Board and schools has proven to be challenging for the Department. I believe that it would be helpful if the Board and principals could provide feedback to the Department regarding its communications as a pathway towards improvement, deepening understanding, and giving voice to people that need to be heard. As a community board, Board Members' feedback regarding Department communications can serve as a proxy for the public and principals can serve as a proxy for the school level because, as the managers of all other school-level personnel, they have a broad and holistic understanding of the challenges and the ability of the system to address those challenges. I believe that the best way to collect this feedback is through a Board Member survey and confidential principal survey run by Board Office regarding Department communications to the public and internally. While the Board does not regularly issue surveys, similar to my statements regarding the employee satisfaction survey, I believe that a survey is a natural extension of the engagement and outreach the Board already does. The Board needs to get more direct feedback from a broader segment of principals. We received an unprecedented amount of testimony from principals and administrators over the last couple of months, which has provided valuable insight, but it is unclear whether the testimony is reflective of the experiences of most administrators. A survey would help the Board to understand the breadth of the concerns being raised. This new metric reads as follows:

> Percentage of Board Members and principals confident that the Department is providing clear and timely communications to the public and internally.
>
> Data Source: Board Member survey and confidential Principal survey run by Board Office regarding communications to the public and internally.
> Reporting: Semi-annual reporting statewide.

Guidance. The Board has received a lot of testimony regarding the guidance documents issued by the Department as a part of the Return to Learn Plan. Principals are the primary individuals who rely on and implement these guidance documents, so their feedback on these documents is the most important. I believe that principal feedback on these guidance documents should be collected through a confidential principal survey run by Board Office regarding the helpfulness of these guidance documents.

Percentage of principals who find the Department's guidance documents helpful.

Data Source: Confidential principal survey run by Board Office regarding helpfulness of Department's guidance documents.
Reporting: Semi-annual reporting statewide.

IV.   RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the Board approve the metrics to monitor and evaluate the Department's comprehensive plan for reopening schools for the 2020-2021 school year as described in my memorandum dated October 15, 2020 and attached as **Exhibit A** and delegating authority to me to work with the Department on identifying data sources for those marked as TBD.

Clean Copy Proposed Metrics Changes

Board Priorities	Proposed Vital Sign Metrics
Health and Safety	1. PPE Gap Formula: (Total number of schools) – (Schools whose CAS have certified that they are equipped with a three month supply of differentiated PPE and sanitation supplies to ensure a safe and healthy environment) = PPE gap. *Data Source: Complex Areas/Schools* *Reporting: Monthly reporting by school, complex area, and statewide.* 2. Social Distance Gap Formula: (Total number of students enrolled) – (Number of students whose school could provide full-time in-person instruction with a minimum of a six-foot distance between students and staff) = social distance gap *Data Source: Complex Areas/Schools* *Reporting: Monthly reporting by school, complex area, and statewide.* 3. Classroom Ventilation Gap Formula: (Total number of classrooms) – (Number of classrooms that are properly ventilated) = classroom ventilation gap. *Data Source: Complex Areas/Schools* *Reporting: Monthly reporting by school, complex area, and statewide.*

Students Most Vulnerable to School Closures and Disruptions to Learning	4. Elementary Quarterly Grades
	  a. Elementary ELA Gap Formula: (Total number of elementary students) - (Number of elementary students meeting proficiency (receiving Meets with Excellence (ME) or Meets with Proficiency (MP) in English Language Arts ("ELA") at the end of each quarter) = Elementary ELA gap.
	
	  b. Elementary Math Gap Formula: (Total number of elementary students) - (Number of elementary students meeting proficiency (receiving Meets with Excellence (ME) or Meets with Proficiency (MP) in Math at the end of each quarter) = Elementary Math gap.
	Data Source: Longitudinal Data System (LDS)
	Reporting: Quarterly reporting by school, complex, complex area, and statewide.
	
	5. Middle School Quarterly Grades
	  a. (Total number of middle school students enrolled in ELA) – (number of middle school students receiving a passing grade (A-D) in ELA at the end of each quarter) = Middle School ELA gap.
	
	  b. (Total number of middle school students enrolled in Math) – (number of middle school students receiving a passing grade (A-D) in Math at the end of each quarter) = Middle School Math gap.
	
	  c. (Total number of middle school students enrolled in Science) – (number of middle school students receiving a passing grade (A-

Board Priorities	Proposed Vital Sign Metrics
	D) in Science at the end of each quarter) = Middle School Science gap.

      d. Middle School Social Studies Gap Formula: (Total number of middle school students enrolled in Social Studies) – (number of middle school students receiving a passing grade (A-D) in Social Studies at the end of each quarter) = Middle School Social Studies gap.

Data Source: Longitudinal Data System (LDS)
Reporting: Quarterly reporting by school, complex, complex area, and statewide.

    6. <u>High School Quarterly Grades</u>
      a. (Total number of high school students enrolled in ELA) – (number of high school students receiving a passing grade (A-D) in ELA at the end of each quarter) = High School ELA gap.

      b. (Total number of high school students enrolled in Math) – (number of high school students receiving a passing grade (A-D) in Math at the end of each quarter) = High School Math gap.

      c. (Total number of high school students enrolled in Science) – (number of high school students receiving a passing grade (A-D) in Science at the end of each quarter) = High School Science gap.

      d. (Total number of high school students enrolled in Social Studies) – (number of high school students receiving a passing grade (A-D) in Social Studies at the end of each quarter) = High School Social Studies gap.

Data Source: Longitudinal Data System (LDS)
Reporting: Quarterly reporting by school, complex, complex area, and statewide.

    7. High-risk Attendance Gap Formula: (Total number of students) – (number of students who have missed less than 8.3% of the instructional days that have passed in the school year) = High-risk attendance gap.

Data Source: Infinite Campus
Reporting: Monthly reporting by school, complex, complex area, and statewide.

    8. Vulnerable Student High-risk Attendance Gap Formula: (Total number of vulnerable students) – (number of vulnerable students who have missed less than 8.3% of the instructional days that have passed in the school year = Vulnerable Student High-risk Attendance Gap

Data Source: Infinite Campus
Reporting: Monthly reporting by school, complex, complex area, and statewide.

    9. Elementary and Middle Universal Screeners and High School On-Track
      a. ELA Elementary Grade Level Gap Formula: (Total number of elementary students who have taken an ELA universal screener) –

Board Priorities	Proposed Vital Sign Metrics
	(number of elementary students meeting grade level using universal screened ELA results) = ELA Elementary Grade Level Gap.
	b. Math Elementary Grade Level Gap Formula: (Total number of elementary students who have taken a Math universal screener) – (number of elementary students meeting grade level using universal screened Math results) = Math Elementary Grade Level Gap.
	c. ELA Middle School Grade Level Gap Formula: (Total number of middle school students who have taken an ELA universal screener) – (number of middle school students meeting grade level using universal screened ELA results) = ELA Middle School Grade Level Gap.
	d. Math Middle School Grade Level Gap Formula: (Total number of middle school students who have taken a Math universal screener) – (number of middle school students meeting grade level using universal screened Math results) = Math Middle School Grade Level Gap.
	e. High School Graduation Gap Formula: (Total number of high school students) – (Total number of high school students on-track to graduate) = High School Graduation gap.
	(Total number of 9th graders) – (Total number of 9th graders on-track to graduate) = 10th grade Graduation Gap.
	(Total number of 10th graders) – (Total number of 10th graders on-track to graduate) = 10th grade Graduation Gap.
	(Total number of 11th graders) – (Total number of 11th graders on-track to graduate) = 11th grade Graduation Gap.
	(Total number of 12th graders) – (Total number of 12th graders on-track to graduate) = 12th grade Graduation Gap.
	Data Source: Longitudinal Data System (LDS) *Reporting: Reporting annually by school, complex, complex area, and statewide.*
In-Person Instruction	10. In-person Learning Gap Formula: (Total number of students) – (Number of students in in-person learning mode) = In-person Learning gap a. Elementary In-person Learning Gap Formula: (Total number of elementary students) – (Number of elementary students in in-person learning mode) = Elementary In-person Learning gap b. Middle School In-person Learning Gap Formula: (Total number of middle school students) – (Number of middle school students in in-person learning mode) = Middle School In-person Learning gap

Board Priorities	Proposed Vital Sign Metrics
	c. High School In-person Learning Gap Formula: (Total number of high school students) – (Number of high school students in in-person learning mode) = High School In-person Learning gap *Data Source: Infinite Campus* *Reporting: Monthly reporting by school, complex, complex area, and statewide.* 11. Full Distance Learning Gap Formula: (Total number of students) – (Total number of students who have elected to return to campus for in-person or hybrid learning) = Full Distance Learning Gap *Data Source: Infinite Campus* *Reporting: Monthly reporting by school, complex area, and statewide.*
Access to Connectivity and Devices	12. Device Gap Formula: (Total student population) – (How many how many students currently have a device, personal or school issued, that can be used to effectively engage in synchronous or asynchronous distance learning) = Device gap *Data Source: Infinite Campus* *Reporting: Monthly reporting by school, complex, complex area, and statewide.* 13. Connectivity Gap Formula: (Total student population) – (How many students currently have internet connectivity sufficient for synchronous or asynchronous distance learning) = Connectivity gap *Data Source: Infinite Campus* *Reporting: Monthly reporting by school, complex, complex area, and statewide.* 14. Distance Learning for Vulnerable Students Gap Formula: (Total number of schools) – (number of schools that can support distance learning for their entire vulnerable student population) = Distance Learning for vulnerable student gap *Data Source: Infinite Campus* *Reporting: Monthly reporting by school, complex, complex area, and statewide.*
Personnel	15. Employee Support Gap Formula: (Total number of employees) – (number of employee who feel they are supported by the Department) = Employee Support Gap. *Data Source: Confidential survey run by Board Office regarding whether employees feel that they are supported by the Department.* *Reporting: Semi-annual reporting by role group statewide.*
Student Transportation and Food Service	16. Transportation Gap Formula: (How many students need to take the bus to get to and from school campuses when the system is in an in-person instructional mode) – (How many students have safe bus transport in accordance with modified school schedules) = transportation gap *Data Source: TBD* *Reporting: Quarterly reporting by school, complex area, and statewide.*

Board Priorities	Proposed Vital Sign Metrics
	17. Food Service Gap Formula: (How many students are eligible for free or reduced lunch) – (How many free and reduced lunches are actually served) = Food service gap *Data Source: TBD* *Reporting: Quarterly reporting by school, complex area, and statewide.*
Confidence, Communications, and Guidance	18. (Projected Enrollment) – (Actual Enrollment) = Enrollment Difference. Convert Enrollment Difference into a change rate and compare it to change rates from previous years. *Data Source: TBD* *Reporting: Monthly reporting by school, complex area, and statewide.* 19. Total number of students that were withdrawn to homeschool or to attend private school in Hawaii every quarter together with a running tally of total withdrawals to homeschool or attend private school in Hawaii for the year. Compare to previous years both quarterly and annual total. *Data Source: Infinite Campus* *Reporting: Quarterly reporting by school, complex area, and statewide.* 20. Percentage of Board Members and principals confident that the Department is providing clear and timely communications to the public and internally. *Data Source: Board Member survey and confidential Principal survey run by Board Office regarding communications to the public and internally.* *Reporting: Semi-annual reporting statewide.* 21. Percentage of principals who find the Department's guidance documents helpful. *Data Source: Confidential principal survey run by Board Office regarding helpfulness of Department's guidance documents.* *Reporting: Semi-annual reporting statewide.*