California ESSA State Plan Glossary

The following acronyms and terms are used throughout the State Plan. Readers of the State Plan are encouraged to refer to this glossary as needed.

Acronym/Term	Definition
CalEDFacts	*CalEDFacts* is a compilation of statistics and information on a variety of issues concerning education in California. http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/pn/fb/
California School Dashboard	The California School Dashboard (Dashboard) is a Web site released in March 2017 that parents/guardians, educators, and the public can use to see how districts and schools are meeting the needs of California's diverse student population based on the concise set of measures included in the new accountability system, including test scores, graduation rates, English learner progress, and suspension rates. Additionally, the Dashboard includes reporting and evaluation of local indicators. The Dashboard is part of California's new school accountability system based on the Local Control Funding Formula, enacted in 2013. As provisioned in California *Education Code*, the Dashboard will be used to support local educational agencies (LEAs) in identifying strengths, weaknesses, and areas for improvement; to assist in determining whether LEAs and schools are eligible for technical assistance; and to assist the state in determining whether LEAs and schools are eligible for more intensive support/intervention. http://www.caschooldashboard.org/
CAASPP	The California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) System was established on January 1, 2014. The CAASPP System replaced the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program, which became inoperative on July 1, 2013. The CAASPP system includes the Smarter Balanced summative assessments for English language arts/literacy and mathematics, the California Science Tests, the reading/language arts standards-based Tests in Spanish, and the California Alternative Assessments. http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ca/

Acronym/Term	Definition
CCEE	The California Collaborative for Educational Excellence (CCEE) was established pursuant to California *Education Code* Section 52074, which states that "[t]he purpose of the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence is to advise and assist school districts, county superintendents of schools, and charter schools in achieving the goals set forth in a local control and accountability plan." The CCEE is a public agency that is governed by a five-member governing board composed of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction (or his or her designee), the president of the State Board of Education (or his or her designee), a county superintendent of schools appointed by the Senate Committee on Rules, a superintendent of a school district appointed by the Governor, and a teacher appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly. http://ccee-ca.org/
CDE	The California Department of Education (CDE) oversees the state's diverse and dynamic public school system, which is responsible for the education of more than seven million children and young adults in more than 10,000 schools. The CDE and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction are responsible for enforcing education law and regulations and for continuing to reform and improve public elementary school programs, secondary school programs, adult education, expanded learning programs, and some preschool and child care programs. The CDE's mission is to provide a world-class education for all students, from early childhood to adulthood. The CDE serves the state by innovating and collaborating with educators, schools, parents, and community partners, preparing students to live, work, and thrive in a highly connected world. http://www.cde.ca.gov/

Acronym/Term	Definition
COE	There are 58 county offices of education (COEs) in California that provide services to the state's school districts. COEs have elected governing boards and are administered by elected or appointed county superintendents. The county superintendent is responsible for examining and approving school district budgets and expenditures and for reviewing and approving Local Control and Accountability Plans. COEs support school districts by performing tasks that can be done more efficiently and economically at the county level. COEs provide or help formulate new curricula, staff development and training programs, and instructional procedures; design business and personnel systems; and perform many other services to meet changing needs and requirements. When economic or technical conditions make county or regional services most appropriate for students, COEs provide a wide range of services, including special and vocational education, programs for youths at risk of failure, and instruction in juvenile detention facilities. In addition, several statutes give COEs responsibility for monitoring districts for adequate textbooks, facilities, and teacher qualifications. http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/sd/co/coes.asp
CPAG	The California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG) provides input to the State Board of Education (SBE) on ongoing efforts to establish a single coherent local, state, and federal accountability system. This advisory committee also serves as the state's committee of practitioners under Title I requirements. The purpose of this advisory committee is to provide input to the SBE on practical implications of decisions before the SBE, which includes providing input on decisions related to implementing the state's Local Control Funding Formula. The committee also reviews any state rules and regulations relating to Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act, in order to advise the state in carrying out its Title I responsibilities. http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/cc/cp/

Acronym/Term	Definition
CSMP	The California Subject Matter Project (CSMP) is a network of nine discipline-based statewide projects that support on-going quality professional development. Activities and programs are designed by university faculty, teacher leaders, and teacher practitioners to improve instructional practices that lead to increased achievement for all students. The CSMP encompasses the course content represented in California's K–12 standards and frameworks, and covers all of the academic disciplines required to meet college entrance ("a–g") requirements. After completing a program, teachers are offered ongoing education resources and support through professional communities, and further, programs cultivate and emphasize teacher leadership. CSMP programs support teachers' implementation of standards and literacy strategies in order to nurture the academic skills of English learners and students with low literacy and content area skills. The CSMP bolsters the state's efforts to incorporate the new standards and assessments, while also addressing the needs of California's diverse students to ensure they acquire the requisite content knowledge to succeed in college and beyond or in their chosen careers. https://csmp.ucop.edu/
CTC	The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) is an agency in the Executive Branch of the California State Government that operates as an independent standards board and works in conjunction with the California Department of Education to serve California teachers. The CTC is statutorily responsible for the design, development, and implementation of standards that govern educator preparation for the public schools of California, for the licensing and credentialing of professional educators in California, for the enforcement of professional practices of educators, and for the review and discipline of applicants and credential holders in the State of California. http://www.ctc.ca.gov/

Acronym/Term	Definition
Curriculum Frameworks	The California State Board of Education (SBE) adopts curriculum frameworks for kindergarten through grade twelve (K–12) in accordance with California *Education Code* (*EC*) Section 51002, which calls for the development of "broad minimum standards and guidelines for educational programs." Curriculum frameworks are aligned to the SBE-adopted academic content standards. The SBE has adopted curriculum frameworks in various content areas, including English language arts/English language development, mathematics, history–social science, science, visual and performing arts, career technical education, health, world language, and physical education. The Instructional Quality Commission (IQC) develops the curriculum frameworks under the authority of *EC* Section 33538, in a process defined in the *California Code of Regulations*, Title 5, sections 9510–9516. The process begins with the California Department of Education conducting four focus groups of educators to get input on improvements to an existing framework. The IQC recruits members for the Curriculum Framework and Evaluation Criteria Committee (CFCC). The CFCC is composed of a minimum of nine to a maximum of 20 members, at least half of whom are classroom teachers. The IQC makes recommendations to the SBE about the development of a curriculum framework and appointments to the CFCC. Curriculum frameworks are developed in a public manner. The CFCC develops a draft document, and the IQC prepares the draft framework for field review and holds public meetings on the document. The IQC is responsible for the draft framework that is recommended to the SBE. After a 60-day public comment period, the SBE also holds a public hearing prior to considering the framework for adoption. After adoption, the frameworks are available for purchase through the CDE and may be viewed on the CDE All Curriculum Frameworks Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/allfwks.asp. Curriculum frameworks have drawn state and national recognition for focusing directly on the curriculum and for contributing substantively to the improvement of teaching and learning. Based on current research in education and the specific content area, the frameworks provide a firm foundation for curriculum and instruction by describing the scope and sequence of knowledge and the skills that all students are expected to master. The frameworks' overarching dedication is to the balance of factual knowledge, fundamental skills, and the application of knowledge and skills.

Acronym/Term	Definition
Curriculum Frameworks (continued)	In addition, the frameworks establish criteria to evaluate instructional materials. These criteria are used to select, through the state adoption process mandated in *EC* sections 60200–60206, instructional materials for K–8. Frameworks also guide district selection of instructional resources for grades nine through twelve. Although curriculum frameworks cover the K–12 educational program, their effect can be seen in preschool programs, child-care centers, adult education programs, higher education instruction, and university entrance requirements.
EL	The Every Student Succeeds Act defines the term English learner (EL) as an individual: (A) who is aged 3 through 21; (B) who is enrolled or preparing to enroll in an elementary school or secondary school; (C) (i) who was not born in the United States or whose native language is a language other than English; (ii)(I) who is a Native American or Alaska Native, or a native resident of the outlying areas; and (II) who comes from an environment where a language other than English has had a significant impact on the individual's level of English language proficiency; or (iii) who is migratory, whose native language is a language other than English, and who comes from an environment where a language other than English is dominant; and (D) whose difficulties in speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language may be sufficient to deny the individual— (i) the ability to meet the challenging state academic standards; (ii) the ability to successfully achieve in classrooms where the language of instruction is English; or (iii) the opportunity to participate fully in society.
Federal Program Monitoring	California provides a coordinated and transparent federal program monitoring (FPM) process to ensure LEAs are meeting program requirements and spending program funds appropriately as required by law. All LEAs in the state are divided into four cohorts. Two cohorts are subject to review each year. Thus, the CDE's FPM process includes a data review of 50 percent of the LEAs in the state to identify and conduct a total of 125 LEA on-site and online reviews during any given year. The remaining 50 percent of the LEAs in the state receive the data review the following year. A description of the FPM process, LEAs identified in each cohort, LEAs selected for online or on-site reviews, and program instruments can be found on the CDE Compliance Monitoring Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/cr/.

Acronym/Term	Definition
Golden State Seal Merit Diploma	California Assembly Bill 3488, approved in July 1996, called for the development of the Golden State Seal Merit Diploma (GSSMD) to recognize public school graduates who have demonstrated their mastery of the high school curriculum in at least six subject matter areas, four of which are English-language arts, mathematics, science, and U.S. history, with the remaining two subject matter areas selected by the student. The GSSMD is awarded jointly by the State Board of Education and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ca/meritdiploma.asp

LCAP	The Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) is an important component of California's Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF). The LCAP is a tool that California local educational agencies use to set goals, plan actions, and leverage resources to meet those goals to improve student outcomes with specific activities to address state and local priorities. The eight state priorities include the following:
	
	1. Basic
	   a. Teacher assignment
	   b. Access to standards-aligned instructional materials
	   c. Facilities
	2. Implementation of State Standards
	3. Parental Involvement
	4. Pupil Achievement
	5. Pupil Engagement
	6. School Climate
	7. Course Access
	8. Other Pupil Outcomes
	
	ESSA local planning requirements are addressed in the LEA LCAP Addendum described below.
	
	California *Education Code* requires that LCAPs be developed in a public process in consultation with teachers, principals, administrators, other school personnel, local bargaining units of the school district, parents, and pupils. http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/lc/

Acronym/Term	Definition
LCAP Addendum	The Local Control and Accountability Plan Addendum (LCAP Addendum) is the mechanism by which local educational agencies will address local planning requirements of Every Student Succeeds Act programs within the LCAP development process. The addendum is intended to supplement the LCAP, just as ESSA funds are intended to supplement state funds. It addresses the local planning requirements for the following ESSA programs: • Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by State and Local Educational Agencies • Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk • Title II, Part A: Supporting Effective Instruction • Title III, Part A: Language Instruction for English Learners and Immigrant Students • Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants

Acronym/Term	Definition
LCFF	California's 2013–14 Budget Act enacted landmark legislation that greatly simplifies the school finance system and provides additional resources to local educational agencies serving students with greater educational needs. The changes introduced by the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) represent a major shift in how the state funds local educational agencies (LEAs), eliminating revenue limits and most state categorical programs. LEAs receive funding based on the demographic profile of the students they serve and gain greater flexibility to use these funds to improve student outcomes. More information regarding the LCFF is available on the California Department of Education (CDE) LCFF Overview Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/lcffoverview.asp.
	LEAs receive a base grant based upon average daily attendance with additional funds for students in certain grade spans. In addition, they receive a supplemental grant equal to 20 percent of the base grant based on the number of students eligible to receive free or reduced-price meals, English learners, and foster youth students, and a concentration grant equal to 50 percent of the adjusted base grant for these same students when exceeding 55 percent of an LEA's enrollment. LEAs have broad discretion regarding use of the base grants but are required to develop, adopt, and annually update a three-year Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) which describes how they intend to meet annual goals for all pupils, with specific activities to address state and local priorities identified in LCFF statute. The law requires LEAs to increase or improve services for high-need students in proportion to the additional funding apportioned on the basis of the target student enrollment in the district.
LEA	In California, local educational agencies (LEAs) include county offices of education, school districts, and direct-funded charter schools.
SBE	The California State Board of Education (SBE) is the state's 11 member K–12 policy-making body for academic standards, curriculum, instructional materials, assessments, and accountability. California *Education Code* 12032 officially designates the SBE as the state educational agency (SEA) for federally funded education programs, including the Every Student Succeeds Act. The SEA has the primary responsibility for overseeing the state's full compliance with provisions of federal law including school accountability. http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/

Acronym/Term	Definition
SEA	The state educational agency (SEA) is defined in ESSA as the agency primarily responsible for the state supervision of public elementary schools and secondary schools. California *Education Code* 12032 officially designates the State Board of Education as the SEA for federally funded education programs, including the ESSA.
Seal of Biliteracy	The State Seal of Biliteracy, codified in California *Education Code* sections 51460–51464, provides recognition to high school students who have demonstrated proficiency in speaking, reading, and writing in one or more languages in addition to English. http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/sealofbiliteracy.asp
TDG	The Technical Design Group (TDG) is a group of experts in psychometric theory and education research that provide recommendations to the California Department of Education on matters related to the state and federal accountability system.

Revised State Template for the Consolidated State Plan

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act

U.S. Department of Education
Issued: March 2017

OMB Number: 1810-0576
Expiration Date: September 30, 2017

Introduction

Section 8302 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA),[1] requires the Secretary to establish procedures and criteria under which, after consultation with the Governor, a State educational agency (SEA) may submit a consolidated State plan designed to simplify the application requirements and reduce burden for SEAs. ESEA section 8302 also requires the Secretary to establish the descriptions, information, assurances, and other material required to be included in a consolidated State plan. Even though an SEA submits only the required information in its consolidated State plan, an SEA must still meet all ESEA requirements for each included program. In its consolidated State plan, each SEA may, but is not required to, include supplemental information such as its overall vision for improving outcomes for all students and its efforts to consult with and engage stakeholders when developing its consolidated State plan.

Completing and Submitting a Consolidated State Plan

Each SEA must address all of the requirements identified below for the programs that it chooses to include in its consolidated State plan. An SEA must use this template or a format that includes the required elements and that the State has developed working with the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO).

Each SEA must submit to the U.S. Department of Education (Department) its consolidated State plan by one of the following two deadlines of the SEA's choice:

- **April 3, 2017**; or
- **September 18, 2017**.

Any plan that is received after April 3, but on or before September 18, 2017, will be considered to be submitted on September 18, 2017. In order to ensure transparency consistent with ESEA section 1111(a)(5), the Department intends to post each State plan on the Department's website.

Alternative Template

If an SEA does not use this template, it must:

1) Include the information on the Cover Sheet;

2) Include a table of contents or guide that clearly indicates where the SEA has addressed each requirement in its consolidated State plan;

3) Indicate that the SEA worked through CCSSO in developing its own template; and

4) Include the required information regarding equitable access to, and participation in, the programs included in its consolidated State plan as required by section 427 of the General Education
Provisions Act. See Appendix B.

Individual Program State Plan

An SEA may submit an individual program State plan that meets all applicable statutory and regulatory requirements for any program that it chooses not to include in a consolidated State plan.

---

[1] Unless otherwise indicated, citations to the ESEA refer to the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA.

If an SEA intends to submit an individual program plan for any program, the SEA must submit the individual program plan by one of the dates above, in concert with its consolidated State plan, if applicable.

Consultation

Under ESEA section 8540, each SEA must consult in a timely and meaningful manner with the Governor, or appropriate officials from the Governor's office, including during the development and prior to submission of its consolidated State plan to the Department. A Governor shall have 30 days prior to the SEA submitting the consolidated State plan to the Secretary to sign the consolidated State plan. If the Governor has not signed the plan within 30 days of delivery by the SEA, the SEA shall submit the plan to the Department without such signature.

Assurances

In order to receive fiscal year (FY) 2017 ESEA funds on July 1, 2017, for the programs that may be included in a consolidated State plan, and consistent with ESEA section 8302, each SEA must also submit a comprehensive set of assurances to the Department at a date and time established by the Secretary. In the near future, the Department will publish an information collection request that details these assurances.

For Further Information: If you have any questions, please contact your Program Officer at OSS. [State]@ed.gov (e.g., OSS.Alabama@ed.gov).

Cover Page

Contact Information and Signatures

SEA Contact (Name and Position): Karen Stapf Walters, Executive Director California State Board of Education	Telephone: 916-319-0699
Mailing Address: California Department of Education 1430 N Street, Suite 5111 Sacramento, CA 95814	Email Address: kstapfwalters@cde.ca.gov

By signing this document, I assure that:

To the best of my knowledge and belief, all information and data included in this plan are true and correct.

The SEA will submit a comprehensive set of assurances at a date and time established by the Secretary, including the assurances in ESEA section 8304.

Consistent with ESEA section 8302(b)(3), the SEA will meet the requirements of ESEA sections 1117 and 8501 regarding the participation of private school children and teachers.

Authorized SEA Representative (Printed Name) Michael Kirst, President California State Board of Education	Telephone: 916-319-0705
Signature of Authorized SEA Representative	Date: July 11, 2018
Governor (Printed Name) Edmund G. Brown, Jr.	Date SEA provided plan to the Governor under ESEA section 8540: August 11, 2017
Signature of Governor	Date: July 11, 2018

Programs Included in the Consolidated State Plan

Instructions: Indicate below by checking the appropriate box(es) which programs the SEA included in its consolidated State plan. If an SEA elected not to include one or more of the programs below in its consolidated State plan, but is eligible and wishes to receive funds under the program(s), it must submit individual program plans for those programs that meet all statutory and regulatory requirements with its consolidated State plan in a single submission.

☒ Check this box if the SEA has included <u>all</u> of the following programs in its consolidated State plan.

or

If all programs are not included, check each program listed below that the SEA includes in its consolidated State plan:

☐ Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies

☐ Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children

☐ Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk

☐ Title II, Part A: Supporting Effective Instruction

☐ Title III, Part A: English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement

☐ Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants

☐ Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers

☐ Title V, Part B, Subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income School Program

☐ Title VII, Subpart B of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act: Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program (McKinney-Vento Act)

Instructions

Each SEA must provide descriptions and other information that address each requirement listed below for the programs included in its consolidated State plan. Consistent with ESEA section 8302, the Secretary has determined that the following requirements are absolutely necessary for consideration of a consolidated State plan. An SEA may add descriptions or other information, but may not omit any of the required descriptions or information for each included program.

Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies

1. <u>Challenging State Academic Standards and Assessments</u> *(ESEA section 1111(b)(1) and (2) and 34 CFR §§ 200.1−200.8.)*[2]

2. <u>Eighth Grade Math Exception</u> *(ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(C) and 34 CFR § 200.5(b)(4))*:
   i. Does the State administer an end-of-course mathematics assessment to meet the requirements under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) of the ESEA?
   □ Yes
   X No

   ii. If a State responds "yes" to question 2(i), does the State wish to exempt an eighth-grade student who takes the high school mathematics course associated with the end-of-course assessment from the mathematics assessment typically administered in eighth grade under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(aa) of the ESEA and ensure that:
      a. The student instead takes the end-of-course mathematics assessment the State administers to high school students under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) of the ESEA;
      b. The student's performance on the high school assessment is used in the year in which the student takes the assessment for purposes of measuring academic achievement under section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i) of the ESEA and participation in assessments under section 1111(c)(4)(E) of the ESEA;
      c. In high school:
      1. The student takes a State-administered end-of-course assessment or nationally recognized high school academic assessment as defined in 34 CFR § 200.3(d) in mathematics that is more advanced than the assessment the State administers under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) of the ESEA;
      2. The State provides for appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR § 200.6(b) and (f); and
      3. The student's performance on the more advanced mathematics assessment is used for purposes of measuring academic achievement under section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i) of the ESEA and participation in assessments under section 1111(c)(4)(E) of the ESEA.
   iii. If a State responds "yes" to question 2(ii), consistent with 34 CFR § 200.5(b)(4), describe, with regard to this exception, its strategies to provide all students in the State the opportunity to be prepared for and to take advanced mathematics coursework in middle school.

3. <u>Native Language Assessments</u> *(ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(F) and 34 CFR § 200.6(f)(2)(ii)) and (f)(4)*:
   i. Provide its definition for "languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population," and identify the specific languages that meet that definition.

---

[2] The Secretary anticipates collecting relevant information consistent with the assessment peer review process in 34 CFR § 200.2(d). An SEA need not submit any information regarding challenging State academic standards and assessments at this time.

California defines "languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population" as any native language other than English spoken by 15 percent or more of the student population (i.e., students enrolled in grades kindergarten through grade twelve [K–12]). The 15 percent threshold is consistent with California *Education Code* 48985 that indicates which languages school districts are required to translate parent information. Using this definition, California has identified Spanish as the language other than English that is present to a significant extent. This is based on 2015–16 Language Data for Districts and Schools by Language Group, which may be accessed on the California Department of Education (CDE) Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/pf/cm/transref.asp. These data indicate that Spanish is spoken by 33.5 percent of students in kindergarten through grade twelve. The next most populous language is spoken by only 1.31 percent of students. Within the English learner student group, Spanish is spoken by 83.4 percent of students, with the next language trailing far behind at 2.2 percent.

ii. Identify any existing assessments in languages other than English, and specify for which grades and content areas those assessments are available.

California is committed to providing reliable assessments in languages other than English based on the constructs being measured. For the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) Smarter Balanced mathematics assessment in grades three through eight and grade eleven, California provides stacked translations in Spanish (stacked translations provide the full translation of each test item above the original item in English), and language glossaries in the 11 languages most commonly spoken in Smarter Balanced member state schools. In addition, for the CAASPP Smarter Balanced mathematics and English language arts assessments, California provides translated test directions in 17 languages.

Beginning in 2017–18, the California Science Test (CAST) will include stacked translations in Spanish and embedded glossaries for specific words.

For the California Alternate Assessment in mathematics for students in grades three through eight and grade eleven, eligible pupils shall have any instructional supports and/or accommodations, including the language of instruction, used in the pupil's daily instruction in accordance with the pupil's individualized education program.

iii. Indicate the languages identified in question 3(i) for which yearly student academic assessments are not available and are needed.

In support of biliteracy, California is currently developing a Spanish reading/language arts assessment, the California Spanish Assessment

(CSA). The State Board of Education (SBE)-approved purpose of the CSA is to measure a student's competency in Spanish language arts in grades three through eight and high school for the purpose of: (1) providing student-level data in Spanish competency; (2) providing aggregate data that may be used for evaluating the implementation of Spanish language arts programs at the local

level; and (3) providing a high school measure suitable to be used, in part, for the State Seal of Biliteracy.

iv. Describe how it will make every effort to develop assessments, at a minimum, in languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population including by providing
   a. The State's plan and timeline for developing such assessments, including a description of how it met the requirements of 34 CFR § 200.6(f)(4);

   Table 1, below, provides the timeline for developing additional assessments.

   Table 1. Timeline for Assessments in Languages Other Than English

Development Strategy	Timeline	Key Accessibility Features*
California Science Tests – Pilot Test	2016–17	Accessibility features in development
California Science Tests	2017–18	Stacked translations (Spanish), translated glossary in nine languages, read aloud in Spanish, translated test directions in seventeen languages
California Alternate Assessment for Science	2016–17	Teachers may translate the directions and test items into the language of instruction

   *This list is not a reflection of all accessibility features available on the California Science Test, but resources specific to English Learners.

   b. A description of the process the State used to gather meaningful input on the need for assessments in languages other than English, collect and respond to public comment, and consult with educators; parents and families of English learners; students, as appropriate; and other stakeholders; and

   With the enactment of Assembly Bill 484 in January 2014, California committed to redefine its statewide assessments into a comprehensive system amenable to improving teaching and learning throughout the state, including assessments in languages other than English. Between May 2014 and August 2015, California conducted in-person regional meetings (inclusive of educators, parents, and community members) and online surveys to gather input on specific assessments, including native language assessments. The activities described above are documented in the March 2016 report from the CDE to the Governor entitled *Recommendations for Expanding California's Comprehensive Assessment System* (https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ca/documents/compassessexpand.pdf). This report was also presented publicly at the March 2016 SBE meeting. That meeting provided all members of the public an opportunity to comment on the plan and to provide written feedback.

The CDE continues to meet regularly with parent, educator, and family advocacy groups, the California Practitioners Advisory Group, the Advisory Commission on Special Education, a Technical Advisory Group, and local educational agency (LEA) representatives to provide assessment updates and receive feedback.

California will continue to engage in conversations with stakeholders and experts in the fields of language acquisition, measurement, and accountability over the course of developing the CSA with the goal of obtaining direction from the SBE regarding the use of a valid and reliable CSA in accountability.

c. As applicable, an explanation of the reasons the State has not been able to complete the development of such assessments despite making every effort.

N/A

4. Statewide Accountability System and School Support and Improvement Activities *(ESEA section 1111(c) and (d))*:
   i. Subgroups *(ESEA section 1111(c)(2))*:
      a. List each major racial and ethnic group the State includes as a subgroup of students, consistent with ESEA section 1111(c)(2)(B).

      In California, the racial/ethnic student groups are the following:

      - Black or African American
      - Asian
      - Filipino
      - Hispanic or Latino
      - American Indian or Alaska Native
      - Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
      - Two or More Races
      - White

      b. If applicable, describe any additional subgroups of students other than the statutorily required subgroups (*i.e.*, economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, children with disabilities, and English learners) used in the Statewide accountability system.

      In addition to the statutorily required student groups, California includes foster youth and homeless children in its accountability system.

      c. Does the State intend to include in the English learner subgroup the results of students previously identified as English learners on the State assessments required under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I) for purposes of State accountability (ESEA section

1111(b)(3)(B))? Note that a student's results may be included in the English learner subgroup for not more than four years after the student ceases to be identified as an English learner.

X Yes
□ No

d. If applicable, choose one of the following options for recently arrived English learners in the State:
X Applying the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(i); or
□ Applying the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(ii); or
□ Applying the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(i) or under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(ii). If this option is selected, describe how the State will choose which exception applies to a recently arrived English learner.

ii. Minimum N-Size *(ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A))*:

a. Provide the minimum number of students that the State determines are necessary to be included to carry out the requirements of any provisions under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that require disaggregation of information by each subgroup of students for accountability purposes.

California's accountability system will be applied to all schools, including charter schools, and all student groups with 30 or more students.

b. Describe how the minimum number of students is statistically sound.

Given the confidence level and margin of error, a sample size of 30 is needed to appropriately estimate the population. A sample size of 30 produces a standardized normal distribution, where the distance between the variance is normal/standard, resulting in statistically significant results (based on the central limit theorem), which is well documented in many statistics textbooks (Cohen, 2001; Cohen and Lea, 2004; Mendenhall and Ott, 1980; Urdan, 2001; Vogt, 2005).

c. Describe how the minimum number of students was determined by the State, including how the State collaborated with teachers, principals, other school leaders, parents, and other stakeholders when determining such minimum number.

Statistical research overwhelmingly supports a minimum n-size of 30 to produce a mean, range, standard deviation, and even distribution (Mendenhall and Ott, 1980; confirmed in later years by Cohen, 2001; Cohen and Lea, 2004; Urdan, 2001; Vogt, 2005). Based on this research, the California Legislature established the n-size for accountability purposes in California *Education Code* (*EC*) Section 52052. There was support from educational stakeholders and a general consensus regarding the established n-size of 30 when the legislation was introduced. In preparation for submission of the State Plan, over 400 comments were received on the

accountability section through the 30-day public comment period through 13 stakeholder meetings, a public survey, and submitted written comments via letters and e-mails. These comments represent feedback from education administrators, teachers, parents, advocacy groups, and members of the public. The CDE's Technical Design Group also concurred that the n-size required under *EC* Section 52052 was statistically valid and reliable.

d. Describe how the State ensures that the minimum number is sufficient to not reveal any personally identifiable information.[3]

To preserve student anonymity, the CDE has a long-established practice to not report data if a student group has less than 11 students. For reporting purposes only, California provides Status/Change data for student groups with 11 to 29 students in the group.

e. If the State's minimum number of students for purposes of reporting is lower than the minimum number of students for accountability purposes, provide the State's minimum number of students for purposes of reporting.

The minimum size for reporting is 11.

iii. Establishment of Long-Term Goals *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A))*:

Long-term goals, and the ability for LEAs or schools to determine interim progress goals, are built into the California Model (for a complete description of the California Model, please see the response to Section A.4.v: Annual Meaningful Differentiation). This new system is based on a five-by-five colored grid that produces 25 results. Each of these 25 results represent a combination of current performance (known as "Status") and how current performance compares to past performance (known as "Change"). Overall performance within the California Model therefore includes whether there has been improvement, and a school and student group's placement on the grid determines the improvement that is required to maintain the current performance level (color) on the grid or to move to the next performance level. Goals can be established relative to overall performance within the Status and/or Change components of the five-by-five colored grids.

An overview of the California accountability model (California Model) is provided on the CDE California Accountability Model & School Dashboard Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/cm/. Detailed information on the production of the indicators in the new California Model is provided in the California Accountability System: California School Dashboard Technical Guide **<Start delete>**2017–18 School Year**<End delete>** available on the CDE Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/cm/ under the Data Files and Guide tab.

---

[3] Consistent with ESEA section1111(i), information collected or disseminated under ESEA section 1111 shall be collected and disseminated in a manner that protects the privacy of individuals consistent with section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g, commonly known as the "Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974"). When selecting a minimum n-size for reporting, States should consult the Institute for Education Sciences report "Best Practices for Determining Subgroup Size in Accountability Systems While Protecting Personally Identifiable Student Information" to identify appropriate statistical disclosure limitation strategies for protecting student privacy.

a. Academic Achievement. *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(aa))*

    1. Describe the long-term goals for improved academic achievement, as measured by proficiency on the annual statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments, for all students and for each subgroup of students, including: (i) baseline data; (ii) the timeline for meeting the long-term goals, for which the term must be the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State; and (iii) how the long-term goals are ambitious.

Proficiency is measured by looking at each student's Distance from Level 3 for their respective grade level. This method compares how far above or below students are from the lowest possible scale score to achieve Level 3 (Standard Met) on the Smarter Balanced assessments, which indicates 'proficiency under ESSA.

The initial baseline was set using only two years of data (2015 and 2016). The third year of data (2017 Smarter Balanced Assessment results) demonstrated a need to make adjustments to ensure stability in the model. As part of the annual review process, the SBE approved in November 2017: (1) a revised layout of the five-by-five colored grid, (2) new Change cut cores for both ELA and math, and (3) new Status cut scores for math. As a result, a new baseline was created and is reflected in the new five-by-five colored tables and in the baseline data tables provided below.

English language arts (ELA) baseline data uses the 2017 ELA assessment results for Status, compared to the 2016 ELA assessment results for Change. The baseline data was used to establish the five-by-five colored grid, which is shown below in Table 2.

Mathematics baseline data uses the 2017 mathematics assessment results for Status, compared to the 2016 mathematics assessment results for Change. The baseline data was used to establish the five-by-five colored grid, which is shown below in Table 3.

For grades 3-8, the goal for all schools and all student groups is to reach the "High" Status, as shown in the five-by-five colored grids below. This means that the goal is for all students and student groups to be at least 10 points above the lowest possible scale score to achieve Level 3 (Standard Met) for ELA. For mathematics, the goal is for all students and student groups to be at the lowest possible scale score to achieve Level 3 (Standard Met).

For ELA, only 28 percent of schools currently meet or exceed this goal; for mathematics, only 22 percent of schools currently meet or exceed this goal, making it ambitious.

For grade 11, the goal for all schools and student groups is to reach the "High" Status, as shown in the five-by-five colored grids below. This means that the goal for all students and student groups is to be at least 30 points above the lowest possible scale score and to achieve Level 3 (Standard Met) for ELA. For mathematics, the goal for all students and student groups is to be at the lowest possible scale score to achieve Level 3 (Standard Met).

This data will be reported in the California School Dashboard using five-by-five colored grids for the first time in the 2018 Dashboard.

For ELA, 33.9 percent of schools would currently meet or exceed this goal. This is an ambitious goal because of the need for schools to improve their overall performance year after year and in light of the significant progress that some student groups need to make to meet the long-term goal and narrow performance gaps. For mathematics, only 13.8 percent of schools would currently meet or exceed this goal, making the goal ambitious.

The SBE has established a seven-year timeline for schools and student groups to reach the goal. The SBE expects to revise the performance levels for state indicators every seven years based on new distributions and has established an annual review process to assess progress on all indicators statewide.

The CDE has produced a report that indicates where schools and student groups are on the five-by-five colored grid, allowing schools to determine how much improvement is needed to reach the goal. These reports are available on the CDE California Model Five-by-Five Placement Reports & Data Web page at https://www6.cde.ca.gov/californiamodel/.

Table 2. ELA – Academic Indicator (Grades 3-8)
<Start add>The Goal for 3-8: 10 Points Above Distance from Standard<End add>

Levels	Change: Declined Significantly **673 Schools** by more than 15 points	Change: Declined **2,449 Schools** by 3 to 15 points	Change: Maintained **1,697 Schools** Declined by less than 3 point or Improved by less than 3 points	Change: Increased **1,950 Schools** by 3 to less than 15 points	Change: Increased Significantly **469 Schools** by 15 points or more
Status: Very High **833 Schools** 45 or more points above	35 (0.5%) Green	278 (3.8%) Green	232 (3.2%) Blue	256 (3.5%) Blue	32 (0.4%) Blue
Status: High **1,284 Schools** 10 to 44.9 points	79 (1.1%) Green	410 (5.7%) Green	333 (4.6%) Green	376 (5.2%) Green	86 (1.2%) Blue
Status: Medium **720 Schools** -5 points to +9.9 points	45 (0.6%) Yellow	234 (3.2%) Yellow	161 (2.2%) Yellow	218 (3.0%) Green	62 (0.9%) Green
Status: Low **3,783 Schools** -5.1 to -70 points	372 (5.2%) Orange	1,281 (17.7%) Orange	860 (11.9%) Orange	999 (13.8%) Yellow	271 (3.7%) Yellow
Status: Very Low **618 Schools** -70.1 points or lower	142 (2.0%) Red	246 (3.4%) Red	111 (1.5%) Red	101 (1.4%) Orange	18 (0.3%) Orange

# of schools	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
7,238	499 (6.9%)	2,632 (36.4%)	1,710 (23.6%)	1,791 (24.7%)	606 (8.4%)

California ESSA Consolidated State Plan
State Board of Education | California Department of Education
December 2019

For all percentages calculated above, the total number of schools (7,238) was used for the denominator.

Table 3. Math – Academic Indicator (Grades 3-8)
<Start add>The Goal for Grades 3-8: +0 Points Above Distance from Standard<End add>

Levels	Change: Declined Significantly **492 Schools** by more than 15 points	Change: Declined **2,056 Schools** by 3 to 15 points	Change: Maintained **1,707 School** Declined by less than 3 points or Increased by less than 3 points	Change: Increased **2,330 Schools** by 3 to less than 15 points	Change: Increased Significantly **652 Schools** by 15 points or more
Status: Very High **741 Schools** 35 points or higher	10 (0.1%) Green	159 (2.2%) Green	211 (2.9%) Blue	304 (4.2%) Blue	57 (0.8%) Blue
Status: High **1,076 Schools** zero to 34.9 points	19 (0.3%) Green	265 (3.7%) Green	266 (3.7%) Green	413 (5.7%) Green	113 (1.6%) Blue
Status: Medium **1,181 Schools** -25 points to less than zero	40 (0.5%) Yellow	289 (4.0%) Yellow	282 (3.9%) Yellow	427 (5.9%) Green	143 (2.0%) Green
Status: Low **3,763 Schools** -25.1 to -95 points	304 (4.2%) Orange	1,147 (15.8%) Orange	870 (12.0%) Orange	1,115 (15.4%) Yellow	327 (4.5%) Yellow
Status: Very Low **476 Schools** -95.1 points or lower	119 (1.6%) Red	196 (2.7%) Red	78 (1.1%) Red	71 (1.0%) Orange	12 (0.2%) Orange

# of schools	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
7,237	393 (5.4%)	2,404 (33.2%)	2,053 (28.4%)	1,702 (23.5%)	685 (9.5%)

For all percentages calculated above, the total number of schools (7,237) was used for the denominator.

Table 4. ELA – Academic Indicator (High School)
The Goal for High Schools: 30 Points Above Distance from Standard

Performance Level	Declined Significantly from Prior Year (by 20.1 points or more)	Declined from Prior Year (by 3.0 to 20 points)	Maintained from Prior Year (declined or increased by 2.9 points or less)	Increased from Prior Year (by 3 points to 14.9 points)	Increased Significantly from Prior Year (by 15 points or more)
Very High +75 points or higher in Current Year	26 (1.9%) Green	42 (3.1%) Green	23 (1.7%) Blue	23 (1.7%) Blue	20 (1.4%) Blue
High +30 to +74.9 points in Current Year	106 (7.9%) Green	94 (7.0%) Green	37 (2.8%) Green	54 (4.0%) Green	32 (2.4%) Blue
Medium 0 to +29.9 points in Current Year	110 (8.2%) Yellow	72 (5.4%) Yellow	39 (2.9%) Yellow	40 (3.0%) Green	30 (2.2%) Green
Low -0.1 to -45 points in Current Year	166 (12.3%) Orange	83 (6.2%) Orange	35 (2.6%) Orange	37 (2.8%) Yellow	28 (2.1%) Yellow
Very Low -45.1 points or lower in Current Year	115 (8.5%) Red	54 (4.0%) Red	17 (1.3%) Red	33 (2.5%) Orange	30 (2.2%) Orange

.

# of Schools	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
1,346	186 (13.8%)	347 (25.8%)	286 (21.3%)	429 (31.9%)	98 (7.3%)

Table 5. Mathematics - Academic Indicator for High School (Grades 7-12)
The Goal for High Schools: +0 Points Above Distance from Standard

Performance Level	Declined Significantly from Prior Year (by more than 20 points)	Declined from Prior Year (by 3 to 20 points)	Maintained from Prior Year (declined by less than 3 points or increased by less than 3 points)	Increased from Prior Year (by 3 to less than 15 points)	Increased Significantly from Prior Year (by 15 points or more)
Very High +25 points or higher in Current Year	17 (1.3%) Green	23 (1.7%) Green	14 (1.1%) Blue	28 (2.1%) Blue	26 (2.0%) Blue
High 0 to +24.9 points in Current Year	14 (1.1%) Green	19 (1.4%) Green	11 (0.8%) Green	23 (1.7%) Green	8 (0.6%) Blue
Medium -0.1 to -59.9 points in Current Year	74 (5.5%) Yellow	99 (7.4%) Yellow	52 (3.9%) Yellow	82 (6.2%) Green	62 (4.7%) Green
Low -60.1 to -115 points in Current Year	118 (8.8%) Orange	121 (9.0%) Orange	74 (5.5%) Orange	79 (5.9%) Yellow	59 (4.4%) Yellow
Very Low -115.1 points or lower in Current Year	116 (8.7%) Red	95 (7.1%) Red	36 (2.7%) Red	55 (4.1%) Orange	33 (2.4%) Orange
# of Schools	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
1,338	247 (18.5%)	401 (30.0%)	363 (27.1%)	251 (18.8%)	76 (5.7%)

The statewide baseline data for all students and each student group are provided below. The tables display the performance gaps among student groups at the state level, and the approximate average annual improvement necessary over the seven-year period for each student group to meet the long-term goal. The tables show that many student groups would need to make significantly more progress than higher performing student groups to reach the statewide goal within 7 years.

<Start delete>Table 6: State Level ELA Data by Student Group

California ESSA Consolidated State Plan
State Board of Education | California Department of Education
December 2019

~~Student Group~~	~~Grade Rate (Status)~~	~~Change~~	~~Color~~	~~Annual Average Improvement to Meet Goal~~	~~Status After Three Years~~
~~All Students~~	~~-6.0~~	~~2.2~~	~~Orange~~	~~2.3 points~~	~~0.9~~
~~American Indian~~	~~-36.8~~	~~2.3~~	~~Orange~~	~~6.7 points~~	~~-16.7~~
~~Asian~~	~~62.4~~	~~2~~	~~Blue~~	~~Increased from Baseline~~	~~62.5~~
~~Black or African American~~	~~-51.8~~	~~0.9~~	~~Orange~~	~~8.8 points~~	~~-25.3~~
~~Filipino~~	~~44~~	~~2.7~~	~~Green~~	~~Increased from Baseline~~	~~44.1~~
~~Hispanic or Latino~~	~~-31.3~~	~~3.2~~	~~Yellow~~	~~5.9 points~~	~~-13.6~~
~~Pacific Islander~~	~~-21.3~~	~~0.7~~	~~Orange~~	~~4.5 points~~	~~-7.9~~
~~Two or More Races~~	~~28.6~~	~~2.3~~	~~Green~~	~~Increased from Baseline~~	~~28.7~~
~~White~~	~~27.7~~	~~0.8~~	~~Green~~	~~Increased from Baseline~~	~~27.8~~
~~English Learner~~	~~-47.1~~	~~3.3~~	~~Yellow~~	~~8.2 points~~	~~-22.6~~
~~Socioeconomically Disadvantaged~~	~~-34.7~~	~~4~~	~~Yellow~~	~~6.4 points~~	~~-15.5~~
~~Students with Disabilities~~	~~-95.5~~	~~2.1~~	~~Red~~	~~15.1 points~~	~~-50.3~~

~~Note: The 10 points above standard goal for 3-8 is applied at the statewide level.~~ **<End delete>**

<Start add>Table 6: State Level ELA Data by Student Group (Grades 3-8)

Student Group	Status	Change	Color	Average Annual Improvement to Meet Goal	Status After Three Years
All Students	-17.0	-0.5	Orange	4 points	-5.0
American Indian	-51.3	-3.2	Orange	9 points	-24.3
Asian	51.1	0.8	Blue	Increased from Baseline	51.2
Black or African American	-60.9	-1.9	Orange	10 points	-30.9
Filipino	32.1	0.4	Green	Increased from Baseline	32.2
Hispanic or Latino	-41.3	-0.6	Orange	7 points	-20.3
Pacific Islander	-29.9	-1.3	Orange	6 points	-11.9
Two or More Races	16.7	-0.7	Green	Increased from Baseline	16.8
White	15.1	-0.5	Green	Increased from Baseline	15.5
English Learner	-50.8	-1.6	Orange	9 points	-23.8
Foster Youth	-86.9	4.0	Orange	14 points	-44.9
Homeless	-62.1	-4.2	Orange	10 points	-32.1
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	-45.9	-44.6	Orange	8 points	-21.9
Students with Disabilities	-104.7	-2.5	Red	16 points	-56.7

Table 7: State Level ELA Data by Student Group (Grade 11)

Student Group	Status	Change	Color	Average Annual Improvement to Meet Goal	Status After Three Years
All Students	18.1	5.1	Green	Increase from Baseline	18.2
American Indian	-14.3	-0.7	Orange	3.5	-3.8
Asian	83.9	7.4	Blue	Increase from Baseline	84.0

Student Group	Status	Change	Color	Average Annual Improvement to Meet Goal	Status After Three Years
Black or African American	-35.8	3	Orange	6.5	-16.3
Filipino	64.3	4.8	Blue	Increase from Baseline	64.4
Hispanic	-6.7	1.7	Orange	2.4	0.5
Pacific Islander	-10.1	-2	Orange	2.9	-1.4
Two or More Races	46.3	9.7	Blue	Increase from Baseline	46.4
White	44.1	9.3	Green	Increase from Baseline	44.2
English Learner	-78.6	-5.2	Red	12.7	-40.5
Foster	-100.5	5.1	Orange	15.8	-53.1
Homeless	-36	-8.3	Orange	6.6	-16.2
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	-10.1	2.2	Orange	2.9	-1.4
Students with Disabilities	-112.5	0	Red	17.5	-60.0

<End add>

<Start delete>Table 7: State Level Mathematics Data by Student Group

Student Groups	Grade Rate (Status)	Change	Color	Annual Average Improvement to Meet Goal	Status After Three Years
All Students	-36.4	1.3	Orange	5.2 points	-20.8
American Indian	-73	-0.7	Orange	10.4 points	-47.7
Asian	56.7	2.4	Blue	Increased from Baseline	56.8
Black or African American	-91.5	0.2	Orange	13.1 points	-52.3
Filipino	13.1	2.8	Green	Increased from Baseline	13.2
Hispanic or Latino	-65.8	1.7	Orange	9.4 points	-37.6
Pacific Islander	-52	-0.7	Orange	7.4 points	-29.7
Two or More Races	1.9	0.1	Green	Increased from Baseline	2.0
White	-1	0.6	Yellow	0.2 points	-.06
English Learner	-69.9	1.5	Orange	10 points	-39.9
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	-67.4	2.3	Orange	9.6 points	-38.5
Students with Disabilities	-125.3	0.8	Red	17.9 points	-71.6

Note: The Zero goal for Grades 3-8 is applied at the statewide level. **<End delete>**

<Start add>Table 8: State Level Mathematics Data by Student Group (Grades 3-8)

Student Group	Status	Change	Color	Annual Average Improvement to Meet Goal	Status After Three Years
All Students	-38.0	0.8	Orange	5 points	-23.0
American Indian	-73.2	-1.8	Orange	10 points	-43.2
Asian	49.9	3.1	Blue	Increased from Baseline	50.0
Black or African American	-90.7	-1.1	Orange	13 points	-51.7

Student Group	Status	Change	Color	Annual Average Improvement to Meet Goal	Status After Three Years
Filipino	10.9	3.0	Green	Increased from Baseline	11.0
Hispanic or Latino	-65.5	0.4	Orange	9 points	-38.5
Pacific Islander	-50.5	0.8	Orange	7 points	-29.5
Two or More Races	-2.5	1.4	Yellow	1 point	0.5
White	-5.0	0.9	Yellow	1 point	-2.0
English Learner	-68.3	-0.5	Orange	10 points	-38.5
Foster Youth	-110.0	6.8	Orange	16 points	-62.0
Homeless	-82.9	-2.7	Orange	12 points	-46.9
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	-68.6	-0.3	Orange	10 points	-38.6
Students with Disabilities	-125.0	-.09	Red	18 points	-71.0

Table 9: State Level Mathematics Data by Student Group (Grade 11)

Student Group	Status	Change	Color	Average Annual Improvement to Meet Goal	Status After Three Years
All Students	-64.5	-0.7	Orange	9.2	-36.9
American Indian	-102.7	-7.3	Red	14.7	-58.6
Asian	46	1.9	Blue	Increase from Baseline	46.1
Black or African American	-129.8	-3.6	Red	18.5	-74.3
Filipino	-15.2	-3.9	Yellow	2.2	-8.6
Hispanic	-99.7	-4.3	Red	14.2	-57.1
Pacific Islander	-92.4	-7.2	Orange	13.2	-52.8
Two or More Races	-34.1	2.8	Orange	4.9	-19.4
White	-34.4	3.3	Yellow	4.9	-19.7

Student Group	Status	Change	Color	Average Annual Improvement to Meet Goal	Status After Three Years
English Learner	-153	-8.2	Red	21.9	-87.3
Foster	-193.6	-3.5	Red	27.7	-110.5
Homeless	-124.7	-13.4	Red	17.8	-71.3
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	-99	-3.4	Red	14.1	-56.7
Students with Disabilities	-200.9	-4.3	Red	28.7	-114.8

<End add>

2. Provide the measurements of interim progress toward meeting the long-term goals for academic achievement in Appendix A.

3. Describe how the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goals for academic achievement take into account the improvement necessary to make significant progress in closing statewide proficiency gaps.

Because all student groups have the same long-term goal, student groups with lower baseline performance will need to make greater improvement over time to reach the long-term goal. The ability for LEAs or schools to determine interim progress goals, including for lower performing student groups, is built into the California Model. In addition, the CDE has produced a report that indicates where schools and student groups are on the five-by-five colored grid, allowing schools to target improvement strategies to reach the goal for each student group. These reports are available on the CDE California Model Five-by-Five Placement Reports & Data Web page at https://www6.cde.ca.gov/californiamodel/.

Additionally, under state law, every LEA must adopt and annually update a Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP). In the LCAP, the LEA must establish goals for all students and the statutory student groups across priority areas defined in statute. The LEA must also describe actions and services, and related expenditures, to meet the goals for student performance.

The template LEAs must use for LCAPs includes a summary in which LEAs must address any indicator where the performance of one or more student groups is two or more color-coded levels below the performance for all students (e.g., student group performance is Red while overall performance is Yellow, Green or Blue; student group performance is Orange while overall performance is Green or Blue). Under the California Model, an LEA is not making progress toward closing performance gaps among student groups if either of the examples described above are present. Accordingly, through the LCAP, such LEAs must describe the efforts they will undertake to make significant progress in closing performance gaps on the relevant indicator(s).

LEAs must therefore annually review and update their overarching plans for educational programming to address areas where the LEA is not making progress in addressing performance gaps among student groups.

This statewide system to assist LEAs to leverage change is an important component to helping narrow statewide proficiency gaps. The tables below show how student groups within schools are doing statewide, broken down by the five color-coded performance levels.

Table 10a School Level Academic Indicator: ELA Student Group Results (Grades 3-8)

Student Groups	Total*	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
All Schools (Total = 7,238)	7,238	499 (6.9%)	2,632 (36.4%)	1,710 (23.6%)	1,791 (24.7%)	606 (8.4%)
African American	1,298	394 (30.4%)	533 (41.1%)	277 (21.3%)	79 (6.1%)	15 (1.2%)
Asian	1,702	6 (0.4%)	127 (7.5%)	125 (7.3%)	750 (44.1%)	694 (40.8%)
Filipino	426	0 (0.0%)	22 (5.2%)	38 (8.9%)	223 (52.3%)	143 (33.6%)
Hispanic/Latino	6,375	573 (9.0%)	2,936 (46.1%)	1,860 (29.2%)	823 (12.9%)	183 (2.9%)
Native American	28	8 (28.6%)	13 (46.4%)	7 (25.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Pacific Islander	9	0 (0.0%)	3 (33.3%)	5 (55.6%)	1 (11.1%)	0 (0.0%)
Two or More Races	681	6 (0.9%)	54 (7.9%)	56 (8.2%)	332 (48.8%)	233 (34.2%)
White	4,034	42 (1.0%)	718 (17.8%)	663 (16.4%)	1,792 (44.4%)	819 (20.3%)
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	6,634	653 (9.8%)	3,280 (49.4%)	1,975 (29.8%)	601 (9.1%)	125 (1.9%)
English Learners (4 years of RFEP)	5,816	915 (15.7%)	2,544 (43.7%)	1,572 (27.0%)	610 (10.5%)	175 (3.0%)
Students with Disabilities	3,688	1,875 (50.8%)	1,347 (36.5%)	371 (10.1%)	80 (2.2%)	15 (0.4%)
Foster Youth	0	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Homeless Youth	628	148 (23.6%)	257 (40.9%)	193 (30.7%)	25 (4.0%)	5 (0.8%)

*Total = Number of schools with 30 or more students at the school level and student group level taking the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments.
- = No data available due to less than 30 for that student group taking the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments.

Table 10b. School Level Academic Indicator: ELA Student Group Results (High Schools)

Student Groups	Total*	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
All Schools (Total = 1,346)	1,346	186 (13.8%)	347 (25.8%)	286 (21.2%)	429 (31.9%)	98 (7.3%)
African American	183	63 (4.7%)	66 (4.9%)	32 (2.4%)	13 (1.0%)	3 (0.2%)
Asian	306	4 (0.3%)	8 (0.6%)	25 (1.9%)	168 (12.5%)	95 (7.1%)
Filipino	100	1 (0.1%)	2 (0.1%)	11 (0.8%)	53 (3.9%)	27 (2.0%)
Hispanic/Latino	1,127	160 (11.9%)	411 (30.5%)	270 (20.1%)	234 (17.4%)	51 (3.8%)
Native American	9	2 (0.1%)	1 (0.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Pacific Islander	5	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Two or More Races	79	0 (0.0%)	6 (0.4%)	6 (0.4%)	41 (3.0%)	21 (1.6%)
White	660	9 (0.7%)	61 (4.5%)	117 (8.7%)	335 (24.9%)	136 (10.1%)
English Learners	658	421 (31.3%)	174 (12.9%)	51 (3.8%)	8 (0.6%)	2 (0.1%)
Foster	6	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Homeless	80	17 (1.3%)	32 (2.4%)	17 (1.3%)	8 (0.6%)	0 (0.0%)
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	1,193	187 (13.9%)	439 (32.6%)	291 (21.6%)	228 (16.9%)	48 (3.6%)
Students with Disabilities	451	293 (21.8%)	137 (10.2%)	19 (1.4%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)

*Total = Number of schools with 30 or more students at the school level and student group level with English Language Arts/Literacy Smarter Balanced Assessment results in both the current and prior year.

Note: For all percentages calculated above, the total number of schools (1,340) was used for the denominator.

Table 11a. School Level Academic Indicator: Math Student Group Results (Grades 3-8)

Student Groups	Total*	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
All Schools (Total = 7,237)	7,237	393 (5.4%)	2,404 (33.2%)	2,053 (28.4%)	1,702 (23.5%)	685 (9.5%)
African American	1,297	408 (31.5%)	501 (38.6%)	338 (26.1%)	46 (3.5%)	4 (0.3%)
Asian	1,701	6 (0.4%)	115 (6.8%)	120 (7.1%)	591 (34.7%)	869 (51.1%)
Filipino	426	0 (0.0%)	37 (8.7%)	51 (12.0%)	208 (48.8%)	130 (30.5%)
Hispanic/Latino	6,375	487 (7.6%)	2,698 (42.3%)	2,197 (34.5%)	857 (13.4%)	136 (2.1%)
Native American	27	9 (33.3%)	10 (37.0%)	8 (29.6%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Pacific Islander	9	2 (22.2%)	3 (33.3%)	3 (33.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (11.1%)
Two or More Races	681	6 (0.9%)	72 (10.6%)	83 (12.2%)	283 (41.6%)	237 (34.8%)
White	4,029	40 (1.0%)	759 (18.8%)	760 (18.9%)	1,662 (41.3%)	808 (20.1%)
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	6,631	534 (8.1%)	2,976 (44.9%)	2,239 (33.8%)	762 (11.5%)	120 (1.8%)
English Learners (4 years of RFEP)	5,817	695 (11.9%)	2,260 (38.9%)	1,818 (31.3%)	737 (12.7%)	307 (5.3%)
Students with Disabilities	3,661	1,644 (44.9%)	1,380 (37.7%)	496 (13.5%)	107 (2.9%)	34 (0.9%)
Foster Youth	0	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Homeless Youth	621	120 (19.3%)	240 (38.6%)	217 (34.9%)	39 (6.3%)	5 (0.8%)

Table 11b. School Level Academic Indicator: Math Student Group Results (High Schools)

Student Groups	Total*	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
All Schools (Total = 1,338)	1,338	247 (18.5%)	401 (30.0%)	363 (27.1%)	251 (18.8%)	76 (5.7%)
African American	174	78 (5.8%)	61 (4.6%)	25 (1.9%)	9 (0.7%)	1 (0.1%)
Asian	299	1 (0.1%)	15 (1.1%)	42 (3.1%)	124 (9.3%)	117 (8.7%)
Filipino	95	0 (0.0%)	6 (0.4%)	33 (2.5%)	31 (2.3%)	25 (1.9%)
Hispanic/Latino	1,123	237 (17.7%)	459 (34.3%)	280 (20.9%)	132 (9.9%)	15 (1.1%)
Native American	3	2 (0.1%)	1 (0.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Pacific Islander	0	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Two or More Races	72	0 (0.0%)	5 (0.4%)	18 (1.3%)	27 (2.0%)	22 (1.6%)
White	656	22 (1.6%)	77 (5.8%)	228 (17.0%)	238 (17.8%)	91 (6.8%)
English Learners	652	344 (25.7%)	223 (16.7%)	47 (3.5%)	26 (1.9%)	12 (0.9%)
Foster	0	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Homeless	71	19 (1.4%)	33 (2.5%)	14 (1.0%)	5 (0.4%)	0 (0.0%)
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	1,189	257 (19.2%)	459 (34.3%)	314 (23.5%)	133 (9.9%)	26 (1.9%)
Students with Disabilities	448	252 (18.8%)	182 (13.6%)	14 (1.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)

Note: For all percentages calculated above, the total number of schools (1,338) was used for the denominator

The mathematics results immediately above show, as one example, that greater improvement among African American students statewide will be needed to make significant progress toward closing achievement gaps. Only 5.7 percent of schools are in the Green and Blue performance levels for this student group, which is more than 25 percentage points lower than the percent of schools in those performance levels overall.

Using the five-by-five grid, the schools represented in this table can determine how much greater improvement is necessary for lower-performing student groups to meet or exceed the goal within the seven-year period of time. All LEAs must also address in their LCAP annually the efforts they will undertake to make significant progress in closing performance gaps where any student group is two or more levels below the overall performance within the LEA. The progress statewide toward narrowing performance gaps reflected in this table will occur as LEAs and schools complete that process and focus on accelerating improvement for students that are at lower levels of performance. California's emerging statewide system of support, described in more detail in section A.4.viii.c, will focus on improving capacity at the local level to identify strengths and weaknesses and prioritize improvement efforts, including narrowing performance gaps.

The tables below display statewide baseline data for all students and each student group, the approximate average annual improvement necessary over the seven-year period for each student group to meet the long-term goal, and the projected Status after year 3 if the student group makes the average annual improvement necessary over the seven-year period for each student group to meet the long-term goal and is therefore on track to meet the long-term goal. The tables show that many student groups would need to make significantly more progress than higher performing student groups to reach the statewide goal within seven years.

<Start delete>
Table 12: State Level ELA Data by Student Group

Student Group	Grade Rate (Status)	Change	Color	Annual Average Improvement to Meet Goal	Status After Three Years
All Students	-6.0	2.2	Orange	2.3 points	0.9
American Indian	-36.8	2.3	Orange	6.7 points	-16.7
Asian	62.4	2	Blue	Increased from Baseline	62.5
Black or African American	-51.8	0.9	Orange	8.8 points	-25.3
Filipino	44	2.7	Green	Increased from Baseline	44.1
Hispanic or Latino	-31.3	3.2	Yellow	5.9 points	-13.6
Pacific Islander	-21.3	0.7	Orange	4.5 points	-7.9
Two or More Races	28.6	2.3	Green	Increased from Baseline	28.7
White	27.7	0.8	Green	Increased from Baseline	27.8
English Learner	-47.1	3.3	Yellow	8.2 points	-22.6
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	-34.7	4	Yellow	6.4 points	-15.5
Students with Disabilities	-95.5	2.1	Red	15.1 points	-50.3

Note: The 10 points above standard goal for 3-8 is applied at the statewide level) **<End delete>**

<Start add>
Table 12a: State Level ELA Data by Student Group (Grades 3-8)

Student Group	Status	Change	Color	Average Annual Improvement to Meet Goal	Status After Three Years
All Students	-17.0	-0.5	Orange	4 points	-5.0
American Indian	-51.3	-3.2	Orange	9 points	-24.3
Asian	51.1	0.8	Blue	Increased from Baseline	51.2
Black or African American	-60.9	-1.9	Orange	10 points	-30.9
Filipino	32.1	0.4	Green	Increased from Baseline	32.2
Hispanic or Latino	-41.3	-0.6	Orange	7 points	-20.3
Pacific Islander	-29.9	-1.3	Orange	6 points	-11.9
Two or More Races	16.7	-0.7	Green	Increased from Baseline	16.8
White	15.1	-0.5	Green	Increased from Baseline	15.5
English Learner	-50.8	-1.6	Orange	9 points	-23.8
Foster Youth	-86.9	4.0	Orange	14 points	-44.9
Homeless	-62.1	-4.2	Orange	10 points	-32.1
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	-45.9	-44.6	Orange	8 points	-21.9
Students with Disabilities	-104.7	-2.5	Red	16 points	-56.7

Table 12b: State Level ELA Data by Student Group (Grade 11)

Student Group	Status	Change	Color	Average Annual Improvement to Meet Goal	Status After Three Years
All Students	18.1	5.1	Green	Increase from Baseline	18.2
American Indian	-14.3	-0.7	Orange	3.5	-3.8

Student Group	Status	Change	Color	Average Annual Improvement to Meet Goal	Status After Three Years
Asian	83.9	7.4	Blue	Increase from Baseline	84.0
Black or African American	-35.8	3	Orange	6.5	-16.3
Filipino	64.3	4.8	Blue	Increase from Baseline	64.4
Hispanic	-6.7	1.7	Orange	2.4	0.5
Pacific Islander	-10.1	-2	Orange	2.9	-1.4
Two or More Races	46.3	9.7	Blue	Increase From Baseline	46.4
White	44.1	9.3	Green	Increase From Baseline	44.2
English Learner	-78.6	-5.2	Red	12.7	-40.5
Foster	-100.5	5.1	Orange	15.8	-53.1
Homeless	-36	-8.3	Orange	6.6	-16.2
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	-10.1	2.2	Orange	2.9	-1.4
Students with Disabilities	-112.5	0	Red	17.5	-60.0

<End add>

<Start delete>Table 13: State Level Mathematics Data by Student Group

Student Group	Grade Rate (Status)	Change	Color	Annual Average Improvement to Meet Goal	Status After Three Years
All Students	-36.4	1.3	Orange	5.2 points	-20.8
American Indian	-73	-0.7	Orange	10.4 points	-47.7
Asian	56.7	2.4	Blue	Increased from Baseline	56.8
Black or African American	-91.5	0.2	Orange	13.1 points	-52.3

Student Group	Grade Rate (Status)	Change	Color	Annual Average Improvement to Meet Goal	Status After Three Years
Filipino	13.1	2.8	Green	Increased from Baseline	13.2
Hispanic or Latino	-65.8	1.7	Orange	9.4 points	-37.6
Pacific Islander	-52	-0.7	Orange	7.4 points	-29.7
Two or More Races	1.9	0.1	Green	Increased from Baseline	2.0
White	-1	0.6	Yellow	0.2 points	.06
English Learner	-69.9	1.5	Orange	10 points	-39.9
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	-67.4	2.3	Orange	9.6 points	-38.5
Students with Disabilities	-125.3	0.8	Red	17.9 points	-71.6

Note: The Zero goal for grades 3-8 is applied at the statewide level. **\<End delete\>**

\<Start add\>Table 13a: State Level Mathematics Data by Student Group (Grades 3-8)

Student Group	Status	Change	Color	Annual Average Improvement to Meet Goal	Status After Three Years
All Students	-38.0	0.8	Orange	5 points	-23.0
American Indian	-73.2	-1.8	Orange	10 points	-43.2
Asian	49.9	3.1	Blue	Increased from Baseline	50.0
Black or African American	-90.7	-1.1	Orange	13 points	-51.7
Filipino	10.9	3.0	Green	Increased from Baseline	11.0
Hispanic or Latino	-65.5	0.4	Orange	9 points	-38.5
Pacific Islander	-50.5	0.8	Orange	7 points	-29.5
Two or More Races	-2.5	1.4	Yellow	1 point	0.5
White	-5.0	0.9	Yellow	1 point	-2.0
English Learner	-68.3	-0.5	Orange	10 points	-38.5

Student Group	Status	Change	Color	Annual Average Improvement to Meet Goal	Status After Three Years
Foster Youth	-110.0	6.8	Orange	16 points	-62.0
Homeless	-82.9	-2.7	Orange	12 points	-46.9
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	-68.6	-0.3	Orange	10 points	-38.6
Students with Disabilities	-125.0	-.09	Red	18 points	-71.0

Table 13b: State Level Mathematics Data by Student Group (Grade 11)

Student Group	Status	Change	Color	Average Annual Improvement to Meet Goal	Status After Three Years
All Students	-64.5	-0.7	Orange	9.2	-36.9
American Indian	-102.7	-7.3	Red	14.7	-58.6
Asian	46	1.9	Blue	Increase From Baseline	46.1
Black or African American	-129.8	-3.6	Red	18.5	-74.3
Filipino	-15.2	-3.9	Yellow	2.2	-8.6
Hispanic	-99.7	-4.3	Red	14.2	-57.1
Pacific Islander	-92.4	-7.2	Orange	13.2	-52.8
Two or More Races	-34.1	2.8	Orange	4.9	-19.4
White	-34.4	3.3	Yellow	4.9	-19.7
English Learner	-153	-8.2	Red	21.9	-87.3
Foster	-193.6	-3.5	Red	27.7	-110.5
Homeless	-124.7	-13.4	Red	17.8	-71.3
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	-99	-3.4	Red	14.1	-56.7
Students with Disabilities	-200.9	-4.3	Red	28.7	-114.8

<End add>

b. Graduation Rate. *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(bb))*

1. Describe the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and for each subgroup of students, including: (i) baseline data; (ii) the timeline for meeting the long-term goals, for which the term must be the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State; and (iii) how the long-term goals are ambitious.

California's overall graduation rates have been steadily increasing since California started calculating the four-year cohort rate beginning with the 2009–10 graduating class.

The baseline data for graduation rate is based on the **<Start delete>**2014–15**<End delete><Start add>**2015-16**<End add>** four-year cohort rate for Status. The baseline data was used to establish the five-by-five colored grid, which is shown below. The **<Start delete>**weighted average of the four-year cohort rates for 2011–12, 2012–13, and 2013–14 **<End delete> <Start add>**2014-15 four-year cohort **<End add>** was used to determine Change in the five-by-five colored grid.**<Start delete>**Beginning with the 2018 Dashboard, performance will only be calculated using Change from prior year only (i.e., not three-year weighted average). This will align the methodology for this Dashboard indicator with the approach for the other Dashboard indicators, for which Change is calculated only as compared to the prior year. **<End delete>**

 < Start add> In July 2019, the SBE adopted an extended-year graduation rate that now includes fifth year graduates. Because the goal for extended graduation rates must be higher than the four-year cohort graduation rate, the SBE increased the goal from 90 percent to 90.5 percent. The goal for all students and all student groups is to reach the "High" Status, shown in the five-by-five colored grid below. This means the goal is to have an extended-graduation rate of at least 90.5 percent.

In addition, because the extended graduation rate has a much more positive impact for schools in the lower percentiles, the SBE approved raised the graduation rate threshold for the "Very Low" Status level from below 67 percent to below 68 percent. Therefore, any school with a graduation rate below 68 percent will be identified for CSI. **<End add>**

<Start delete>The goal for all schools and all student groups is to reach the "High" Status, shown in the five-by-five colored grid below. This means that the goal is for all students and all student groups to have at least a 90 percent graduation rate. **<End delete>**

For graduation rate, **<Start delete>** 64**<End delete> <Start add>**48.5**<End add>** percent of schools would currently meet or exceed this goal for all student performance. This is an ambitious goal because of the need for schools to improve their overall performance year after year and in light of the significant progress that some student groups need to make to meet the long-term goal and narrow performance gaps.

The SBE has established a seven year timeline for reaching the goal. The SBE expects to revise the performance levels for state indicators every seven years and has established an annual review process to assess progress on all indicators statewide.

The CDE has produced a report that indicates where schools and student groups are on the five-by-five colored grid, allowing schools to determine how much improvement is needed to reach that goal. The report is available on the CDE California Model Five-by-Five Placement Reports & Data Web page at https://www6.cde.ca.gov/californiamodel/.

Table 14. High School Graduation Rate Indicator

Levels	Change: Declined Significantly **73 Schools** Declined by greater than 5%	Change: Declined **190 Schools** Declined by 1% to 5%	Change: Maintained **333 Schools** Declined or increased by less than 1%	Change: Increased **493 Schools** Increased by 1% to 5%	Change: Increased Significantly **275 Schools** Increased by 5% or greater
Status: Very High **520 Schools** 95% or more	N/A	39 (2.9%) Blue	203 (14.9%) Blue	224 (16.4%) Blue	54 (4.0%) Blue
Status: High **354 Schools** 90.*5% to less than 95%	5 (0.4%) Orange	65 (4.8%) Yellow	71 (5.2%) Green	142 (10.4%) Green	71 (5.2%) Blue
Status: Medium **164 Schools** 85% to less than *90.5%	6 (0.4%) Orange	29 (2.1%) Orange	28 (2.1%) Yellow	55 (4.0%) Green	46 (3.4%) Green
Status: Low **204 Schools** ^68% to less than 85%	28 (2.1%) Red	33 (2.4%) Orange	21 (1.5%) Orange	52 (3.8%) Yellow	70 (5.1%) Yellow
Status: Very Low **122 Schools** Less than ~68%	34 (2.5%) Red	24 (1.8%) Red	10 (0.7%) Red	20 (1.5%) Red	34 (2.5%) Red

*change from 90% to 90.5%, ^change from 68 % to 67%, ~change from 67% to 68%

# of schools	N/A	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
1,364	N/A	150 (11.0%)	94 (6.9%)	215 (15.8%)	314 (23.0%)	591 (43.3%)

For all percentages calculated above, the total number of schools (1,364) was used for the denominator. The statewide baseline data, which uses the 2014–15 cohort rate, for all students and each student group are provided below. The table shows the approximate average annual improvement necessary over the seven-year period for each student group to meet the long-term goal. The table displays the performance gaps at the state level among student groups who attend non-alternative schools, and shows that some student

groups will need to make significantly more progress than higher performing student groups to reach the statewide goal within seven years.

Table 15. State Level Graduation Rate by Student Group

<Start delete>

Student Group	Grade Rate (Status)	Change	Color	Average Annual Improvement to Meet Goal	Status After Year 3
All Students	88.4	1.7	Green	0.2%	89.0
American Indian	82.9	0.6	Orange	1.0%	85.9
Asian	94.1	0.6	Green	Increased from Baseline	94.2
Black or African American	81.5	3.1	Yellow	1.2%	85.1
Filipino	94.7	1.2	Green	Increased from Baseline	94.8
Hispanic or Latino	86.3	2.6	Green	0.5%	87.8
Pacific Islander	88.8	2.9	Green	0.2%	89.4
Two or More Races	90.6	0.6	Green	Increased from Baseline	90.7
White	92.0	0.5	Green	Increased from Baseline	92.1
English Learner	77.7	5.5	Yellow	1.8%	83.1
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	85.3	2.5	Green	0.7%	87.4
Students with Disabilities	69.0	2.3	Yellow	3.0%	78.0

<End delete>

<Start add>

Student Group	Grade Rate (Status)	Change	Color	Average Annual Improvement to Meet Goal	Status After Year 3
All Students	83.8	0.9	Orange	1.3	87.8
American Indian	74.0	-0.4	Orange	3.3	83.9
Asian	93.7	0.9	Green	Increased from Baseline	93.8
Black or African American	72.9	0.3	Orange	3.5	83.5

Student Group	Grade Rate (Status)	Change	Color	Average Annual Improvement to Meet Goal	Status After Year 3
Filipino	94.0	0.7	Green	Increased from Baseline	94.1
Hispanic or Latino	80.5	1.5	Yellow	2.0	86.5
Pacific Islander	83.3	0.1	Orange	1.4	87.6
Two or More Races	85.8	-0.5	Yellow	0.9	88.6
White	88.9	0.4	Yellow	0.3	89.9
English Learner	72.5	3.0	Yellow	3.6	83.3
Foster Youth	51.1	1.0	Red	7.9	74.7
Homeless	70.5	3.1	Yellow	4.0	82.5
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	79.8	1.8	Yellow	2.1	86.2
Students with Disabilities	66.1	1.4	Red	4.9	80.7

<End add>

2. If applicable, describe the long-term goals for each extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate, including (i) baseline data; (ii) the timeline for meeting the long-term goals, for which the term must be the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State; (iii) how the long-term goals are ambitious; and (iv) how the long-term goals are more rigorous than the long-term goal set for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate.

<Start delete>~~Not applicable. California is the exploring the incorporation of the five-year cohort graduation rate into the accountability system. If California does incorporate the five-year cohort graduation rate, it will update the long-term goals.~~ **<End delete>**

<Start add>At the July 2019 meeting, the SBE adopted an extended-year graduation rate that now includes fifth year graduates. Because the goal for extended graduation rates must be higher than the four-year cohort graduation rate, the SBE adopted at their September 2019 an increase in the goal from 90 percent to 90.5 percent. The goal for all students and all student groups is to reach the "High" Status, shown in the five-by-five

colored grid below. This means the goal is to have an extended-graduation rate of at least 90.5 percent.

In addition, because the extended graduation rate has a much more positive impact for schools in the lower percentiles, the SBE determined that it was appropriate to raise the graduation rate threshold for the "Very Low" Status level from below 67 percent to below 68 percent. Therefore, any school with a graduation rate below 68 percent will be identified for CSI. **<End add>**

3. Provide the measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate in Appendix A.

4. Describe how the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate take into account the improvement necessary to make significant progress in closing statewide graduation rate gaps.

Given that all student groups have the same long-term goal, student groups with lower baseline performance will need to make greater improvement over time to reach the long-term goal. The ability for LEAs or schools to determine interim progress goals, including for lower performing student groups, is built into the California Model. In addition, the CDE has produced a report that indicates where schools and student groups are on the five-by-five colored grid, allowing schools to target improvement strategies to reach the goal for each student group. These reports are available on the CDE California Model Five-by-Five Placement Reports & Data Web page at https://www6.cde.ca.gov/californiamodel/.

Additionally, under state law, every LEA must adopt and annually update a LCAP. In the LCAP, the LEA must establish goals for all students and the statutory student groups across priority areas defined in statute. The LEA must also describe actions and services, and related expenditures, to meet the goals for student performance.

The template LEAs must use for LCAPs includes a summary in which LEAs must address any indicator where the performance of one or more student groups is two or more color-coded levels below the performance for all students (e.g., student group performance is Red while overall performance is Yellow, Green or Blue; student group performance is Orange while overall performance is Green or Blue). Under the California Model, an LEA is not making progress toward closing performance gaps among student groups if either of the examples described above are present. Accordingly, through the LCAP, such LEAs must describe the efforts they will undertake to make significant progress in closing performance gaps on the relevant indicator(s).

LEAs must therefore annually review and update their overarching plans for educational programming to address areas where the LEA is not making progress in addressing performance gaps among student groups.

This statewide system to assist LEAs to leverage change is an important component to helping narrow statewide proficiency gaps. The table below shows how student groups within schools are doing statewide, broken down by the five color-coded performance levels.

Table 16. School Graduation Rate Indicator, Performance Categories for Student Groups

Student Groups	Total*	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
All Schools	1,364	150 (11.0%)	94 (6.9%)	215 (15.8%)	314 (23.0%)	591 (43.3%)
African American	257	36 (2.6%)	34 (2.5%)	48 (3.5%)	73 (5.4%)	66 (4.8%)
Asian	325	6 (0.4%)	19 (1.4%)	35 (2.6%)	34 (2.5%)	231 (16.9%)
Filipino	120	2 (0.1%)	3 (0.2%)	14 (1.0%)	18 (1.3%)	83 (6.1%)
Hispanic/Latino	1,116	123 (9.0%)	108 (7.9%)	183 (13.4%)	258 (18.9%)	444 (32.6%)
Native American	5	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.1%)	1 (0.1%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (0.2%)
Pacific Islander	1	1 (0.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Two or More Races	56	3 (0.2%)	7 (0.5%)	9 (0.7%)	5 (0.4%)	32 (2.3%)
White	801	64 (4.7%)	54 (4.0%)	107 (7.8%)	123 (9.0%)	453 (33.2%)
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	1,249	147 (10.8%)	140 (10.3%)	213 (15.6%)	318 (23.3%)	431 (31.6%)
English learners	749	157 (11.5%)	84 (6.2%)	175 (12.8%)	152 (11.1%)	181 (13.3%)
Students with Disabilities	664	233 (17.1%)	118 (8.7%)	176 (12.9%)	78 (5.7%)	59 (4.3%)

*Total = Number of schools with 30 or more students at the schoolwide level and student group level.

For all percentages calculated above, the total number of schools (1,364) was used for the denominator.

The results show, as one example, that greater improvement among English learners statewide will be needed to make significant progress toward narrowing achievement gaps. Only 333 schools (44.4 percent) are in the Green and Blue performance levels for this student group, which is 22 percentage points lower than the percent of schools in those performance levels overall.

Using the five-by-five grid, the schools represented in this table can determine how much greater improvement is necessary for lower-performing student groups to meet or exceed the goal within the relevant period of time. All LEAs must also address in their LCAP annually the efforts they will undertake to make significant progress in closing performance gaps where any student group is two or more levels below the overall performance within the LEA. The progress statewide toward narrowing performance gaps reflected in this table will occur as LEAs and schools complete that process and focus on accelerating improvement for students that are at lower levels of performance. California's emerging statewide system of support, discussed in more detail in section A.4.viii.c, will focus on improving capacity at the local level to identify strengths and weaknesses and prioritize improvement efforts, including narrowing performance gaps.

The table below displays statewide baseline data for all students and each student group, the approximate average annual improvement necessary over the seven-year period for each student group to meet the long-term goal, and the projected Status after year 3 if the student group makes the average annual improvement necessary over the seven-year period for each student group to meet the long-term goal and is therefore on track to meet the long-term goal. The tables show that many student groups would need to make significantly more progress than higher performing student groups to reach the statewide goal within seven years.

The table show that many student groups would need to make significantly more progress than higher performing student groups to reach the statewide goal within seven years. The statewide baseline data, which uses the **<Start delete>**~~2014–15~~**<End delete>** **<Start add>** 2015-16**<End add>** cohort rate, for all students and each student group are provided below. The table displays the performance gaps at the state level among student groups who attend non-alternative schools, and shows that some student groups will need to make significantly more progress than higher performing student groups to reach the statewide goal within seven years.

Table 17. State Level Graduation Rate by Student Group
<Start delete>

Student Groups	Status	Change	Color	Average Annual Improvement to Meet Goal	Status After Year 3
All Students	**88.4**	1.7	Green	0.2%	89.0
American Indian	**82.9**	0.6	Orange	1.0%	85.9
Asian	**94.1**	0.6	Green	Increased from Baseline	94.2
Black or African American	**81.5**	3.1	Yellow	1.2%	85.1
Filipino	**94.7**	1.2	Green	Increased from Baseline	94.8
Hispanic or Latino	**86.3**	2.6	Green	0.5%	87.8
Pacific Islander	**88.8**	2.9	Green	0.2%	89.4
Two or More Races	**90.6**	0.6	Green	Increased from Baseline	90.7
White	**92.0**	0.5	Green	Increased from Baseline	92.1
English Learner	**77.7**	5.5	Yellow	1.8%	83.1
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	**85.3**	2.5	Green	0.7%	87.4
Students with Disabilities	**69.0**	2.3	Yellow	3.0%	78.0

<End delete>

<Start add>

Student Group	Grade Rate (Status)	Change	Color	Average Annual Improvement to Meet Goal	Status After Year 3
All Students	83.8	0.9	Orange	1.3	87.8
American Indian	74.0	-0.4	Orange	3.3	83.9
Asian	93.7	0.9	Green	Increased from Baseline	93.8
Black or African American	72.9	0.3	Orange	3.5	83.5

Student Group	Grade Rate (Status)	Change	Color	Average Annual Improvement to Meet Goal	Status After Year 3
Filipino	94.0	0.7	Green	Increased from Baseline	94.1
Hispanic or Latino	80.5	1.5	Yellow	2.0	86.5
Pacific Islander	83.3	0.1	Orange	1.4	87.6
Two or More Races	85.8	-0.5	Yellow	0.9	88.6
White	88.9	0.4	Yellow	0.3	89.9
English Learner	72.5	3.0	Yellow	3.6	83.3
Foster Youth	51.1	1.0	Red	7.9	74.7
Homeless	70.5	3.1	Yellow	4.0	82.5
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	79.8	1.8	Yellow	2.1	86.2
Students with Disabilities	66.1	1.4	Red	4.9	80.7

<End add>

c. English Language Proficiency. *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii))*
   1. Describe the long-term goals for English learners for increases in the percentage of such students making progress in achieving English language proficiency, as measured by the statewide English language proficiency assessment including: (i) baseline data; (ii) the State-determined timeline for such students to achieve English language proficiency; and (iii) how the long-term goals are ambitious.

   As discussed in more detail in section A.4.iv.d, the English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) provides credit to schools when students move up one performance level on the state English language proficiency test from the prior year to the current year. Using the **<Start delete>** current prior**<End delete> <Start add>** former **<End add>** English language assessment results (the California English Language Development Test [CELDT]) and current methodology, a student that starts with a beginning level on the CELDT is expected to achieve English language proficiency within five years and maintain language proficiency until meeting all reclassification criteria.

   Research indicates that it takes five to seven years for English learner (EL) students to become English language proficient (Cook, Linquanti, Chinen & Jung, 2012; Thompson, 2015; Umansky & Reardon, 2014). Therefore, the design of the ELPI sets high expectations for schools.

California **<Start delete>** is currently transitioning**<End delete>** **<Start add>** recently transitioned**<End add>** to a new English language proficiency test. The first operational administration of the new summative assessment, the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC), **<Start delete>** will **<End delete>** occurred in spring 2018 **<Start add>** and the second administration occurred in spring 2019**<End add>.**
<Start delete> Once the ELPAC is operational and the CDE has two years of results, the SBE will revisit the ELPI methodology, cut points, and timelines for English language proficiency. **<End delete>**

<Start add>In November 2019, **<End add>** the SBE **<Start delete>**will be able to established **<End delete>** **<Start add>**adopted**<End add>** cut scores for Status based on the first two years of results, so performance for LEAs and schools on Status **<Start delete>**will be**<End delete>** **<Start add>** were**<End add>** reported in the 2019 California School Dashboard. As discussed in Section vi.d and f below, California **<Start delete>**has**<End delete>** updated the timeline for identifying schools for comprehensive support and additional targeted support to reflect an additional cohort of schools that**<Start delete>** will be **<End delete>** **<Start add>**were**<End add>** identified for this support based on the 2019 Dashboard. This **<Start delete>**will**<End delete>** ensured that California **<Start delete>**is able to**<End delete>** used the ELPI in assistance and support determinations for LEAs and schools at the earliest point practicable after transitioning to the new assessment.

<Start delete>The ELPI baseline data is based on student progress between the 2014 and 2015 CELDT administrations. The baseline data was used to establish the five-by-five colored grid, which is shown below. The Change component is based on comparing the Status to student progress between the 2013 and 2014 CELDT administrations.**<End delete>**

<Start add>The ELPI baseline data for Status is based on progress between 2018 and 2019.**<End add>** The goal for all schools is to reach the "High" Status, as shown in the **<Start delete>**five-by-five colored grid**<End delete>** **<Start add>**table**<End add>** below. This means that the goal is for at least **<Start delete>** 75 **<End delete>** **<Start add>**55 **<End add>** percent of students to gain one performance level on the language proficiency assessment annually. Only **<Start delete>** 17.1**<End delete>** **<Start add>**25**<End add>** percent of schools**<Start delete>**would**<End delete>** currently meet or exceed this goal, making it ambitious for the state to meet.

The SBE has established a seven-year timeline for reaching the goal. The SBE expects to revise the performance levels for state indicators every seven years and has established an annual review process to assess progress on all indicators statewide.

<Start add>In 2020, when a third year of ELPAC data is available,**<End add>** the CDE **<Start delete>**has**<End delete>** **<Start add>**will**<End add>** produce a report that indicates where schools and student groups are on the

five-by-five colored grid, allowing schools to target improvement strategies to reach the goal. **<Start delete>** ~~These~~ **<End delete> <Start add>**This**<End add>** report**<Start delete>** ~~s are~~**<End delete>** **<Start add>** will be**<End add>** available on the CDE California Model Five-by-Five Placement Reports & Data Web page at https://www6.cde.ca.gov/californiamodel/.

<Start delete> ~~Table 18. School English Learner Progress Indicator~~

~~Levels~~	~~Change: Declined Significantly **928 Schools** by greater than 10%~~	~~Change: Declined **2,030 Schools** by 1.5% to 10%~~	~~Change: Maintained **834 Schools** Declined or Increased by less than 1.5%~~	~~Change: Increased **1,769 Schools** by 1.5% to less than 10%~~	~~Change: Increased Significantly **876 Schools** by 10% or greater~~
~~Status: Very High **266 Schools** 85% or more~~	~~0 (0.0%) Yellow~~	~~49 (0.8%) Green~~	~~40 (0.6%) Blue~~	~~104 (1.6%) Blue~~	~~73 (1.1%) Blue~~
~~Status: High **870 Schools** 75% to less than 85%~~	~~24 (0.4%) Orange~~	~~184 (2.9%) Yellow~~	~~121 (1.9%) Green~~	~~288 (4.5%) Green~~	~~253 (3.9%) Blue~~
~~Status: Medium **1,467 Schools** 67% to less than 75%~~	~~85 (1.3%) Orange~~	~~369 (5.7%) Orange~~	~~209 (3.2%) Yellow~~	~~524 (8.1%) Green~~	~~280 (4.3%) Green~~
~~Status: Low **1,772 Schools** 60% to less than 67%~~	~~169 (2.6%) Red~~	~~634 (9.8%) Orange~~	~~244* (3.8%) Orange~~	~~532 (8.3%) Yellow~~	~~193 (3.0%) Yellow~~
~~Status: Very Low **2,062 Schools** Less than 60%~~	~~650 (10.1%) Red~~	~~794 (12.3%) Red~~	~~220 (3.4%) Red~~	~~321 (5.0%) Orange~~	~~77 (1.2%) Yellow~~

~~**Statewide Schools' Performance**~~

# of Schools	~~Red~~	~~Orange~~	~~Yellow~~	~~Green~~	~~Blue~~
~~6437~~	~~1,833 (28.5%)~~	~~1,677 (26.1%)~~	~~1,195 (18.6%)~~	~~1,262 (19.6%)~~	~~470 (7.3%)~~

~~* Includes 3 schools that were assigned Orange for note testing 50% of their EL population.~~

~~Total Number of Schools: 8,424~~

~~Number of Schools without a Color: 1,987~~

~~Number of Schools with a Color: 6,437~~

~~For all percentages calculated above, the total number of schools (6,437) was used for the denominator.~~

~~* Three schools in the Very Low and Maintained box are assigned Orange because they are schools (at least 30 EL students in the current year) that did not administer the CELDT to at least 50 percent of the EL population.~~

<End delete>

<Start add>Table 18: English Learner Progress Status Levels

Percentile	Status Rate	Status Level
5	31.1	Very Low
9.1	34.9	Very Low
10	35.5	Low
15	38.6	Low
20	41.1	Low
25	42.8	Low
30	44.1	Low
32.7	44.9	Low
35	45.5	Medium
40	46.9	Medium
45	48.0	Medium
50	49.0	Medium
55	50.1	Medium
60	51.3	Medium
65	52.6	Medium
70	53.8	Medium
74.5	54.9	Medium

Percentile	Status Rate	Status Level
75	55.1	High
80	56.8	High
85	59.1	High
90	62.1	High
93.5	64.8	High
95	67.3	Very High

<End add>

The statewide baseline data, which uses the English Language Proficiency Assessment data from **<Start delete>** 2013–14 and 2014–15**<End delete> <Start add>**2017-18 and 2018-19**<End add>**, for all English learner students are provided in the Table below. The table displays the statewide baseline performance on this indicator and shows the approximate average annual improvement necessary over the seven-year period to meet the long-term goal.

Table 19. State Level English Learner Progress Performance Level <Start delete>

Student Group	2013-14 ELPI Status	2014-15 ELPI Status	Change	Color	Average Annual Improvement to Meet Goal	Status After Year 3
English Learners	69.0	68.7	-0.35	Yellow	1%	73.0

<End delete>

<Start add>

Student Group	208-19 ELPI Status	Average Annual Improvement to Meet Goa	Status After Year 3
English Learners	48.3	1.3	52.2

<End add>

2. Provide the measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goal for increases in the percentage of English learners making progress in achieving English language proficiency in Appendix A.

iv. Indicators *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B))*
   a. Academic Achievement Indicator. Describe the Academic Achievement indicator, including a description of how the indicator (i) is based on the long-term goals; (ii) is

measured by proficiency on the annual Statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments; (iii) annually measures academic achievement for all students and separately for each subgroup of students; and (iv) at the State's discretion, for each public high school in the State, includes a measure of student growth, as measured by the annual Statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments.

The Academic Indicator includes the CAASPP for ELA and mathematics in grades three through eight (3–8) for elementary and middle schools and grade 11 for high schools. Proficiency is measured by looking at a student's Distance from Level 3 (for each grade), which compares how far above or below students are from the lowest possible scale score to achieve Level 3 (Standard Met/Proficiency) on the administration of the Smarter Balanced assessments. "Status" is determined using the average of these distances on the most recent administration of the Smarter Balanced assessments, and "Change" is the difference between performance from the prior year and current year. The same calculation methodology is used at both the school level and the student group level. Results for both ELA and mathematics will be reported as their own academic measures.

The Smarter Balanced Assessments uses vertically aligned scale scores, which provides a basis for describing individual student progress over time, setting goals, and ultimately determining whether students are on track for college and career readiness. Using scale scores provides a more precise measure of school status and progress. Distance from Level 3 uses scales scores to determine how far each student is from the lowest scale score needed to achieve Level 3 (Standard Met), which indicates 'proficiency' under ESSA. As a result all of the students within a school are reflected in the calculation showing how close the "all students" group and each student group is to proficiency. Because the progress of all students are taken into consideration the tendency for schools to focus on only those students just below proficiency will be reduced.

For the purposes of the State Plan, the academic achievement indicator consists only of the Status component of California's Academic Achievement Indicator on the Dashboard for grades 3-8. For grade 11, the indicator includes both Status and Change, as authorized by ESSA, Section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i).

Detailed information on the production of the new indicators in the new California Model is provided in the California Accountability System: California School Dashboard Technical Guide **<Start delete>** 2017-18 School Year" **<End delete>** available on the CDE Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/cm/ under the Data Files and Guide tab.

Indicator for Public Elementary and Secondary Schools that are Not High Schools (Other Academic Indicator). Describe the Other Academic indicator, including how it annually measures the performance for all students and separately for each subgroup of students. If the Other Academic indicator is not a measure of student growth, the description must include a demonstration that the indicator is a valid and reliable

statewide academic indicator that allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance.

Chronic absenteeism will serve as an additional academic indicator for grades K–8, given its strong correlation with future academic attainment. There is wide agreement that students who are absent 10 percent or more of the school year, including excused and unexcused absences, are at greater risk of reading below grade level and dropping out of high school (Ginsburg, Jordan, and Chang, 2014; Balfanz and Byrnes, 2012; Ginsburg and Chudowsky, 2012).

In addition, this indicator will be especially important for schools that only serve students in grades K–2. A study in California found that only 17 percent of children chronically absent in both kindergarten and grade 1 were proficient readers by the end of grade 3, as compared to 64 percent of their peers who attended school regularly (Bruner, Discher, and Chang, 2011). This research, along with review and approval of the indicator by the CDE's Technical Design Group, will allow chronic absenteeism to serve as a valid and reliable academic indicator.

LEAs reported chronic absence data to the state for the first time in CALPADS for the 2016–17 school year. Each LEA reported which students were chronically absent, which is defined in California Education Code Section 60901(c)(1) as "a pupil who is absent on 10 percent or more of the school days in the school year when the total number of days a pupil is absent is divided by the total number of days the pupil is enrolled and school was actually taught in the regular day schools of the district, exclusive of Saturdays and Sundays." LEAs reported the second year of chronic absence data in CALPADS for the 2017-18 school year, which allowed the SBE to establish color-coded performance levels for this indicator prior to releasing the 2018 Dashboard. Additionally, chronic absence data is available via the CDE's DataQuest Web Site: https://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/DQCensus/ AttChrAbsRate.aspx?agglevel=State&cds=00&year=2016-17. The SBE established the color-coded performance levels using the methodology described in section v.a below, which is the methodology used to establish the five-by-five grids for other indicators that are included throughout this state plan and therefore ensure meaningful differentiation among the color-coded performance levels. The calculation formula is number of students chronically absent 10 percent or more divided by the number of students who are eligible for chronic absenteeism enrollment. The calculation formula for Change is the current year chronic absence rate minus the prior year chronic absence rate. Below is the five-by-five colored table that will be used to determine performance levels.

Table 20. Chronic Absenteeism Performance Levels

Performance Level	Increased Significantly From Prior Year (by 3.0% or more)	Increased From Prior Year (by 0.5% to less than 3.0%)	Maintained From Prior Year (declined or increased by less than 0.5%)	Declined From Prior Year (by 0.5% to less than 3.0%)	Declined Significantly From Prior Year (by 3.0% or more)
Very Low 2.5% or less in Current Year	0 (0.0%) Yellow	62 (0.8%) Green	168 (2.2%) Blue	185 (2.4%) Blue	53 (0.7%) Blue
Low More than 2.5% to 5.0% in Current Year	18 (0.2%) Orange	361 (4.7%) Yellow	311 (4.1%) Green	386 (5.1%) Green	61 (0.8%) Blue
Medium More than 5.0% to 10.0% in Current Year	139 (1.8%) Orange	1,106 (14.5%) Orange	520 (6.8%) Yellow	856 (11.2%) Green	214 (2.8%) Green
High More than 10.0% to 20.0% in Current Year	459 (6.0%) Red	960 (12.6%) Orange	311 (4.1%) Orange	587 (7.7%) Yellow	245 (3.2%) Yellow
Very High More than 20.0% in Current Year	182 (2.4%) Red	227 (3.0%) Red	36 (0.5%) Red	138 (1.8%) Orange	47 (0.6%) Yellow
# of Schools	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
7,632	900 (11.8%)	2,680 (35.1%)	1,756 (23.0%)	1,829 (24.0%)	467 (6.1%)

As noted in Section iv.a above, the academic indicator consists only of the "Status component of California's Academic Indicator on the Dashboard for grades 3-8. The "Change" component of California's Academic Indicator will

serve as an additional academic indicator for grades 3-8. The method for calculating this indicator is as described in Section iii.A.1.

b. Graduation Rate. Describe the Graduation Rate indicator, including a description of (i) how the indicator is based on the long-term goals; (ii) how the indicator annually measures graduation rate for all students and separately for each subgroup of students;
(iii) how the indicator is based on the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate; (iv) if the State, at its discretion, also includes one or more extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates, how the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate is combined with that rate or rates within the indicator; and (v) if applicable, how the State includes in its four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates students with the most significant cognitive disabilities assessed using an alternate assessment aligned to alternate academic achievement standards under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(D) and awarded a State-defined alternate diploma under ESEA section 8101(23) and (25).

<Start add>Beginning in 2019,**<End add>** California's Graduation Rate Indicator **<Start add>**will use**<End add>** the **<Start delete>**four-year cohort**<End delete>** **<Start add>**extended year **<End add>** graduation rate **<Start add>** which includes fifth year graduates**<End add>**. The same calculation methodology is used at both the school level and the student group level. The **<Start delete>**four-year cohort**<End delete>** **<Start add>** extended**<End add>** graduation rate was used to establish the long-term goal for graduation rate described in section b.1 above, which applies to all schools and all student groups.

For the purposes of the State Plan, graduation rate consists only of the Status component of California's Graduation Rate Indicator on the Dashboard.

Currently, students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are held to the same graduation requirements as all other students.

c. Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP) Indicator. Describe the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator, including the State's definition of ELP, as measured by the State ELP assessment.

California's English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) is based on performance on the **<Start add>**English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC)**<End add>** **<Start delete>**English language proficiency test, currently the CELDT**<End delete>** For accountability purposes, the **<Start delete>**CELDT**<End delete>** **<Start add>**ELPI**<End add>** has six performance levels.

The current ELPI calculation formula for "Status" is:

Annual **<Start delete>**~~CELDT~~**<End delete>** **<Start add>**ELPAC**<End add>**
Test Takers Who Increased at least 1 **<Start delete>**~~CELDT~~**<End delete>**
<Start add>ELPI**<End add>** Level

plus

Annual **<Start delete>**~~CELDT~~**<End delete>** **<Start add>**ELPAC**<End add>**
Test Takers Who Maintained **<Start delete>**~~Early Advanced/Advanced English Proficient on the CELDT~~**<End delete>** **<Start add>**Level 4 on the ELPAC**<End add>**

divided by

The Number of Annual **<Start delete>**~~CELDT~~**<End delete>** **<Start add>**ELPAC**<End add>** Test Takers in the Current Year

The ELPI calculation formula for "Change" is:

Current Year Status minus Prior Year Status

Students who have demonstrated English proficiency on the assessment must maintain their English proficiency while meeting other criteria for reclassification and exit from EL status. This model was developed in consultation with the CDE's Technical Design Group to ensure that EL achievement is validly and reliably measured. This indicator is applied to all EL students in grades **<Start delete>**~~K~~**<End delete>** **<Start add>**1**<End add>** – 12.

For the purposes of the State Plan, this indicator consists only of the Status component of California's ELPI on the Dashboard.

California **<Start delete>**~~is currently~~**<End delete>** **<Start add>**recently**<End add>** transitioned to a new English language proficiency test. The first administration of the new assessment, the ELPAC, **<Start delete>**~~will~~**<End delete>** occurred in spring 2018 **<Start add>**and the second administration occurred in spring 2019**<End add>**. As noted in Section iii.c.1 above, **<Start delete>**~~once~~**<End delete>** **<Start add>**now that**<End add>** the ELPAC is operational and the CDE has two years of results, the SBE **<Start delete>**~~will revisit~~**<End delete>** **<Start add>**established **<End add>** the ELPI methodology **<Start add>** and the Status**<End add>** cut points **<Start add>**at the November 2019 SBE meeting, **<End add>** **<Start delete>**~~and timelines for English language proficiency. The SBE will be able to establish cut scores for Status based on the first two years of results,~~**<End delete>**so **<Start add>**Status**<End add>** performance levels for LEAs and schools **<Start delete>**~~on Status will be~~**<End delete>** **<Start add>**were**<End add>** reported in the 2019 California School Dashboard.

The previously submitted language above provided a brief description of the process and timeline to be undertaken to standardize EL Entrance and Exit Criteria for English learners in California. Further details of the timeline are included here:

- In January 2019, a study related to the use of the new English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) scores will be presented to the State Board of Education to adopt a new ELPAC

reclassification criteria. The standardized Language Observation Tool and Parent Involvement Protocol will be developed in 2018–19 and piloted in 2019–20.

- In January 2019, work with the Legislature will begin to change the reclassification criteria in California Education Code. This process generally takes one year. Legislation will include the standardized, statewide Language Observation Tool and Parent Involvement Protocol.

- If the Legislature enacts law to change the reclassification criteria including the Language Observation Tool, and Parent Involvement Protocol, the law goes into effect on July 1, 2020.

- The Regulatory Process would begin in 2020–21, and full implementation is expected in 2021–22.

d. <u>School Quality or Student Success Indicator(s)</u>. Describe each School Quality or Student Success Indicator, including, for each such indicator: (i) how it allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance; (ii) that it is valid, reliable, comparable, and statewide (for the grade span(s) to which it applies); and (iii) of how each such indicator annually measures performance for all students and separately for each subgroup of students. For any School Quality or Student Success indicator that does not apply to all grade spans, the description must include the grade spans to which it does apply.

The Suspension Rate Indicator will be used to measure school quality for all students in K–12. For all state indicators, the California Model determines performance levels based on the distribution of LEA data. The distribution is used to set four cut scores for both Status and Change. However, for the Suspension Rate Indicator, the data were significantly different among elementary, middle, and high schools. After consulting with the Technical Design Group about the implications of this difference, three distributions were created for the Suspension Rate Indicator only, one for elementary, one for middle, and one for high schools. The three sets of distributions resulted in the establishment of three different sets of cut scores, which allows for meaningful differentiation and a valid and reliable comparison among schools statewide by school type. The same calculation methodology will be used at both the school level and the student group level.

The calculation formula for Status is the number of students suspended divided by the number of students cumulatively enrolled. The calculation formula for Change is the current year suspension rate minus the prior year suspension rate.

Below are the three five-by-five colored tables that will be used to determine performance levels for elementary, middle, and high schools.

Table 21. Suspension Indicator (Elementary School)

Level	Change: Increased Significantly by greater than 2.0%	Change: Increased by 0.3% to 2.0%	Change: Maintained Declined or increased by less than 0.3%	Change: Declined by 0.3% to less than 1.0%	Change: Declined Significantly by 1.0% or greater
Status: Very Low 0.5% or less	N/A	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue
Status: Low Greater than 0.5% to 1.0%	N/A	Yellow	Green	Green	Blue
Status: Medium Greater than 1.0% to 3.0%	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green
Status: High Greater than 3.0% to 6.0%	Red	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Yellow
Status: Very High Greater than 6.0%	Red	Red	Red	Orange	Yellow

Table 22. Suspension Indicator (Middle School)

Level	Change: Increased Significantly by greater than 4.0%	Change: Increased by 0.3% to 4.0%	Change: Maintained Declined or increased by less than 0.3%	Change: Declined by 0.3% to less than 3.0%	Change: Declined Significantly by 3.0% or greater
Status: Very Low 0.5% or less	N/A	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue
Status: Low Greater than 0.5% to 2.0%	N/A	Yellow	Green	Green	Blue
Status: Medium Greater than 2.0% to 8.0%	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green
Status: High Greater than 8.0% to 12.0%	Red	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Yellow
Status: Very High Greater than 12.0%	Red	Red	Red	Orange	Yellow

Table 23. Suspension Indicator (High School)

Level	Change: Increased Significantly by greater than 3.0%	Change: Increased by 0.3% to 3.0%	Change: Maintained Declined or increased by less than 0.3%	Change: Declined by 0.3% to less than 2.0%	Change: Declined Significantly by 2.0% or greater
Status: Very Low 0.5% or less	N/A	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue
Status Low Greater than 0.5% to 1.5%	N/A	Yellow	Green	Green	Blue
Status: Medium Greater than 1.5% to 6.0%	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green
Status: High Greater than 6.0% to 10.0%	Red	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Yellow
Status: Very High Greater than 10.0%	Red	Red	Red	Orange	Yellow

As noted above, the "Change" component for California's Graduation Rate Indicator and English Learner Progress Indicator are additional indicators of student success. The methods for calculating these indicators are as described in sections iii.A.3 & 4 above.

The College/Career Indicator is an additional indicator of student success for high schools. The SBE adopted performance standards (i.e., five-by-five grid) for the College/Career Indicator (CCI) prior to the initial year of school identification in 2018–19. The five-by-five grid was established using the methodology described in section v.a below, which is the methodology used to establish the five-by-five grids for other indicators that are included throughout this state plan and therefore ensures meaningful differentiation among the color-coded performance levels.

The CCI is designed to include multiple measures in order to value the multiple pathways that students may take to prepare for postsecondary. The CCI currently has three levels (Prepared, Approaching Prepared, and Not Prepared) and is designed to allow new measures to be added when they become available. To determine how well schools have prepared students for postsecondary, the CCI evaluates all students in the four-year

graduation cohort. The same calculation methodology is used for both the school level and the student group level.

In consulting with the CDE's Technical Design Group, it was determined that the following measures were valid and reliable measures of college/career readiness. These measures are included in the Fall 2017 California School Dashboard release:

- Grade 11 CAASPP results in ELA and mathematics
- a–g Completion[4]
- Dual Enrollment
- Advanced Placement (AP) exam
- International Baccalaureate (IB) exam
- Career Technical Education (CTE) pathway completion

California added new data elements to California's student-level data collection, the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS), in the 2016–17 school year, which the SBE subsequently approved for inclusion within the CCI calculation. These measures are:

- State Seal of Biliteracy
- Articulated CTE Pathways

For the CCI, "Status" is determined using the current CCI rate and "Change" is the difference between the current rate and the prior year's rate. Below is the five-by-five colored table that will be used to determine performance levels.

---

[4] Additional information about the a-g subject requirements is available on the University of California's Web site: https://www.ucop.edu/agguide/a-g-requirements/.

Table 24. College/Career Indicator Performance Levels

Performance Level	Declined Significantly From Prior Year (by 9.1% or more)	Declined From Prior Year (by 2.0% to 9.0%)	Maintained From Prior Year (declined or increased by 1.9%)	Increased From Prior Year (by 2.0% to 8.9%)	Increased Significantly From Prior Year (by 9.0% or more)
Very High 70.0% or greater in Current Year	6 (0.3%) Yellow	35 (1.9%) Green	62 (3.4%) Blue	71 (3.9%) Blue	40 (2.2%) Blue
High 55.0% to less than 70.0% in Current Year	11 (0.6%) Orange	53 (2.9%) Yellow	70 (3.9%) Green	89 (4.9%) Green	69 (3.8%) Blue
Medium 35.0% to less than 55.0% in Current Year	36 (2.0%) Orange	136 (7.6%) Orange	114 (6.3%) Yellow	147 (8.2%) Green	92 (5.1%) Green
Low 10.0% to less than 35.0 in Current Year %	42 (2.3%) Red	85 (4.7%) Orange	59 (3.3%) Orange	72 (4.0%) Yellow	30 (1.7%) Yellow
Very Low Less than 10.0% in Current Year	5 (0.3%) Red	74 (4.1%) Red	321 (17.8%) Red	82 (4.6%) Orange	0 (0.0%) Yellow

# of Schools	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
1,801	442 (24.5%)	409 (22.7%)	275 (15.3%)	433 (24%)	242 (13.4%)

California ESSA Consolidated State Plan
State Board of Education | California Department of Education
December 2019

v. <u>Annual Meaningful Differentiation</u> *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(C))*

a. Describe the State's system of annual meaningful differentiation of all public schools in the State, consistent with the requirements of section 1111(c)(4)(C) of the ESEA, including a description of (i) how the system is based on all indicators in the State's accountability system, (ii) for all students and for each subgroup of students. Note that each state must comply with the requirements in 1111(c)(5) of the ESEA with respect to accountability for charter schools.

California has developed a multiple measures accountability system that uses percentile distributions to create a five-by-five grid. This five-by-five grid provides 25 results that combine "Status" and "Change" to make an overall determination for each of California's Dashboard indicators. "Status" and "Change" receive equal weight in determining overall performance.

"Status" is determined using the current year performance (i.e., current year graduation rate), and "Change" is the difference between performance from the current year and the prior year, or between the current year and a multi-year weighted average.

To determine the percentile cut scores for "Status," LEAs and schools were ordered from highest to lowest and four cut points were selected based on the distribution. These cut points created five "Status" levels:

- Very High
- High
- Medium
- Low
- Very Low

For "Change" cut scores, LEAs and schools were ordered separately from highest to lowest for positive change and lowest to highest for negative change. These cuts points created five "Change" levels:

- Increased significantly
- Increased
- Maintained
- Declined
- Declined significantly

Each indicator has its own unique set of cut points for "Status" and "Change," which are determined in consultation with the CDE's Technical Design Group to ensure validity and reliability in the indicator's measurement. The cut points will generally remain in place for seven years, although the SBE may adjust the cut points earlier if statewide data demonstrate that the existing cut points no longer support meaningful differentiation of schools. By combining the results of both "Status" and "Change," one of five color-coded "Performance Levels" can be assigned for each indicator:

- Blue
- Green

- Yellow
- Orange
- Red

The following table is a sample of the five-by-five grid California will use to illustrate school, LEA, and student group performance relative to each indicator:

Table 25. Sample Five-by-Five Grid

Levels	Change: Declined Significantly	Change: Declined	Change: Maintained	Change: Increased	Change: Increased Significantly
Status: Very High	Yellow	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue
Status: High	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green	Blue
Status: Medium	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green
Status: Low	Red	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Yellow
Status: Very Low	Red	Red	Red	Orange	Yellow

Schools receive a color-coded performance level for all students and each student group with at least 30 students on each indicator that applies based on the grades served by the school.

The differing possible combinations of colors on the indicators that apply for each school allow meaningful differentiation of performance for all students and each student group. For example, a school with all Green indicators is higher performing than another school with all Yellow indicators, but lower performing than a third school with all Green indicators except for one Blue indicator.

Similarly, the five distinct levels within Status and Change allow meaningful differentiation within each component used to determine overall performance.

b. Describe the weighting of each indicator in the State's system of annual meaningful differentiation, including how the Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in ELP indicators each receive substantial weight individually and, in the aggregate, much greater weight than the School Quality or Student Success indicator(s), in the aggregate.

For each indicator, "Status" and "Change" have equal weight. In addition, each indicator is given equal weight when meaningfully differentiating schools, with ELA and Mathematics assessments considered as two separate indicators for school differentiation.

Seven of the eleven possible school-level indicators described in this plan are academic. Two of these represent the Status" component in determining a color-coded performance level on a Dashboard indicator, contributing half of the overall color-coded performance levels for two of California's Dashboard indicators (Graduation Rate Indicator and English Learner

Progress Indicator). The "Change" components of these two Dashboard indicators serve as student success indicators. Due to the combination of "Status" and "Change" to determine an overall color-coded performance level for each of California's Dashboard indicators, two-thirds of the overall performance determination within California's system of meaningful differentiation is therefore attributed to academics without devaluing the importance of school quality.

As noted, the differing possible combinations of colors on the indicators that apply for each school allow meaningful differentiation of performance for all students and each student group. For example, a school with all Green indicators is higher performing than another school with all Yellow indicators, but lower performing than a third school with all Green indicators except for one Blue indicator. Accordingly, the academic indicators receive much greater weight, in the aggregate, than the other indicators within California's system of meaningful differentiation.

c. If the States uses a different methodology or methodologies for annual meaningful differentiation than the one described in 4.v.a. above for schools for which an accountability determination cannot be made (*e.g.*, P-2 schools), describe the different methodology or methodologies, indicating the type(s) of schools to which it applies.

California will produce an accountability report for every public school in the state. Schools with less than 30 students will receive data; however, they will not receive a performance level (i.e., a color) consistent with the requirement in ESSA, Section 1111(c)(3)(A)(i) that the state plan describe a minimum n-size to be used for any provisions requiring disaggregation of performance data by student groups and that the minimum n-size be the same for all students and student groups. This will provide small schools with data that they can use to improve student performance.

In addition, California's new accountability system includes LEAs. The indicators used for school accountability will also be applied at the LEA level. As a result, the performance of students in schools with less than 30 students will be rolled up to the LEA level and to the state level, and the performance of those students is used for accountability determinations and identification for assistance of LEAs under state law. California is in the process of developing tools for all LEAs and schools to use for continuous improvement and implementing state law requirements for assistance and intervention for LEAs that are low-performing on the indicators described for the state and additional local indicators that apply only at the LEA level. Schools with less than 30 students will have access to these tools to assist them in their improvement plans. (Note: For privacy purposes results are never displayed for fewer than 11 students.)

For schools that are so small that they do not receive a color-coded performance level on any indicator within the Dashboard (approximately 100 schools in 2017-18), the CDE will review their performance data and other relevant information annually and shall identify them for comprehensive support

and improvement or targeted support and improvement assistance based on any identified performance issues.

California's accountability system uses both "Status" and "Change," which requires two consecutive years of data. Therefore, newly opened schools will not receive performance levels on the state indicators until the second year of data are available. Schools will not be eligible for comprehensive or targeted support until they receive performance levels on the state indicators.

State assessments are administered starting at grade 3. Elementary schools with kindergarten, grade 1, and/or grade 2 students will have their ELA and mathematics reports based on grade 3 results of schools with which they are paired, using the same Distance from Met methodology that is applied to all schools and student groups. Pairing is based on matriculation patterns. For start-up schools, where there is not a matriculation pattern, the grade 3 district average will be used.

vi. Identification of Schools *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D))*

a. Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. Describe the State's methodology for identifying not less than the lowest-performing five percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds in the State for comprehensive support and improvement, including the year in which the State will first identify such schools.

Consistent with the system of meaningful differentiation described in sections A. 4.v.a and A.4.v.b above, California will use the color combinations that schools receive on California School Dashboard indicators to identify the lowest performing 5 percent of Title I schools statewide for comprehensive support.

The selection criteria for the selection of at least the lowest performing of 5 percent of Title I schools is based on all of the following criteria:

- Schools with all red indicators;

- Schools with all red but one indicator of any other color;

- Schools with all red and orange indicators; and

- Schools with five or more indicators where the majority are red.

Based on simulations completed using the fall 2017 Dashboard data, these business rules result in the selection of at least 5 percent of Title I schools statewide. Under this approach, performance on a single indicator is not determinative of selection among the lowest performing 5 percent of Title I schools.

b. Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. Describe the State's methodology for identifying all public high schools in the State failing to graduate one third or more of their students for comprehensive support and improvement, including the year in which the State will first identify such schools.

<Start add>Beginning with the 2019 Dashboard, **<End add>** California will use the average of three years of graduation rate data to identify schools with a high school graduation rate less than **<Start delete>**67 **<End delete>**

<Start add>68**<End add>** percent. Any school with a graduation rate less than **<Start delete>**67**<End delete>** **<Start add>**68**<End add>** percent averaged over three years will be identified for comprehensive assistance. For the **<Start delete>**2018-19 **<End delete>** **<Start add>**2019-20**<End add>** school identification, only two years of data will be used to calculate the graduation rate due **<Start add>**to the use of the extended graduation rate**<End add>** **<Start delete>**to a change in the business rules in response to a U.S. Department of Education Office of Inspector General audit. **<End delete>**

Three years of data will be used to identify schools; therefore, newly opened schools will not be identified for comprehensive support and improvement until the third year of data is available. However, all schools and student groups with a graduation rate below **<Start delete>**67**<End delete>** **<Start add>**68**<End add>** percent will be given the lowest performance level, Red, on the California School Dashboard. This performance level will be used as part of the criteria when determining schools under consideration of comprehensive support in addition to the lowest 5 percent (section A.4.vi.a).

c. <u>Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools</u>. Describe the methodology by which the State identifies public schools in the State receiving Title I, Part A funds that have received additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C) (based on identification as a school in which any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I) using the State's methodology under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)) and that have not satisfied the statewide exit criteria for such schools within a State-determined number of years, including the year in which the State will first identify such schools.

California will determine whether any school identified for additional targeted support, as specified in section A.4.vi.f, did not meet the exit criteria specified in section A.4.viii.b within four years. The earliest that the initial identification of any "additional targeted support" school that did not exit such status for comprehensive support and improvement will occur is fall 2024.

d. <u>Frequency of Identification</u>. Provide, for each type of school identified for comprehensive support and improvement, the frequency with which the State will, thereafter, identify such schools. Note that these schools must be identified at least once every three years.

California will initially identify schools for each type of school identified in consecutive years (fall 2018, **<Start delete>**and**<End delete>** fall 2019 **<Start add>**, fall 2020**<End add>**). **<Start delete>**and then will identify schools once every three years. **<Start delete>** **<Start add>** Schools will be identified in 2019 to ensure that the ELPI is used in assistance and support determinations. Schools will be identified in 2019 to ensure that the incorporation of the participation rate into the Academic Indicator, as required in ESEA section

1111(c)(4)(C), is used in assistance and support determinations. After the 2020 determinations, schools will be identified once every three years. **<End add>**

As discussed in Section iii.C.1 above, California has transitioned to a new English language proficiency test, the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC), in spring 2018. The SBE established cut scores for Status based on the first two year of results, so performance for LEAs and schools on Status **<Start add>**was**<End add>** **<Start delete>**will be**<End delete>** reported in the 2019 California School Dashboard. The frequency of identification described above will ensure that California is able to use the ELPI in assistance and support determinations for LEAs and schools at the earliest point practicable after transition to the new assessment. It also will bring the three-year cycle for school identification into alignment with the timeline for LEAs to develop Local Control Accountability Plans (LCAPs), which is also on a three-year cycle. The next three-year period begins in 2020-21, and the 2019 Dashboard data will inform the LCAP development process.

e. <u>Targeted Support and Improvement</u>. Describe the State's methodology for annually identifying any school with one or more "consistently underperforming" subgroups of students, based on all indicators in the statewide system of annual meaningful differentiation, including the definition used by the State to determine consistent underperformance. *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(C)(iii))*

California's definition of a school with one or more "consistently underperforming" student group" is a school in which any student group both receives at least two color-coded performance ratings on California's Dashboard indicators and, on its own, meets the criteria for being identified for comprehensive support pursuant to section vi(a) above in two consecutive years. The methodology for identifying such schools is to determine whether any student group at a school has the color-coded performance levels on applicable indicators that match the color-coded performance levels used as criteria for identifying the lowest performing schools receiving Title I, Part A funds for comprehensive support in two consecutive years. California will identify schools with one or more "consistently underperforming" student group annually, beginning in 2018-19 (based on data from the 2016-17 and 2017-18 school years).

f. <u>Additional Targeted Support</u>. Describe the State's methodology for identifying schools in which any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I) using the State's methodology under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D), including the year in which the State will first identify such schools and the frequency with which the State will, thereafter, identify such schools. *(ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C)-(D))*

California will identify schools for additional targeted support from among the schools with one of more "consistently underperforming" student group, as specified in section vi(e) above. Schools with one or more "consistently underperforming" student group will be identified for additional targeted support if

any student group at the school, one its own, meets the criteria used to identify the lowest performing Title I schools for comprehensive support.

California will initially identify schools for additional targeted support in consecutive years (fall 2018**<Start delete>** and**<End delete>** fall 2019**<Start add>**, and fall 2020**<End add>**) then will identify schools once every three years. As discussed in Section iii.C.1 above, California **<Start delete>**will **<End delete>** has transitioned to a new English language proficiency test, with the first operational administration of the new summative assessment, the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC), in spring 2018. The SBE **<Start delete>**will be able to**<End delete>** establish**<Start add>**ed**<End add>** cut scores for Status based on the first two years of results, so performance for LEAs and schools on Status **<Start add>**was**<End add>** **<Start delete>**will be**<End delete>** reported in the 2019 California School Dashboard. The frequency of identification described above will ensure that California is able to use the ELPI in assistance and support determinations for LEAs and schools at the earliest point practicable after transitioning to the new assessment.

<Start add>Also, as discussed above, in the event a school or student group has a participation rate below 95 percent, California will assign the lowest possible scale score (LOSS) to the number of students needed to bring the participation rate to 95 percent. The identification of schools in the fall of 2020 will ensure that the LOSS is factored into the participation rate for the Academic Indicator and is used in assistance and support determinations at the earliest point possible. **<End add>**

g. <u>Additional Statewide Categories of Schools</u>. If the State chooses, at its discretion, to include additional statewide categories of schools, describe those categories.

Not applicable.

vii. <u>Annual Measurement of Achievement</u> *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E)(iii))*: Describe how the State factors the requirement for 95 percent student participation in statewide mathematics and reading/language arts assessments into the statewide accountability system.

Schools that do not meet the 95 percent participation rate will have their distance from level 3 score adjusted downward**<Start delete>**to reflect the difference between the actual participation rate and the 95 percent rate target. **<End delete>** **<Start add>**The Lowest Obtainable Scale Score (LOSS) will be assigned for each student needed to bring school, district, and student group to a 95 percent participation rate. The LOSS score will be compared to the lowest possible scale score for Level 3 (Standard Met) to determine Distance from Standard (DFS). These scores will be included in the calculation of the school's and student group's DFS. **<End add>**

viii. <u>Continued Support for School and LEA Improvement</u> *(ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A))*

a. Exit Criteria for Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. Describe the statewide exit criteria, established by the State, for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement, including the number of years (not to exceed four) over which schools are expected to meet such criteria.

The statewide exit criteria are whether the school has improved performance so that it no longer meets the criteria that were used to identify schools for comprehensive support at the time the school was initially identified, with an additional check to ensure that the Status for the indicators with improved performance has increased. Consequently, a school will have to improve its performance across indicators (including an increase in Status in the relevant indicator(s)) so that it no longer has any combination of color-coded performance levels that meet the criteria used for identification at the time the school was identified. If the school's color-coded performance levels for the current year match the color combinations used to identify schools for comprehensive support when the school was initially identified, it has not met the exit criteria.

Schools are expected to meet these exit criteria within four years from initial identification.

b. Exit Criteria for Schools Receiving Additional Targeted Support. Describe the statewide exit criteria, established by the State, for schools receiving additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C), including the number of years over which schools are expected to meet such criteria.

The statewide exit criteria are whether the performance of the student group(s) at the school has improved so that it no longer meets the criteria that were used to identify these schools for additional targeted support at the time the school was initially identified, with an additional check to ensure that the Status for the indicators with improved performance has increased. Consequently, a school will have to improve its performance across indicators (including an increase in Status for the relevant indicator(s)) for the relevant student group(s) so that it no longer has any combination of color-coded performance levels that meet the criteria used for identification at the time the school was identified. If the school's color-coded performance levels for the current year match the color combinations used to identify schools for additional targeted support when the school was initially identified, it has not met the exit criteria.

Schools are expected to meet these exit criteria within four years from initial identification.

c. More Rigorous Interventions. Describe the more rigorous interventions required for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement that fail to meet the State's exit criteria within a State-determined number of years consistent with section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i)(I) of the ESEA.

California's Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), enacted in 2013, fundamentally changed how all local educational agencies (LEAs) in the state are funded, how they are measured for results, and the services and supports they receive to allow all students to succeed to their greatest potential. California is committed to aligning state and federal education policies to the greatest extent possible to develop an integrated local, state, and federal accountability and continuous improvement system grounded in the LCFF. Under the LCFF, LEAs are held accountable for improving student performance. Specifically, LCFF sets eight priorities for school districts and charter schools (ten for county offices of education) that LEAs must address in Local Control and Accountability Plans (LCAPs). Informed by performance data provided through the California School Dashboard, LCAPs describe each LEA's overall vision for students, annual goals, and specific actions that will be taken to achieve the vision and goals.

To ensure that federally funded goals and activities are aligned to state priorities and to streamline and to align local planning processes to the greatest extent possible, the CDE, in collaboration with LEA representatives, has designed a new approach to meeting federal planning requirements within the context of the LCAP process—the LCAP Addendum. The addendum is intended to supplement the LCAP, just as Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) funds are intended to supplement state funds.

California's System of Support

California is building a statewide system of support that will help LEAs and their schools meet the needs of each student they serve, with a focus on building local capacity to sustain improvement and to effectively address disparities in opportunities and outcomes. Inspired by the conceptual framework behind a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS), California's statewide system of support will align state and regional resources to support improvement for all schools and districts. This multi-tiered approach will provide support to LEAs and schools within California's integrated local, state, and federal accountability and continuous improvement system. It builds on three levels of supports: Support for All LEAs and Schools, Differentiated Assistance, and Intensive Intervention, as shown in Table 27 below.

Table 26. Overview of California's Support System

Level of Support	Description of Supports Available
Support for All LEAs and Schools (Level 1)	Various state and local agencies provide an array of support resources, tools, and voluntary technical assistance that all LEAs may use to improve student performance at the LEA and school level and narrow disparities among student groups across the LCFF priorities, including recognition for success and the ability to share promising practices.

Level of Support	Description of Supports Available
Differentiated Assistance (Level 2)	County superintendents (or the Superintendent of Public Instruction/California Department of Education, when provided to county offices of education) and the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence provide differentiated assistance for LEAs in the form of individually designed technical assistance, to address identified performance issues, including significant disparities in performance among student groups.
Intensive Intervention (Level 3)	The Superintendent of Public Instruction may require more intensive interventions for LEAs with persistent performance issues and a lack of improvement over a specified time period.

The first level of support will provide all LEAs and schools with early support so that they do not require more intensive assistance in the second and third levels of support, based on low performance. The California School Dashboard will provide all LEAs and schools with data regarding student performance on the state and local performance indicators and will highlight disparities among student groups on those indicators. This will guide LEAs and schools as they review and update their LCAPs annually and address school-level planning and improvement requirements.

The second level of support will provide differentiated assistance to LEAs including any LEA with a school identified for comprehensive support that does not meet the exit criteria within four years of identification.

Three primary statewide teams provide the foundation for the statewide system of support: the California Department of Education (CDE), California's county offices of education (COEs), and the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence (CCEE), with the State Board of Education (SBE) playing a central policy role. These entities have key roles in providing supports to help all LEAs and schools improve and are given statutory responsibility for providing more focused, evidence-based interventions and assistance for LEAs that are struggling. Critical roles will also be played by multiple stakeholders in the full system of support including other state entities (i.e., the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing and California Subject Matter Project), labor, state associations, researchers, non-profit organizations, institutions of higher education, philanthropy, and coalitions. Systematic collaboration and coordination among all of these entities will facilitate coherent technical assistance and support at the local level and ensure alignment of efforts to continuously improve student outcomes.

California's educational system is founded on the belief that the LEA is the primary unit of change and plays the central role in supporting schools to

implement and sustain improvement efforts. California's diversity requires more than a "one size fits all solution" to help LEAs and schools successfully implement continuous improvement efforts and meet the needs of all learners, particularly those students most in need. Although they will be differentiated to meet local needs to the greatest extent possible, all of California's supports and interventions for schools and districts will be implemented within the larger context of this statewide system of support.

California will monitor the implementation of the supports described below and throughout the State Plan and will make improvements, based on LEA and stakeholder feedback, or additions as new, vetted resources and strategies become available. As part of the statewide system of support, California will incorporate ESSA and state resources to the greatest extent possible to ensure that Title I LEAs and schools identified as needing additional assistance have the necessary support to develop or strengthen integrated and coherent processes and procedures that lead to successful continuous improvement of student outcomes.

Intensive Interventions

Schools that are identified for comprehensive support and intervention (CSI) that do not meet exit criteria within four years from initial identification will be eligible for more rigorous, or intensive, interventions within the system of support described above. Specifically, the LEA will become eligible for differentiated assistance (Level 2), with the assistance focused particularly on helping the LEA improve in its ability to support its schools in general, and the school that did not meet the exit criteria in particular. The support provided will focus on building LEA capacity to identify issues that impact student learning and to implement interventions and strategies with only the strongest evidence that addresses those issues. This approach is grounded in working with local educators and stakeholders to analyze data and identify strengths, weaknesses, and goals, and provide ongoing performance and progress monitoring to build internal accountability with evidence of improvement.

Any LEA with schools that fail to meet exit criteria after four years will be required to **partner with an external entity, agency, or individual** with demonstrated expertise and capacity to conduct a deep, comprehensive, evidence-based review of the LEA and school. More rigorous interventions will include, but not be limited to, the following activities:

* LEAs will partner with an external entity, agency, or individual to conduct a new comprehensive and/or segmented **needs assessment** that focuses on systemic factors and conduct a deep **root cause analysis** that identifies gaps between current conditions and desired conditions in student performance and progress.

* LEAs will continue to partner with an external entity, agency, or individual to utilize the results of the deep root cause analysis along with stakeholder feedback to develop a **new improvement plan** that includes a prioritized set of more rigorous interventions and strategies that have demonstrated

impact or that are supported by the strongest or moderate levels of evidence. The amended plan will include a **program evaluation** component with support to conduct more rigorous **ongoing performance and progress monitoring**, as well as to build internal accountability with evidence of improvement.

d. <u>Resource Allocation Review</u>. Describe how the State will periodically review resource allocation to support school improvement in each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement.

California will periodically review resource allocation to those LEAs and schools identified for CSI and targeted support and improvement (TSI). The state will assist the COEs to work with LEA and school leaders and local stakeholders to identify the resources and supports available through existing local, state, and federal programs and to maximize the utility of those resources by aligning, reconfiguring, and streamlining them. Based on locally identified needs, gaps in resources or capacity to provide support or opportunities to redirect existing resources to more effectively meet needs may be identified.

Based on available data, elements of the process may include, but are not limited to, the following activities:

- **Comprehensive Support and Improvement Review**: California will review and approve initial CSI plans, including a review of how the LEA will address identified resource inequities.

- **Targeted Support and Improvement Review Supports**: California will provide guidance and templates to support development, review, and approval of initial TSI plans, which may be incorporated in the Single Plan for Student Achievement and will include a review of how the LEA will address identified resource inequities.

- **Consolidated Application Reporting System (CARS)**: The CDE will revise and periodically review resource allocation pages in the CARS for LEAs with a significant number of schools identified for CSI and TSI.

- **Federal Program Monitoring**: The CDE will annually review selected LEAs, including LEAs with a significant number of schools identified for CSI and TSI, for resource allocation inequities, strategies designed to resolve resource allocation inequities, and progress in resolving resource allocation inequities. This process may include technical assistance and support for program strategies.

- **Differentiated Assistance**: California will provide assistance to LEAs and schools identified for CSI and TSI with more intensive and differentiated assistance focused on LEAs with a significant number of

schools identified for CSI and TSI with the intent to build LEA capacity
to identify, correct, and monitor the resolution of resource inequities.

e.   Technical Assistance. Describe the technical assistance the State will provide to each
      LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for
      comprehensive or targeted support and improvement.

Foundational Technical Assistance and Support

California will support all LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A to
continuously improve student outcomes by providing planning supports,
reviewing plans, and monitoring the implementation of plans. In addition to these
formal processes, California will also provide to Title I LEAs a Title I, Part A
Guidance document, technical assistance, statewide conferences and local
institutes, and an online collection of resources and strategies that support
continuous improvement. All of these supports and strategies are described
below. Supports for LEAs with a significant number of schools identified for CSI
and TSI will be differentiated to address specific local needs.

Supporting the Development of LCAP Addenda

Title I LEAs will be required to submit to the state educational agency (SEA) a
LCAP Addendum, which addresses all of the local planning requirements under
the ESSA and serves as the LEA Plan. In its LCAP Addendum, each LEA will
describe how it is leveraging Title I, Part A funds to improve student outcomes.
California will provide all Title I LEAs with a Title I, Part A Guidance document
containing recommendations for addressing the local planning requirements in
the ESSA.

Reviewing LCAP Addenda

In reviewing LCAP Addenda, the SEA will only approve LEA plans that include
descriptions regarding how the LEA will use ESSA funds to supplement goals
and priorities identified in the LEA's LCAP. If the LEA's response is insufficient,
California will return the LCAP Addendum with suggestions for ways to
strengthen the LEA's response based on the recommendations in the Title I, Part
A Guidance document. California will provide the LEA with a designated expert
point of contact at the state and regional levels with whom they can discuss
these recommendations and be supported to develop a stronger LCAP
Addendum.

Monitoring Title I LEAs

California provides a coordinated and transparent federal program monitoring
(FPM) process to ensure Title I LEAs are meeting program requirements and
spending program funds appropriately as required by law. All LEAs in the state
are divided into four cohorts. Two cohorts are subject to review each year. Thus,
the CDE's FPM process includes a data review of 50 percent of the LEAs in the
state to identify and conduct a total of 125 LEA on-site and online reviews during
any given year. The remaining 50 percent of the LEAs in the state receive the

data review the following year. A description of the FPM process, LEAs identified in each cohort, LEAs selected for online or on-site reviews, and program instruments can be found on the CDE Compliance Monitoring Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/cr/.

Through the FPM process, Title I LEAs will have access to resources, instruments, training, and state and regional staff experts that will support them to prepare for the monitoring process, and, upon completion of the monitoring process, address any findings that suggest the LEA is not meeting Title I, Part A requirements.

Providing Technical Assistance

California will provide technical assistance to Title I LEAs who have questions or need support to develop or implement plans. California will provide the LEA with designated expert points of contact at the state and regional levels with whom they can discuss topics such as coordinating resources, information, and supports to address identified needs at school sites. This technical assistance will be provided through timely and responsive phone or e-mail correspondence.

Statewide Conferences and Local Institutes

California will provide and sponsor regular statewide meetings, conferences, and local institutes that will include presentations, workshops, and facilitated Q and A sessions by national, state, and local leaders to facilitate sharing and dissemination of best practices and develop productive relationships with colleagues from across the state.

Online Collection of Resources and Strategies

To ensure continuous access and consistent guidance to Title I LEAs, the CDE will make available an online collection of resources that support school improvement. The Web site will include the guidance document described above, frequently asked questions and answers regarding school improvement, and contact information for regional and statewide technical assistance.

Targeted/Focused Technical Assistance and Support

California will provide differentiated and responsive technical assistance and support to LEAs with significant numbers of for schools that have been identified for CSI or TSI that is designed to build LEA capacity to support local school improvement efforts. Using a systemic approach to problem solving, California will focus technical assistance and support in three key areas: needs assessment and root cause analysis, improvement planning and evidence-based decision-making, and performance and progress monitoring, which is aligned to the general approach to technical assistance for LEAs identified for support under LCFF and broader school improvement strategies for schools identified for comprehensive and targeted supports. A description of the three key areas of technical assistance and support is provided below.

Needs Assessment and Root Cause Analysis

A well-designed and executed needs assessment lays the foundation for a strong improvement plan with interventions that are not only evidence-based but have been proven effective. California will provide resources and tools to support LEAs as they design and complete needs assessments for various school improvement efforts. Information will include a process for engaging stakeholders and examining student, school, and educator needs, as well as potential root causes of gaps between current practice and desired outcomes for student performance and progress. Technical assistance will focus on helping school districts understand the relationship between school-level needs assessments and root cause analysis and the connection to broader system-wide improvement. This understanding will strengthen improvement planning, implementation, and performance and progress monitoring.

Improvement Planning and Evidence-based Decision-making

California will provide resources to support LEAs in developing improvement strategies based on evidence-based interventions and determining whether specific evidence-based strategies meet the specific needs and context of the school. This will include providing access to planning tools and guidance documents, and highlighting promising or proven planning strategies and interventions being implemented by LEAs.

In addition, California will direct LEAs to databases, clearinghouses, and guidance documents that outline processes for reviewing and selecting interventions on the basis of their evidence and relevance to local context and needs.

Performance and Progress Monitoring

California will provide school districts with opportunities to participate in meetings and trainings focused on monitoring and evaluating the impact of evidence-based interventions. To support this work, California will make available resources to support ongoing evaluation and program review that LEAs can use to conduct interim progress checks.

f. Additional Optional Action. If applicable, describe the action the State will take to initiate additional improvement in any LEA with a significant number or percentage of schools that are consistently identified by the State for comprehensive support and improvement and are not meeting exit criteria established by the State or in any LEA with a significant number or percentage of schools implementing targeted support and improvement plans.

Not applicable.

1. Disproportionate Rates of Access to Educators (*ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B)):* Describe how low-income and minority children enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are not served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers, and the

measures the SEA will use to evaluate and publicly report the progress of the SEA with respect to such description.[5]

Evaluating and Reporting Disproportionate Rates of Access to Educators Under the No Child Left Behind Act

California's 2016 State Plan to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators (2016 equity plan), available on the California Department of Education (CDE) Educator Excellence Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/pd/ee/, includes California's most recent data regarding the rates at which low-income and minority children enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are served at disproportionate rates by unqualified, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers. The definitions provided in Table 28 below were used to collect relevant teacher and student data and calculate disproportionate rates of access to educators (or equity gaps) to meet requirements under the 2001 reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, No Child Left Behind (NCLB).

Table 27. California Definitions for Purposes of Collecting Equity Data Under NCLB

Term	Definition
Unqualified teacher	A teacher who is assigned based on the issuance of a Provisional Intern Permit (PIP), Short-term Staff Permit (STSP), or Variable or Short-term Waiver.
Out-of-field teacher	A teacher who holds a Limited Assignment Teaching Permit.
Inexperienced teacher	A teacher who has two or fewer years of teaching experience.
Minority student	A student who is American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, African American, Filipino, Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander, Hispanic, or Two or More Races Not Hispanic.
Low-income student	A student who is eligible to receive Free or Reduced-Price Meals. These students are referred to as socioeconomically disadvantaged (SED) throughout the plan.

For the 2016 equity plan, the CDE used data collected via the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS), data collected by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC), and *CalEdFacts* to create data profiles that provide information regarding the rates at which low-income and minority children are taught by unqualified, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers compared to the rates at which other children are taught by these teachers.

---

[5] Consistent with ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B), this description should not be construed as requiring a State to develop or implement a teacher, principal or other school leader evaluation system.

At the request of stakeholders, and to provide a more precise depiction of statewide gaps, the plan includes equity gap data with California's 10,453 schools organized by student demographics into deciles. The 1,002 schools in decile 1 were compared to the 1,002 schools in decile 10.

A summary of disproportionate rates of access to educators as described in the 2016 equity plan is provided in Table 29 below.

Table 28. Summary of Equity Gaps Described in California's 2016 Equity Plan

Term	Equity Gap
Inexperienced Teachers by Minority Decile	13.5 percent of teachers in California's schools with the highest percentage of minority students had been teaching for 2 or fewer years, while 10.1 percent of teachers in schools with the lowest percentage of minority students have been teaching for 2 or fewer years. This represents an equity gap of 3.4 percent.
Inexperienced Teachers by SED Decile	14.3 percent of teachers in schools with the highest percentage of SED students have been teaching for 2 or fewer years, while 9.4 percent of teachers in schools with the lowest percentage of SED students have been teaching for 2 or fewer years. This represents an equity gap of 4.9 percent.
Unqualified Teachers by Minority Decile	2.2 percent of teachers in schools with the highest percentage of minority students hold a PIP, STSP, or Waiver; while 0.8 percent of teachers in schools with the lowest percentage of minority students hold a PIP, STSP, or Waiver. This represents an equity gap of 1.4 percent.
Unqualified Teachers by SED Decile	2 percent of teachers in schools with the highest percentage of SED students hold a PIP, STSP, or Waiver; while 1 percent of teachers in schools with the lowest percentage of SED students hold a PIP, STSP, or Waiver. This represents an equity gap of 1 percent.
Out-of-field Teachers by Minority Decile	0.7 percent of teachers in schools with the highest percentage of minority students held a Limited Assignment Permit, while 0.5 percent of teachers in schools with the lowest percentage of minority students hold a Limited Assignment Permit. This represents an equity gap of 0.2 percent.
Out-of-field Teachers by SED Decile	0.6 percent of teachers in schools with the highest percentage of SED students held a Limited Assignment Permit, while 0.4 percent of teachers in schools with the lowest percentage of SED students hold a Limited Assignment Permit. This represents an equity gap of 0.2 percent.

Evaluating and Reporting Equity Gaps Under the Every Student Succeeds Act

California's Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), enacted in 2013, fundamentally changed how all local educational agencies (LEAs) in the state are funded, how they are measured for results, and the services and supports they receive to allow all students to succeed to their greatest potential. California is committed to aligning state and federal

education policies to the greatest extent possible to develop an integrated local, state, and federal accountability and continuous improvement system grounded in the LCFF.

Under the LCFF, LEAs are held accountable for improving student performance. Specifically, California's LCFF-based system sets eight priorities for school districts and charter schools (ten for county offices of education). LCFF Priority 1 recognizes that LEAs should be accountable for providing all students with access to standards-aligned instructional materials, facilities that are in good repair, and teachers who hold teaching credentials and are appropriately assigned (have official certification for the position in which they are teaching). Teachers are not appropriately assigned if they are placed in a position for which the employee does not hold a legally recognized certificate or credential or if placed in a certificated teaching or services position that the employee is not otherwise authorized by statute to hold. State law provides that teachers in charter schools shall hold a certificate, permit, or other document equivalent to that which a teacher in other public schools would be required to hold, but grants charter schools credentialing flexibility with regard to non-core, non-college preparatory courses.[5]

Under NCLB, California did not collect data regarding teacher effectiveness, nor did the state have a definition for the term "ineffective teacher." The CDE has consulted with diverse stakeholders regarding the most appropriate approach for addressing the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) requirement to evaluate and publicly report data regarding "ineffective" teachers and the students they serve.

To meet ESSA requirements, California's definition for "ineffective teacher" builds on LCFF Priority 1 by focusing on credential and assignment status – specifically whether teachers are not appropriately assigned or are teaching without a credential – while recognizing the flexibility afforded charter schools under state law. California will meet the requirement by reporting – at the school and district levels and statewide – data illustrating the various credential statuses recognized by state law and teacher misassignments and any equity gaps that may exist within each status. The data profile will include:

- The percent of teachers who are holding either preliminary or clear credentials;

- The percent of teachers with intern credentials;

- The percent of teachers who are misassigned; and

- The percent of teachers with emergency permits, provisional permits, or waivers.

Under the ESSA, the definitions provided in Table 13 below will be used to collect relevant teacher and student data and calculate equity gaps.

Table 29. California Definitions for Purposes of Collecting Equity Data Under ESSA[6]

Term	Definition
Ineffective teacher	**<Start delete>**~~A teacher who is: (a) misassigned (placed in a position for which the employee does not hold a legally recognized certificate or credential or a certificated employee placed in a teaching or services position in which the employee is not otherwise authorized by statute to serve), or (b) teaching without a credential~~**<End delete>** **<Start add>**An ineffective teacher is any of the following: • An individual whose assignment is legally authorized by an emergency permit that does not require possession of a full teaching license; or • A teacher who holds a teaching credential but does not possess a permit or authorization that temporarily allows them to teach outside of their credentialed area (misassigned); or • An individual who holds no credential, permit, or authorization to teach in California. Under this definition, teachers with the following limited emergency permits would be considered ineffective: • Provisional Internship Permits, • Short-Term Staff Permits • Variable Term Waivers Substitute permits or Teaching Permits for Statutory Leave (TPSL) holders serving as the teacher of record**<End add>**

---

[6] California *Education Code (EC)* Section 47605(l) states that teachers in charter schools shall hold a CTC certificate, permit, or other document equivalent to that which a teacher in other public schools would be required to hold. However, *EC* Section 47605(l) grants charter schools credentialing flexibility with regard to non-core, non-college preparatory courses. Therefore, the ESSA required definitions and approach to reporting data for ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers will account for the statutory flexibility afforded to charter schools under state law.

Term	Definition
Out-of-field teacher	**\<Start delete\>**~~A teacher who has not yet demonstrated subject matter competence in the subject area(s) or for the student population to which he or she is assigned. Under this definition, teachers with the following limited permits would be considered out-of-field:~~ • ~~General Education Limited Assignment Permit (GELAP)~~ ~~Special Education Limited Assignment Permit (SELAP)~~ **\<End delete\>** **\<Start add\>**A credentialed out-of-field teacher is: A credentialed teacher who has not yet demonstrated subject matter competence in the subject area(s) or for the student population to which he or she is assigned. Under this definition, the following limited permits will be considered out of field: • General Education Limited Assignment Permit (GELAP) • Special Education Limited Assignment Permit (SELAP) • Short-Term Waivers • Emergency English Learner or Bilingual Authorization Permits • Local Assignment Options **\<End add\>**
Inexperienced teacher	A teacher who has two or fewer years of teaching experience.
Minority student	A student who is American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, African American, Filipino, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic, or Two or More Races Not Hispanic.
Low-income student	A student who is eligible to receive Free or Reduced-Price Meals.

California is currently determining the process through which teacher misassignment data will be collected. Once the process has been clarified, and no later than spring 2019, the CDE will use data collected via the CALPADS, data collected by the CTC, and *CalEdFacts* to create data profiles that provide information regarding the rates at which low-income and minority children are taught by teachers in the credential and assignment statuses recognized by state law, consistent with the ineffective teacher definition, out-of-field teachers, and inexperienced teachers, compared to the rates at which other children are taught by these types of teachers. The data profile will include comparisons for each of these components. To provide a more precise depiction of equity gaps, California will continue to organize data by deciles.

Each year, the CDE will use this data to evaluate equity gaps and prepare a report that communicates the state's progress toward eliminating equity gaps. The report will be provided to the State Board of Education and posted on CDE Web pages.

Beyond the evaluation and public reporting of equity gaps, California will take a number of steps to ensure that low-income and minority children enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are not served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers. Under ESSA Section 1112(b)(2), each LEA is required to submit a plan to the state educational agency (SEA) that describes how it will identify and address any disparities that result in low-income students and minority students being taught at higher rates than other students by ineffective, inexperienced, or out-of-field teachers. Beginning in the 2018–19 school year, LEAs will need to address this provision in the LCAP Addendum. The LCAP is the LEA strategic planning document that is submitted every three years and updated annually, while the Addendum ensures LEAs are meeting federal planning requirements and is submitted to the SEA for approval. In reviewing LCAP Addenda, the SEA will only approve LEA plans that include descriptions about how the LEA will identify and address any disparities that result in low-income students and minority students being taught at higher rates than other students by ineffective, inexperienced, or out-of-field teachers. If the LEA's response is insufficient, California will return the LCAP Addendum with suggestions for ways to strengthen the LEA's response.

Further, once updates to California's procedures for calculating, reporting, and evaluating equitable access to teachers are completed and new procedures have been established, the CDE will provide training to the relevant state and local educational agencies to promote statewide understanding of the new requirements as they relate to the LCAP process and to provide support in informing LEAs about the new teacher equity reporting process. State and county educational agencies within the statewide system of support will collaborate to develop and provide resources, tools, support, and technical assistance regarding teacher equity issues that will be available to all LEAs (Level 1 supports). These agencies will also develop and provide needs assessment, root cause analysis, improvement planning, evidence-based decision making, and performance and progress monitoring tools and training that is differentiated to the needs of LEAs that have been identified as having persistent teacher equity gaps (Level 2 supports). LEAs will also be provided with expert points of contact at the state and regional levels with whom they can discuss available guidance and be supported to develop strong teacher equity plans.

Table 30. 2014–15 Inexperienced Teachers for Title I Schools by Minority Student Enrollment

Quartile Rank for Title I Schools	Number of schools	Total Student Enrollment	Minority Student Enrollment	Percent of Minority Student Enrollment	Total Teachers	Number of Inexperienced Teachers	Percent of Inexperienced Teachers
Quartile 1	1,616	777,822	400,462	51.5%	40,914	4,874	11.9%
Quartile 2	1,611	1,017,172	849,284	83.5%	48,509	5,978	12.3%
Quartile 3	1,614	1,052,844	1,000,984	95.1%	49,811	5,916	11.9%
Quartile 4	1,613	1,030,616	1,019,670	98.9%	48,882	6,236	12.8%
Title I Total	6,454	3,878,454	3,270,400	84.3%	188,116	23,004	12.2%
Statewide Total	10,028	6,224,433	4,697,286	75.5%	300,997	35,525	11.8%

Table 31. 2014–15 Out of Field Teachers for Title I Schools by Minority Student Enrollment

Quartile Rank for Title I Schools	Number of Schools	Total Student Enrollment	Minority Student Enrollment	Percent of Minority Student Enrollment	Total Teachers	Number of Out of Field Teachers	Percent of Out of Field Teachers
Quartile 1	1,616	777,822	400,462	51.5%	40,914	226	0.6%
Quartile 2	1,611	1,017,172	849,284	83.5%	48,509	327	0.7%
Quartile 3	1,614	1,052,844	1,000,984	95.1%	49,811	327	0.7%
Quartile 4	1,613	1,030,616	1,019,670	98.9%	48,882	354	0.7%
Title I Total	6,454	3,878,454	3,270,400	84.3%	188,116	1,234	0.7%
Statewide Total	10,028	6,224,433	4,697,286	75.5%	300,997	1,953	0.6%

Table 32. 2014–15 Inexperienced Teachers for Title I Schools by Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Student Enrollment

Quartile Rank for Title I Schools	Number of schools	Total Student Enrollment	Socio-economically Disadvantaged Student Enrollment	Percent of Socio-economically Disadvantaged Student Enrollment	Total Teachers	Number of Inexperienced Teachers	Percent of Inexperienced Teachers
Quartile 1	1,613	966,149	447,575	46.3%	48,601	5,417	11.1%
Quartile 2	1,614	966,758	727,573	75.3%	46,376	5,785	12.5%
Quartile 3	1,614	996,175	868,422	87.2%	47,390	5,803	12.2%
Quartile 4	1,613	949,372	902,922	95.1%	45,749	5,999	13.1%
Title I Total	6,454	3,878,454	2,946,492	76.0%	188,116	23,004	12.2%
Statewide Total	10,028	6,224,433	3,760,569	60.4%	300,997	35,525	11.8%

Table 34.2014–15 Out of Field Teachers for Title I Schools by Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Student Enrollment

Quartile Rank for Title I Schools	Number of schools	Total Student Enrollment	Socio-economically Disadvantaged Student Enrollment	Percent of Socio-economically Disadvantaged Student Enrollment	Total Teachers	Number of Out of Field Teachers	Percent of Out of Field Teachers
Quartile 1	1,613	966,149	447,575	46.3%	48,601	284	0.6%
Quartile 2	1,614	966,758	727,573	75.3%	46,376	353	0.8%
Quartile 3	1,614	996,175	868,422	87.2%	47,390	351	0.7%
Quartile 4	1,613	949,372	902,922	95.1%	45,749	246	0.5%
Title I Total	6,454	3,878,454	2,946,492	76.0%	188,116	1,234	0.7%
Statewide Total	10,028	6,224,433	3,760,569	60.4%	300,997	1,953	0.6%

Table 34. 2014–15 Unqualified Teachers by Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Student Enrollment

School Type	Number of schools	Total Student Enrollment	Socio-economically Disadvantaged Student Enrollment	Percent of Socio-economically Disadvantaged Student Enrollment	Total Teachers	Number of Unqualified Teachers	Percent of Unqualified Teachers
Title I	6,454	3,878,454	2,946,492	76.0%	188,116	2,940	1.6%
Non-Title I	3,574	2,345,979	814,077	34.7%	112,881	1,555	1.4%
Statewide Total	10,028	6,224,433	3,760,569	60.4%	300,997	4,495	1.5%

Table 35. 2014–15 Out of Field Teachers by Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Student Enrollment

School Type	Number of schools	Total Student Enrollment	Socio-economically Disadvantaged Student Enrollment	Percent of Socio-economically Disadvantaged Student Enrollment	Total Teachers	Number of Out of Field Teachers	Percent of Out of Field Teachers
Title I	6,454	3,878,454	2,946,492	76.0%	188,116	1,234	0.7%
Non-Title I	3,574	2,345,979	814,077	34.7%	112,881	719	0.6%
Statewide Total	10,028	6,224,433	3,760,569	60.4%	300,997	1,953	0.6%

6. <u>School Conditions</u> (*ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(C)):* Describe how the SEA agency will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A to improve school conditions for student learning, including through reducing: (i) incidences of bullying and harassment; (ii) the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom; and (iii) the use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety.

California's Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF)-based system sets eight priorities for school districts and charter schools (ten for county offices of education) and places significant emphasis on the improvement of school conditions for student learning. State Priority 6 specifically focuses on School Climate and requires local educational agencies

(LEAs) to support the development of positive school climate through their Local Control and Accountability Plans (LCAPs) while considering suspension rates, pupil expulsion rates, and other local measures, including surveys of pupils, parents, and teachers on the sense of safety and school connectedness.

Progress for each of the LCFF priorities is tracked through state and local indicators adopted by the State Board of Education (SBE). Suspension rates have been selected as a state indicator and are used as a measure of school quality. California's strong commitment to the improvement of school conditions for student learning is further underscored by its selection of chronic absence as its additional kindergarten through grade eight (K–8) academic measure under the ESSA. This is a reflection of the state's understanding of the correlation of chronic absence with academic achievement and its utility as a key indicator of student risk. LEAs will use information regarding suspension rates and chronic absenteeism, provided annually via the California School Dashboard, to assess and continuously improve their local plans to improve school conditions for student learning.

California will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A to improve school conditions by providing planning supports, reviewing plans, and monitoring the implementation of plans that address school conditions including through reducing incidences of bullying and harassment; the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom; and the use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety. In addition to these formal processes, California will also provide to Title I LEAs a Title I, Part A Guidance document, technical assistance, statewide conferences and local institutes, and an online collection and resource exchange of strategies that support improved school climate. All of these supports and strategies are described below.

State Educational Agency Support for Title I LEAs

Supporting the Development of LCAP Addenda

Title I LEAs will be required to submit to the state educational agency (SEA) an LCAP Addendum, which addresses all of the local planning requirements under the ESSA and serves as the LEA Plan. In its LCAP Addendum, each LEA will describe, among other things, how it will improve school conditions for learning and specifically how it will support efforts to reduce the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom.

To support Title I LEAs in developing plans to improve school conditions for student learning, California will provide all Title I LEAs with a Title I, Part A Guidance document that will contain strategies for addressing the local planning requirements in the ESSA, including strategies to improve school conditions and reduce the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom. The strategies California will provide to Title I LEAs are described in the "State Identified Strategies for Title I LEAs" section below.

Reviewing LCAP Addenda

In reviewing LCAP Addenda, California will only approve LEA plans that include descriptions regarding how the LEA will improve school conditions for student learning and address the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom. If the LEA's response is insufficient, California will return the LCAP Addendum with suggestions for ways to strengthen the LEA's response based on the information in the Title I, Part A Guidance document. California will provide the LEA with a designated expert point of contact at the state and regional levels with whom they can discuss this guidance and be supported to develop a stronger LCAP Addendum.

Monitoring Title I LEAs

California provides a coordinated and transparent federal program monitoring (FPM) process to ensure Title I LEAs are meeting program requirements and spending program funds appropriately as required by law. All LEAs in the state are divided into four cohorts. Two cohorts are subject to review each year. Thus, the California Department of Education's (CDE's) FPM process includes a data review of 50 percent of the LEAs in the state to identify and conduct a total of 125 LEA on-site and online reviews during any given year. The remaining 50 percent of the LEAs in the state receive the data review the following year. A description of the FPM process, LEAs identified in each cohort, LEAs selected for online or on-site reviews, and program instruments can be found on the CDE Compliance Monitoring Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/cr/.

Through the FPM process, Title I LEAs will have access to resources, instruments, training, and state and regional staff experts that will support them to prepare for the monitoring process, and, upon completion of the monitoring process, address any findings that suggest the LEA is not meeting Title I, Part A requirements.

Providing Technical Assistance

Designated state and regional staff will be responsible for providing technical assistance to Title I LEAs who have questions or need support to develop or implement plans to improve school conditions. This technical assistance will be provided through timely and responsive phone or e-mail correspondence.

Statewide Conferences and Local Institutes

California will sponsor regular statewide conferences and local institutes that will include presentations, workshops, and Q and A sessions by national, state, and local leaders to help disseminate best practices to and with Title I LEAs to improve or refine services and supports to improve school conditions for student learning, reduce incidences of bullying and harassment, reduce the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom, and reduce the use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety.

Online Collection of Resources and Strategies

To ensure continuous access and consistent guidance to Title I LEAs, the CDE will make available an online collection of resources and strategies that support school

improvement. The Web site will include the guidance document described above, frequently asked questions and answers regarding school improvement, and contact information for regional and statewide technical assistance.

State Identified Strategies for Title I LEAs

As part of California's emerging statewide system of support, described in the State Plan section A.4.viii.c, the CDE and its partners will utilize the processes described above to provide the following strategies and resources to Title I LEAs to improve school conditions for student learning.

Implementation of the strategies listed to improve school conditions will contribute to a positive school climate with infrequent incidences of bullying and harassment, more positive discipline practices, and student health and safety. Additional strategies that the CDE provides for schools and LEAs to specifically address bullying and harassment, positive discipline practices, and student health and safety are described at the end of this section.

Strategies to Improve School Conditions for Student Learning

The **California School Climate, Health, and Learning Survey (CAL-SCHLS) System** is comprised of three interrelated surveys developed for and supported by the CDE: the California Healthy Kids Survey, the California School Staff Survey, and the California School Parent Survey. These surveys provide schools and districts with critical information about the learning and teaching environment, the health and well-being of students, and supports for parents, school staff, and students that foster learning and school success. More information is available on the WestEd California Survey System Web page at http://cal-schls.wested.org/.

The use of a **Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)** will also improve school conditions for student learning in Title I LEAs. MTSS is a research-based system utilized in California schools to promote the building of a stronger student academic and behavioral support system at the local level. California will provide technical assistance to Title I educators through the processes, events, and resources described above in aligning their systems of student support at both district and site levels using the MTSS framework for a system-wide approach that promotes deeper knowledge of differentiated instruction to support the needs of all learners and provide targeted support for struggling learners. The MTSS model expands California's Response to Instruction and Intervention approach by aligning all systems of high-quality first instruction (using Universal Design for Learning principles and appropriate supports, strategies, and accommodations) and provides a framework to plan for intervention using a three-tiered approach. The model also includes structures for building, changing, and sustaining systems, and developing well-designed assessment processes and progress monitoring to allow for data-based problem solving in instruction and decision making. MTSS aids systematic change through intentional design and redesign of services and supports that quickly identify and match the needs of all students in general education contexts.

California has awarded a grant to two collaborating county offices of education with the intent of developing and scaling up a **MTSS framework** statewide. This framework will

continue the state's work to support implementation of MTSS as critical strategy to improve school conditions for student learning and will provide resources for Title I LEAs.

California has established several work groups focused on developing policy recommendations and tools to support implementation of programs and evaluating the effectiveness of programs designed to reduce incidences of bullying and harassment, the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom, and the use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety. The CDE formed the **School Conditions and Climate Working Group (CCWG)** to explore options for the further advancement of school conditions and climate measures and support tools. The CDE has joined a group of eight states that share information, best practices, and promising tools and ideas in the interest of building strong **Social and Emotional Learning (SEL)** in schools across their states. The CDE has developed and promotes a **Family Engagement Framework** and convened an **Ad Hoc Family Engagement Work Group** to foster regular, meaningful two-way communication between the CDE and family engagement stakeholders to inform statewide family engagement initiatives and improve technical assistance to LEAs.

Strategies to Reduce Incidences of Bullying and Harassment

The CDE has produced and promotes a variety of tools and resources for parents, administrators, and students about bullying and harassment. Resources include examples of bullying, a description of the key elements of a bullying prevention program, frequently asked questions and answers, sample policies and implementation plans to address bullying, publications, and links to national resources. More information is available on the CDE Bullying and Hate-Motivated Behavior Prevention Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/ss/se/bullyingprev.asp.

Strategies to Reduce the Overuse of Discipline Practices that Remove Students from the Classroom

The CDE promotes specific strategies to reduce the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom, including information regarding keeping high-risk students in school, improving student engagement, and the importance to replacing punitive discipline practices with positive interventions. More information is available on the CDE Behavioral Intervention Strategies and Supports Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/ss/se/behaviorialintervention.asp.

Strategies to Reduce the Use of Aversive Behavioral Interventions that Compromise Student Health and Safety

The CDE maintains and promotes a Web page that provides extensive information regarding Positive Behavioral Supports and Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports. Resources include information regarding culturally responsive supports and restorative practices. More information is available on the CDE Core Component 6: Positive Behavioral Support Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/ri/corecomp6.asp. The CDE also shares guidance documents and technical assistance resources created to help LEAs implement positive behavioral intervention plans instead of aversive behavioral interventions on the CDE Behavioral Intervention Plans Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/ac/bip.asp.

Additional Strategies to Promote Student Health and Safety

California also promotes a variety of resources to support LEAs with student mental health and substance abuse prevention strategies:

- **Student Assistance Programs (SAPs)** address substance abuse and a wide range of issues that impede adolescent academic achievement. The goals of SAPs are to reduce students' behavioral and disciplinary violations and substance use habits while improving school attendance and academic performance through the referral and facilitation of appropriate services. More information and resources to assist in establishing SAPS is available on the CDE Student Assistance Programs Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/he/at/sap.asp.

- **Mental health services** in schools include a broad range of services, settings, and strategies. Resources to support mental health services and programs can be found on the CDE Mental Health Resources Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/cg/mh/mhresources.asp.

- **Underage drinking prevention** resources provide a wide variety of materials and information including state and nationwide reports, data, adolescent brain research, alcohol-related campaigns, contact information, conferences and legislative initiatives. Resources are available on the CDE Underage Drinking Prevention Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/he/at/preventionresguide.asp.

- **The Tobacco Use Prevention Education (TUPE)** program provides funding for programs in grades six through twelve to reduce youth tobacco use by helping young people make healthful tobacco-related decisions through tobacco-specific, research-validated educational instruction and activities that build knowledge as well as social skills and youth development assets. More information regarding the TUPE program is available on the CDE TUPE Program Overview Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/he/at/tupeoverview.asp.

Continuous Improvement

California will monitor the implementation of these supports and strategies and will make improvements, based on LEA and stakeholder feedback, or additions as new, vetted resources and strategies become available. As part of the statewide system of support, described in section A.4.viii.c, California will incorporate ESSA and state resources to the greatest extent possible to ensure that Title I LEAs and schools identified as needing additional assistance have the necessary support to develop or strengthen integrated and coherent processes and procedures across state and federal programs that lead to successful continuous improvement of school conditions for student learning.

7. School Transitions *(ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(D))*: Describe how the State will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A in meeting the needs of students at all levels of schooling (particularly students in the middle grades and high school), including how the State

will work with such LEAs to provide effective transitions of students to middle grades and high school to decrease the risk of students dropping out.

California will support local educational agencies (LEAs) receiving assistance under Title I, Part A in meeting the needs of students at all levels of schooling by providing planning supports, reviewing plans, and monitoring the implementation of plans that address successful student transitions and help to prevent dropouts. In addition to these formal processes, California will also provide to Title I LEAs a Title I, Part A Guidance document, technical assistance, statewide conferences and local institutes, and an online collection and resource exchange of strategies that help to meet the diverse needs of students, support successful student transitions, and prevent dropouts. All of these supports and strategies are described in more detail below.

State Educational Agency Support for Title I LEAs

Supporting the Development of LCAP Addenda

Title I LEAs will be required to submit to the state educational agency (SEA) a Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) Addendum, which addresses all of the local planning requirements under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and serves as the LEA Plan. In their LCAP Addendum, LEAs will describe, among other things, how they will support, coordinate, and integrate services provided under Title I with early childhood education programs at the LEA or individual school level, including plans for the transition of participants in such programs to local elementary school programs. They will also describe how they will implement strategies to facilitate effective transitions for students from middle grades to high school and from high school to postsecondary education or to entering the workforce.

California will provide guidance and resources to LEAs that will support them in developing and implementing plans to meet the diverse needs of students and support successful student transitions. In order to support Title I LEAs in developing successful transition plans, California will provide all Title I LEAs with a **Title I, Part A Guidance document** that will contain strategies for addressing the local planning requirements in the ESSA, including addressing diverse student needs, successful student transitions, and dropout prevention. The strategies California has identified to support Title I LEAs are described under the "State Identified Strategies for Title I LEAs" section below.

Reviewing LCAP Addenda

In reviewing LCAP Addenda, California will only approve LCAP addenda that include descriptions about how the LEA will meet diverse student needs and ensure successful student transitions, including specific information about aligning early education programs to elementary school programs, the transitions into and out of middle school and high school, and strategies to reduce dropouts. If the LEA's response is insufficient, California will return the LCAP Addendum with suggestions for ways to strengthen the LEA's response based on the information in the Title I, Part A Guidance document. California will provide the LEA with designated expert points of contact at the state and regional levels with whom they can discuss this guidance and be supported to develop a stronger LCAP Addendum.

Monitoring Title I LEAs

California provides a coordinated and transparent federal program monitoring (FPM) process to ensure Title I LEAs are meeting program requirements and spending program funds appropriately as required by law. All LEAs in the state are divided into four cohorts. Two cohorts are subject to review each year. The CDE's FPM process includes a data review of 50 percent of the LEAs in the state, which results in the identification and subsequent implementation of a total of 125 LEA on-site and online reviews during any given year. The remaining 50 percent of the LEAs in the state receive the data review the following year. A description of the FPM process, LEAs identified in each cohort, LEAs selected for online or on-site reviews, and program instruments can be found on the CDE Compliance Monitoring Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/cr/.

Through the FPM process, Title I LEAs will have access to resources, instruments, training, and state and regional staff experts that will support them to prepare for the monitoring process, and, upon completion of the monitoring process, address any findings that suggest the LEA is not meeting Title I, Part A requirements.

Providing Technical Assistance

Designated state and regional staff will be responsible for providing technical assistance to Title I LEAs who have questions or need support to develop or implement plans to support successful student transitions and prevent dropouts. This technical assistance will be provided through timely and responsive phone or e-mail correspondence.

Statewide Conferences and Local Institutes

California will sponsor regular statewide conferences and regional and local institutes that will include presentations, workshops, and Q and A sessions by national, state, and local leaders to help disseminate and exchange best practices to and with Title I LEAs to improve or refine services and supports that help meet the diverse needs of students, ensure successful transitioning of students, and prevent dropouts.

Online Collection of Resources and Strategies

To ensure continuous access and consistent guidance to Title I LEAs, California will make available an online collection of resources and strategies that support successful student transitions and prevent dropouts. The Web page will include the Title I, Part A Guidance document, information pertaining to the strategies described below, frequently asked questions and answers regarding student transitions, and contact information for regional and statewide technical assistance.

State Identified Strategies for Title I LEAs

The table below lists the strategies California will provide to Title I LEAs, through the processes described above, to address diverse student needs, support successful student transitions, and prevent dropouts. These strategies are explained below the table.

Table 36. California Strategies for Meeting Student Needs and Providing Effective Transitions

Transition Phase	California Strategies
Across the Education Continuum	- Curriculum Frameworks - Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) - Pupil Promotion and Retention Statutes 21st Century Community Learning Centers - Dropout Prevention - California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) - Chronic Absenteeism Indicator (2018) - School Attendance Review Board (SARB) Handbook - Model SARBs
Early Education Transition to Elementary School	*Alignment of California Preschool Learning Foundations with Key Early Education Resources* - Recommendations for early education and elementary school collaboration - Coordination with local programs enrolled in California's Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) - Transitional Kindergarten
Transitions into and Out of Middle School	- Taking Center Stage Act II/Schools to Watch - California Mathematics Placement Act of 2015
High School Transitions to College/ Career	- Early Assessment Program (EAP) - College/Career Indicator - Career Technical Education Courses and Career Pathways - California Career Resource Network (CalCRN) - Concurrent enrollment practices

Across the Education Continuum

In providing support to Title I LEAs, California will draw from several resources that help to address diverse student needs and support student transitions at all levels of schooling.

California's **curriculum frameworks** represent the state's most comprehensive guidance for implementing the state's academic content standards and are developed by content experts and teachers from across California. They include sections on content and pedagogy for each content area and grade level, transitional kindergarten through grade 12 (TK–12), and chapters regarding access and equity that provide detailed guidance for addressing the diverse needs of California's student population. For instance, the California English Language Arts/English Language Development Framework chapter on access and equity provides guidance for addressing the needs of students with common learning differences such as learning English or disabilities. However, the framework goes beyond these common learning differences to address certain types of English learning, certain disabilities, and learning differences that may arise from living in poverty, LGBT status, and advanced learning. The curriculum frameworks will provide the basis for California's technical assistance to Title I LEAs to help them develop or improve coherent, responsive educational programs between feeder and receiving schools. California also provides training on each curriculum framework across the state and Title I LEAs will have priority registration at these events.

The use of a **Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)** will also strengthen successful student transitions across the education continuum in Title I LEAs. MTSS is a research-based system utilized in California schools to promote the building of a stronger student academic and behavioral support system at the local level. California will provide technical assistance to Title I educators through the processes, events, and resources described above in aligning their systems of student support at both district and site levels using the MTSS framework for a system-wide approach that promotes deeper knowledge of differentiated instruction to support the needs of all learners and provide targeted support for struggling learners. The MTSS model expands California's Response to Instruction and Intervention approach by aligning all systems of high-quality first instruction (using Universal Design for Learning principles and appropriate supports, strategies, and accommodations) and provides a framework to plan for intervention using a three-tiered approach. The model also includes structures for building, changing, and sustaining systems, and developing well-designed assessment processes and progress monitoring to allow for data-based problem solving in instruction and decision making. MTSS aids systematic change through intentional design and redesign of services and supports that quickly identify and match the needs of all students in general education contexts.

California has awarded a grant to two collaborating county offices of education with the intent of developing and scaling up a **MTSS framework** statewide. This framework will continue the state's work to support implementation of MTSS as critical strategy to improve school conditions for student learning and will provide resources for Title I LEAs.

California also has **statutory requirements regarding pupil promotion and retention** to support the use of appropriate promotion practices. California will support Title I LEAs

through the processes described above to develop, implement, or evaluate promotion and retention policies.

Additionally, the state's ESSA Title IV, Part B **21st Century Community Learning Centers** program will give funding priority to those expanded learning programs that target services to students (and their families) who primarily attend schools that enroll students who may be at risk for academic failure, dropping out of school, involvement in criminal or delinquent activities, or who lack strong positive role models.

Dropout Prevention

California supports Title I LEAs to reduce dropouts by providing a student data system and providing training to ensure appropriate uses of the system. The **California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS)** is the foundation of California's K–12 education data system, comprised of student demographic, program participation, grade level, enrollment, course enrollment and completion, discipline, and statewide assessment data. The student-level, longitudinal data in CALPADS enables the calculation of more accurate dropout and graduation rates. It provides LEAs with immediate access to longitudinal data and reports on their own students enabling the LEAs to determine if a student has actually dropped out or moved to a different school and a student's risk for dropping out. All CALPADS data are maintained in compliance with state and federal privacy laws, including the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).

California is also helping Title I LEAs reduce dropouts by including the **Chronic Absenteeism Indicator** into its accountability system given the strong correlation between chronic absence and future academic attainment. There is wide agreement that students who are absent 10 percent or more of the school year, including excused and unexcused absences, are at greater risk of reading below grade level and dropping out of high school (Ginsburg, Jordan, and Chang, 2014; Balfanz and Byrnes, 2012; Ginsburg and Chudowsky, 2012). LEAs will report chronic absence data to the state for the first time in fall 2017. It is expected that the State Board of Education (SBE) will approve color-coded performance levels scores to be reported in the California School Dashboard, as described in section A.4.iv.b of this plan, no earlier than the fall 2018, when at least two years of data will be available. When this indicator becomes operational, it will help the state support Title I LEAs by setting a long-term goal for reducing dropouts statewide. The state will disseminate strategies through the processes described above to Title I LEAs that will help them meet the long term goal.

Title I LEAs will be supported to implement practices and effective strategies for dropout reduction included in California's **School Attendance Review Board Handbook**, available at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/ai/sb/sarbhandbook.asp. The State **School Attendance Review Board** (SARB) coordinates statewide policy and personnel training on the operation of county and local SARBs. SARBs provide intensive guidance and community services to meet the special needs of students with school attendance or school behavior problems. The State SARB is a partnership that includes representatives from school districts, parent groups, county probation departments, county welfare departments, county superintendents of schools, law enforcement agencies, community-based service centers, school guidance personnel, the health care

and mental health professions, and state associations interested in youth with school attendance or behavioral problems. The State SARB makes annual recommendations regarding strategies to reduce the number of dropouts in the state's public education system. The State SARB also coordinates the **Model SARB** Recognition Program to encourage best practices in dropout prevention and to encourage the development of effective strategies to prevent students from dropping out of California's public schools.

Early Education Transition to Elementary School

California's early education programs are administered by the CDE so that such programs are aligned with K–12 settings. This alignment is clearly delineated in the publication *Alignment of California Preschool Learning Foundations with Key Early Education Resources,* available on the CDE Alignment of the Preschool Learning Foundations Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cd/re/psalignment.asp, which provides an in-depth analysis of how the nine domains of the preschool foundations closely align with the *California Infant/Toddler Learning and Development Foundations*, the California Content Standards, and the Head Start Child Development and Early Learning Framework. This publication is an integral guidance resource for all of California's early education programs and will be used in Title I, Part A technical assistance to support Title I LEAs in aligning early education programs with elementary school programs.

To further support the meaningful alignment and coordination between early education and K–12 systems beyond content standards, California will provide **guidance for the development of locally driven agreements** between LEAs and Head Start and other entities carrying out early education development programs. This guidance will elevate best practices that support the (1) development and implementation of systematic data and records sharing, (2) establishment of channels of communication from K–12 school staff to early education partners, (3) facilitation of meetings with parents, teachers, and early education staff to discuss developmental needs of individual children, including children with disabilities, (4) organization of joint transition-related training of school and early childhood staff, and (5) linkage and coordination of LEAs with the services provided by early education and support programs, local Head Start agencies, and other programs administered by partner agencies, including California First 5. This guidance will be included in the Title I, Part A Guidance document.

California's **Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) and related supports** will be used by California, as appropriate, to support Title I LEAs to assess, improve, and communicate the level of quality in their early education programs. QRIS is a quality rating and improvement system that provides a framework to align program standards of quality in early education programs. The goal of QRIS is to ensure that children in California have access to high quality early education programs so that they thrive in their early learning settings and succeed in kindergarten and beyond.

Title I, Part A technical assistance will also support LEAs in evaluating and continuously improving **transitional kindergarten** (TK) programs. TK is the first year of a two-year kindergarten program that uses a modified kindergarten curriculum that is age and developmentally appropriate. A child is eligible for TK if they have their fifth birthday between September 2 and December 2. TK curriculum is aligned to the state-adopted

academic content standards and frameworks, the California Preschool Learning Foundations, and California Preschool Curriculum Frameworks. Each elementary or unified school district must offer TK classes for all children eligible to attend. A child who completes one year in a TK program may continue in a kindergarten program for one additional year. Early research into TK programs has shown that TK participants are better prepared for kindergarten (Manship et al., 2015).

Transitions Into and Out of Middle School

California will support Title I LEAs serving middle schools through the processes, events, and resources described above to implement strategies recommended in *Taking Center Stage Act II (TCSII)*, and connect with high-performing, high needs **Schools to Watch** in their region.

TCSII is an online professional development publication developed collaboratively with educational experts across California and intended for use by middle level educators and schools. *TCSII* promotes, illustrates, and supports the concepts embedded in CDE's 12 Recommendations for Middle Grades Success. It applies youth development and brain development research on young adolescents to identify transition-relevant educational strategies and practices.

TCSII also informs the California middle school student success program Schools to Watch. Each year, the program identifies middle schools that meet the unique challenges of their student populations and are academically excellent, developmentally responsive, socially equitable, and structured for success. *TCSII* recommendations provide the criteria by which middle schools are selected for Schools to Watch, and all middle schools may use the nationally proven School Self-Study and Rating Rubric (http://www.clms.net/stw/forms/STW-TCSSelf-StudyRatingRubric.pdf) to evaluate and improve their school's instructional program. Schools to Watch also maintains a network of high-performing middle schools that are actively involved in assisting struggling middle schools in their region or with similar student population characteristics.

California will help Title I LEAs, through the processes, events, and resources described above, to support schools in evaluating mathematics placement policies that help to clarify vertical articulation between feeder and receiver schools. The **California Mathematics Placement Act of 2015** required the governing boards of LEAs that serve pupils entering grade 9 to adopt "a fair, objective, and transparent mathematics placement policy" before the beginning of the 2016–17 school year. The mathematics placement policy must have been adopted in a regularly scheduled public meeting. The law further supports successful transitions by authorizing the governing boards of LEAs serving pupils who are transitioning between elementary school and middle or junior high school to develop and implement a mathematics placement policy.

High School Transitions to College/Career

California, through the processes, events, and resources described above, will support Title I schools to increase **Early Assessment Program** (EAP) participation and evaluate supports for students who have been deemed less than "Ready" for college-level coursework. Each spring, all grade 11 students in California take the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for English language arts and mathematics. These

assessments also serve as an indicator of readiness for college-level coursework in English and mathematics and are used by the California State University (CSU) and participating California Community Colleges (CCCs) to determine (EAP) status. In addition to receiving a student's results on the ELA and mathematics assessments, parents/guardians also receive their student's EAP status, which is one of four levels: Ready, Conditionally Ready, Not Yet Ready, and Not Ready. "Ready" students are considered ready for English and/or mathematics college-level coursework. These students are able to register in college degree-bearing courses upon enrolling in a CSU or a participating CCC. Providing this information to students before they begin grade 12 has been shown to decrease the need for college remediation. The EAP program demonstrates the continuous partnership between the SEA and California universities and colleges to ensure articulation of the pre-kindergarten–grade 12 system with the postsecondary education system.

Furthermore, Title I LEAs will be supported through the processes described above to analyze **College/Career Indicator** (CCI) results, establish CCI goals, and align resources to meet those goals. As noted in section A.4.iv.a of this State Plan, the CCI includes various measures that evaluate a student's preparedness for college or career including results on the grade 11 English language arts and mathematics assessments, career technical education (CTE) pathway completion, Advanced Placement or International Baccalaureate exam results, dual enrollment grades, and completion of state university admission requirements. The CCI is designed to include multiple measures in order to value the multiple pathways that students may take to prepare for life after high school.

California will also promote and expand use of **CTE courses** so students in Title I LEAs have access to **career pathways in the 15 Industry Sectors** as identified in the model CTE standards that the SBE adopted in 2013. CDE will focus on promoting and expanding use of the CTE courses that meet the a–g criteria needed for students to enter state colleges and universities. For three years (2015–16, 2016–17, and 2017–18) California allocated $900 million in state funds to provide incentive funds to districts to expand and improve CTE programs or in some cases to establish new programs. California will also utilize a factsheet for LEAs that helps them to identify ways in which CTE programs can be implemented or expanded in support of their LCAP goals and actions. CTE programs in California have been shown to increase a student's persistence to high school graduation and college entrance and graduation, making these programs an important strategy for effective transitioning to careers and dropout prevention.

California will also use the processes described above to support Title I LEAs to utilize the **California Career Resource Network (CalCRN)**, available at http://www.californiacareers.info/, which distributes career information, resources, and training materials to middle school and high school counselors, educators, and administrators in order to ensure that middle schools and high schools have the necessary information available to provide a student with guidance and instruction on education and job requirements necessary for career development. CalCRN is a resource developed and maintained by a partnership committee comprised of representatives from state agencies for education, employment development, postsecondary education, corrections and rehabilitation, social services, workforce investment, and developmental services.

Additionally, the CDE, in collaboration with California's postsecondary segments, will identify successful **concurrent enrollment practices** among districts and colleges, including early college and middle college programs, and share these approaches with Title I LEAs through the processes described above.

Continuous Improvement

California will monitor the implementation of these supports and strategies and will make improvements, based on LEA and stakeholder feedback, or additions as new, vetted resources and strategies become available.

As part of the state's emerging statewide system of support, described in section A. 4.viii.c, California will incorporate ESSA and state resources to the greatest extent possible to ensure that Title I LEAs and schools identified as needing additional assistance have the necessary support to develop or strengthen integrated and coherent processes and procedures that lead to successful student transitions from pre-kindergarten to postsecondary.

B. Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children

1. <u>Supporting Needs of Migratory Children</u> *(ESEA section 1304(b)(1))*: Describe how, in planning, implementing, and evaluating programs and projects assisted under Title I, Part C, the State and its local operating agencies will ensure that the unique educational needs of migratory children, including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school, are identified and addressed through:

   i. The full range of services that are available for migratory children from appropriate local, State, and Federal educational programs;

   The California Department of Education (CDE) subgrants Migrant Education Program (MEP) funding to 20 local educational agencies (LEAs) that provide supplementary services in the areas with the highest concentrations of migratory workers. These MEP subgrantees' identification and recruitment (I&R) staff regularly review the mobility data of migrant populations to plan area I&R activities, and this mobility information allows subgrantees to target I&R efforts for the times of year when higher numbers of migratory families and youths arrive in their areas. All of the state's subgrantees develop specific I&R plans and strategies to meet the needs of their respective communities. School- and community-based approaches are both utilized to identify migratory families that may be eligible for MEP services. Recruiters in urban and mixed communities rely more on using school-based strategies, such as interviewing the parents of students who are newly enrolled in the local school district. Recruiters in less-populated or more rural areas typically utilize more community-based opportunities to interview families and youths, such as visiting farms, fields, orchards, dairies, ranches, and farmworker housing facilities.

   Once a migrant family or youth is identified, a recruiter interviews the parent, guardian, or youth to determine eligibility for MEP services using a

customizable interview script that is facilitated by the state's data system, the Migrant Student Information System, or "MSIN 6.0." An automated procedure in the MSIN 6.0 produces a table that contains a list of all students who might be eligible to be counted or served by the program. To verify residence in years two and three of eligibility, the CDE requires that subgrantees make contact with all families and youth in their geographic areas at least once each year (typically on the anniversary of their qualifying arrival date). The subgrantee must document the nature of the contact (phone or in person), verify that children on the Certificate of Eligibility are still at the residence, verify if additional age-eligible children have joined the residence, and document if a worker has moved to seek or obtain employment. If a new qualifying move has been made, the recruiter must make a personal visit to the residence to complete a new Certificate of Eligibility.

If a family is eligible for the migrant program, services may be provided, based upon student need, to children ages 3–21, including dropouts, and out-of-school youth, so long as they have not yet earned a high school diploma or its equivalency.

Students that are identified as migratory students receive the core instruction, including physical education and visual and performing arts, as provided through state funds. Students who are low-income and disadvantaged may also receive supplementary services from Title I, Part A.

In California, about half of the migratory student population is identified as English learners and these students are eligible to receive supplementary services through Title III. In addition, the CDE provides training and resources to its MEP subgrantees for students learning English via funding for early education services such as the MEP Family Biliteracy Program, the MEP Binational Program, and the MEP expanded learning programs focused on English language development (ELD). Subgrantees determine the best use of funding to meet the diverse needs within their program areas.

Collaboration between educational services and health agencies is coordinated by the 20 subgrantees.

ii. Joint planning among local, State, and Federal educational programs serving migratory children, including language instruction educational programs under Title III, Part A;

The California MEP collaborates with other local, state, and federal programs to ensure that comprehensive services, including language instruction programs under Title III and Title I, Part A, are provided to migratory students. At the state level, the CDE works with other state and federal programs, including Title I and Title III, to provide a variety of resources to the local MEP subgrantees. Moreover, California solicits parent involvement in the planning, operation, and evaluation of the MEP through the establishment of state and local parent advisory councils.

Additionally, the CDE MEP supports the education of preschool-aged migratory children (ages 3–5) through collaboration with the Early Education and Support Division within CDE to provide trainings to regional MEP staff via the California Preschool Instructional Network (CPIN). CPIN provides high quality professional development to regional staff that provide direct instruction to pre-k migratory students. The CDE MEP also works with the Nutrition Services Division at the CDE and the Summer Meals Program to ensure that children have access to nutritious, low-cost (or free) food year round.

To support migratory students' high school graduation and dropout prevention, the MEP partners with internal CDE offices (e.g., Coordinated School Health Office, Career Technical Education) to provide access to various initiatives and activities (e.g., California Healthy Kids Survey) and disseminate these resources and information to the local MEPs. For migratory students who have dropped out, the CDE collaborates with programs within the CDE (e.g. Homeless Education). The Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) provides collaboration activities for the MEP to address the needs of migrant education students who have dropped out of school and for adult migratory farmworkers.

California's Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) reinforces joint planning among local, state, and federal programs serving migratory children. The LCFF emphasizes equity by focusing on student group performance and coordination of services and provides core and base services for all students, including migrant students. California's new accountability system has an academic achievement indicator, a graduation rate indicator, and an English learner progress indicator amongst other state and federal indicators. Since approximately half of all migrant students are English learners, the emphasis on the accountability progress of English learners promotes joint planning and collaboration to provide services to migratory students.

iii. The integration of services available under Title I, Part C with services provided by those other programs; and

Additionally, the CDE meets with community-based organizations to identify promising practices at the local level and shares them with the local MEP Directors as appropriate during the Migrant Director's quarterly meetings. California *Education Code* sections 54443.1(c)(10) and 54443.1(h) requires MEP subgrantees to coordinate with other state and federal education programs at the local level. At the state level, both the Title III Program and the Migrant Program reside in the same CDE division in order to promote integration of services. The administrators of both programs present at various events including the annual Title III conference, Title III quarterly meetings, annual State Parent Conference, and statewide migrant meetings and conferences. Interagency coordination between the MEP and other programs that improve services to migratory children is monitored through the CDE's Federal Program Monitoring process as described in section A.4.viii.e.

This integration of services ensures that migratory children are receiving the services to meet their unique educational needs.

California will monitor the implementation of the full range of services; joint planning among local, state, and federal programs; and the integration of services for migratory children and will make improvements based on subgrantee and stakeholder feedback. As part of the state's emerging statewide system of support, described in section A.4.viii.c, California will incorporate ESSA and state resources to the greatest extent possible to ensure that local MEPs and LEAs have the necessary support to develop or strengthen integrated and coherent processes and procedures that lead to successful outcomes for the migratory children they serve.

iv. Measurable program objectives and outcomes.

To ensure that the unique educational needs of migratory children are met and that migrant students participate effectively in school, the CDE has a three-part process. The first step includes identifying migratory student needs via a statewide Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA). The second step includes developing a State Services Delivery Plan (SSDP) based on the statewide CNA, which outlines the statewide needs as well as measurable program objectives and outcomes as a target to meet those needs. The third step includes the revision of the CDE funding application to align with the SSDP objectives and outcomes.

Moving forward, the CDE will require that all Title I, Part C subgrantees provide an annual update using the funding application to monitor program and student achievement. Starting in 2017–18, the funding application will be on a three-year cycle, and subgrantees will have to provide an annual update on three sections: student needs, measurable program outcomes, and revision of programs based on outcomes. Subgrantees will revise the needs of migratory children in their funding application based on several data sources to ensure that all eligible student needs are reviewed annually. Additionally, subgrantees will revise their direct services and measurable program objectives and outcomes to implement a cycle of continuous improvement.

Based on the results of the statewide needs assessment, outcomes and measurable program objectives were developed for nine focus areas: 1) English language arts (ELA), 2) ELD, 3) mathematics, 4) high school graduation/dropout, 5) school readiness, 6) out-of-school youth, 7) health, 8) parent engagement, and 9) student engagement. The table below displays outcomes and measurable program objectives for the California MEP. The first two outcomes are required and based on the Office of Migrant Education's Government Performance and Results Act. The second two outcomes, are unique to the California MEP and align with the California's accountability and continuous improvement system. Additional outcomes are in the process of being finalized and once complete will be made publicly available on the CDE Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/me/mt/statesrvcdelivrypln.asp.

Table 37. California MEP Outcomes and Measurable Program Objectives

Focus Area	Outcome	Measurable Program Objective/ Performance Target
ELA	Increase in migratory students' ELA proficiency.	By 2021, migratory students scoring at Level 3 – Standard Met and Level 4 – Standard Exceeded on overall ELA achievement, will increase by 12.5 percent.
Mathematics	Increase in migratory students' mathematics proficiency.	By 2021, migratory students scoring at Level 3 – Standard Met and Level 4 – Standard Exceeded on overall math achievement will increase by 10.5 percent.
ELD	Increase in migratory students' English language proficiency.	Performance targets will be developed once the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California initial and summative assessments become operational and data becomes available in 2018–19.
High School Graduation	Increase the number of migratory students graduating high school.	By 2021, migratory students will have a graduation rate of 82.3 percent.

Evaluating migratory students' needs occurs every three years within the MEP's continuous improvement cycle to ensure that the state and local MEPs address migratory students' needs as they change over time; therefore, these specific outcomes and targets will be updated periodically at the end of each cycle throughout the duration of this law. For future outcomes and measurable program objectives, please visit the link above.

2. Promote Coordination of Services (*ESEA section 1304(b)(3))*: Describe how the State will use Title I, Part C funds received under this part to promote interstate and intrastate coordination of services for migratory children, including how the State will provide for educational continuity through the timely transfer of pertinent school records, including information on health, when children move from one school to another, whether or not such move occurs during the regular school year.

Title I, Part C funded subgrantees utilize the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) and the MSIN to promote interstate and intrastate coordination of services for migratory children and the timely transfer of pertinent school records. The MSIX is a federally funded national data collection system that ensures greater continuity of educational services for migratory children by

providing a mechanism for all states to exchange education-related information on migratory children who move from one state to another. The MSIN is the California state equivalent to the MSIX and provides a mechanism for exchanging education-related information on migratory children who move within the state and assists the CDE-funded subgrantees in locating migrant students throughout the state using the Migrant Student Locator. Both the MSIX and the MSIN help to improve the timeliness of school enrollments, the appropriateness of grade and course placements, and the sharing of immunization information of migratory children. Lastly, the CDE and subgrantees collaborate with other states serving the same migratory students to ensure these eligible students receive services as they migrate. The CDE and subgrantees participate in interstate organizational meetings and conferences with the Interstate Migrant Education Council and the National Association of State Directors of Migrant Education.

3. Use of Funds *(ESEA section 1304(b)(4))*: Describe the State's priorities for the use of Title I, Part C funds, and how such priorities relate to the State's assessment of needs for services in the State.

California's priorities for the use of Title I, Part C funds directly relate to the state's evaluation of the unique educational needs of migratory children. The SSDP guides the MEP in planning and service delivery at the state, regional, and local levels by identifying the CDE's priorities to address the needs of migratory children with a focus on students identified as Priority for Services (PFS). Priorities within the SSDP include closing student achievement gaps in ELA, mathematics, ELD, and high school graduation. Additional priorities include increasing school readiness knowledge and skills, parent and student engagement, and access to health services. Meeting the needs of populations of concern, such as out-of-school youth and PFS students, are also priorities listed in the SSDP. Strategies to administer Title I, Part C funds may be updated to align with the emerging statewide system of support.

C. Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth who are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk

1. Transitions Between Correctional Facilities and Local Programs *(ESEA section 1414(a)(1)(B))*: Provide a plan for assisting in the transition of children and youth between correctional facilities and locally operated programs.

California will provide funded agencies with professional development and training targeting transitional planning for youth, relationship building with workforce and post-secondary institutions, data management, program evaluation, and implementing evidence-based and outcome driven strategies that are aligned to college and career readiness standards. California will continue to build statewide partnerships with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, California Workforce Investment Board, and California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation to support local level planning and coordination with external partners. California will ensure that funded agencies are complying with federal, state, and local laws and regulations by conducting on-site and online reviews

through the annual federal program monitoring review process that is conducted on an annual basis as described in A.4.viii.e.

2. <u>Program Objectives and Outcomes</u> *(ESEA section 1414(a)(2)(A))*: Describe the program objectives and outcomes established by the State that will be used to assess the effectiveness of the Title I, Part D program in improving the academic, career, and technical skills of children in the program.

   Title I, Part D, subpart 2 provides for supplemental education programs for neglected, delinquent, and at-risk students at the LEA level rather than at the state agency level. In California, these funds are allocated to and administered by county offices of education (COE) that act as the LEA. The COEs use these funds primarily to support and supplement detention center education programs.

   COEs are permitted to use Title I, Part D funds for a variety of services and supports, as appropriate, to achieve the purpose of the program. Additionally, the COEs are required to conduct a program evaluation of their Title I, Part D program every three years to determine the program's impact on the students' ability to improve educational achievement, accrue school credits, transition to regular school, complete high school and obtain employment, and as appropriate, participate in postsecondary education or job training. The COEs are to use the results of this evaluation to plan and improve subsequent programs for participating children and youth. As appropriate, the COEs may enact program changes based on their evaluation and provide services and supports, such as increased transition support to students and their families, drop-out prevention programs, coordination of health and social services, programs to meet the unique needs of their students, assistance in securing loans for postsecondary education, or mentoring and peer mediation groups.

   The LEA requesting Title I, Part D funds submits an application to the state educational agency. In California, the COEs annually submit their Title I, Part D application to the California Department of Education (CDE) via the Consolidated Application Reporting System (CARS). The Title I, Part D program data provided in CARS by the COEs is reviewed by CDE program staff to identify and guide necessary support or technical assistance to participating COEs.

   In addition to the program evaluation conducted by the COEs, which evaluates the program's impact on their students' ability to improve their educational achievement, accrue school credits, transition to regular school, complete high school and obtain employment and as appropriate, participate in postsecondary education or job training, California will also increase annually its pre- and post-testing of youth in Title I, Part D programs in reading and mathematics. California will also increase the number of students who earn a high school diploma or pass a high school equivalency exam, and increase the enrollment of students in career-related programs or in programs to continue their education. These goals and objectives are aligned and built upon the U.S. Department of Education's leading indicators and will be used to assess the effectiveness of Title I, Part D programs in California. The CDE will develop and implement required regional training and technical assistance to funded agencies to support local and state

level implementation of Title I, Part D requirements in alignment with the emerging statewide system of support as described in A.4.viii.c.

D. Title II, Part A: Supporting Effective Instruction

1. <u>Use of Funds</u> *(ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(A) and (D))*: Describe how the State educational agency will use Title II, Part A funds received under Title II, Part A for State-level activities described in section 2101(c), including how the activities are expected to improve student achievement.

Implementation of State Academic Content Standards and Curriculum Frameworks

The California State Board of Education (SBE) first adopted statewide academic content standards (standards) for English language arts (ELA) and mathematics in 1997. Since that time, California has been building an educational system based upon some of the most rigorous and well-respected standards in the nation. The SBE has approved standards for ELA, English language development (ELD), mathematics, science, career technical education, health education, history-social science, model school library, physical education, visual and performing arts, and world language. California's SBE-adopted curriculum frameworks (frameworks), described in greater detail in section D.4 below, provide guidance for implementing SBE-adopted standards.

Since 2010, California has been steadily supporting the transition to new standards for ELA/literacy, mathematics, ELD, and science. The SBE has updated the frameworks for each of these sets of standards and has also updated the framework for the history-social science standards.

Successful implementation of standards to support student achievement requires strong instructional leadership in every school and well-prepared teachers in every classroom. California will use Title II, Part A resources to build the capacity of California educators to successfully implement California's standards and frameworks while emphasizing the importance of meeting the specific, and often multiple, learning needs of diverse students including, but not limited to, English learners, students with disabilities, foster youth, and low-income students.

State-level activities to support the dissemination of standards and frameworks will be designed collaboratively by the California Department of Education (CDE), SBE, California Collaborative for Educational Excellence (CCEE), county offices of education (COEs), California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC), California Subject Matter Project (CSMP), and other entities as appropriate. Currently, the CDE, SBE, and COEs are working in collaboration with other state, regional, and local partners to support the implementation of standards and frameworks. The Standards Implementation Steering Committee, Collaboration Committees, and Communities of Practice support implementation through collaborative and coordinated efforts at the state, regional, and local levels in the areas of curriculum, instruction, and professional learning.

California will use Title II, Part A funds and funds available through related programs to continue and build upon this work, deploying a variety of strategies consistent with the Quality Professional Learning Standards to design and provide professional learning opportunities for educators to support student achievement of the standards. Further, to support the success of every student, inclusive best practices such as social emotional learning and a multi-tiered system of support approach will be highlighted. Activities will be designed to address areas of need identified through the California School Dashboard, review of Local Control and Accountability Plans (LCAPs) and LCAP Addenda, and stakeholder surveys. These data points will be reviewed regularly and activities updated as necessary to support continuous improvement.

Support for School Leaders

California will use the optional 3 percent reservation of the Title II, Part A LEA subgrant allocation to develop the expertise and capacity of the statewide system of support, as described in section A.4.viii.c, to strengthen school leaders' abilities to identify areas of need and to implement and sustain local actions that result in improvements while addressing inequities. This work will emphasize the development of individual leaders and leadership teams to guide and support teachers and staff in engaging students in differentiated teaching and learning so that all students have access to high quality standards-based instruction and graduate ready for success in college and careers.

The support structure will utilize lessons from past and current leadership initiatives focused on student-centered improvements. Key strategies and activities for principals and other school leaders will include, but not be limited to:

- Utilizing California's standards and frameworks to build instructional leadership capacity to meet the needs of all students;

- Collecting and analyzing data related to student achievement and well-being;

- Implementing cycles of continuous improvement based on data;

- Making evidence-based decisions to solve problems of practice;

- Establishing and maintaining evidence-based professional learning opportunities focused on building instructional capacity to improve student outcomes;

- Developing cultural competence and improving access to instructional resources;

- Implementing strategies to support equitable distribution of the educator workforce and labor-management collaboration; and

- Implementing strategies for establishing and supporting distributed or shared leadership at the school site that includes teacher leaders and site administrators in communities of practice.

California will analyze Dashboard data and stakeholder feedback to monitor the implementation of these supports and strategies and will make improvements in collaboration with the partners that contribute to the statewide system of support.

California Subject Matter Project

Title II, Part A funds will be used to support the work of the CSMP, an essential component of California's professional learning infrastructure. With more than 90 regional sites statewide, the CSMP is a network of nine discipline-based communities of practice that promote high-quality teaching and leadership. CSMP activities are designed by university faculty, teacher leaders, and teacher practitioners to improve standards-based instructional practices that lead to increased achievement for all students.

Equitable Services

Title II, Part A funds will also be used to provide state-wide professional development activities to California's nonprofit private school teachers and administrators based on a proportional share and on an equitable basis of Title II, Part A funding for state-level activities. The CDE consults with a diverse body of current practitioners from private schools and private school networks across the state that represent the broadly inclusive needs and interests of California's nonprofit, private school students to conduct and analyze needs assessments and collaboratively design these statewide professional learning activities.

Administration and Technical Assistance

Title II, Part A funds will be used to support CDE staff who distribute, monitor, and provide technical assistance regarding appropriate use of local Title II funds.

2. Use of Funds to Improve Equitable Access to Teachers in Title I, Part A Schools *(ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(E))*: If an SEA plans to use Title II, Part A funds to improve equitable access to effective teachers, consistent with ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B), describe how such funds will be used for this purpose.

Title II, Part A funds will be used to collect and evaluate pertinent data, and then report on equitable access to teachers in schools that receive Title I, Part A funds. Consistent with California's commitments to equity, continuous improvement, and local control, the state will incorporate resources and supports for LEA efforts to address issues regarding educator equity into the statewide system of support, and will use Title II, Part A funds for this purpose. Specific strategies will be developed within the context of the emerging statewide system of support.

The statewide system of support will incorporate an equity planning process that brings LEA stakeholder teams together to build expertise and capacity in the areas of access, equity, and cultural competence. LEAs will have the benefit of intra/inter-district collaboration while engaging in facilitated learning sessions rooted in a continuous improvement approach on data review, stakeholder engagement, and implementation science to build the capacity of local leadership teams to spearhead equity work in their LEAs.

3. System of Certification and Licensing *(ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(B))*: Describe the State's system of certification and licensing of teachers, principals, or other school leaders.

The CTC operates as an independent standards board and works in conjunction with the CDE to serve California's teachers. The CTC is statutorily responsible for the design, development, and implementation of standards that govern educator preparation for the public schools of California and for the licensing and credentialing of professional educators in California.

The CTC is responsible for issuing any and all licenses required by law to serve in an instructional, administrative, service, or counseling position in the public schools in California. *Education Code* Section 44225 requires the CTC to award the following types of credentials to applicants whose preparation and competence satisfy its standards: basic teaching credentials for teaching in kindergarten, or any of grades 1 to 12 inclusive; credentials for teaching adult education classes and vocational education classes; credentials for teaching specialties, including bilingual education, early childhood education, and special education; and credentials for school services, such as administrators, school counselors, speech language therapists, audiologists, school psychologists, library media teachers, supervisors of attendance, and school nurses.

California teachers and administrators are required to participate in a two-year induction program in order to clear their preliminary credentials and become fully licensed. The CTC is responsible for both developing induction program standards and approving educator induction programs. The *California Standards for the Teaching Profession* serve as the basis for teacher induction programs. Strong and effective mentoring is one of the primary factors contributing to teacher retention and classroom performance and is the most important aspect of induction. Teacher induction programs emphasize meeting the new teacher's immediate needs and supporting long-term teacher growth through ongoing reflection on and analysis of practice. More information regarding teacher induction is available on the CTC Elementary/Multiple Subjects Credentials Web page at http://www.ctc.ca.gov/help/MS/renewal.html.

The *California Professional Standards for Education Leaders* serve as the basis for administrator induction programs. The heart of the clear credential program for administrators is a coaching-based professional induction process contextualized through the job the administrator currently holds while still continuing to develop candidates for future leadership positions. This new structure is designed to provide the best career preparation for effective leadership in California's 21st century schools. More information regarding administrator induction is available on the CTC Clear Administrative Services Credential Web page at http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/clear-asc%5Cdefault.html.

4. Improving Skills of Educators *(ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(J))*: Describe how the SEA will improve the skills of teachers, principals, or other school leaders in order to enable them to identify students with specific learning needs, particularly children with disabilities, English learners, students who are gifted and talented, and students with low literacy levels, and provide instruction based on the needs of such students.

California's curriculum frameworks serve as the cornerstone for the state's efforts to improve the skills of teachers, principals, and other school leaders to address the specific learning needs of students and improve student outcomes. The SBE-adopted frameworks provide guidance to K–12 educators for implementing California's academic content standards by outlining the scope and sequence of the learning trajectory across grade levels. They contain guidance on content and pedagogy, access and equity, and strategies for professional learning and leadership. Figure 2 below, a screenshot from the English language arts/English language develop (ELA/ELD) framework's "Access and Equity" chapter, illustrates California's commitment to identifying and meeting the needs of all of its diverse students, including children with disabilities, English learners, students who are gifted and talented, and students with low literacy levels.

Figure 1. Chapter at a Glance of "Chapter 9: Access and Equity" of the *English Language Arts/English Language Development Framework for California Public Schools Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve*, p. 879[7]

Access and Equity

Chapter 9

Page	Chapter at a Glance
880	Introduction
881	California's Diversity
882	Standard English Learners
884	African American English Speakers
886	Chicana/Chicano English Speakers
888	English Learners
891	Reclassified English Proficient Students
891	Instructional Programs and Services for English Learners
893	Biliterate Students
893	Students Who are Deaf and Bilingual in ASL and Printed English
894	Students Who are Deaf and Hard of Hearing Who Communicate with Spoken English or Simultaneous Communication, Including Sign Supported Speech
895	Students Living in Poverty
897	Migrant Students
898	Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Students
899	Advanced Learners
902	Students with Disabilities
905	Accommodations and Modifications for Students with Disabilities
907	Students with Autism Spectrum Disorders
908	Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities
910	Planning for and Supporting the Range of Learners
910	Universal Design for Learning
913	Multi-Tiered System of Supports
916	Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Teaching
920	Instructional Practices for Supporting Students Experiencing Difficulty Reading
928	Linguistic and Cultural Congruence for ELs
928	Literacy Learning and Males
929	Conclusion
930	Works Cited

Frameworks inform educator professional learning across the career continuum; they are used in educator preparation and induction programs and in the professional learning activities of in-service educators. Dissemination of the frameworks is the primary objective of the statewide standards implementation work described in section D.1 above. The frameworks also include evaluation criteria for instructional materials, encouraging publishers to develop classroom resources that support framework content. Instructional materials approved by the SBE must meet the criteria described in the frameworks.

---

[7] Available at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/rl/cf/elaeldfrmwrksbeadopted.asp.

Additional strategies to support educators to identify and meet the needs of specific groups of students are described below.

Supporting Educators to Identify and Meet the Needs of English Learners

The California English Language Development Standards (CA ELD Standards) are designed to guide instruction so that English learners develop sufficient language to gain access to and engage in academic subjects, achieve in grade-level academic content, and meet state academic standards for college and career readiness. The CA ELD Standards were adopted in 2012 and are correlated to the ELA standards that were adopted in 2010. California is first in the nation to produce an integrated ELA/ELD curriculum framework and all subsequently adopted frameworks now include the integration of ELD.

Supporting Educators to Identify and Meet the Needs of Students with Disabilities

Further, to ensure that students with disabilities are served more effectively regardless of setting, California is undertaking substantial revisions to its teacher preparation standards and programs. The CTC has engaged a stakeholder group to redesign program standards for both special educators and general education teachers. This redesign is based on the concept of cross-training and will include increased preparation for general education teachers in serving students with disabilities. California recognizes that most students with disabilities receive much of their instruction in general education classrooms, so it is critical that general educators are better prepared to address the needs of the students with disabilities they serve.

Concurrently, special education program standards will be revised to include additional preparation to serve general education students, resulting in a broadened credential authorization that will allow special educators to serve general education students. As a result, special education expertise will be available through intervention and remediation activities to assist general education students who are struggling to overcome barriers to improved academic performance. These efforts to recognize the needs of students with disabilities in general education classrooms, and the challenges of the teachers who serve them, were inspired by the groundbreaking work of California's Statewide Special Education Task Force and their summary report, "One System: Reforming Education to Serve All Students."

Supporting Educators to Identify and Meet the Needs of Students with Low Literacy Levels

The ELA/ELD curriculum framework provides guidance on learner differences and levels of support in order to help educators help students achieve their full potential. The framework stresses excellent initial instruction be provided to all learners, in all grade levels and content areas, and through close, ongoing monitoring of student progress, subsequent instruction can be tailored to meet students' needs (e.g., strategic scaffolding and grouping, culturally and linguistically responsive instruction, tiered interventions, and varied instructional approaches).The Multi-Tiered System of Supports approach to support and intervention promoted by the CDE incorporates a three-tiered structure of increasing levels of supports, beginning with core instruction in Tier 1 for all students in general education, increasing in intensity in Tier 2 with specific targeted instruction and support for students needing extra support, to intensive intervention for those students who experience difficulty in achieving grade level expectations, even with Tier 2 supports (e.g. low literacy skills).

Supporting Educators to Identify and Meet the Needs of Students Who are Gifted and Talented

The CDE provides guidance and resources to help educators and parents understand how gifted and talented education (GATE) programs fit into the current funding context, an overview of the history of legislation and regulations related to implementation of GATE programs, and Web links to resources for the public to access as needed. The CDE also collaborates with the University of Southern California in a grant-funded project that focuses on early identification of potentially gifted children using non-traditional methods, with specific attention placed on the identification of underrepresented students from preschool through grade two (English learners, ethnic and racial minorities, socioeconomically disadvantaged, etc.).

Continuous Improvement

California's accountability and continuous improvement system based on the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) provides LEAs with information and tools to identify areas where specific groups of students may need additional support. Performance data on a variety of state priorities is reported to the public through the California School Dashboard. LEAs can use this information to identify local educator professional learning needs, develop strategies, set goals, and resource these activities appropriately. The statewide system of support, a multi-leveled system that includes the standards implementation and support for school leaders activities described in section D.1 above, will provide resources and assistance to schools and districts as they work to address locally-determined professional learning needs of educators.

5. Data and Consultation *(ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(K))*: Describe how the State will use data and ongoing consultation as described in ESEA section 2101(d)(3) to continually update and improve the activities supported under Title II, Part A.

Data and consultation are at the heart of California's school funding system. At the local level, LCAPs are updated annually, allowing for local evaluation of programs and activities and realignment of resources that is responsive to the evolving needs of educators, students, and the district community.

Supplementing the LCAP development process with its requirements for community engagement, LEAs must complete the LCAP Addendum, which is the mechanism by which LEAs address the local planning requirements of the ESSA. Specifically, LEAs must describe programs and activities they will engage in using their Title II, Part A funds. Therefore, the expenditure of these funds is planned for in consultation with the local school community.

State-level activities will also be continuously evaluated and improved through data analysis and consultation. In reviewing LCAP Addenda, analyzing statewide Dashboard data annually, and consulting with state system of support partners, the state will prioritize state-level activities under Title II, Part A to address areas of greatest need. Systematic coordination with other state and federal programs will reduce redundancies and ensure the greatest impact at the local level.

Beyond the evaluation and public reporting of equity gaps, California will take a number of steps to ensure that low-income and minority children enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are not served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers. Under ESSA Section 1112(b)(2), each LEA is required to submit a plan to the state educational agency (SEA) that describes how it will identify and address any disparities that result in low-income students and minority students being taught at higher rates than other students by ineffective, inexperienced, or out-of-field teachers. Beginning in the 2018–19 school year, LEAs will need to address this provision in the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) Addendum. The LCAP is the LEA strategic planning document that is submitted every three years and updated annually, while the Addendum ensures LEAs are meeting federal planning requirements and is submitted to the SEA for approval. In reviewing LCAP Addenda, the SEA will only approve LEA plans that include descriptions about how the LEA will identify and address any disparities that result in low-income students and minority students being taught at higher rates than other students by ineffective, inexperienced, or out-of-field teachers. If the LEA's response is insufficient, California will return the LCAP Addendum with suggestions for ways to strengthen the LEA's response.

Further, once updates to California's procedures for calculating, reporting, and evaluating equitable access to teachers are completed and new procedures have been established, the CDE will provide training to the relevant state and local educational agencies to promote statewide understanding of the new requirements as they relate to the LCAP process and to provide support in informing LEAs about the new teacher equity reporting process. State and county educational agencies within the statewide system of support will collaborate to develop and provide resources, tools, support, and technical assistance regarding teacher equity issues that will be available to all LEAs (Level 1 supports). These agencies will also develop and provide needs assessment, root cause analysis, improvement planning, evidence-based decision making, and performance and progress

monitoring tools and training that is differentiated to the needs of LEAs that have been identified as having persistent teacher equity gaps (Level 2 supports). LEAs will also be provided with expert points of contact at the state and regional levels with whom they can discuss available guidance and be supported to develop strong teacher equity plans.

6. Teacher Preparation *(ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(M))*: Describe the actions the State may take to improve preparation programs and strengthen support for teachers, principals, or other school leaders based on the needs of the State, as identified by the SEA.

The State plans to leverage partnerships with institutions of higher education, LEAs, and other organizations in order to collaboratively and innovatively address teacher shortage areas in science, math, special education, and bilingual education. California does not plan to utilize Title II, Part A funds to improve preparation programs. Investments to strengthen supports for educators will be made within California's state system of support as described above in section A. 4.viii.c.

E. Title III, Part A, Subpart 1: English Language Acquisition and Language Enhancement

1. Entrance and Exit Procedures *(ESEA section 3113(b)(2))*: Describe how the SEA will establish and implement, with timely and meaningful consultation with LEAs representing the geographic diversity of the State, standardized, statewide entrance and exit procedures, including an assurance that all students who may be English learners are assessed for such status within 30 days of enrollment in a school in the State.

The statewide California entrance procedures ensure that all students who may be English learners (ELs) are assessed for such status using a valid and reliable instrument within 30 days of enrollment in a school in the state. Upon enrollment, parents of new students complete a standardized, statewide Home Language Survey (HLS). If the answer to any of the first three questions on the survey is a language other than English, the student is assessed to determine if the student is an EL. The state's English language proficiency (ELP) assessment guidance document, available at**<Start delete>**http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ep/documents/celdt1618guide.pdf**<End delete> <Start add>**https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ep/documents/elpacinfoguide19.pdf,**<End add>** contains the standardized entrance procedures.

For th**<Start add>**e**<End add> <Start delete>**is**<End delete>** initial assessment, California**<Start delete>** is**<End delete>** administer**<Start add>**ed**<End add> <Start delete>**ing**<End delete>** the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) in the 2017–18 school year while field testing the new English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) initial assessment. In 2018–19, the ELPAC initial assessment **<Start delete>**will**<End delete>** replace**<Start add>**d**<End add>** the CELDT as the state's initial ELP assessment. Regulations for the implementation of the ELPAC initial assessment **<Start delete>**will be**<End delete> <Start add>**were**<End add>** finalized in October 2017 and contained detailed updated entrance procedures. Validity of the ELPAC **<Start delete>** is **<End delete> <Start add>** was **<End add>** assured through the processes used to

develop the assessment instrument including content review, alignment studies, standard setting procedures, and comparison studies.

California has established processes to ensure timely and meaningful consultation with LEAs representing the geographic diversity of the state in the development of our standardized, statewide entrance and exit procedures by engaging stakeholders in meetings throughout the state; eliciting input and feedback at statewide conferences and trainings; soliciting participation in various committees; soliciting public comment during the regulations process; and providing policy updates. Evaluations, written feedback, and attendance records are evidence of timely and meaningful consultation, as well as collaboration to co-develop guidance documents and provide professional development.

In November 2018, a study related to the use of the new English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) scores will be presented to the State Board of Education to adopt a new ELPAC reclassification criteria. The standardized Language Observation Tool and Parent Involvement Protocol will be developed in 2018–19 and piloted in 2019–20.

In January 2019, work with the Legislature will begin to change the reclassification criteria in California Education Code. This process generally takes one year. Legislation will include the standardized, statewide Language Observation Tool and Parent Involvement Protocol.

If the Legislature enacts law to change the reclassification criteria including the Language Observation Tool, and Parent Involvement Protocol, the law goes into effect on July 1, 2020.

The Regulatory Process would begin in 2020–21, and full implementation is expected in 2021–22.

2. <u>SEA Support for English Learner Progress</u> *(ESEA section 3113(b)(6))*: Describe how the SEA will assist eligible entities in meeting:
   i. The State-designed long-term goals established under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii), including measurements of interim progress towards meeting such goals, based on the State's English language proficiency assessments under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(G); and
   ii. The challenging State academic standards.

   California will assist eligible entities in meeting the state-designed long-term goals, including measurements of interim progress, and provide assistance to meet the challenging State academic standards through a cohesive system of support that includes: adopting standards, developing assessments, establishing long term goals and an accountability system; providing resources to support LEAs in assisting ELs; and fostering continuous improvement.

   The State Board of Education (SBE) has adopted state academic standards, including the English Language Development Standards, and has defined the

EL subgroup in each of the state accountability indicators required under ESSA Section 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii).

State Standards

The California English Language Development Standards (CA ELD Standards) are designed to guide instruction so that ELs develop sufficient language to gain access to and engage in academic subject learning, achieve in grade-level academic content, and meet state academic standards for college and career readiness. The CA ELD Standards were adopted in 2012 and have been validated to align to the state's current English Language Arts (ELA) standards. California is the first state in the nation to produce an integrated ELA/ELD framework and all subsequently adopted frameworks now include the integration of ELD. In 2015, a correspondence study was conducted to ensure the CA ELD Standards are also aligned to both the Science and Mathematics standards. The study found a strong correspondence between the language demands of the content standards and the CA ELD Standards. California ensures every content area framework incorporates the CA ELD Standards and the SBE adopts materials that are aligned to the content standards and the CA ELD Standards.

State Assessments

ELs also participate in the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) system. ELs who have attended a school in the U.S. for less than 12 months are exempted from one administration of the state ELA assessment.

Accountability System

The state-designed long-term goals for ELs are based on meeting the statewide and local accountability measures. Three indicators will be used: the Academic Indicator (to measure EL academic progress in ELA and mathematics), the English Learner Progress Indicator (to measure English proficiency growth based on CELDT scores and reclassification rates), and the Graduation Rate Indicator (to measure graduation rate growth).

The English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) measures the percent of EL students who are making progress toward English language proficiency from one year to the next on the **<Start delete>**CELDT**<End delete> <Start add>**ELPAC**<End add> <Start delete>**and the number of ELs who were reclassified from EL to fluent English proficient in the prior year**<End delete>**. The **<Start delete>**CELDT **<End delete> <Start add>** ELPI**<End add>** has **<Start delete>**five**<End delete> <Start add>**six**<End add>** performance levels, and the interim goal for every EL student is to progress at least one **<Start delete>**ELD**<End delete> <Start add>**ELPI**<End add>** performance level each year. Therefore, the benchmark for all students is to advance one performance level a year. The long-term goal for the newcomer EL with beginning-level initial English proficiency is to achieve English proficiency within five years. The entry performance level determines the number of years

expected to reach proficiency, and at a minimum one year's progress is expected. As noted above, California **<Start delete>will<End delete>** transition**<Start add>ed<End add>** to full implementation of the ELPAC **<Start add>beginning<End add>** in the **<Start delete>2018–19<End delete>** **<Start add>2017–18<End add>** school year, replacing the CELDT. The ELPI is reported on the California School Dashboard, which can be found on the CDE California Accountability Model & School Dashboard Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/cm/. Progress on the California School Dashboard as well as local metrics will be used to measure interim progress and achievement of the academic goals for ELs.

Supporting the Development of LCAP Addenda

Title III LEAs will be required to submit to the state educational agency (SEA) a Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) Addendum, which addresses all of the local planning requirements under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and serves as the LEA Plan. In their LCAP Addendum, LEAs will describe, among other things, Title III professional development, programs and activities, school support for assisting ELs in achieving English proficiency and the state academic standards, and parent, family, and community engagement in the education of ELs.

Reviewing LCAP Addenda

In reviewing LCAP Addenda, California will only approve LEA plans that include descriptions for Title III professional development, programs and activities, school support for assisting ELs in achieving English proficiency and the state academic standards, and parent, family, and community engagement in the education of ELs. If the LEA's response is insufficient, California will return the LCAP Addendum with suggestions for ways to strengthen the LEA's response based on the state guidance for Title III. The LEA will be provided designated expert points of contact at the state and regional levels with whom they can discuss this guidance and be supported to develop a stronger LCAP Addendum.

Developing Resources for LEAs to Support ELs

The state has established several systems of support that provide assistance to LEAs to ensure that students meet English language proficiency and state academic standards, including: a library of online resources for LEAs to conduct interim assessments and monitor progress; statewide professional development provided by integrated teams of language, assessment, accountability, and academic experts; and a system of county level support. Title III funds are used to supplement existing efforts and provide additional targeted support to the LEAs that receive the funds. The state and Title III Regional County Office Leads provide in-person, virtual, and web-based assistance to support the planning, implementation, evaluation, and reporting of required and authorized activities designed to meet interim and long-term

goals in English language proficiency as well as California's academic content standards.

Additionally, in response to a recent voter-approved ballot initiative, the California Education for a Global Economy Initiative (Proposition 58), and other changes in state and federal policy related to ELs, the CDE will issue the *California English Learner Roadmap*. This resource will include guidance on how LEAs and schools can implement and strengthen comprehensive, evidence-based programs and services for all profiles of ELs that enable access to college- and career-ready learning, as well as opportunities to attain the State Seal of Biliteracy.

Continuous Improvement

California will monitor the implementation of these supports and will develop additional tools, toolkits, and guidance documents to support ELs, their teachers, parents, school administrators, and other school personnel, from pre-kindergarten through grade 12, as necessary based on LEA and stakeholder feedback.

As part of the state's emerging statewide system of support, described in section A.4.viii.c, California will incorporate ESSA and state resources to the greatest extent possible to ensure that LEAs and schools identified as needing additional assistance have the necessary support to develop or strengthen integrated and coherent processes and procedures that lead to successful student outcomes for ELs.

3. <u>Monitoring and Technical Assistance</u> *(ESEA section 3113(b)(8))*: Describe:
   i. How the SEA will monitor the progress of each eligible entity receiving a Title III, Part A subgrant in helping English learners achieve English proficiency; and
   ii. The steps the SEA will take to further assist eligible entities if the strategies funded under Title III, Part A are not effective, such as providing technical assistance and modifying such strategies.

Monitoring Title III LEAs

California provides a coordinated and transparent federal program monitoring (FPM) process to ensure Title III LEAs are meeting program requirements and spending program funds appropriately as required by law. All LEAs in the state are divided into four cohorts. Two cohorts are subject to review each year. Thus, the CDE's FPM process includes a data review of 50 percent of the LEAs in the state to identify and conduct a total of 125 LEA on-site and online reviews during any given year. The remaining 50 percent of the LEAs in the state receive the data review the following year. A description of the FPM process, LEAs identified in each cohort, LEAs selected for online or on-site reviews, and program instruments can be found on the CDE Compliance Monitoring Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/cr/.

Through the FPM process, Title III LEAs will have access to resources, instruments, training, and state and regional staff experts that will support them to prepare for the monitoring process, and, upon completion of the monitoring process, address any findings that suggest the LEA is not meeting Title IIII, Part A requirements.

Providing Technical Assistance

The CDE provides technical assistance to LEAs in planning for the use of state and federal funds to meet the local and state accountability measures. In addition, Title III Regional County Office Leads are trained by the CDE to provide local technical assistance to LEAs on federal requirements, best practices, and improvement of EL progress in English language proficiency and meeting state academic standards. Title III Regional County Office Leads also recommend modifications to EL strategies as necessary.

Further Assistance to Address Title III-funded Strategies That Are Not Effective

The CDE works closely with the California Comprehensive Center and other entities to provide further assistance to eligible entities if the strategies funded under Title III are not effective. Root cause analysis tools and technical assistance are provided to LEAs to determine how to modify existing strategies.

Continuous Improvement

California will monitor the implementation of these monitoring and technical assistance processes and will make improvements as necessary, based on LEA and stakeholder feedback. As part of the statewide system of support, California will incorporate ESSA and state resources to the greatest extent possible to ensure that LEAs and schools identified as needing additional assistance have the necessary support to develop or strengthen integrated and coherent processes and procedures that lead to successful linguistic and academic outcomes for EL students.

F. Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants

1. Use of Funds *(ESEA section 4103(c)(2)(A)):* Describe how the SEA will use funds received under Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 for State-level activities.

   California intends transfer the Title IV, Part A state-level activities funds to Title II, Part A to support state-level activities under Title II, Part A beginning in the 2018–19 fiscal year, subject to meaningful consultation with all relevant stakeholders around the intended use and any equitable distribution requirements.

2. Awarding Subgrants *(ESEA section 4103(c)(2)(B))*: Describe how the SEA will ensure that awards made to LEAs under Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 are in amounts that are consistent with ESEA section 4105(a)(2).

In order to ensure that awards made to LEAs under Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 are in the amounts consistent with Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Section 4105(a)(2), the California Department of Education (CDE) will allocate funds in the manner described in the steps below:

1. Calculate the percentage of each LEA's Title I, Part A allocation from the total amount of Title I, Part A funding allocated to all LEAs by the state during the prior fiscal year.

2. Compute each LEA's share of the Title IV, Part A allocation by applying the above calculated percentage to the total amount of Title IV, Part A funds available for allocation.

3. If there are insufficient Title IV, Part A funds resulting in LEAs not receiving the minimum-allowed amount of $10,000, California will ratably reduce the LEA allocations of Title IV, Part A funding. This will involve a calculation by which a certain proportionate amount of each LEA allocation is reduced so that every applying LEA may receive at least the minimum allotment of $10,000 as pursuant to ESSA Section 4105(a)(2).

G. Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers

1. <u>Use of Funds</u> *(ESEA section 4203(a)(2))*: Describe how the SEA will use funds received under the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program, including funds reserved for State-level activities.

California's Expanded Learning Programs (ELPs) support local educational agencies (LEAs) and local communities by aligning with the regular school day for a well-rounded and supportive education for students. ELPs offer youth opportunities for leadership, engaging youth leaders, as an example, in the reduction or elimination of incidents of bullying and harassment. ELPs are designed to promote student well-being through balanced nutrition, physical activity, and other enrichment activities supplementing the student's regular school day academic instruction.

ELPs recruit, train, and retain high quality staff and volunteers to provide academic and enrichment activities. They build collaborative relationships among internal school and external stakeholders, including students, parents, families, governmental agencies (e.g., city and county parks and recreation departments), local law enforcement, community organizations, and the private sector to improve programs. This ensures active family engagement and gathering additional community resources to expand and benefit the number of students being served in the most disadvantaged neighborhoods.

California plans to use Title IV, Part B state-level activity funds to contract with statewide technical assistance providers such as the California After School Network, ASAPconnect, county offices of education (COEs), and STEM Power of Discovery. This technical assistance system, in collaboration with the state, is called the System of Support for Expanded Learning (SSEL). The SSEL provides technical assistance to ELPs that are new, not meeting attendance or performance goals, or otherwise need assistance. It supports overall quality for all programs while still

allowing local schools and districts the leeway and flexibility to deploy resources so they can improve.

California has developed, in collaboration with stakeholders, Quality Standards for Expanded Learning Programs. These standards are the foundation that the SSEL uses to provide support to ELPs. A portion of the state-level reservation will be used for administration of Title IV, Part B funds: awarding and monitoring grants; providing technical assistance, evaluation, and training services; and providing local assistance funds to support continuous quality improvement.

2. Awarding Subgrants *(ESEA section 4203(a)(4)):* Describe the procedures and criteria the SEA will use for reviewing applications and awarding 21st Century Community Learning Centers funds to eligible entities on a competitive basis, which shall include procedures and criteria that take into consideration the likelihood that a proposed community learning center will help participating students meet the challenging State academic standards and any local academic standards.

California funds five-year 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) programs to establish or expand high quality before-and-after school programs for students that primarily attend low performing schools or schools identified by LEAs as in need of intervention. These programs serve economically disadvantaged students and their families.

California has posted its 21st Century Request for Applications (RFA) for funds allocated beginning in the 2017–18 fiscal year to align with the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) requirements. Consistent with federal requirements, California will award 21st CCLC funds in a competitive grant application process.

Those entities eligible to apply for 21st CCLC funding will be public or private entities or a consortium of such entities that propose to serve students (and their families) who primarily attend schools eligible for schoolwide programs under ESSA Section 1114, schools implementing comprehensive or targeted support and improvement activities under ESSA Section 1111(d), and schools determined by the LEA to be in need of intervention and support.

Applicants will be required to provide a local match. The applicant may not use matching funds from other federal or state funds. The amount of the match will be based on a sliding scale that takes into account the relative poverty of the population to be targeted by the eligible entity and the ability of the eligible entity to obtain such matching. If an eligible entity is unable to provide a match, a justification will be required as to why they are unable to provide a match.

The 21st CCLC RFA includes a program quality evaluation rubric that is derived from the Quality Standards for Expanded Learning in California, as well as state and federal application requirements. An online application reader's conference will use impartial, qualified, and calibrated peer evaluators to determine grant application program quality. Grant applications that have been identified as high quality programs will then be assigned priority for funding based on state and federal requirements. The RFA gives priority funding to applications:

1. That propose to target services to students (and their families) who primarily attend schools that:

    a. Are implementing comprehensive support and improvement activities or targeted support and improvement activities under Section 1111(d) or other schools determined by the LEA to be in need of intervention and support to improve student academic achievement and other outcomes; and

    b. Enroll students who may be at risk for academic failure, dropping out of school, involvement in criminal or delinquent activities, or who lack strong positive role models;

2. Are submitted jointly by eligible entities consisting of at least one:

    a. LEA receiving funds under of Title I, Part A; and

    b. Another eligible entity[8];

    The applicant will be given this priority if it demonstrates that it is unable to partner with a community-based organization in reasonable geographic proximity and of sufficient quality.

3. Demonstrate that the activities proposed in the application:

    a. Are, as of the date of the submission of the application, not accessible to students who would be served; or

    b. Would expand accessibility to high-quality services that may be available in the community.

4. Replace an expiring grant. (This is a general state funding priority requirement.)

5. Will provide year-round expanded learning programming. (This is a state middle and elementary funding priority requirement.)

6. Have programs that have previously received funding, but are not currently expiring. (This is a state high school funding priority requirement.)

7. Propose expansion of existing grants up to the per site maximum. (This is a state high school funding priority requirement.)

Priority will not be given to eligible entities that propose to use 21st CCLC funding to extend the regular school day.

These funding priorities will be additive. The proposed sites with the highest number of priorities will be funded first. High quality grant applications with an equal number

---

[8] Eligible entities include LEAs, community based organizations, Indian tribes or tribal organizations, another public or private entity, or a consortium of two or more such agencies or organizations or entities.

of state and federal priorities will be selected for funding based on the highest percentage of school level poverty. All grantees will be required to sign assurances that they will comply with all ESSA and state requirements.

California's 21st CCLC program will have a minimum grant award per program site of $50,000 as required by federal law. In addition, grant awards are subject to state legislative cap amounts of $112,500 for programs serving elementary schools and $150,000 for programs serving middle or junior high schools. High school programs are similarly capped at $250,000 per school site. Elementary, middle, and junior high school awards may be increased up to double amounts using a large school adjustment formula.

Currently, all expiring 21st CCLC grantees must re-apply for a new five-year grant. As allowed by the ESSA, California will consider renewing sub-grants of existing grantees based on grantee performance during the preceding sub-grant period.

H. Title V, Part B, Subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income School Program

1. Outcomes and Objectives *(ESEA section 5223(b)(1))*: Provide information on program objectives and outcomes for activities under Title V, Part B, Subpart 2, including how the SEA will use funds to help all students meet the challenging State academic standards.

   To support California students, the Rural and Low Income Schools (RLIS) Program's goal and objective is that resources under this program support rural LEAs in California that have a proportionately high rate of poverty among its population in meeting California's challenging academic standards. California expects LEAs to meet these standards by utilizing the flexible funds provided by the RLIS program to improve teaching and learning in the classroom through professional development to teachers and administrators in schools and by providing learning tools and resources that effectively engage children so that they can meet the challenging academic standards. The program objectives will also include, but will not be limited to, ensuring that all eligible LEAs are aware of, and have the ability to apply for and receive RLIS funding; ensuring that all eligible LEAs use the RLIS fund to effectively support other specified federal programs; and ensuring that RLIS LEAs report annually on allowable uses of funds through the Consolidated Application Reporting System.

2. Technical Assistance *(ESEA section 5223(b)(3))*: Describe how the SEA will provide technical assistance to eligible LEAs to help such agencies implement the activities described in ESEA section 5222.

   California's system of support will build the capacity of LEAs in the administration of these funds by providing technical assistance through training, information sharing, grant management, and on-demand support via webinars, e-mails, and telephone. The Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) and LCAP Addendum planning process will support LEAs in tying this support to their overall goals.

I. Education for Homeless Children and Youth program, McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, Title VII, Subtitle B

a. <u>Student Identification</u> *(722(g)(1)(B) of the McKinney-Vento Act)*: Describe the procedures the SEA will use to identify homeless children and youth in the State and to assess their needs.

LEAs identify and track homeless students using a variety of methods, including, but not limited to, self-identification, questions on registration forms, data queries, and in-take questionnaires. Since identification of homeless students can also come about because of student and family relationships with school staff, LEAs will ensure all school staff are trained on the proper identification and reporting procedures. Information will be provided by the California Department of Education (CDE) on LEA liaisons' participation in the local Point-In-Time Counts, as required by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and best practices for engaging with local planning efforts to help improve the identification of homeless children and youth to LEAs, HUD, and other continuum of care agencies. Each LEA is required to identify and track the number of homeless students by grade level in the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS), which houses student-level data including demographics, course data, discipline, assessment, and other data for state and federal reporting.

LEAs use the following housing categories in CALPADS to determine if a student is homeless: temporary shelters, hotels/motels, temporarily doubled-up, and temporarily unsheltered. It is important to note that CALPADS also collects information regarding homeless unaccompanied youth, which is a youth that is not in the physical custody of their parent and/or guardian. These categories are based on the requirements outlined in the Consolidated State Performance Report that is submitted to the U.S. Department of Education annually. The data provided through CALPADS serves as California's means of identifying homeless children and youth in the state.

California provides support and technical assistance to LEAs to assist with the identification of homeless students. This includes tracking data in CALPADS and performing targeted outreach to LEAs that identify their homeless count as zero; creating and disseminating training modules on identification methods and strategies to LEA registrars, attendance clerks, school counselors, and LEA liaisons; and providing LEAs with posters outlining the educational rights of homeless children and youths and tracking LEA use of the poster through California's Consolidated Application and Reporting System (CARS).

Each LEA is required to identify at least one LEA liaison who is charged with representing the interests of the homeless students that the LEA serves, assessing the needs of these students, ensuring that needs are addressed by the appropriate entity, and serving as a resource to parents, families, and school and LEA personnel. The LEA liaison can be paid through a variety of funding sources, including state general funding and Title I, Part A reservation funds for homeless education.

To facilitate best practices regarding the assessment of the needs of homeless students, California will continue to support LEAs to conduct data analyses for their

homeless students, implement case management models, and collaborate with relevant agencies to coordinate services.

To further enhance assessment of student needs, California is currently developing an intake template that will collect information related to the individual needs of the homeless students that a school or district serves. This template will be disseminated to LEAs for use in the 2018–19 school year. Staff will provide the tool and relevant trainings on its use to LEAs, measure its use through CARS, and encourage its use to assess the needs of homeless youth across the state. This template will assist LEAs during the federal program monitoring (FPM) process (described under I.6), as well as offer LEAs a resource for assessing student needs.

California will monitor the implementation of these procedures to identify homeless children and youth and assess their needs and will make improvements as necessary based on LEA and stakeholder feedback. As part of the statewide system of support, as described in section A.4.viii.c, California will incorporate resources to the greatest extent possible to ensure that LEAs and schools identified as needing additional assistance have the necessary support to develop or strengthen integrated and coherent processes and procedures across state and federal programs that lead to successful outcomes for homeless children and youth.

b. Dispute Resolution *(722(g)(1)(C) of the McKinney-Vento Act)*: Describe procedures for the prompt resolution of disputes regarding the educational placement of homeless children and youth.

The current dispute resolution process involves key steps aimed at ensuring that disputes are resolved promptly while safeguarding the rights of all parties. Every student, including an unaccompanied youth, must be immediately enrolled regardless of any dispute that arises. In the case of a dispute, the matter is first referred to the LEA liaison, with a written explanation from the disputing school; the LEA liaison then makes a determination regarding school selection, eligibility, or enrollment. The LEA has five business days to make a determination. If unresolved or appealed, the matter is referred to the county office of education (COE) liaison, who is required to make the school selection, eligibility, or enrollment decision within five working days of receipt of dispute materials. If the matter is not resolved at the LEA or COE level, the case will then be referred to the State Homeless Coordinator for review, and a final school selection, eligibility, or enrollment decision will be made within ten working days of receipt of materials.

California intends to make revisions to the dispute resolution process in 2017 to include more specific language regarding timelines, roles of all stakeholders, student-centered factors, unaccompanied youth rights, and eligibility to facilitate the prompt resolution of disputes. California will gather input from outside agencies, as well as parents, to strengthen the dispute resolution process.

The current process is posted on the CDE Resources for Homeless Children and Youths Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/hs/cy/disputeres.asp. California will continue to provide professional development and technical assistance to LEAs

regarding the dispute resolution process to ensure effective implementation, as well as continue the monitoring of LEAs through the FPM process (described under I.6). This process includes the review of the dispute resolution process, identification, implementation of federal and state laws, use of Title I, Part A reservation funds, parent/guardian involvement, and professional development.

In addition, sample board policies and administrative regulations have been developed by the California School Boards Association (CSBA) that address the specific steps of the dispute resolution process, including a dispute resolution form LEAs can complete to identify the persons involved and track and record the process. LEAs throughout the state use the CSBA's sample board policies and administrative regulations to ensure compliance with state and federal laws.

c. <u>Support for School Personnel</u> *(722(g)(1)(D) of the McKinney-Vento Act)*: Describe programs for school personnel (including the LEA liaisons for homeless children and youth, principals and other school leaders, attendance officers, teachers, enrollment personnel, and specialized instructional support personnel) to heighten the awareness of such school personnel of the specific needs of homeless children and youth, including runaway and homeless children and youth.

California will continue to collect the number and frequency of LEA liaisons participating in homeless education professional development through the Homeless Education Implementation and Policy page in the CARS. California will add an additional question to the Homeless Education Implementation and Policy page regarding the status of local training at each LEA and offer technical assistance to those LEAs and their liaisons that report that they have not participated in homeless education professional development within the past year.

California routinely offers professional development and trainings on homeless education to a variety of stakeholders, including LEAs, COEs, service providers, and local school attendance review boards, which are comprised of school personnel and other relevant stakeholders. Staff presents at various statewide conferences, regional and local meetings upon requests from LEAs and COEs, and various stakeholder meetings. Each training emphasizes collaboration and coordination with a variety of community agencies.

California will develop training modules with stakeholder input on various homeless education topics for principals, teachers, LEA liaisons, health care providers, outside agencies, preschool staff, and registrars. These training modules will be posted online and disseminated during the 2017–18 school year. They will include an overview of EHCY and all EHCY provisions under the ESSA, such as definitions, identification, enrollment, transportation, collaboration, dispute resolution, unaccompanied youths, preschool-age students, and Title I, Part A reservation funds.

California will continue to collect and post annually a database of LEA liaisons and their contact information through the CDE Resources for Homeless Children and Youths Web page to enable school personnel to contact LEA liaisons for specific information and resources as needed. This list of LEA liaisons becomes the basis for

the Homeless Education Resources Listserv, which allows the State Homeless Coordinator to disseminate resources, materials, updates, and training modules.

In the past year, the State Coordinator has convened a "Homelessness Matters Workgroup" that is comprised of various state agencies such as the Department of Social Services, the Department of Public Health, the California Homeless Youth Project, the California Coalition for Youth, the Department of Community Services and Development, the Department of Housing and Community Development, and the Department of Health Care Services. All of the agencies, along with several COE liaisons, have developed goals and objectives to generate statewide activities and strategies to promote awareness about the plight of homeless students in California. The Workgroup has developed a "street sheet," which is a one page factsheet that includes graphics and information regarding homeless youth, as well as an agency registry to disseminate to Workgroup members, LEAs, other state agencies that serve homeless families, and other stakeholders. The Workgroup is also planning a social media campaign for fall 2017.

Finally, at conferences, workshops, and training sessions, the CDE presents information about runaway and unaccompanied youth students that offers strategies for working effectively with those students. The State Coordinator works closely with LEA liaisons who are in contact with local shelters that serve the special needs of runaway and unaccompanied homeless youths in California.

As with the procedures to identify and address the needs of homeless children and youth, California also intends to monitor school personnel programs meant to heighten the awareness of the specific needs of homeless children and youth and will make improvements based on LEA and stakeholder feedback. As part of the statewide system of support, California will incorporate ESSA and state resources to the greatest extent possible to ensure that LEAs and schools identified as needing additional assistance have the necessary support to develop or strengthen integrated and coherent processes and procedures across state and federal programs that lead to successful outcomes for homeless children and youths.

d. Access to Services *(722(g)(1)(F) of the McKinney-Vento Act)*: Describe procedures that ensure that:

    i. Homeless children have access to public preschool programs, administered by the SEA or LEA, as provided to other children in the State;

       The CDE will continue to coordinate and collaborate with Head Start, Early Head Start, and the Interagency Coordinated Council (ICC) and offer professional development and technical assistance to LEAs, as well as to preschool programs, regarding homeless education and preschool collaboration. There will be an emphasis on identification, enrollment, transportation, and accessibility to community resources. Professional development and technical assistance will include guidance for literacy programs, addressing basic health needs, transitioning into kindergarten, and school readiness. LEAs and preschool programs will be encouraged to

establish a case management process to meet the needs of homeless preschoolers.

Additionally, the CDE will add a question on the Homeless Education Implementation and Policy page in the CARS regarding the number of homeless preschoolers enrolled by an LEA- or state-run preschool program.

California's Homeless Education Posters and COE and LEA liaison contact information are provided to all Head Start, Early Head Start, and ICC Regional/Family Resource Centers on an annual basis. In addition, the State Coordinator and CDE early education program staff participate in a state advisory committee convened by WestEd. This advisory committee discusses supports for homeless children, ages zero to five, and their families in order to develop ongoing guidance and a publication that will include best practices for planning curriculum and supports that are responsive to the needs these children and their families and collaboration between early education programs with homeless children and family programs. The State Coordinator also presents annually at the Infant Development Association of California Conference. All of these outreach activities provide technical assistance, professional development, and knowledge to better identify, enroll, and serve homeless children between the ages zero to five.

ii. Homeless youth and youth separated from public schools are identified and accorded equal access to appropriate secondary education and support services, including by identifying and removing barriers that prevent youth described in this clause from receiving appropriate credit for full or partial coursework satisfactorily completed while attending a prior school, in accordance with State, local, and school policies; and

California will undertake a variety of activities to support access to secondary education for homeless youth. California will continue to implement state *Education Code* Section 51225.1 that enables homeless students to complete the school district's high school graduation requirements within a fifth year or to complete state graduation requirements. California will disseminate information to ensure LEA policies are in place to allow homeless youth to remain in their school of origin and their right to be immediately enrolled as provisioned in California *Education Code* Section 48852.7. California will train LEAs to analyze their homeless student data available in the California School Dashboard and other sources, including dropout rates and graduation rates, to determine homeless student needs and ways to collaborate and coordinate with various agencies to meet these needs. California has disseminated resources, sample templates, and presentations on credit recovery, partial credit acceptance, and the fee waiver process for the GED or High School Proficiency exam. Currently, the California *Education Code* requires LEAs to accept appropriate credit for full or partial coursework, and California will update the *2007 Granting and Transferring of Partial Course Credit* letter to LEAs to reflect new requirements under state policies and the ESSA.

For homeless youth that are separated from public schools, the State coordinator conducts presentations to LEA liaisons that emphasize the specific barriers that these students face. In addition, the California Homeless Youth Project and California Coalition for Youth offer a variety of resources that complement the state's efforts to identify and support homeless youth, such as a youth crisis line, webinars, a statewide conference, and resources for housing, health/wellness, and employment. The CDE homeless hotline number is also promoted statewide to assist parents, school personnel, state agencies, and community partners in identifying and supporting homeless youth. The State Coordinator also collaborates with the state Title I, Part D - Neglected and Delinquent Coordinator who works with juvenile correctional facilities to help provide information and technical assistance on transitional services for youths exiting the juvenile system.

For homeless youth disconnected from the school system, model policies, practices, and various programs will be shared so that LEAs can effectively partner with community-based organizations (CBOs). California will focus on how CBOs that work with homeless youth can participate in the Local Control and Accountability Plan process and help youth who have dropped out transition back into the educational system.

iii. Homeless children and youth who meet the relevant eligibility criteria do not face barriers to accessing academic and extracurricular activities, including magnet school, summer school, career and technical education, advanced placement, online learning, and charter school programs, if such programs are available at the State and local levels.

California state law requires that a homeless child or youth be immediately deemed to meet all residency requirements for participation in interscholastic sports or other extracurricular activities. The CDE continues to collaborate and coordinate internally with regard to access to academic programs for homeless children and youths and the implications for charter schools, expanded learning, special education, adult education, and career and college transitions. California will ensure that the various programs are addressed and included in the training modules as it relates to the implementation of state laws, policies, and ESSA requirements. Also, through professional development and technical assistance, California will encourage LEA liaisons to coordinate and collaborate with these different programs to ensure accessibility for homeless children and youths.

Using the Homeless Education Resource Listserv, the State Coordinator disseminates many resources from the National Center for Homeless Education including, but not limited to, *Ensuring Full Participation in Extra-Curricular Activities for Students Experiencing Homelessness* and *Serving Homeless Children and Youth in Charter Schools* briefs. Due to new state and federal laws, California homeless education programs and expanded learning programs are developing greater coordination, including the mutual sharing of resources, such as guidance, frequently asked questions, and homeless education posters to better serve LEAs in coordinating local programs.

e. Strategies to Address Other Problems *(722(g)(1)(H) of the McKinney-Vento Act)*: Provide strategies to address other problems with respect to the education of homeless children and youth, including problems resulting from enrollment delays that are caused by—

    i. requirements of immunization and other required health records;
    ii. residency requirements;
    iii. lack of birth certificates, school records, or other documentation;
    iv. guardianship issues; or
    v. uniform or dress code requirements.

    The California training modules will address each of the issues listed above. The training modules will offer strategies and best practices to remove the barriers to immediate enrollment and ways to access various resources to obtain immunizations, other medical records, birth certificates, school records, and uniforms. California will also continue to encourage LEAs to use their EHCY grant funding and/or Title I, Part A reservation funds to assist with the costs associated with these efforts. Currently, the CDE Resources for Homeless Children and Youths Web page (http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/hs/cy/) has various samples of residency forms, intake forms, caregiver affidavits, and other key resources posted for LEA use. As mentioned above, California will develop and disseminate a training module for LEA-level registrars, attendance clerks, and school counselors to assist with identification, enrollment, and other homeless children and youth provisions under the ESSA.

    California law requires homeless children, youth, and adults obtain free identification cards and copies of birth certificates through the Department of Motor Vehicles. The State Coordinator has included this information in trainings to better serve homeless populations. LEAs contact the State Coordinator and/or the COE liaison if there is a delay in enrollment due to transfer of records. In addition, through professional development activities, LEAs are encouraged to coordinate and collaborate with any community resource, faith-based organizations, or service providers to assist with the needs of our homeless children, youth, and their families. Recommendations to LEAs include connecting with their local health departments to set up local clinics to obtain their immunizations, medical records, and assess medical needs of homeless children and youth, and also providing information about food banks, clothes closets, and social services to homeless youth and their families.

f. Policies to Remove Barriers (*722(g)(1)(I) of the McKinney-Vento Act)*: Demonstrate that the SEA and LEAs in the State have developed, and shall review and revise, policies to remove barriers to the identification of homeless children and youth, and the enrollment and retention of homeless children and youth in schools in the State, including barriers to enrollment and retention due to outstanding fees or fines, or absences.

California, through the CARS Homeless Education Implementation and Policy page, continues to collect the number of LEAs that have an approved homeless education board policy and the date in which it was last approved. Technical assistance is

offered to those LEAs that do not have an approved homeless education board policy. California requires those LEAs that are applying for the federal supplemental EHCY grant funding to submit their approved homeless education board policies and administrative regulations. The CDE and the CSBA work closely together to ensure that the CSBA sample board policies meet all requirements. Finally, California continues to monitor LEAs for homeless education compliance, including approved homeless education board policies, through the FPM process.

California provides a coordinated and transparent FPM process to ensure LEAs are meeting program requirements and spending program funds appropriately as required by law. All LEAs in the state are divided into four cohorts. Two cohorts are subject to review each year. Thus, the CDE's FPM process includes a data review of 50 percent of the LEAs in the state to identify and conduct a total of 125 LEA on-site and online reviews during any given year. The remaining 50 percent of the LEAs in the state receive the data review the following year. A description of the FPM process, LEAs identified in each cohort, LEAs selected for online or on-site reviews, and program instruments can be found on the CDE Compliance Monitoring Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/cr/. Through the FPM process, LEAs will have access to resources, instruments, training, and state and regional staff experts that will support them to prepare for the monitoring process, and, upon completion of the monitoring process, address any findings that suggest the LEA is not meeting EHCY requirements.

Again, through the training modules, California reminds LEAs that they are required to remove any and all barriers to homeless children and youth education, including unpaid fines and fees. It is recommended that unpaid fines and fees be waived, or paid using local, state, or federal funds. Also, LEAs and their LEA liaisons are expected to provide interventions and support to assist with school attendance issues. Interventions may include provision of transportation, alarm clocks, school supplies, referrals to outside agencies, etc.

g. Assistance from Counselors *(722(g)(1)(K))*: A description of how youths described in section 725(2) will receive assistance from counselors to advise such youths, and prepare and improve the readiness of such youths for college.

Within the training modules mentioned above, California will provide an overview of the requirements and showcase successful strategies for advising youth in order to prepare and improve their readiness for college. These modules will be for any stakeholder to learn about state and federal law with a focus on collaboration and coordination with higher education, new state laws, and the process for completing the Free Application for Federal Student Aid. There will be an emphasis on coordination between school counselors and LEA liaisons to identify and better prepare homeless youth for college and career readiness. Strategies within the module will encourage LEAs and their counselors to organize college campus visits for homeless youth, address application/tuition fee waivers, campus resources, and career options. Once school counselors and other stakeholders participate in the modules, homeless youth will be the direct recipient of the information and assistance, which includes: college campus visits, application and tuition fee waiver assistance, connections to campus resources and connections to career options/ information.

California will assist in various ways to ensure adherence to California state law that requires postsecondary educational institutions designate a staff member to serve as the Homeless and Foster Student Liaison, such as providing training to these liaisons on how to certify the homeless status of a youth. This staff member can be employed within the financial aid office or another appropriate office or department. The Homeless and Foster Student Liaison will be responsible for understanding the provisions of the federal Higher Education Act pertaining to financial aid eligibility of homeless youth, including unaccompanied homeless youth. The liaison shall assist these students in applying for and receiving federal and state financial aid and other available services.

As noted above, the CDE CARS Homeless Education Implementation and Policy page will ensure that school counselors have been trained regarding homeless education and the importance of guiding homeless youth to career and college opportunities. For those LEAs that indicate that their school counselors have not been trained, technical assistance will be provided on an annual basis.

Finally, during the 2017–18 school year, California will develop a plan to reach out to the various postsecondary agencies and stakeholders to train and inform them of the requirements to serve and support homeless youth. Part of the training module will be to encourage them to reach out to the LEA liaisons in their area. California will also encourage LEAs and COEs to do the same to develop relationships, collaboration, and coordination with the various local postsecondary institutions.

Appendix A: Measurements of interim progress

Instructions: Each SEA must include the measurements of interim progress toward meeting the long-term goals for academic achievement, graduation rates, and English language proficiency, set forth in the State's response to Title I, Part A question 4.iii, for all students and separately for each subgroup of students, including those listed in response to question 4.i.a. of this document. For academic achievement and graduation rates, the State's measurements of interim progress must take into account the improvement necessary on such measures to make significant progress in closing statewide proficiency and graduation rate gaps.

A. Academic Achievement

The five-by-five grids included in Section A.iii.a.1 allow LEAs or schools to determine how much progress is needed within the relevant period of time for schools and student groups to reach the goal, both in the baseline year and at any point within the seven-year time period.

The tables below display statewide baseline data for all students and each student group, and the approximate average annual improvement necessary over the seven-year period for each student group to meet the long-term goal. The tables show that many student groups would need to make significantly more progress than higher performing student groups to reach the statewide goal within 7 years.

<Start delete> ~~Table 38: State Level ELA Data by Student Group~~

~~Student Group~~	~~Grade Rate (Status)~~	~~Change~~	~~Color~~	~~Annual Average Improvement to Meet Goal~~	~~Status After Three Years~~
~~All Students~~	~~-6.0~~	~~2.2~~	~~Orange~~	~~2.3 points~~	~~0.9~~
~~American Indian~~	~~-36.8~~	~~2.3~~	~~Orange~~	~~6.7 points~~	~~-16.7~~
~~Asian~~	~~62.4~~	~~2~~	~~Blue~~	~~Increased from Baseline~~	~~62.5~~
~~Black or African American~~	~~-51.8~~	~~0.9~~	~~Orange~~	~~8.8 points~~	~~-25.3~~
~~Filipino~~	~~44~~	~~2.7~~	~~Green~~	~~Increased from Baseline~~	~~44.1~~
~~Hispanic or Latino~~	~~-31.3~~	~~3.2~~	~~Yellow~~	~~5.9 points~~	~~-13.6~~
~~Pacific Islander~~	~~-21.3~~	~~0.7~~	~~Orange~~	~~4.5 points~~	~~-7.9~~
~~Two or More Races~~	~~28.6~~	~~2.3~~	~~Green~~	~~Increased from Baseline~~	~~28.7~~
~~White~~	~~27.7~~	~~0.8~~	~~Green~~	~~Increased from Baseline~~	~~27.8~~
~~English Learner~~	~~-47.1~~	~~3.3~~	~~Yellow~~	~~8.2 points~~	~~-22.6~~
~~Socioeconomically Disadvantaged~~	~~-34.7~~	~~4~~	~~Yellow~~	~~6.4 points~~	~~-15.5~~
~~Students with Disabilities~~	~~-95.5~~	~~2.1~~	~~Red~~	~~15.1 points~~	~~-50.3~~

~~Note: The 10 points above standard goal for 3-8 is applied at the statewide level.~~ **<End delete> <Start add>**

Table 38a: State Level ELA Data by Student Group (Grades 3-8)

Student Group	Status	Change	Color	Average Annual Improvement to Meet Goal	Status After Three Years
All Students	-17.0	-0.5	Orange	4 points	-5.0
American Indian	-51.3	-3.2	Orange	9 points	-24.3
Asian	51.1	0.8	Blue	Increased from Baseline	51.2
Black or African American	-60.9	-1.9	Orange	10 points	-30.9

Student Group	Status	Change	Color	Average Annual Improvement to Meet Goal	Status After Three Years
Filipino	32.1	0.4	Green	Increased from Baseline	32.2
Hispanic or Latino	-41.3	-0.6	Orange	7 points	-20.3
Pacific Islander	-29.9	-1.3	Orange	6 points	-11.9
Two or More Races	16.7	-0.7	Green	Increased from Baseline	16.8
White	15.1	-0.5	Green	Increased from Baseline	15.5
English Learner	-50.8	-1.6	Orange	9 points	-23.8
Foster Youth	-86.9	4.0	Orange	14 points	-44.9
Homeless	-62.1	-4.2	Orange	10 points	-32.1
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	-45.9	-44.6	Orange	8 points	-21.9
Students with Disabilities	-104.7	-2.5	Red	16 points	-56.7

Table 38b: State Level ELA Data by Student Group (Grade 11)

Student Group	Status	Change	Color	Average Annual Improvement to Meet Goal	Status After Three Years
All Students	18.1	5.1	Green	Increase from Baseline	18.2
American Indian	-14.3	-0.7	Orange	3.5	-3.8
Asian	83.9	7.4	Blue	Increase from Baseline	84.0
Black or African American	-35.8	3	Orange	6.5	-16.3
Filipino	64.3	4.8	Blue	Increase from Baseline	64.4
Hispanic	-6.7	1.7	Orange	2.4	0.5
Pacific Islander	-10.1	-2	Orange	2.9	-1.4
Two or More Races	46.3	9.7	Blue	Increase from Baseline	46.4

Student Group	Status	Change	Color	Average Annual Improvement to Meet Goal	Status After Three Years
White	44.1	9.3	Green	Increase from Baseline	44.2
English Learner	-78.6	-5.2	Red	12.7	-40.5
Foster	-100.5	5.1	Orange	15.8	-53.1
Homeless	-36	-8.3	Orange	6.6	-16.2
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	-10.1	2.2	Orange	2.9	-1.4
Students With Disabilities	-112.5	0	Red	17.5	-60.0

<End add>

<Start delete>Table 39: State Level Mathematics Data by Student Group

Student Group	Grade Rate (Status)	Change	Color	Annual Average Improvement to Meet Goal	Status After Three Years
All Students	-36.4	1.3	Orange	5.2 points	-20.8
American Indian	-73	-0.7	Orange	10.4 points	-47.7
Asian	56.7	2.4	Blue	Increased from Baseline	56.8
Black or African American	-91.5	0.2	Orange	13.1 points	-52.3
Filipino	13.1	2.8	Green	Increased from Baseline	13.2
Hispanic or Latino	-65.8	1.7	Orange	9.4 points	-37.6
Pacific Islander	-52	-0.7	Orange	7.4 points	-29.7
Two or More Races	1.9	0.1	Green	Increased from Baseline	2.0
White	-1	0.6	Yellow	0.2 points	-.06
English Learner	-69.9	1.5	Orange	10 points	-39.9
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	-67.4	2.3	Orange	9.6 points	-38.5
Students with Disabilities	-125.3	0.8	Red	17.9 points	-71.6

Note: The Zero goal for grades 3-8 is applied at the statewide level. **<End delete>**

<Start add> Table 39a: State Level Mathematics Data by Student Group (Grades 3-8)

Student Group	Status	Change	Color	Annual Average Improvement to Meet Goal	Status After Three Years
All Students	-38.0	0.8	Orange	5 points	-23.0
American Indian	-73.2	-1.8	Orange	10 points	-43.2
Asian	49.9	3.1	Blue	Increased from Baseline	50.0
Black or African American	-90.7	-1.1	Orange	13 points	-51.7

Student Group	Status	Change	Color	Annual Average Improvement to Meet Goal	Status After Three Years
Filipino	10.9	3.0	Green	Increased from Baseline	11.0
Hispanic or Latino	-65.5	0.4	Orange	9 points	-38.5
Pacific Islander	-50.5	0.8	Orange	7 points	-29.5
Two or More Races	-2.5	1.4	Yellow	1 point	0.5
White	-5.0	0.9	Yellow	1 point	-2.0
English Learner	-68.3	-0.5	Orange	10 points	-38.5
Foster Youth	-110.0	6.8	Orange	16 points	-62.0
Homeless	-82.9	-2.7	Orange	12 points	-46.9
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	-68.6	-0.3	Orange	10 points	-38.6
Students with Disabilities	-125.0	-.09	Red	18 points	-71.0

Table 39b: State Level Mathematics Data by Student Group (Grade 11)

Student Group	Status	Change	Color	Average Annual Improvement to Meet Goal	Status After Three Years
All Students	-64.5	-0.7	Orange	9.2	-36.9
American Indian	-102.7	-7.3	Red	14.7	-58.6
Asian	46	1.9	Blue	Increase From Baseline	46.1
Black or African American	-129.8	-3.6	Red	18.5	-74.3
Filipino	-15.2	-3.9	Yellow	2.2	-8.6
Hispanic	-99.7	-4.3	Red	14.2	-57.1
Pacific Islander	-92.4	-7.2	Orange	13.2	-52.8
Two or More Races	-34.1	2.8	Orange	4.9	-19.4
White	-34.4	3.3	Yellow	4.9	-19.7

Student Group	Status	Change	Color	Average Annual Improvement to Meet Goal	Status After Three Years
English Learner	-153	-8.2	Red	21.9	-87.3
Foster	-193.6	-3.5	Red	27.7	-110.5
Homeless	-124.7	-13.4	Red	17.8	-71.3
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	-99	-3.4	Red	14.1	-56.7
Students With Disabilities	-200.9	-4.3	Red	28.7	-114.8

<End add>

The same calculation is possible at the LEA and school levels, as illustrated through an example using the five-by-five grid for mathematics below: a school with a Low (Status) and Declined (Change) will receive a performance level of Orange, and a goal of reaching High (Status) and Maintained (Change) within 7 years. If the school's baseline Status was 40 points below Level 3, improving by 6 points the next year would move it into the Yellow performance level based on Low (Status) and Increased (Change). If the school continues that progress, on average, over the next six years, it will be in the Green performance level, based on High (Status) and Increased (Change), exceeding the goal. Another school that started in the same Low (Status) and Declined (Change), but had a Status of 70 points below Level 3, would have to make greater improvements each year to meet or exceed the goal, and can use the five-by-five grid to measure its interim progress toward the goal. It is important to note that the amount of change will vary from year to year. Schools and/or student groups may make significant growth one year and less growth the following year. Therefore, the amount of growth required each year would always be based on the prior year's performance.

The CDE has produced a report that indicates where schools and student groups are on the five-by-five colored grid, allowing LEAs and schools to determine how much improvement is needed to reach the goal. These reports are available on the CDE California Model Five-by-Five Placement Reports & Data Web page at https://www6.cde.ca.gov/californiamodel/. California will ensure that LEAs report their measures of interim progress through the required LEA report card.

Additionally, under state law, every LEA must adopt and annually update a Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP). In the LCAP, the LEA must establish goals for all students and the statutory student groups across priority areas defined in statute. The LEA must also describe actions and services, and related expenditures, to meet the goals for student performance.

The template LEAs must use for LCAPs includes a summary in which LEAs must describe changes to programs or services that the LEA will make to address any area of low performance, which is defined to include Orange or Red performance levels on any of the required indicators under ESSA. Under the California Model, any LEA that has a Red or Orange performance level as its measure of interim progress is not on track for reaching and maintaining performance that meets the long-term established in the state plan. Accordingly, through the LCAP, such LEAs must describe the efforts they will undertake to improve performance on the relevant indicator to get back on track for making progress toward the long-term goal.

The summary included in the LCAP template also requires LEAs to address any indicator where the performance of one or more student groups is two or more color-coded levels below the performance for all students (e.g., student group performance is Red while overall performance is Yellow, Green or Blue; student group performance is Orange while overall performance is Green or Blue). Under the California Model, an LEA is not making progress toward closing performance gaps among student groups if either of the examples described above are present. Accordingly, through the LCAP, such LEAs must describe the efforts they will undertake to make significant progress in closing performance gaps on the relevant indicator(s).

LEAs must therefore not only report performance on the LEA report card using the measures of interim progress, but also must annually review and update their overarching plans for educational programming to address areas where performance is not on track to meet the long-term goal or where the LEA is not making progress in addressing performance gaps among student groups.

Table 40. Math – Academic Indicator Change

Levels	Declined Significantly by more than 15 points	Declined By 3 to 15 points	Maintained Declined by less than 3 points or Increased by less than 3 points	Increased by 3 to less than 15 points	Increased Significantly By 15 points or more
Very High 35 points or higher	Green	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue
High zero to 34.9 points	Green	Green	Green	Green	Blue
Medium -25 points to less than zero	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Green
Low -25.1 to -95 points	Orange	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Yellow
Very Low -95.1 points or lower	Red	Red	Red	Orange	Orange

B. Graduation Rates

The five-by-five grids included in Section A.iii.b.1 provide LEAs and schools the tools to determine locally how much progress is needed within the seven-year period of time to reach the goals for schools and student groups, both in the baseline year and at any point within the seven years.

The table below displays statewide baseline data for all students and each student group, and the approximate average annual improvement necessary over the seven-year period for each student group to meet the long-term goal. The tables show that many student groups would need to make significantly more progress than higher performing student groups to reach the statewide goal within 7 years.

<Start delete>~~Table 42. State Level Graduation Rate by Student Group~~

Student Group	Grade Rate (Status)	Change	Color	Average Annual Improvement to Meet Goal	Status After Year 3
All Students	88.4	1.7	Green	0.2%	89.0
American Indian	82.9	0.6	Orange	1.0%	85.9
Asian	94.1	0.6	Green	Increased from Baseline	94.2
Black or African American	81.5	3.1	Yellow	1.2%	85.1
Filipino	94.7	1.2	Green	Increased from Baseline	94.8
Hispanic or Latino	86.3	2.6	Green	0.5%	87.8
Pacific Islander	88.8	2.9	Green	0.2%	89.4
Two or More Races	90.6	0.6	Green	Increased from Baseline	90.7
White	92.0	0.5	Green	Increased from Baseline	92.1
English Learner	77.7	5.5	Yellow	1.8%	83.1
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	85.3	2.5	Green	0.7%	87.4
Students with Disabilities	69.0	2.3	Yellow	3.0%	78.0

<End delete>

<Start Add>

Student Group	Grade Rate (Status)	Change	Color	Average Annual Improvement to Meet Goal	Status After Year 3
All Students	83.8	0.9	Orange	1.3	87.8
American Indian	74.0	-0.4	Orange	3.3	83.9
Asian	93.7	0.9	Green	Increased from Baseline	93.8
Black or African American	72.9	0.3	Orange	3.5	83.5

Student Group	Grade Rate (Status)	Change	Color	Average Annual Improvement to Meet Goal	Status After Year 3
Filipino	94.0	0.7	Green	Increased from Baseline	94.1
Hispanic or Latino	80.5	1.5	Yellow	2.0	86.5
Pacific Islander	83.3	0.1	Orange	1.4	87.6
Two or More Races	85.8	-0.5	Yellow	0.9	88.6
White	88.9	0.4	Yellow	0.3	89.9
English Learner	72.5	3.0	Yellow	3.6	83.3
Foster Youth	51.1	1.0	Red	7.9	74.7
Homeless	70.5	3.1	Yellow	4.0	82.5
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	79.8	1.8	Yellow	2.1	86.2
Students with Disabilities	66.1	1.4	Red	4.9	80.7

<End Add>

The same calculation is possible at the LEA and school levels, as illustrated through an example using the five-by-five grid for graduation rate below: a school in the Orange performance level due to the combination of Low (Status) and Declined (Change), and a goal of reaching High (Status) and Maintained (Change) within 7 years. If the school's initial status was 75 percent, improving by 2 percentage points the next year would move it into the Yellow performance level based on Low (Status) and Increased (Change). If the school continues that progress, on average, over the next five years, it will be in the Green performance level, based on Medium (Status) and Increased (Change), but not meeting the goal.

The CDE has produced a report that indicates where schools and student groups are on the five-by-five colored grid, allowing LEAs and schools to determine how much improvement is needed to reach the goal. These reports are available on the CDE California Model Five-by-Five Placement Reports & Data Web page at https://www6.cde.ca.gov/californiamodel/. California will ensure that LEAs report their measures of interim progress through the required LEA report card. California will ensure that LEAs report their measures of interim progress through the required LEA report card.

Additionally, under state law, every LEA must adopt and annually update a Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP). In the LCAP, the LEA must establish goals for all students and the statutory student groups across priority areas defined in statute. The LEA must also describe actions and services, and related expenditures, to meet the goals for student performance.

The template LEAs must use for LCAPs includes a summary in which LEAs must describe changes to programs or services that the LEA will make to address any area of low performance, which is defined to include Orange or Red performance levels on any of the required indicators under ESSA. Under the California Model, any LEA that has a Red or Orange performance level as its measure of interim progress is not on track for reaching and maintaining performance that meets the long-term established in the state plan. Accordingly, through the LCAP, such LEAs must describe the efforts they will undertake to improve performance on the relevant indicator to get back on track for making progress toward the long-term goal.

The summary included in the LCAP template also requires LEAs to address any indicator where the performance of one or more student groups is two or more color-coded levels below the performance for all students (e.g., student group performance is Red while overall performance is Yellow, Green or Blue; student group performance is Orange while overall performance is Green or Blue). Under the California Model, an LEA is not making progress toward closing performance gaps among student groups if either of the examples described above are present. Accordingly, through the LCAP, such LEAs must describe the efforts they will undertake to make significant progress in closing performance gaps on the relevant indicator(s).

LEAs must therefore not only report performance on the LEA report card using the measures of interim progress, but also must annually review and update their overarching plans for educational programming to address areas where performance is not on track to meet the long-term goal or where the LEA is not making progress in addressing performance gaps among student groups.

Table 42. Graduation Rate Indicator

Level	Declined Significantly by greater than 5.0%	Declined by 1.0% to 5.0%	Maintained Declined or increased by less than 1.0%	Increased by 1.0% to less than 5.0%	Increased Significantly by 5.0% or greater
Very High 95.0% or greater	N/A	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue
High 90.5% to less than 95.0%	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green	Blue
Medium 85.0% to less than 90.5%	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green
Low 67.0% to less than 85.0%	Red	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Yellow
Very Low Less than 68.0%	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red

C. Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency

The five-by-five grids included in Section A.iii.c.1 allow LEAs or schools to determine how much progress is needed within the relevant period of time to reach the goal, both in the baseline year and at any point within the seven year time period.

The table below displays statewide baseline data on this indicator, and the approximate average annual improvement necessary over the seven-year period to meet the long-term goal.

<Start delete>Table 43: State Level English Learner Progress Performance Level

Student Group	2013-14 ELPI Status	2014-15 ELPI Status	Change	Color	Average Annual Improvement to Meet Goal	Status After Year 3
English Learners	69.0	68.7	-0.35	Yellow	1%	73.0

Note: This table will be updated prior to submission to ED to reflect the calculations using progress on the assessment only. **<End delete>**

<Start add>

Student Group	2018-19 ELPI Status	Average Annual Improvement to Meet Goa	Status After Year 3
English Learners	48.3	1.3	52.2

<End add>

The same calculation is possible at the LEA and school levels, as illustrated through an example using the**<Start add>**prior**<End add>** five-by-five grid for the ELPI below: a school in the Orange performance level due to the combination of Low (Status) and Declined (Change), and a goal of reaching High (Status) and Maintained (Change) within seven years. If the school's initial status was 61 percent, improving by 5 percentage points the next year would move it into the Yellow performance level based on Low (Status) and Increased (Change). If the school continues that progress, on average, over the next five years, it will be in the Blue performance level, based on Very High (Status) and Increased (Change), exceeding the goal.

The CDE has produced a report that indicates where schools are on the five-by-five colored grid, allowing LEAs and schools to determine how much improvement is needed to reach the goal. These reports are available on the CDE California Model Five-by-Five Placement Reports & Data Web page at https://www6.cde.ca.gov/californiamodel/. California will ensure that LEAs report their measures of interim progress through the required LEA report card. **<Start add>**Note: A third year of ELPAC data is required to produce a five-by-five colored grid for the ELPI. As a result, the new color grid will not be available until the 2020 Dashboard. **<End add>**

Additionally, under state law, every LEA must adopt and annually update a LCAP. In the LCAP, the LEA must establish goals for all students and the statutory student groups across priority areas defined in statute. The LEA must also describe actions and services, and related expenditures, to meet the goals for student performance.

The template LEAs must use for LCAPs includes a summary in which LEAs must describe changes to programs or services that the LEA will make to address any area of low performance, which is defined to include Orange or Red performance levels on any of the required indicators under ESSA. Under the California Model, any LEA that has a Red or Orange performance level as its measure of interim progress is not on track for reaching and maintaining performance that meets the long-term established in the state plan. Accordingly, through the LCAP, such LEAs must describe the efforts they will undertake to improve performance on the relevant indicator to get back on track for making progress toward the long-term goal.

The summary included in the LCAP template also requires LEAs to address any indicator where the performance of one or more student groups is two or more color-coded levels below the performance for all students (e.g., student group performance is Red while overall performance is Yellow, Green or Blue; student group performance is Orange while overall performance is Green or Blue). Under the California Model, an LEA is not making progress toward closing performance gaps among student groups if either of the examples described above are present. Accordingly, through the LCAP, such LEAs must describe the

efforts they will undertake to make significant progress in closing performance gaps on the relevant indicator(s).

LEAs must therefore not only report performance on the LEA report card using the measures of interim progress, but also must annually review and update their overarching plans for educational programming to address areas where performance is not on track to meet the long-term goal or where the LEA is not making progress in addressing performance gaps among student groups.

Table 44. English Learner Progress Indicator <Start add> (Five-by-Five used for the 2017 Dashboard) <End add>

Level	Declined Significantly by greater than 10.0%	Declined by 1.5% to 10.0%	Maintained Declined or increased by less than 1.5%	Increased by 1.5% to less than 10.0%	Increased Significantly by 10.0% or greater
Very High 85.0% or greater	Yellow	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue
High 75.0% to less than 85.0%	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green	Blue
Medium 67.0% to less than 75.0%	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green
Low 60.0% to less than 67.0%	Red	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Yellow
Very Low Less than 60.0%	Red	Red	Red	Orange	Yellow

Appendix B: Section 427 of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA)

Instructions: In the text box below, describe the steps the applicant proposes to take to ensure equitable access to, and participation in, its Federally-assisted program for students, teachers, and other program beneficiaries with special needs provide the information to meet the requirements of Section 427 of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA), consistent with the following instructions.

California state law ensures that all persons in public schools—regardless of gender, race, national origin, color, disability, or age—are provided equitable access to, and participation in, federally-assisted education programs. Per California *Education Code:*

- Section 200: It is the policy of the State of California to afford all persons in public schools, regardless of their disability, gender, gender identity, gender expression, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, or any other characteristic that is contained in the definition of hate crimes set forth in Section 422.55 of the Penal Code, equal rights and opportunities in the educational institutions of the state. The purpose of this chapter is to prohibit acts that are contrary to that policy and to provide remedies therefor.

- Section 201(a): All pupils have the right to participate fully in the educational process, free from discrimination and harassment.

- Section 220: No person shall be subjected to discrimination on the basis of disability, gender, gender identity, gender expression, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, or any other characteristic that is contained in the definition of hate crimes set forth in Section 422.55 of the Penal Code in any program or activity conducted by an educational institution that receives, or benefits from, state financial assistance or enrolls pupils who receive state student financial aid.

- Section 250: Prior to receipt of any state financial assistance or state student financial aid, an educational institution shall provide assurance to the agency administering the funds, in the manner required by the funding agency, that each program or activity conducted by the educational institution will be conducted in compliance with the provisions of this chapter and all other applicable provisions of state law prohibiting discrimination. A single assurance, not more than one page in length and signed by an appropriate responsible official of the educational institution, may be provided for all the programs and activities conducted by an educational institution.

- Section 260: The governing board of a school district shall have the primary responsibility for ensuring that school district programs and activities are free from discrimination based on age and the characteristics listed in Section 220 and for monitoring compliance with any and all rules and regulations promulgated pursuant to Section 11138 of the Government Code.

  Section 262.3(a): A party to a written complaint of prohibited discrimination may appeal the action taken by the governing board of a school district pursuant to this article, to the State Department of Education.

NOTICE TO ALL APPLICANTS

The purpose of this enclosure is to inform you about the following provision in the Department of Education's General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) that applies to applicants for new grant awards under Department programs. This provision is Section 427 of GEPA, enacted as part of the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 (Public Law (P.L.) 103-382).

To Whom Does This Provision Apply?

Section 427 of GEPA affects applicants for new grant awards under this program. **ALL APPLICANTS FOR NEW AWARDS MUST INCLUDE INFORMATION IN THEIR APPLICATIONS TO ADDRESS THIS NEW PROVISION IN ORDER TO RECEIVE FUNDING UNDER THIS PROGRAM.**

(If this program is a State-formula grant program, a State needs to provide this description only for projects or activities that it carries out with funds reserved for State-level uses. In addition, local school districts or other eligible applicants that apply to the State for funding need to provide this description in their applications to the State for funding. The State would be responsible for ensuring that the school district or other local entity has submitted a sufficient section 427 statement as described below.)

What Does This Provision Require?

Section 427 requires each applicant for funds (other than an individual person) to include in its application a description of the steps the applicant proposes to take to ensure equitable access to, and participation in, its Federally-assisted program for students, teachers, and other program beneficiaries with special needs. This provision allows applicants discretion in developing the required description. The statute highlights six types of barriers that can impede equitable access or participation: gender, race, national origin, color, disability, or age. Based on local circumstances, you should determine whether these or other barriers may prevent your students, teachers, etc. from such access or participation in, the Federally-funded project or activity. The description in your application of steps to be taken to overcome these barriers need not be lengthy; you may provide a clear and succinct description of how you plan to address those barriers that are applicable to your circumstances. In addition, the information may be provided in a single narrative, or, if appropriate, may be discussed in connection with related topics in the application.

Section 427 is not intended to duplicate the requirements of civil rights statutes, but rather to ensure that, in designing their projects, applicants for Federal funds address equity concerns that may affect the ability of certain potential beneficiaries to fully participate in the project and to achieve to high standards. Consistent with program requirements and its approved application, an applicant may use the Federal funds awarded to it to eliminate barriers it identifies.

What are Examples of How an Applicant Might Satisfy the Requirement of This Provision?

The following examples may help illustrate how an applicant may comply with Section 427.

(1) An applicant that proposes to carry out an adult literacy project serving, among others, adults with limited English proficiency, might describe in its application how it intends to distribute a brochure about the proposed project to such potential participants in their native language.

(2) An applicant that proposes to develop instructional materials for classroom use might describe how it will make the materials available on audio tape or in braille for students who are blind.

(3) An applicant that proposes to carry out a model science program for secondary students and is concerned that girls may be less likely than boys to enroll in the course, might indicate how it intends to conduct "outreach" efforts to girls, to encourage their enrollment.

(4) An applicant that proposes a project to increase school safety might describe the special efforts it will take to address concern of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender students, and efforts to reach out to and involve the families of LGBT students

We recognize that many applicants may already be implementing effective steps to ensure equity of access and participation in their grant programs, and we appreciate your cooperation in responding to the requirements of this provision.

Estimated Burden Statement for GEPA Requirements

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1.5 hours per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The obligation to respond to this collection is required to obtain or retain benefit (Public Law 103-382. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20210-4537 or email ICDocketMgr@ed.gov and reference the OMB Control Number 1894-000

California ESSA Consolidated State Plan
State Board of Education | California Department of Education
December 2019