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# **MEMORANDUM**

**DATE:** August 22, 2018

**TO:** MEMBERS, State Board of Education

**FROM:** TOM TORLAKSON, State Superintendent of Public Instruction

**SUBJECT:** Every Student Succeeds Act Implementation Timeline

## Summary of Key Issues

California’s Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plan was approved by the U. S. Department of Education (ED) on July 12, 2018. The California Department of Education (CDE) and California’s local educational agencies (LEAs) are currently beginning to implement the ESSA requirements, as well as taking advantage of new opportunities to partner with stakeholders to improve education for all students.

The ESSA requires LEAs to complete an LEA Plan that addresses required provisions of ESSA programs under which an LEA applies for federal education funds. Within California, the LEAs that apply for ESSA funds are required to complete a Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP), LCAP Federal Addendum (Addendum) and the Consolidated Application (ConApp). The LCAP is the primary strategic planning document for each LEA. The LCAP, in conjunction with the Addendum and the ConApp, serves to meet the ESSA LEA Plan requirements.

Included within the ESSA State Plan is the criteria for identifying schools for improvement, including comprehensive support and improvement (CSI), targeted support and improvement (TSI), and additional targeted support (ATS). Information from the 2018 California School Dashboard (planned for release in early December) will be used to subsequently identify schools within each category in January 2019.

## Postponement of the Local Control and Accountability Plan Federal Addendum Submission Date

At the CDE’s request, the ED has allowed the 2018–19 school year to serve as a planning year to develop the ESSA LEA plan. This will allow the CDE to develop guidance on aspects of the State Plan that were recently approved by the ED, including the sections on CSI, TSI and ATS. The additional time will also allow the CDE to enhance its existing guidance for completing the Addendum.

As such, the CDE has postponed the submission date for the Addendum, originally established as August 15, 2018. The new submission date for the Addendum will be on or before July, 1, 2019, to better align with the school and district-level planning process.

Following the CDE’s determination that County Offices of Education (COEs), school districts, and charter schools Addenda meet the approval criteria for each provision, the CDE will recommend those Addenda for approval at a regularly scheduled State Board of Education (SBE) meeting.

This memorandum includes the following Attachments:

Attachment 1: California’s ESSA Implementation Timeline, 2018-21, includes the major milestones of the federal statute in the first few years of implementing new accountability, reporting and school improvement systems, based on the current approved State Plan. The timeline was created in order to provide the SBE, LEAs and other stakeholders with a sense of opportunities and requirements for the 2018-19, 2019-20, and 2020-21 school years.

Attachment 2: Key ESSA Implementation Activities outlines state decision points and planning processes in the initial years for implementing the federal statute, based on the current approved State Plan. This timeline was created in order to provide the SBE, LEAs and other stakeholders with a sense of the most immediate opportunities and requirements now and throughout the 2018-19 school year.

Attachment 3: A table showing LEA and school identification under the Local Control Funding Formula and the ESSA, and associated implementation timelines.

## Attachment(s)

**Attachment 1:** California ESSA Implementation Timeline, 2018-21 (2 Pages)

**Attachment 2:** Key ESSA Implementation Activities for 2018-19 (4 Pages)

**Attachment 3:** Local Educational Agency and School Identification under the Local Control Funding Formula and the Every Student Succeeds Act (3 pages)

# **Attachment 1: California ESSA Implementation Timeline, 2018-21**

| **Year** | **Timeline** |
| --- | --- |
| 2018–19 school year | * Annual Dashboard release (fall) * Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) schools identified (January) (CSI identified once every 3 years) * Additional Targeted Support (ATS) schools identified for first time (January) (ATS identified once every 3 years) * Local educational agencies (LEA) and/or schools develop improvement strategies aligned to the LEA’s LCAP for schools identified for CSI, TSI or ATS. * Planning year for LEA Plans * LEA Report Cards (annual) * California Department of Education (CDE) to update Educator Equity Plan (annual) * Federal Program Monitoring instruments fully-aligned to ESSA requirements |
| 2019–20 school year | * LEA Plans due to the CDE (July 2019) * Annual Dashboard release (fall) * LEAs implementing CSI and ATS improvement strategies for identified schools * Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) schools identified (winter) * LEA Report Cards, with expenditure data incorporated for first time (annual) * CDE to update Educator Equity Plan (annual) |
| 2020–21 school year | * Annual Dashboard release (fall) * LEAs continue implementing CSI and ATSI improvement strategies for identified schools * TSI schools identified (winter) * LEA Report Cards (annual) * CDE to update Educator Equity Plan (annual) |

# **Attachment 2: Key ESSA Implementation Activities for 2018**

| **Action Point** | **SBE Action or CDE Action** |
| --- | --- |
| Incorporation of **Grade 11 Test Scores** into the Dashboard | SBE Action |
| Development of Business Rule to Ensure **Participation Rate** is Incorporated into Academic Indicator | CDE Action |
| **School Improvement Plan** Timelines and Format | To Be Determined |
| Guidance for **School-Level Expenditure Reporting** | CDE Action |
| **State Education Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agency (LEA) Report Card** Format (In Development) | CDE Action |
| Finalize submission deadline and review process for **LEA Plans** and update guidance (CDE); approve LEA Plans (SBE) | SBE Action and CDE Action |
| Reassess **Communication Channels** to the Field for ESSA-Related Programs with System of Support | CDE Action |
| Align **Federal Program Monitoring** to ESSA requirements | CDE Action |

Below are brief summaries of each of the issues described in the table above, along with the reference to the relevant section of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). For certain issues, additional information about options for implementation decisions is included.

## Grade 11 Test Scores

The performance levels for the academic indicator were adopted by the State Board of Education (SBE) for grades 3-8, before the SBE took action to include grade 11 test scores in the indicator. In 2018-19 the SBE will consider taking action to adopt the cut scores for the grade 11 performance levels in light of this addition and whether to incorporate the grade 11 results into the Dashboard.

ESSA Section: 1111(c)(4)(B)

## Participation Rate

The CDE will develop business rules for the 2018 Dashboard to ensure that participation rate is incorporated into the academic indicator, as ESSA requires.

ESSA Section: 1111(c)(4)(E)(iii)

## School Improvement Plans

The format and development timelines for School Improvement Plans are in development. Both the SBE and CDE will seek public input over the coming months on how to incorporate the school improvement planning requirements into existing state and federal plan templates.

ESSA Section: 1003(e)

As noted in prior SBE materials, both the purpose and consequences of the identification process are important considerations when evaluating options for implementing ESSA’s school improvement requirements. Additionally, staff have noted opportunities to utilize existing planning requirements to meet ESSA’s requirements, which has the potential of ensuring state priorities remain central and reducing redundancy and duplication of planning at the local level.

ESSA requires states to identify multiple categories of schools for different types of support:

1. At least the lowest performing 5 percent of Title I schools (comprehensive support)
2. High schools with graduation rates below 67 percent (comprehensive support)
3. Schools with “consistently underperforming” student groups (targeted support)
4. Schools identified under #3 where a student group on its own is performing at or below the level of schools identified under 1 (additional targeted support)

Under ESSA, the following actions are required when the state identifies schools for ***comprehensive support*** (i.e., the lowest performing Title I schools and high schools with graduation rates below 67 percent):

* The LEA in which the school is located must develop and implement a “comprehensive support and improvement plan” for the school that considers all accountability indicators, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies any resource inequities.
* The school, LEA, and State educational agency must approve the plan.
* The State educational agency must monitor and periodically review the plan.

As noted in the April 2018 agenda item, Item 1, Attachment 1 (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/apr18item01a1.docx>), the SBE could consider modifying the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) plan summary template to include school-level prompts so that school improvement requirements for LEAs with comprehensive support schools can be addressed through the LCAP process. The LEA must adopt the LCAP annually, which would satisfy ESSA’s requirement that the LEA approve the school’s planned improvement strategies. The existing LCAP review and approval process provides an avenue for addressing the requirement that the SEA also approve the plan. Finally, incorporating this information into the LCAP would help ensure that the school improvement strategies align with the LCAP and that the LEA considers how it is supporting the comprehensive support schools within the LCAP development process.

Under ESSA, the following actions are required when the state identifies schools for ***targeted support***:

* The school must develop and implement a “targeted support and improvement plan” for any identified student group at the school that considers all accountability indicators, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment.
* For schools identified for additional targeted support, the plan must also identify any resource inequities to be addressed.
* The LEA must approve the plan.
* The LEA must monitor the plan.

Under existing state law, schools that receive Title I funding must annually develop a Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA). The SPSA must be approved by the local governing board, which would satisfy ESSA’s requirement that the LEA approve the school’s planned improvement strategies. Additionally, district superintendents must ensure that the strategies in the district’s LCAP and school SPSAs align. Utilizing the SPSA would therefore help reinforce the importance of LEAs ensuring that school-level strategies align with the broader LEA-level strategies reflected in the LCAP.

## School-Level Expenditure Reporting

Under the ESSA, each State report card is required to include the per pupil expenditures of federal, state and local funds, including actual personnel expenditures and non-personnel expenditures of federal, state and local funds, disaggregated by source of funds for each LEA and each school in the State for the preceding fiscal year. On August 1, 2018, the CDE issued guidance to LEAs for how to collect and report this information, available at The Every Student Succeeds Act Per-Pupil Expenditure Reporting Requirement (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/ac/co/essappeltr.asp>).

ESSA Section: 1111(h)(1)(c)(x)

## SEA and LEA Report Cards

The reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act as the ESSA changed many of the requirements of the components of the SEA and LEA report cards. In 2018-19, the CDE will seek input from the public in order to develop appropriate templates for both report cards.

ESSA Section: 1111(h)(1)

## LEA Plans

At the CDE’s request, the ED has allowed the 2018-19 school year to serve as a planning year to develop the ESSA local educational agency plan. This planning year will allow LEAs to meaningfully address specific provisions and prompts within the Local Control and Accountability Plan Federal Addendum (Addendum) related to improvement activities and other programmatic requirements. Instead of the original proposed submission date of August 15, 2018, the new submission date will be on or about July 1, 2019, to better align with the school and district-level planning development process. This timeline will allow the CDE to develop guidance on aspects of the State Plan that were recently approved by the ED and the review the existing guidance for completing the Addendum.

ESSA Section: 1112

## Communication Channels

Starting in 2018–19 and continuing through a cycle of continuous improvement, the CDE is reassessing its communication methods and channels to the field for ESSA-related programs. Due to the multiple programmatic changes within the ESSA statute, and the various changes to delivery systems for LEA support and assistance, the CDE will adapt its methods for how information is provided to the field.

ESSA Sections: multiple

# **Attachment 3: Local Educational Agency and School Identification under the Local Control Funding Formula and the Every Student Succeeds Act**

The table below is a summary of the identification criteria for state and federal accountability activities, reflecting state law and California’s approved Every Student Succeeds Act State Plan and the proposed process for addressing the school improvement requirements. This information is further articulated in Attachment 2.

| **Activity** | **Identification Criteria** | **Level** | **Process** | **Timeline** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF)** | Student group meets criteria for 2 or more LCFF priorities/indicators | Local educational agencies | County offices of education (COE) differentiated assistance | Identified every year |
| **Comprehensive Support**  ***Lowest Performing Title I Schools*** | 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. | School  Title I schools only | LCAP summary prompt reflecting school improvement strategy in approved Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA), subject to COE approval | First identified January 2019  Identified once every 3 years |
| **Comprehensive Support**  ***Graduation Rate below 67%*** | California will use the average of two years of graduation rate data to identify schools with a high school graduation rate less than 67 percent. Any school with a graduation rate less than 67 percent averaged over two years will be identified for comprehensive assistance.  Note: The State Plan states this will be based on the average of three years of data. The U.S. Department of Education, however, has indicated that California can use two years data for this initial year due to the recent implementation of an updated methodology for calculating the four-year cohort graduation rate, as described in a June information memorandum (https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-jun18item02.docx). | School  High schools only | LCAP summary prompt reflecting approved SPSA, subject to COE approval | First identified January 2019  Identified once every 3 years |
| **Targeted Support** | Schools identified for Targeted Support are those with one or more “consistently underperforming” student groups, defined as any student group that 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 in two consecutive years. | School, based on student group performance  Any school | SPSA, approved by LEA (must align to LCAP and follow CDE template) | First identified January 2019  Identified every year\*\* |
| **Additional Targeted Support** | California will identify schools for additional targeted support from among the schools with one of more “consistently underperforming” student group. Schools with one or more “consistently underperforming” student group will be identified for additional targeted support if any student group at the school, on its own, meets the criteria used to identify the lowest performing Title I schools for comprehensive support. | School, based on student group performance  Any school | SPSA, approved by LEA (must align to LCAP and follow CDE template) | First identified January 2019  Identified once every 3 years |

\*\*Note: Because of the interrelated selection criteria, schools are only identified for “targeted support” in the years when schools are not identified for “additional targeted support.” Additional targeted support schools are selected from among schools with “consistently underperforming” student groups, and all schools with “consistently underperforming” student groups will meet the criteria for additional targeted support.

**Timeline**

| **2018**–**19** | **2019**–**20** | **2020**–**21** | **2021**–**2022** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| LCFF  Comprehensive Support  *Cohort 1*  Targeted Support\*\*  Additional Targeted Support  *Cohort 1* | LCFF  Targeted Support | LCFF  Targeted Support | LCFF  Comprehensive Support  *Cohort 2*  Targeted Support\*\*  Additional Targeted Support  *Cohort 2* |

\*\*Note: Because of the interrelated selection criteria, schools are only identified for “targeted support” in the years when schools are not identified for “additional targeted support.” Additional targeted support schools are selected from among schools with “consistently underperforming” student groups, and all schools with “consistently underperforming” student groups will meet the criteria for additional targeted support.