

State of California

Department of Education

# INFORMATION MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** August 4, 2004

**TO:** MEMBERS, STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

**FROM:** Sue Stickel, Deputy Superintendent  
Curriculum and Instruction Branch

**SUBJECT:** Immediate Intervention/Underperforming Schools Program (II/USP):  
Background information in preparation for first list of potential state-monitored schools

The Legislature enacted the II/USP in 1999, which is a program that provides schools in decile ranks 1-5 an opportunity to apply for funding to improve student achievement in exchange for greater accountability. Schools participating in the program received \$50,000 in the first year to develop an improvement plan and \$200 per student annually to implement the plan for two to three years. In return for the funding, schools agreed to be held accountable for steadily increasing student achievement. According to the law, schools that do not demonstrate "significant growth" as defined by the State Board of Education (SBE) become subject to state sanctions/intervention at the end of the two- or three-year period. Based on the recommendation of the Public Schools Accountability Act (PSAA) Advisory Committee, the SBE has defined significant growth as making positive growth on the schoolwide Academic Performance Index (API) in either of the two funded implementation years and each year thereafter until the school exits the program.

In August, the Policy and Evaluation Office will release the schoolwide API data as part of the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) report. Based on the schoolwide API, schools in Cohorts I and II that are currently "under watch" and schools in Cohort III that have completed two years of II/USP implementation may potentially be identified as state-monitored if they fail to demonstrate significant growth. Schools that are "under watch" did not exit the II/USP program after the first two years of implementation. These schools are reviewed annually to determine if they will exit the program (i.e., meet all growth targets), remain "under watch" (i.e., make significant growth only) or become state-monitored (i.e., make zero or negative growth on the schoolwide API).

In addition, schools without valid API growth data are also at risk of being deemed state-monitored unless the schools are able to demonstrate significant growth using the alternative criteria adopted by the SBE in January 2004 (see attached criteria).

The first list of potential state-monitored schools will be brought to the SBE for consideration in September. At that time the Superintendent will recommend which of the sanctions should be invoked (in accordance with law) on the schools deemed state-monitored.

Attachment 1: Criteria for II/USP Schools Without Valid APIs to Demonstrate Academic Growth  
(Page 1 of 1)

## **Criteria for II/USP Schools Without Valid APIs to Demonstrate Academic Growth**

Elementary schools must demonstrate that:

- The percentage of students (schoolwide) at or above the proficient level on the California Standards test in English/language arts increased by at least one percentage point from 2003 to 2004 (note: 0.99 does not equal 1.00), **and**
- The percentage of students (schoolwide) at or above the proficient level on the California Standards test in Mathematics Standards increased by at least one percentage point from 2003 to 2004.

Middle Schools must demonstrate that:

- The percentage of students at or above the proficient level (schoolwide) on the California Standards test in English/language arts increased by at least one percentage point from 2003 to 2004 (note: 0.99 does not equal 1.00), **and**
- The percentage of students (schoolwide) at or above the proficient level on the California Standards tests in the Mathematics Standards, General Math, and Algebra I increased by at least one percentage point from 2003 to 2004.

High schools must demonstrate that:

- The percentage of students (schoolwide) at or above the proficient level on the California Standards test in English/language arts increased by at least one percentage point from 2003 to 2004 (note: 0.99 does not equal 1.00), **and**
- The percentage of students (schoolwide) at or above the proficient level on the California Standards test in General Mathematics, Algebra I, and Geometry increased by at least one percentage point from 2003 to 2004.