

# California State Plan to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators



**Revised August 2016**

Prepared by:  
Professional Learning Support Division  
Instruction, Learning, and Standards Support Branch  
California Department of Education  
1430 N Street, Suite 4309  
Sacramento, CA 95814-5901  
Phone: (916) 445-7331  
FAX: 916-319-0136

The California State Board of Education (SBE) and the California Department of Education (CDE) respectfully submit to the U.S. Department of Education (ED) a revised plan of current and future work related to gaps in equitable access to excellent educators for all students. This plan responds to Education Secretary Duncan's July 7, 2014, letter to state educational agencies (SEAs), augmented with guidance published on November 10, 2014 as well as with changes set forth by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA); specifically how the State intends to define the term "ineffective teacher"; collect, report, and analyze such data to inform State strategies for equally distributing teachers.

California's work to date complies with (1) the requirement in Section 1111(b)(8)(C) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), reauthorized by the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act, that each state's Title I, Part A plan include information on the specific steps that the SEA will take to ensure that students from low-income families and minority students are not taught at higher rates than other children by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers, and the measures that the agency will use to evaluate and publicly report the progress of the agency with respect to such steps; and (2) the requirement in ESEA Section 1111(e)(2) that a state's plan be revised by the SEA if appropriate.

This document details a theory of action and progress toward achieving equitable access to excellent teachers and leaders for all students. It provides information regarding the initiatives embarked upon by the CDE, under the leadership of State Superintendent of Public Instruction (SSPI) Tom Torlakson, the SBE, and the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC), a collaborative partner in the State's efforts to improve teacher quality, teaching quality, and instructional leadership. It also provides a summary of how California will continue to evaluate and strategically plan how to continually improve the distribution of its teachers so that poor and minority students are not taught at disproportionate rates by inexperienced, unqualified (ineffective), or out-of-field teachers.

## Section 1: Introduction

California has long been committed to working with diverse stakeholders to provide a high quality education to all students regardless of socioeconomic status or background. Educational equity has been a thoughtfully and deliberatively discussed priority for many years. The state is already implementing a number of ambitious and proactive research-based strategies and initiatives designed to achieve the objectives described in the ESEA, and as ESSA requirements become clear, more will need to be done. We plan to leverage and expand upon this work to recruit, prepare, and maintain a highly skilled educator workforce for the benefit of all students and to promote equitable access to an excellent education for students from historically underserved communities, in particular.

The CDE is proud to share the progress to date. With a fresh perspective and impetus on continuous improvement within our education system, we also appreciate the opportunity to look at what must still be accomplished to ensure that students from low-income and historically underserved families are not disproportionately attending schools taught and led by inexperienced or unqualified teachers and principals.

It is important to note that this plan addresses the equity gaps identified by the current data and the stakeholders who were engaged in the plan update process. Using this information, the CDE will continue to prepare a report on the progress of the California State Plan to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators (EEP) and present it to the SBE on an annual basis. During this transition year from the NCLB Act to the ESSA, California will continue to collect and report data pertaining to unqualified teachers as is defined in this document. The 2017 EEP, in alignment with the ESSA, will discuss the State's process for defining, or providing guidelines for the local process of defining the term "ineffective teacher" which will replace the current term "unqualified teacher" in future plans. This plan will be implemented within California's unique context and in tandem with the implementation of other important reform efforts currently underway.

**The importance of local control in California.** Given the size and diversity of the state, California's education system is founded on the belief that many education decisions should appropriately be made by local educational agencies (LEAs) and their communities of stakeholders. Each of California's LEAs has the authority and responsibility for developing and maintaining its own locally bargained contractual agreements with its employees. The ability for agencies to attract, retain, and provide professional learning for teachers and principals is fundamentally dependent on local contexts, and, therefore, is a matter best addressed by the stakeholders most familiar with those contexts.

California's new education funding system, the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), furthers this local engagement and autonomy by providing additional funds for agencies serving high-need students and by requiring public engagement in making plans to improve the academic outcomes for those students. In the 2015–16 California State Budget, an increase of \$6 billion was provided to continue the state's transition to the

LCFF. This formula commits additional funding to districts serving English learners (ELs), students from low-income families, and youth in foster care. The LCFF requires LEAs to develop their own plans for improving student outcomes in consultation with the whole school community, including parents, students, teachers, and administrators. Further, those local plans are reviewed and refined in collaboration with California's county offices of education, ensuring that LEA's receive timely and informed technical assistance.

While California has been involved in a number of statewide initiatives to support educator equity, the LCFF provides an opportunity to capitalize on those efforts, bringing to bear local expertise and additional funds that are essential for identifying and addressing equity gaps. This document identifies a total of 14 strategies. The LCFF is described more thoroughly in Strategy 4A of this plan.

**Dedicated funding to support educator excellence.** The 2015 California State Budget provided \$490 million in one-time funds to LEAs to support educator effectiveness. The funds may be expended for up to three fiscal years through 2017–18. These funds, allocated on a per educator basis, can be used for the following:

- Beginning teacher and administrator support and mentoring
- Professional development (PD), coaching, and support services for teachers who have been identified as needing improvement or additional support
- PD for teachers and administrators that is aligned to the state academic content standards

**Coherence across reform efforts.** The LCFF is just one of several important reforms currently being implemented in California designed to improve student outcomes. With the adoption of new academic content standards beginning in 2010, the state has taken advantage of the opportunity to reexamine existing practices and policies to ensure they support excellence in teaching and leading in California public schools.

- *Greatness by Design:* Since 2012, much of California's work to improve educator excellence has been grounded in *Greatness by Design: Supporting Outstanding Teaching to Sustain a Golden State (GbD)*, a report from the California Educator Excellence Task Force (EETF). The EETF was comprised of more than 50 education stakeholders—including parents, K–12 educators, postsecondary educators, researchers, and community leaders—and was charged with drafting recommended actions that could be woven together into a coherent system that would produce exceptional teachers and principals.

More information regarding the EETF and *GbD* is available on the CDE EETF Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/eo/in/ee.asp>. The *GbD* recommendations address a wide range of education issues in California, focusing broadly on recruitment, preparation, induction, professional learning, evaluation, and

leadership. Implementation of many of the *GbD* recommendations is well underway.

- California's Statewide Special Education Task Force Recommendations: In 2013, prompted by SBE President Michael Kirst and CTC Chair Linda Darling-Hammond, California convened a group of 34 representative stakeholders to study why students with disabilities are not succeeding at the same levels as their general education peers. The statewide Special Education Task Force was convened to ensure success for all of the state's children and is directly tied to the state's work to ensure equitable access to highly qualified teachers. Task Force members were charged with identifying needed changes in policy and practice.

The Task Force recommendations call for a unified education system in which all children, including students with disabilities, are considered general education students first and foremost. The Task Force membership included parents, teachers, school and district administrators, university professors, members of the policy community, and other stakeholder groups. A list of Task Force members and their affiliations is available on the CDE's Special Education Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/>.

- California's English Language Arts/English Language Development Curriculum Framework: In July 2014, the SBE adopted the *English Language Arts/English Language Development Framework for California Public Schools (Framework)*. This is the first time in the nation that a state has adopted dual guidelines in one publication for both English language arts (ELA) and English language development (ELD). By combining both sets of standards into a coherent curriculum framework, California has made clear that its goal is to prepare all students for literacy in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

The *Framework* provides guidance to teachers implementing the CA Common Core State Standards for ELA/Literacy as well as the CA ELD Standards, including instructional strategies and resources such as vignettes and models that teachers may use to strengthen the learning for every student. It provides guidance to schools and districts on curriculum, instructional programs, assessment, leadership, professional learning, and issues of equity and access. The *Framework* was developed by educators and literacy experts, most of whom are teachers in California classrooms. The *Framework* and resources to support its implementation are available on the CDE SBE-Adopted ELA/ELD Framework Chapters Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/rl/cf/elaeldfrmwrksbeadopted.asp>.

California is committed to creating coherence across existing and new reform efforts so that they build on and leverage one another rather than create confusion and contradictions as implementation of each of the initiatives progresses.

## Section 2: Equity Gaps

### California's Students

California's K–12 system is comprised of more than 6.2 million students who attend more than 10,000 schools in 1,022 school districts including charter schools. The number of California public school students is greater than the entire population of more than 30 other states combined.

California students are among the most ethnically diverse in the nation.

**Table 1: California Student Demographics: 2014–15**

Ethnicity	Number of students	Percentage
African American not Hispanic	373,280	6.16%
American Indian or Alaska Native	36,755	0.62%
Asian	545,720	8.70%
Filipino	158,224	2.43%
Hispanic or Latino	3,344,431	53.25%
Pacific Islander	31,513	0.53%
White not Hispanic	1,531,088	25.00%
Two or More Races Not Hispanic	175,700	2.68%
None Reported	38,809	0.63%
Total	6,235,520	100.00%

Source: *CalEdFacts* 2014–15. Available on the CDE Fingertip Facts on Education in California *CalEdFacts* Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/cb/ceffingertipfacts.asp>.

Based on 2014–15 data, 74 percent of California's student population is designated as a national minority with the largest population of minority students reported as being Hispanic or Latino.<sup>1</sup> As a majority-minority state, California currently does not have an official definition of "minority" but given the large percentage of our student population designated minority, it is imperative that we work with stakeholders to develop a definition that more accurately describes historically underserved students. For the purposes of this iteration of the plan and to align with the teacher and student data that has been collected, **minority students** are defined as all students who are American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, African American, Filipino, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic, or Two or More Races Not Hispanic. The CDE will continue to collect data as needed for the EEP and will also explore the recommendations from the SBE and stakeholders regarding additional data collection needs.

<sup>1</sup> Source: *CalEdFacts* 2014–15. Available on the CDE Fingertip Facts on Education in California *CalEdFacts* Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/cb/ceffingertipfacts.asp>.

**Poor students** are defined for the purposes of this plan as those who are eligible to receive Free or Reduced-Price Meals. In 2014–15, 3,760,569, or 60.4 percent, of California students were designated “poor,” and are referred to as socioeconomically disadvantaged (SED) throughout the plan.

### California’s Teachers

Nearly 300,000 teachers are employed in California public schools. The vast majority, or 97 percent, of these teachers are fully credentialed. In future EEP revisions, this section will be updated to include a definition for an ineffective teacher. This definition has not yet been determined by CDE and the SBE.

**Table 2: Teachers Serving in California Public Schools with Full Authorization versus Intern Credentials, Permits, and Waivers Issued: 2014–15**

	Number of Teachers	% of Total
Fully Credentialed Teachers	288,615	97.6%
University Intern Credentials	2,457	0.8%
District Intern Credentials	478	0.2%
Provisional Intern Permit (PIP)	511	0.2%
Short-term Staff Permit (STSP)	1,879	0.6%
Variable Term Waivers	125	0.0%
Limited Assignment Teaching Permit	1,735	0.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>295,800</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Source: CTC, *Teacher Supply in California: A Report to the Legislature: Annual Report: 2014–2015* available at <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/reports/TS-2014-2015-AnnualRpt.pdf>.

An **inexperienced teacher** is defined for the purposes of this plan as a teacher who has two or fewer years of teaching experience. In 2014–15, 35,525 inexperienced teachers were teaching in California schools. Inexperienced teachers represent 12 percent of the teacher workforce.<sup>2</sup>

An **unqualified teacher** is defined for the purposes of this plan as 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. In 2014–15, there were 2,515 unqualified teachers teaching in California schools. This represents 0.8 percent of the teacher workforce.

- Provisional Intern Permits are available when the employing agency knows that there will be a teacher vacancy, yet is unable to recruit a suitable candidate. A bachelor’s degree, passage of the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST),

<sup>2</sup> Source: DataQuest Staff Service and Inexperience Report for 2014–15.

and specific course work or experience is required. The permit is issued for one year and may be renewed once if the individual takes all the subject matter exams listed on the document and does not pass. Only two provisional internship documents of any kind may be issued to an individual.

- Short-term Staff Permits may be requested by an employing agency when there is an acute staffing need. A bachelor's degree, passage of the CBEST, and specific course work or experience is required. The permit is issued for one year, cannot be renewed, and is available to a candidate only once in a lifetime.
- Variable and Short-term Waivers may be requested by an employer on behalf of an individual when the employer is unable to find credentialed teachers or individuals who qualify for an emergency permit.
  - Variable Term Waivers provide the employing agency up to one year or for a period set by the CTC to: 1) allow individuals additional time to complete a credential requirement; 2) facilitate assignment in school programs addressing issues of educational reform; 3) allow geographically isolated regions with severely limited ability to develop personnel time to hire personnel; or 4) obtain waivers for situations when all other efforts to find appropriately credentialed teachers have been exhausted.
  - Short-term Waivers may be approved at the local level to provide the employing agency with one semester or less to address unanticipated, immediate, short-term organizational needs by assigning only individuals who hold basic teaching credentials to teach outside their credentialed authorizations with the consent of the teacher. They may be issued once to any individual teacher and only once for a given class and cannot be used for a non-teaching assignment.

An **intern teacher** is defined for the purposes of this plan as a teacher who is assigned a District or University Intern Credential. In 2014–15, there were 2,935 intern teachers teaching in California schools. Intern teachers represent 0.9 percent of the teacher workforce.

In California, there are two types of initially issued Intern Credentials: District and University. District Intern programs require the intern to satisfy specific requirements and complete a program that is developed and implemented by a school district or county office of education in accordance with a Professional Development Plan. The intern is assisted and guided through the approved training period. University Internship Programs are a cooperative effort between a school district and an institution of higher education. The university intern must satisfy specific requirements. The internship program must be approved by the CTC prior to enrolling students and may not be available in all school districts.

An **out-of-field teacher** is defined for the purposes of this plan as a teacher who holds a Limited Assignment Teaching Permit. In 2014–15, there were 1,735 out-of-field teachers teaching in California schools; this number represents 0.5 percent of the teacher workforce.

A Limited Assignment Teaching Permit may be issued at the request of an employing school district, county office of education, charter school, or state agency to fill a staffing vacancy or need. They are issued for a one-year period and can be reissued in any one subject or special education specialization area twice if the holder completes the renewal requirements and the employing agency requests the permit. Employing agencies are required to have a current Declaration of Need on file with the CTC before the permit can be issued. Individuals must hold a valid California general or special education teaching credential based on a bachelor's degree and professional preparation program, including student teaching, have an assigned experienced educator in the subject or specialization area of the limited assignment if the applicant has not obtained permanent status, and consent to serve on the Limited Assignment Permit.

### Data Tables<sup>3</sup>

The CDE has drawn upon data collected via the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS), CTC, and *CalEdFacts* to create data profiles (shown below) that provide information regarding the rates at which poor and minority children are taught by inexperienced, unqualified, out-of-field, and intern teachers compared to the rates at which other children are taught by these teachers.

At the request of stakeholders, to provide a more precise depiction of statewide gaps, the CDE prepared equity gap data with California's 10,028 schools organized by student demographics into deciles. The tables below compare the 1,002 schools in decile 1 to the 1,002 schools in decile 10.

Key to acronyms:

- LMD=lowest minority decile  
Based on student demographics, the decile of schools that have the lowest number of minority students enrolled
- HMD=highest minority decile  
Based on student demographics, the decile of schools that have the highest number of minority students enrolled
- LPD=lowest poverty decile

---

<sup>3</sup> **Note:** The count of total teachers noted in these tables is greater than the total noted in the California's Teachers section because, with this data, teachers teaching at multiple schools have been counted more than once.

Based on student demographics, the decile of schools that have the lowest number of low income students enrolled

- HPD=highest poverty decile  
Based on student demographics, the decile of schools that have the highest number of low income students enrolled
- SED=socioeconomically disadvantaged

**Table 3: Inexperienced Teachers by Minority Decile**

As summarized by Table 3 below, 13.5 percent of teachers in California's schools with the highest percentage of minority students have 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.

Minority Decile Rank	Total Enrollment	Minority Enrollment	% Minority Students	Total Teachers	Number of Inexperienced Teachers	% Inexperienced Teachers
<b>LMD</b>	388,780	101,778	<b>26.2%</b>	20,339	2,059	<b>10.1%</b>
<b>HMD</b>	571,049	568,153	<b>99.5%</b>	27,176	3,662	<b>13.5%</b>
<b>Statewide Total</b>	6,224,433	4,697,286	<b>75.5%</b>	300,997	35,525	<b>11.8%</b>

**Table 4: Inexperienced Teachers by SED Decile**

As shown in Table 4 below, 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.

SED Decile Rank	Total Enrollment	SED Enrollment	% SED Students	Total Teachers	Number of Inexperienced Teachers	% Inexperienced Teachers
<b>LPD</b>	688,275	62,891	<b>9.1%</b>	32,608	3,058	<b>9.4%</b>
<b>HPD</b>	509,520	493,160	<b>96.8%</b>	24,984	3,570	<b>14.3%</b>
<b>Statewide Total</b>	6,224,433	3,760,569	<b>60.4%</b>	300,997	35,525	<b>11.8%</b>

**Table 5: Unqualified Teachers by Minority Decile**

As illustrated by Table 5 below, 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.

Minority Decile Rank	Total Enrollment	Minority Enrollment	% Minority Students	Total Teachers	Number of Unqualified Teachers (PIPs, STSPs, waivers)	% Unqualified Teachers (PIPs, STSPs, waivers)
LMD	388,780	101,778	26.2%	20,339	170	0.8%
HMD	571,049	568,153	99.5%	27,176	600	2.2%
<b>Statewide Total</b>	6,224,433	4,697,286	75.5%	300,997	4,495	1.5%

**Table 6: Unqualified Teachers by SED Decile**

As shown in Table 6 below, 2.0 percent of teachers in schools with the highest percentage of SED students hold a PIP, STSP, or Waiver; while 1.0 percent of teachers in schools with the lowest percentage of SED students hold a PIP, STSP, or Waiver. This represents an equity gap of 1.0 percent.

SED Decile Rank	Total Enrollment	SED Enrollment	% SED Students	Total Teachers	Number of Unqualified Teachers (PIPs, STSPs, waivers)	% Unqualified Teachers (PIPs, STSPs, waivers)
LPD	688,275	62,891	9.1%	32,608	328	1.0%
HPD	509,520	493,160	96.8%	24,984	511	2.0%
<b>Statewide Total</b>	6,224,433	3,760,569	60.4%	300,997	4,495	1.5%

**Table 7: Intern Teachers by Minority Decile**

As shown in Table 7 below, 1.8 percent of teachers in schools with the highest percentage of minority students are intern teachers, while 0.4 percent of teachers in schools with the lowest percentage of minority students are intern teachers. This represents an equity gap of 1.4 percent.

Minority Decile Rank	Total Enrollment	Minority Enrollment	% Minority Students	Total Teachers	Number of Interns	% Interns
LMD	388,780	101,778	26.2%	20,339	77	0.4%
HMD	571,049	568,153	99.5%	27,176	501	1.8%
<b>Statewide Total</b>	6,224,433	4,697,286	75.5%	300,997	2,850	0.9%

**Table 8: Intern Teachers by SED decile**

As shown in Table 8 below, 1.6 percent of teachers in schools with the highest percentage of SED students are intern teachers, while 0.4 percent of teachers in schools with the lowest percentage of SED students are intern teachers. This represents an equity gap of 1.2 percent.

<b>SED Decile Rank</b>	<b>Total Enrollment</b>	<b>SED Enrollment</b>	<b>% SED Students</b>	<b>Total Teachers</b>	<b>Number of Interns</b>	<b>% Interns</b>
<b>LPD</b>	688,275	62,891	<b>9.1%</b>	32,608	121	<b>0.4%</b>
<b>HPD</b>	509,520	493,160	<b>96.8%</b>	24,984	403	<b>1.6%</b>
<b>Statewide Total</b>	6,224,433	3,760,569	<b>60.4%</b>	300,997	2,850	<b>0.9%</b>

**Table 9: Out-of-field Teachers by Minority Decile**

As shown in Table 9 below, 0.7 percent of teachers in schools with the highest percentage of minority students hold 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.

<b>Minority Decile Rank</b>	<b>Total Enrollment</b>	<b>Minority Enrollment</b>	<b>% Minority Students</b>	<b>Total Teachers</b>	<b>Number of OOF Teachers</b>	<b>% OOF Teachers</b>
<b>LMD</b>	388,780	101,778	<b>26.2%</b>	20,339	95	<b>0.5%</b>
<b>HMD</b>	571,049	568,153	<b>99.5%</b>	27,176	189	<b>0.7%</b>
<b>Statewide Total</b>	6,224,433	4,697,286	<b>75.5%</b>	300,997	1,953	<b>0.6%</b>

**Table 10: Out-of-field Teachers by SED Decile**

As shown in Table 10 below, 0.6 percent of teachers in schools with the highest percentage of SED students hold 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.

<b>SED Decile Rank</b>	<b>Total Enrollment</b>	<b>SED Enrollment</b>	<b>% SED Students</b>	<b>Total Teachers</b>	<b>Number of OOF Teachers</b>	<b>% OOF Teachers</b>
<b>LPD</b>	688,275	62,891	<b>9.1%</b>	32,608	139	<b>0.4%</b>
<b>HPD</b>	509,520	493,160	<b>96.8%</b>	24,984	145	<b>0.6%</b>
<b>Statewide Total</b>	6,224,433	3,760,569	<b>60.4%</b>	300,997	1,953	<b>0.6%</b>

California reviewed the 2015 equity gap data with participants at six separate stakeholder meetings held between December 2015 and June 2016. There was much discussion held regarding the work completed to date around the strategies identified to address the original root causes in the area where the equity gap was most evident—the gap between the percentage of inexperienced teachers in schools with relatively high numbers of SED and minority students and the percentage of inexperienced teachers in schools serving relatively low numbers of SED and minority students. The discussion with stakeholders is expanded upon in the next section of this document.

### Section 3: Stakeholder Engagement

Stakeholder engagement in public education has long been a priority in California, recognizing the democratic values of our nation and the positive effects of an empowered citizenry. The SSPI, the CDE, and the SBE have continued this tradition and have brought together numerous stakeholder groups and task forces to consider and address issues facing California schools.

- In 2012, the SSPI, in collaboration with the CTC, convened the EETF to recommend ways to strengthen California's teacher corps. Task force members included teachers, parents, superintendents, school employees, leading academics, and business community members. The task force's recommendations are reported in *GbD*, which—due to its broad base of stakeholder engagement, input, and consensus—has influenced policy decisions at multiple state and local agencies and institutions, implementing a statewide vision for recruitment, distribution, preparation, induction, professional learning, and evaluation that supports high quality educators and teaching.
- Stakeholder contributions are intrinsic to the implementation of the LCFF at both the state and local levels. Since 2013, the state has organized a series of regionally-based input sessions to provide district, county, charter, and school leaders with an opportunity to offer local insights regarding various elements of the new funding system. Further, at the local level, each LEA must obtain parent and public input in developing, revising, and updating Local Control Accountability Plans (LCAPs). With the LCAP, LEAs are required to regularly engage local stakeholders in the process of using data to establish goals and define the measures that will be used to monitor and evaluate progress toward these goals. The LCFF reinforces California's commitment to wide and continuous stakeholder engagement.

Between December 2015 and June 2016, the CDE conducted six stakeholder events with facilitation support from the California Comprehensive Center at WestEd (dates and venues shown below). These events were held to gather input on the root causes identified in the 2015 plan and the strategies being used by the state to address these root causes. Combined, there were a total of 169 individual stakeholder participants.

**Table 11: Stakeholder Engagement**

Event Title	Date
16th Annual Accountability Leadership Institute for English Learners and Immigrant Students	12/7/15
The 2016 California Title I Conference, Navigating the Way for California's Future	03/01/16
California Association of African-American Superintendents and Administrators, From Cradle to College and Career	03/03/16
California Association for Bilingual Education, The CAFE Legacy: Making 21 <sup>st</sup> Century Multilingual Dreams Come True	03/24/16
Corona Norco USD - Parent Engagement (with Spanish translation)	05/24/16
Original group of stakeholders from the first analysis of state data in May 2015, invited to provide additional feedback a year into the work	06/23/16

Agendas and participant lists from these six meetings (with the exception of the participant list from the December 7, 2015 meeting) are included in Appendix A of this document. Parents, teachers, administrators, community members, policymakers and representatives from school districts, civil rights groups, and institutions of higher education participated in these meetings. Specifically, the meetings included representatives from the following organizations:

- Association of California School Administrators
- California Alliance of African American Educators
- California County Superintendents Educational Services Association
- California Parent Teacher Association
- California Teachers Association
- California Together
- California Voice
- Children Now
- Ed Source
- Education Trust West
- Educators for Excellence

- Learning Policy Institute
- Opportunity Institute
- Policy Analysis for California Education
- Public Advocates
- Stanford University

To keep the discussions constructive and on point, we used structured protocols and experienced facilitators. At each stakeholder event, participants were presented with the 2013–14 state data (2014–15 state data were not yet available) around inequitable access to quality teachers, the identified root causes of these inequities, and current state strategies being used to address these issues as dictated in the 2015 plan. Participants were then asked to select one of the identified root cause categories and provide insight regarding the strategies addressing each root cause. Each feedback form also included space for general comments and recommendations.

Root Causes 1, 2, and 4 were the three areas participants most commonly selected to provide their input.

**Root Cause 1** focused on uneven teacher preparation and induction. Of the strategies identified by the state to address this root cause, Strategy 1D: Include Cultural Awareness and Responsive Teaching Principles and Practices within Teacher Preparation Programs and Local Induction was most commonly identified as a priority strategy. Next was Strategies 1B: Strengthen and Streamline Accreditation and 1C: Increase Support for Teacher Induction. Some examples of the feedback provided by participants included:

- Providing teachers training on “building community and parent relationships”
- “Teacher(s) or districts should not have to pay for induction” support

**Root Cause 2** focused on uneven administrator preparation and induction. Strategies 2A: Refreshing California’s Professional Learning Standards for Education Leaders and Descriptions of Practice and 2B: Developing Modules to Support Administrator Induction were most commonly identified by participants as priority strategies to address this root cause.

**Root Cause 3** focused on inadequate support for educator professional learning. Several of the participants that chose to focus on this root cause identified Strategy 3A: Disseminate and Promote the Superintendent’s Quality Professional Learning Standards as a priority. Most participants suggested additional strategies focused mainly on professional learning and specific content to be covered in professional learning opportunities. Examples of the strategies suggested by participants included:

- “Keep support structures focused on PD rather than other administrative tasks”
- “Need training on implementation plans, measuring data, and core competencies (content knowledge, 21 century skills, technology integration, and pedagogical best practices, including practices that are culturally relevant and responsive)”

**Root Cause 4** focused on challenging working conditions in high-need schools. Some participants identified the strategy in the plan “Implement the Local Control Funding Formula” as a priority. However, most participants suggested a number of other strategies mostly focused on wrap-around (whole child) services for students and their families. Examples of these other strategies suggested by participants included:

- “Create school communities that provide wrap-around resources that truly address the needs of low income students—health services, food services, housing, counseling, academic intervention. Teachers alone cannot solve the issues of their students. We need much more support to counteract the socioeconomic problems of our students”
- “PD for administrators, teachers and staff: (a) cultural awareness; (b) training on family engagement strategies; (c) measuring continuous improvement”

**Root Cause 5** focused on the need to enhance parent and community engagement in high-need schools. This root cause was among the least prioritized by non-parent participants, yet it was overwhelmingly prioritized by parents. None of the participants who chose this root cause prioritized the strategies identified in the plan. Most of the suggested strategies focused on actual parent engagement activities such as:

- Communication and providing education/training opportunities for parents
- “Increase opportunities for parents to receive information (i.e. electronic, various languages, time of day for meetings)”
- “Provide a welcoming environment for parents – staff that speaks to parents in their primary language”
- Computer training for parents

**Root Cause 6**, focused on local root causes, was the least selected root cause with only one participant submitting a completed form focused on this root cause. The participant listed the following as a priority to be addressed at the local level:

- Recruitment and hiring of ethnic minority teachers

The CDE will convene an annual Educator Equity meeting to ensure that the plan is implemented well and to leverage the expertise of California’s diverse stakeholders in

improving equitable access to excellent educators as new opportunities and challenges emerge. At this annual meeting, stakeholders will review data regarding equitable access to excellent educators and make adjustments to the strategies contained in this plan as appropriate.

The outcomes of the root cause and strategy discussions are discussed in the sections that follow.

## Section 4: Root Causes and Strategies for Eliminating Equity Gaps

Once available, CDE staff reviewed the 2014–15 state CALPADS data which showed that the largest equity gaps identified and reported in 2015 remained the same. There were very small changes in the data with the highest gap being the gap between the percentage of inexperienced teachers in schools with relatively high numbers of SED and minority students and the percentage of inexperienced teachers in schools serving relatively low numbers of SED and minority students.

Following the stakeholder conversations, CDE staff updated the work completed to date relating to the priority strategies (shown in Table 12 beginning on page 41). It is important to note that these strategies are embedded in a California context of strong local control. Stakeholders repeatedly expressed the belief that the role of the state is to provide guidance, exemplars, and support but that many decisions regarding educators and teaching are most appropriately made at the local level.

The following six root causes that were revisited are:

- Uneven teacher preparation and induction
- Uneven administrator preparation and induction
- Inadequate support for educator professional learning
- Challenging working conditions in high-need schools
- Need to enhance parent and community engagement in high-need schools
- Diverse local root causes.

### Root Cause 1: Uneven Teacher Preparation and Induction

California is home to many excellent preparation programs for both teachers and principals that serve as models for others in the nation. These are drawn from the ranks of both innovative pre-service and internship programs. However, the range of program quality is wide, and some educators are permitted to enter the profession with little training and without having met meaningful standards for knowledge of content and pedagogy. Given the challenges facing today's educators as they seek to teach ever more challenging content to an increasingly diverse set of students, there are areas of preparation that must be deepened, and the variability in quality among preparation programs must be narrowed. Programs preparing educators to serve ELs, early childhood-age students and students with disabilities need particular attention. (*GbD* p. 15)

Studies have long shown that high-quality teacher induction programs lead to teachers who stay in the profession at higher rates, accelerated professional growth among new teachers and improved student learning. In a review of 15 empirical studies regarding the impact of induction programs, Ingersoll and Strong (2011) describe having a mentor teacher, common planning time with teachers in the same subject, and regularly scheduled collaboration with other teachers as some of the most important features of successful induction. (*GbD* p. 40)

In each of the six California meetings, stakeholders stated that teachers need to be better prepared to succeed in high-minority and SED schools and expressed concern regarding the supports new teachers receive when they enter the profession.

**Theory of Action:** If California teachers, including early childhood educators, receive strong preparation and support from pre-service through their first two years in the profession, then they will be better able to succeed in high-need schools, lessening teacher turnover and inequitable access to excellent educators.

To that end, California is implementing the following strategies to increase the rigor and effectiveness of the State's preparation and induction process to better prepare and induct teachers into the profession:

### **Strategy 1A: Implement Teaching Performance Assessments**

Since 2008, to ensure prospective teachers are as prepared as possible, California requires credential program candidates to pass a teaching performance assessment (TPA) prior to earning a teaching credential. Now that TPAs have been required for a number of years, the CTC is requiring the TPAs to be reviewed and updated to ensure that the assessment remains an appropriate bar that prospective teachers must meet prior to earning the Preliminary Teaching Credential.

The CTC's TPA, the CalTPA, incorporates four performance tasks that increase in complexity. These tasks are intended to be completed as the teacher progresses through his or her teacher preparation program. Each teacher preparation program decides how and where each task is embedded in the program coursework and/or related program activities in accordance with the assessment design standards.

Taken as a whole, the four performance tasks ask teachers to demonstrate that they know how to:

- Find out information about a given class and about specific focus students within the class such as an English learner or a student with identified special needs
- Plan appropriate subject-specific instruction for all students in alignment with state-adopted K–12 student academic content standards and/or frameworks
- Implement the instruction according to the lesson plans the teacher has developed and reflect upon the outcomes of that instruction, including evidence of student learning
- Design and implement assessment activities appropriate to the lesson and to the learners and use the assessment results to inform the next round of lesson planning

- Reflect upon the teachers own professional growth as a member of the teaching profession

The CTC adopted revised Assessment Design Standards (ADS) that require all CTC-approved TPAs to be centrally scored to assure reliability and validity of the scoring process. In addition, the ADS require all TPA models to assess that teachers are prepared to teach California's most current academic content standards. Each prospective teacher also needs to demonstrate that he or she can effectively teach students who are English learners and students with disabilities as part of the TPA. The 2015–16 state budget provided funds to update California's state TPA model and it is expected that the revised TPAs will be field tested in 2017–18 and fully operational beginning with the 2018–19 school year.

### **Strategy 1B: Strengthen and Streamline Accreditation**

In June 2014, the CTC directed that work should take place to strengthen and streamline the CTC's accountability and accreditation system (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2014-06/2014-06-2E.pdf>). How teachers are initially prepared will be reviewed and updated as needed, based on data collected from the performance assessments individuals must pass prior to earning a Preliminary Teaching Credential and surveys completed by program completers, master teachers, and employers. The work will also look at how teachers are inducted in the first two years of teaching and include a data warehouse and data dashboard system for California. This will also help the CTC identify which preparation programs are producing teachers who are well-prepared for the classroom.

An overview of the work to date in this area is provided in the June 2015 CTC agenda item: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2015-06/2015-06-5B.pdf>.

### **Strategy 1C: Increase Support for Teacher Induction**

Teachers' induction across the state is also an area that appears to be uneven depending on the LEA providing the induction program. This unevenness impacts the number of prepared teachers in classrooms. The CTC, as part of its work to review and revise its accreditation system, charged a task group to propose revised Induction Standards and requirements. The group has developed revised program standards and other recommendations for new teacher induction in California and the CTC adopted revised program standards at its December 2015 meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2015-12/2015-12-2G.pdf>).

The focus for new teacher induction is job-embedded mentoring for first and second year teachers. The task group has recommended that induction be provided in the first and second year of teaching to support the new teacher to be effective with all students. The task group also recommends that an individual holding a Preliminary Teaching Credential needs to have a fully credentialed teacher assigned to the new teacher to support participation in induction.

The focus for the induction programs will be to support the new teacher in his or her current assignment, support the new teacher in joining the learning community at the school and district, and to use cycles of inquiry to reflect on and improve practice.

### **Strategy 1D: Include Cultural Awareness and Responsive Teaching Principles and Practices within Teacher Preparation Programs and Local Induction**

In all of the stakeholder meetings, it was clearly stated that placing new teachers in situations where they may have little understanding of the culture of the students was a problem that needs to be addressed. The Preliminary Standards Task Group that is working within the Accreditation Advisory Panel has discussed the need for new teachers to be well prepared to teach all students. The revised Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) place enhanced focus on inclusive practices, restorative justice, and cultural competency during the preliminary preparation program and will require each prospective teacher to pass a performance assessment that includes the enhanced focus on these topics. The Commission adopted the revised TPEs, after a validity study, in June 2016 (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2016-06/2016-06-2B.pdf>).

The program standards focus on the prospective teacher having the opportunity to learn, practice, and be assessed on the TPEs. In addition, the program standards raise the requirements for clinical practice, or student teaching, in the preliminary preparation program. The quality, duration, and depth of the clinical experience is key to the preparation of new teachers.

The CTC adopted the revised program standards (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2015-12/2015-12-2A.pdf>) at its December 2015 meeting. Programs are transitioning to the revised standards during 2016–17 and the programs must fully meet the revised program standards in 2017–18.

### **Root Cause 2: Uneven Administrator Preparation and Induction**

There are 61 institutional sponsors of Preliminary Administrative Services programs in California. The CTC adopted revised program standards for Preliminary Administrative Services programs in December 2013 and programs are required to transition to the revised standards as of July 1, 2015. CTC staff has provided technical assistance, including regional meetings, to support the programs to meet the CTC's revised requirements.

Once an administrator has earned a Preliminary Administrative Services Credential and has a position as a school administrator, the individual will be required to complete an Administrative Services induction program. The standards for Administrative Services induction programs were adopted by the CTC in February 2014. There are 46 CTC-approved Administrative Services induction programs. Technical assistance is

being provided to the programs to ensure that the programs meet the CTC's revised requirements.

Stakeholders cited a need for strong leadership at both the school and district levels. They stated that strong leaders at the site level are better able to support and retain strong teachers and that those entrusted with hiring new teachers at the district level must be adequately prepared and supported to make good decisions.

**Theories of Action:** If California administrators receive strong preparation and support from pre-service through their first two years in the profession, then they will be better able to succeed in high-need schools, lessening administrator turnover and inequitable access to excellent educators. If administrators are better prepared and supported, then they will be better able to support teachers at their sites, thus improving teacher retention.

To that end, California is implementing the following strategies to better prepare and induct administrators into the profession:

### **Strategy 2A: Refresh the California Professional Standards for Education Leaders (CPSEL) and Descriptions of Practice (DOP)**

The work of teachers in schools and their ability to be successful in helping all students meet their potential is greatly dependent on the quality of the site administrator or principal. The CTC adopted the revised CPSEL at its February 2014 meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2014-02/2014-02-6B.pdf>). The CPSEL identify what an administrator must know and be able to do in order to move into sustainable, effective practice. They are a set of broad policy standards that are the foundation for administrator preparation, induction, development, professional learning, and evaluation in California. Taken together, the CPSEL describe critical areas of leadership for administrators and offer a structure for developing and supporting education leaders throughout their careers. Following the adoption, CTC staff has been working with the CDE and the research, development, and services agency WestEd to update the current "Descriptions of Practice" exemplifying candidate performance at different levels along a continuum of professional practice relating to each of the CPSEL. The status of this work is described below.

The 2014 CPSEL have three levels—the standard, the elements, and the indicators. The standards, although recently updated, address the same six broad categories that the previous version addressed. The elements have been substantially updated and reflect a more current view of an education administrator's responsibilities. The indicators, a new component, further delineate leader action. The indicators serve primarily as examples of how an education leader might demonstrate the element or standard within his or her practice; they are not intended to be a comprehensive or required list of administrator behaviors.

Most, if not all, of California's approved Administrative Services credentialing programs use WestEd's publication *Moving Standards into Everyday Work: Descriptions of Practice* (initially published in 2003) as a tool to document the level of candidate competence in each of the CPSEL. With the revision of the CPSEL, this tool needed revision as well.

In a joint effort, the CTC, the CDE, and WestEd facilitated the revision of this document during the 2014–15 year. A panel with representation from a broad spectrum of stakeholders was assembled to examine the new CPSEL, review the existing rubric, and identify places where changes were needed. Once edits were identified, the group crafted new structures and new language to reflect the 2014 CPSEL revisions. The editing work of this document has been completed and the document is available.

### **Strategy 2B: Develop Modules to Support Administrator Induction**

The implementation of a coaching-based, job-embedded induction model for administrative programs represents a significant departure from the prior traditional Institutes for Higher Education (IHE) coursework and fieldwork model. To support institutions in transitioning to this new paradigm, the CTC, the CDE, and WestEd are overseeing the development of several implementation and training modules on topics that include the content of the new standards, current research on best practices, the revised CPSEL, and the accompanying new descriptions of practice (DOP) tool. These modules will be available to programs and the programs will make decisions regarding which of the modules to use locally. A panel of experts with representation from a broad spectrum of stakeholder groups met throughout the 2014–15 year to complete this work.

The modules are being organized into three groupings: *Briefings*, *Best Practice Examples*, and *Future Views*. *Briefings* will address the new content found in the program and performance standards and highlight key concepts to address. *Best Practice Examples* will cover key points of the induction program (e.g., the first meeting between coach and candidate), offering approaches that existing programs with strong coaching components have found to be beneficial. *Future Views* is similar to *Best Practice Examples* but focuses on new components of the program, projecting what research tells us will be profitable approaches.

The modules became available through the CTC's Web site in 2015. Because the panel is working to provide information to a variety of interested parties (e.g., program sponsors, coaches, employers), the members are planning to design a Web page that offers multiple pathways to using the modules and materials. Current thinking includes approaches by viewer's role, by key program documents, and by various program components.

## **Strategy 2C: Develop an Administrator Performance Assessment**

To ensure administrators have the abilities needed to lead a school, the Governor's budget for 2015–16 includes \$4 million from the General Fund to the CTC to develop and revise educator preparation assessments. Of that amount, \$1 million will be allocated to the development of an Administrator Performance Assessment (APA) for program route candidates. Reliable and consistent scoring would be managed by a contracted entity whose work would be overseen by the CTC. The quality and appropriateness of the assessment for California Preliminary Administrative Services credential candidates would be assured by requiring the assessment developer to meet the CTC's adopted Assessment Design Standards for Administrator Performance Assessment. The content and focus of the assessment would be to assess each candidate's performance relative to the CTC's adopted Content and Performance Expectations for Preliminary Administrative Services Credential candidates. This work will be informed by the CA Education Leadership Professional Learning Initiative (CELPLI) grant awarded to the University of San Diego by the CDE.

The CDE has awarded \$997,894 in Federal Title II Part A Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Program funds for professional learning activities related to the future development of an APA for candidates completing the program route to the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential. A Request for Applications process was conducted to select a grantee for this work. The federal requirements for these funds specified that eligible grantees had to be a partnership comprised of a minimum of three specific types of entities: a high-need LEA, a school of Arts and Sciences, and a school of Education (these latter two could be, but were not required to be, from the same institution).

The grantee for this work was a partnership of San Diego Unified School District and the University of San Diego. The scope of work for this grant includes professional learning activities focusing on prospective school administrators and the development of a self-assessment tool based on the CTC's adopted administrator content and performance expectations to help prospective school administrators determine their level of knowledge, skills, ability, and interest in school administration as a next step in their career. It is intended that the foundational work done on the self-assessment tool can form the basis for the future development of an actual APA for candidates who have completed or are on the verge of completing a Preliminary Administrative Services Credential program and who should already possess the requisite knowledge, skills, and abilities to begin competent beginning practice as a school administrator.

## **Root Cause 3: Inadequate Support for Educator Professional Learning**

Funding for professional learning has been severely reduced in California, in part as a result of recent budget cuts, and in part because of categorical flexibility provisions that allowed districts to use those dollars to fill other budget gaps. More than half of districts report that they have eliminated, or significantly reduced, professional development offered to teachers and principals, and one-third of districts have reduced paid professional development days (*GbD*, p. 50).

It is important to note that the CDE, like the Educator Excellence Task Force, has drawn the same distinction between PD and professional learning. *GbD* states, “Old-style PD that follows a ‘one size fits all’ approach, conducted in the ‘drive-by, spray-and-pray’ workshops educators have often grown to dread, does not generally improve teaching practices or student achievement” (*GbD*, p. 50).

During the recent recession from 2007 through 2011, California districts and schools experienced over \$20 billion in cumulative cuts. Districts responded by increasing class size, laying off teaching and administrative staff, scaling back support and professional development for teachers, and reducing instructional days.<sup>4</sup> California K–12 public education is only now recovering from the State’s financial challenges.

Information regarding professional learning opportunities for educators is not collected at the state level. Therefore, for the purpose of this plan, the relevant metrics are based on national research conducted by the Boston Consulting Group in 2014 for the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. The report, *Teachers Know Best: Teachers’ Views on Professional Development*, indicates that the professional learning delivered by schools and districts “is highly fragmented and characterized by key disconnects between what decision-makers intend and the professional learning teachers actually experience.”<sup>5</sup> Specifically, the research found:

- Few teachers (29 percent) are highly satisfied with current PD offerings
- Few teachers (34 percent) think PD has improved
- Large majorities of teachers do not believe that PD is helping them prepare for the changing nature of their jobs, including using technology and digital learning tools, analyzing student data to differentiate instruction, and implementing academic content standard
- PD formats strongly supported by district leadership and principals, such as professional learning communities and coaching, are currently not meeting teachers’ needs
- Principals largely share teachers’ concerns about the efficacy of professional learning

---

<sup>4</sup> Bland, J., Sherer, D., Guha, R., Woodworth, K., Shields, P., Tiffany-Morales, J., & Campbell, A. (2011). *The status of the teaching profession 2011*. Sacramento, CA: The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning at WestEd.

<sup>5</sup> Boston Consulting Group. *Teachers Know Best: Teachers’ Views on Professional Development*. 2014. <http://k12education.gatesfoundation.org/resource/teachers-know-best-teachers-views-on-professional-development/>

*GbD* states:

Research suggests that district and school professional learning systems should be standards-focused, engage practitioners in sustained inquiry related to problems of practice and foster collaboration and sharing of promising practices. These systems should differentiate for educators' professional stages and build coherent learning cultures from induction to expert practice. (*GbD*, p. 53)

An emerging body of research illustrates that the contexts in which teachers' work shape teachers' effectiveness and decisions to move to another school site or leave the profession. Teachers who work in supportive professional learning cultures stay in the classroom longer, and improve more rapidly, than their peers in less-supportive environments.<sup>6</sup>

The California Subject Matter Project (CSMP), established in 1988, is an essential component within the California professional learning infrastructure. With more than 90 regional sites statewide, it is a network of nine discipline-based communities of practice that promote high-quality teaching and leadership. The CSMP sites operate on fundamental beliefs that include rigorous professional learning, designed collaboratively by K–12 and university educators, to enhance learning for all students. More importantly, the CSMPs advance a “teachers teaching teachers” principle that is central to its sustainability, as it is what fuels the passion for each institution of higher education faculty and their teacher leader colleagues to keep the CSMP operational and effective.

Due to overall budget cuts, funding for the CSMP decreased significantly in the past ten years. Despite these cuts, the CSMP has maintained an impressive reputation among K–12 educators for the variety and quality of professional learning opportunities they offer. These opportunities include workshops, leadership institutes, and in-service programs designed to:

- Revise and develop new programs aligned with California's academic content standards based on school/district needs
- Rebuild teacher leadership development through intensive year-round professional learning institutes in a variety of formats to accommodate teacher availability. Teachers may participate in the CSMPs through release time, time compensated by stipend, or unpaid time. The CSMP support can include providing school day coaching opportunities and support. These opportunities may occur onsite or off-site

---

<sup>6</sup> Johnson, S., Kraft, M., Papy, J. *How context matters in high-need schools: The effects of teachers' working conditions on their professional satisfaction and their students' achievement*. 2011. [http://scholar.harvard.edu/files/mkraft/files/johnson\\_kraft\\_papay\\_teacher\\_working\\_conditions\\_final.pdf](http://scholar.harvard.edu/files/mkraft/files/johnson_kraft_papay_teacher_working_conditions_final.pdf)

- Identify and foster the development of a greater number of mentor teachers from shortage areas to support new teachers in induction
- Revise and develop new programs for site administrators that refresh or reinforce the necessary leadership and pedagogical skills to assess, coach, and mentor their staff and create and sustain the essential conditions for encouraging professional growth and improving instructional practice
- Expand the delivery models and uses of technology to provide high-quality professional learning opportunities for teachers and administrators to help them better understand California's academic content standards
- Assist teachers in understanding how literacy is addressed not only in English language arts, but in all subject areas

LEAs need a professional learning system built on the premise that it is for the professional growth of all teachers and leaders. While educator evaluation alone is an ineffective approach to significantly improving the quality of all teachers and leaders, it is an important component of a high-quality professional learning system.

California *Education Code* sections 44660–44665, often referred to as the Stull Act, provide California's primary guidance regarding educator evaluation. The provisions are relatively broad and there have been several legislative efforts to change or enhance the law regarding how educators are evaluated in California. According to a 2010 report released by the National Board Resource Center at Stanford University, "While evaluation processes across the state vary widely, many of them look very much the same as they did in 1971..." Comments from Accomplished California Teachers, a Web-based state teacher leadership network, indicate that current approaches to teacher evaluation result in a system that teachers do not trust, that rarely offers clear direction for improving practice, and often charges school leaders to implement without preparation or resources.

Stakeholders at each of the six meetings expressed the need for teachers and administrators, particularly those in SED and high-minority schools, to participate in a high quality system of professional learning designed to support their success, improve educator retention, and improve educational outcomes for students.

**Theory of Action:** If California educators, including early childhood educators, are supported by a high quality, integrated professional learning system that supports continuous professional growth throughout their careers, as described in *GbD*, then they will be better able to succeed in high-need schools, lessening turnover and inequitable access to excellent educators.

To that end, California is implementing the following strategies to better support the implementation of a high-quality, statewide professional learning system.

### **Strategy 3A: Disseminate and Promote the *Superintendent's Quality Professional Learning Standards (QPLS)***

When *GbD* was written, California did not have state standards for professional learning. The Educator Excellence Task Force identified the need for a common language and set of expectations to help those that prepare educators and those who teach and lead to improve system coherence.

LEAs, educator preparation programs, professional development providers, and policymakers and policy implementers, with professional learning standards establishing the attributes of best practices, now have a framework for discussion within the state, regional, and local context. Adopted by the SBE on May 7, 2015, the Quality Professional Learning Standards (QPLS) present the elements of a quality professional learning system that, if well implemented, will benefit educators focused on increasing their professional capacity and performance. The standards are not meant to be used to evaluate any educator in any aspect of his or her work. Rather, the QPLS are intended to help educators, LEAs, and the state develop and contextualize professional learning system goals and plans. The QPLS identify a clear outcome for professional learning—to continuously develop educators' capacity to teach and lead so that all students learn and thrive—and seven interdependent professional learning standards focused on:

- **Data:** Quality professional learning uses varied sources and kinds of information to guide priorities, design, and assessments
- **Content and Pedagogy:** Quality professional learning enhances educators' expertise to increase students' capacity to learn and thrive
- **Equity:** Quality professional learning focuses on equitable access, opportunities, and outcomes for all students, with an emphasis on addressing achievement and opportunity disparities between student groups
- **Design and Structure:** Quality professional learning reflects evidence-based approaches, recognizing that focused, sustained learning enables educators to acquire, implement, and assess improved practices
- **Collaboration and Shared Accountability:** Quality professional learning facilitates the development of a shared purpose for student learning and collective responsibility for achieving it
- **Resources:** Quality professional learning dedicates resources that are adequate, accessible, and allocated appropriately toward established priorities and outcomes

- **Alignment and Coherence:** Quality professional learning contributes to a coherent system of educator learning and support that connects district and school priorities and needs with state and federal requirements and resources

Since the SSPI's approval in 2013, professional learning providers have started incorporating the QPLS into their collaborative discussions and planning with teacher leaders when developing priorities for professional learning. The seven QPLS represent essential components of a comprehensive, research-based, quality professional learning system that is appropriate for California. By adapting or adopting the QPLS, educators, policymakers, education officials, and other stakeholders will have a shared expectation of what professional learning is and how it should be supported. The CDE has been disseminating the QPLS. A letter was sent throughout the system from CDE leadership regarding the adoption of the QPLS. The California Comprehensive Center at WestEd, instrumental in the development of the QPLS, is working with the CDE to produce supporting materials and a webinar describing how educators can use the standards. A rubric to measure the effectiveness of professional learning at all education levels to inform system improvement activities has been developed and made available to the public. Additionally, the QPLS have been incorporated into the *Framework*. The *Framework* and resources to support its implementation are available on the CDE SBE-Adopted ELA/ELD Framework Chapters Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/rl/cf/elaeldfrmwrksbeadopted.asp>.

### **Strategy 3B: Disseminate and Promote Integrated Professional Learning System Work**

The CDE, with the *GbD* report as the chief resource, is focusing on the development and vetting of “promising practices and processes” that will serve as models to inform LEAs as they adopt or adapt professional learning system components that will build system alignment and coherence. This work is based, in part, on the Instructional Capacity Building Framework, based on the research by Ann Jaquith (2009; 2012), which identifies the conditions and resources necessary to support effective teaching as:

- **Instructional knowledge** (knowledge of content, pedagogy, and students)
- **Instructional tools or materials** (curriculum, teaching materials, and assessments)
- **Instructional relationships** characterized by trust and mutual respect
- **Organizational structures** that promote the use of various instructional resources, such as common learning time for teachers and formal instructional leadership roles

In an Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development article entitled “Instructional Capacity: How To Build It Right,” Jaquith states, “School leaders need to

know where these four types of instructional resources reside within their schools and how they interact. They also need to know how to create opportunities for teachers to use these resources to improve teaching and learning.”<sup>7</sup>

The CDE is currently overseeing promising grant projects designed to create prototypes for the implementation of the recommendations of the Educator Excellence Task Force. The Teacher-Based Reform Grant Pilot Project (T-BAR) is designed to inform state, regional, and local policymakers about effective strategies to help each education level focus on specific problems of practice and identify existing, new, or repurposed resources to solve those problems. Funded until September 30, 2018, the grant is supporting district and school prototypes that focus on their own problems of practice related to educator evaluation, the peer assistance and review program, induction, leadership, improving instructional practice, and a substantive number of other professional learning system components identified in the *GbD* report that place professional growth at the center.

This work is funded by the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Program, a federal program, established under Title II, Part A of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. The purpose of these projects is to build a working knowledge of the processes and practices through which instructional capacity is developed while demonstrating that it is possible to support a teacher-developed, teacher-led professional learning model with the potential to improve teacher quality within California.

Resourcing Professional Learning Systems (RPLS) T-BAR project, led by the UC Davis Resourcing Excellence in Education Center, is funded through September 30, 2018. In addition to the Instructional Capacity Building work, it has been focusing on developing a generative process to help LEAs build their own instructional capacity to resource professional growth. The RPLS project is facilitating a process with over thirty LEA teams comprised of labor and management, including county offices of education, to plan, develop, and test prototypes for their continuous improvement. A key principle for this work is to develop and/or repurpose existing resources for the professional growth of all teachers and administrators, not just the few that have been singled out for intervention. The creation and testing of prototypes by the LEA teams include the necessary components of a comprehensive evaluation system.

For district teams to choose the appropriate strategies and action plans based on their local context, by often reestablishing instructional relationships (i.e., trust and mutual respect), the RPLS project is supporting labor-management collaboration by providing expertise, space, and opportunities to collaborate. Regardless of where the district teams begin, the desired end result is the development of an integrated professional learning system and the site-based conditions needed to support, sustain, and

---

<sup>7</sup> Jaquith, A. 2013. *Instructional Capacity: How To Build It Right*. Available from ACSD: Educational Leadership. October 2013/Volume 71/Number 2. *Leveraging Teacher Leadership*.

continuously improve that system. Using the original T-BAR Model and the ICB Framework, the RPLS project will provide tools, materials, and processes for:

- Intensive coaching/mentoring support that results in district and site use of the locally contextualized evaluation tool as part of an emerging comprehensive teacher evaluation system, including the use of observation protocols, feedback cycles, calibration and training sessions, and peer professional learning sessions
- Administrator professional learning opportunities focused on an LEA's ability to access and use calibration, observation protocols, and collegial conversations as resources to support implementation of an integrated professional learning system aligned to the QPLS
- An Articulated Interventions and Mentoring model and pilot testing of the model using a structured cycle of inquiry process as articulated in the Network Improvement Community materials. This will include analytic protocols and approaches to measure and inform instructional change and shifts in instructional capacity over time
- A suite of online tools and materials to resource implementation of integrated professional learning materials including: documentation and suggested curriculum for all academies, video demonstrations of ambitious teaching and learning, observation protocols, calibration materials, and effective feedback protocols that are aligned to the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) and the CPSEL
- Models and promising practices that showcase how districts collaborate and learn when provided with structured support around a set of common objectives
- Dissemination of new knowledge and resources generated as a result of the activities outlined above

The CDE will make available on its Web pages and promote the successful prototypes generated by the Integrated Professional Learning System work via news releases and other communications to LEAs, institutions of higher education, and other education stakeholders. The promising practices exhibited by the successful prototypes will include:

- Evaluation system components and processes that may be used by school districts to implement the best practices teacher evaluation system
- Processes for implementing observations of instructional and other professional practices
- Processes for defining calibration for purposes of training evaluators

- Processes for developing the observation tool that may be used for observations of instructional and other professional practices
- Processes for determining and defining the performance levels for the evaluation of teacher performance

#### **Root Cause 4: Challenging Working Conditions in High-Need Schools**

Schools serving large numbers of poor and minority students present challenging workplace conditions for teachers, including social factors, lack of authentic and sufficient community engagement, and inequitable salaries. Research has shown that high teacher turnover in high-need schools has much to do with working conditions related to social factors, such as school leadership, collegial relationships, and elements of school culture.<sup>8</sup> Related to this, parents of students in high poverty communities are less likely to be involved in the school, to hold teachers accountable, and to be able to provide financial or other support.<sup>9</sup>

During all six stakeholder meetings, challenging working conditions were cited as a root cause of the California's equity gap. Stakeholders postulated that students attending high-minority and SED schools bring with them greater social, emotional, and academic needs, placing more stress on educators in these schools and resulting in more attrition. To address this challenge, stakeholders suggested that high-need schools receive additional funds to employ counselors, nurses, and additional support staff.

**Theory of Action:** If California's high-need schools receive additional fiscal resources and are required to address conditions of learning through expenditure and accountability plans developed in collaboration with the entire school community, they will be better able to improve working conditions to attract and retain high quality educators, lessening educator turnover and inequitable access to excellent educators.

To that end, California is implementing the following strategy to provide more resources to high-need schools:

#### **Strategy 4A: Implement the Local Control Funding Formula**

California's 2013–14 Budget Act enacted landmark legislation that greatly simplifies the school finance system and provides additional resources to LEAs serving students with greater educational needs. The changes introduced by the LCFF represent a major shift in how the state funds 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

---

<sup>8</sup> Simon and Moore Johnson, "Teacher Turnover in High-Poverty Schools: What we Know and Can Do," 2015

<sup>9</sup> EdSource report "The Power of Parents: Research underscores the impact of parent involvement in schools," February 2014

information regarding the LCFF is available on the 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, ELs, 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 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.

The LCAP must describe goals and specific actions and services to achieve those goals for all pupils for each of the state priorities and any locally identified priorities. LEAs must annually review the progress toward the expected annual outcomes based on, at a minimum, the required metrics identified in the LCFF statute. LEAs are required to consult with teachers, principals, administrators, local-bargaining units, and other school personnel, in addition to parents and students, in developing the LCAP. The state priorities include student achievement; implementation of state academic content standards; measurement of English learner pupils making progress toward English proficiency; student engagement as measured by graduation rates, dropout rates, absenteeism and attendance; and school climate as measured by suspension and expulsion rates. In addition, the state priorities include parent involvement as measured by the extent to which parents participate in key school decisions and ensuring facilities are maintained in good repair. Within these priorities, LEAs have the opportunity to develop, at the local level, specific, measurable goals that address the challenging workplace conditions characteristic of high minority/poverty schools. By prioritizing these issues statewide, and maintaining local control and accountability, LEAs and school communities with high numbers of the identified targeted students have the autonomy and additional funding to invest in better facilities, more professional learning opportunities for staff, better engagement with parents and families, and stronger support for teachers.

### **Root Cause 5: Need to Enhance Parent and Community Engagement in High-Need Schools**

Research has shown that parent and community engagement has a measurable impact on student outcomes, but traditionally, schools serving large numbers of poor and minority students have been particularly challenged in engaging parents and communities.<sup>10</sup> Families from all backgrounds desire to be involved, want their children

---

<sup>10</sup> EdSource report "The Power of Parents: Research underscores the impact of parent involvement in schools," February 2014

to do well in school, and hope their children will achieve a better life than their parents.<sup>11</sup> However, parents of students in high poverty communities are less likely to be involved in the school, to hold teachers accountable, and to be able to provide financial or other support.<sup>12</sup> Research has revealed a range of barriers to parent involvement in their child's education: "lack of time among working parents; negative prior experiences with schools; an inability of parents to help children with their homework; limited funding to support parent engagement activities; teachers and administrators connecting to parents primarily when their children misbehave; and a lack of staff training in different strategies to engage parents."<sup>13</sup>

During each of its six stakeholder meetings, the CDE heard from stakeholders that schools, particularly those serving large numbers of SED and minority students, needed to more effectively engage their parent communities. Stakeholders expressed the concern that educators did not receive sufficient support and training to communicate with parents effectively.

**Theories of Action:** If California's high-need schools genuinely and respectfully encourage and receive additional support and input from parent and community stakeholders, and build the capacity of both parents and educators to work as partners, they will be better able to improve working conditions to attract and retain high quality educators, lessening turnover and inequitable access to excellent educators. If schools have additional guidance and resources to support effective parent engagement, then they will improve their ability to engage parents in schools.

To these ends, California is implementing the following strategies to better engage parents and community members in high-need schools:

### **Strategy 5A: Implement the Local Control Funding Formula**

As described in Strategy 4A, the LCFF requires LEAs to regularly engage parents and community members in the process of using data to establish goals and define the measures that will be used to monitor and evaluate progress toward these goals.

### **Strategy 5B: Promote Resources Designed to Assist Schools to Effectively Engage Parents**

The CDE home Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/> has been redesigned in order to provide direct access to a parent portal, at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/di/po/parents.asp>,

---

<sup>11</sup> Gandara. *Bridging Language and Culture* (2011); Redding, Murphy, Sheley, *Handbook on Family and Community Engagement*, and Weiss, Bouffard, Bridglall, Gordon, *Reframing Family Involvement in Education: Supporting families to Support Educational Equity* (2009)

<sup>12</sup> EdSource report "The Power of Parents: Research underscores the impact of parent involvement in schools," February 2014

<sup>13</sup> EdSource report "The Power of Parents: Research underscores the impact of parent involvement in schools," February 2014

which links site visitors directly to resources that are most relevant to and most sought after by parents and families.

The *Family Engagement Framework: A Tool for California School Districts* has been revised, in collaboration with WestEd, to provide comprehensive guidance to educators, districts, schools, families, and communities as they plan, implement, and evaluate strategies across multiple educational programs for effective family engagement to support student achievement. Specifically, this framework is organized around five principles that address essential actions at the district level: build capacity; demonstrate leadership; resources: fiscal and other; monitor progress; and access and equity. The guidance in this framework provides federal and state requirements for family engagement and rubrics to describe basic, progressive, and innovative implementation of those requirements. Guidance that supports the engagement of families in high minority/poverty communities includes capacity building for educators and families in effective partnerships, integrating resources and services from the community, establishing multiple and diverse opportunities for involvement, and policies that support and respect the variety of parenting traditions and practices within the community's cultural and religious diversity.

Hard copies of the *Family Engagement Framework* were mailed to all LEAs, and the SSPI announced its availability in a news release. The CDE's Title I Policy and Program Guidance Office provides training for LEAs in the use of the Framework for planning, implementing, and evaluating family engagement programs and activities. Since the implementation of LCFF, there has been a much higher demand for this framework. The 2014 *Family Engagement Framework*, available in English and Spanish, can be viewed on the CDE Web site at

<http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/pf/pf/documents/famengageframeenglish.pdf>.

The CDE Parent/Family Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/pf/pf/> includes an abundance of resources about academic content standards, advisory committees and councils, multilingual documents, parents' rights, policies, and federal requirements. Communication to parents, families, and educators regarding statewide family engagement resources, activities, legislation, and more, is provided through the California Family Engagement listserv, which is open to all members of the public. The wide use of the *Family Engagement Framework* and the resources available on these Web pages is evident by participant feedback in trainings, Web site traffic, and e-mail requests for the *Framework* and training.

The CDE continues to meet with statewide parent stakeholder groups and collect feedback on efforts to improve parent involvement and engagement. This work, in addition to LEAs working to meet the requirements of the LCFF, will continue to foster school to home partnerships.

## **Root Cause 6: Diverse Local Root Causes**

It can be challenging to identify root causes to educational inequity that affect every LEA. For instance, in the Educator Equity Profile provided by ED, educator absenteeism in high poverty/high minority schools was less than two percentage points higher than low poverty/low minority schools, and this margin is narrower when compared to the statewide average. If we look at the highest poverty/minority districts, we can see that absenteeism is a major issue for some, but not all of these districts. This is not to say that absenteeism should not be addressed at the state level, but that in order to support local agencies in addressing these issues, the State must support a system where expertise of the local context can be leveraged.

Stakeholders at each of the six meetings made clear that the State role in providing equitable access to excellent educators needed to go beyond providing guidance and sharing best practices. Even in the context of strong local control, the CDE must monitor and support LEAs to ensure that students have equitable access to excellent educators within their local contexts.

**Theory of Action:** If the State provides technical assistance and intervenes when LEAs do not provide equitable access to educators, then LEAs will more equitably distribute these educators.

### **Strategy 6A: Implement the Compliance Monitoring, Intervention and Sanctions Program**

It should be noted that all California LEAs receiving funds under the ESEA are required to develop and implement an LEA Plan, the purpose of which is to develop an integrated, coordinated set of actions that LEAs will take to ensure that they meet certain programmatic requirements.

Included in the LEA plan is an assurance document regarding a number of educational issues including Item 24 which indicates that LEAs will comply with the following:

Ensure, through incentives for voluntary transfers, the provision of professional development, recruitment programs, or other effective strategies, that low-income students and minority students are not taught at higher rates than other students by unqualified, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers consistent with sections 1111(b)(8)(C) and 1112(C)(1)(L).

In addition, California's current EEP requires LEAs to develop and implement a detailed and coherent plan to ensure that poor and minority students are not taught at higher rates than other students by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers. To comply with federal law, in 2007 the Legislature authorized the Compliance Monitoring, Intervention, and Sanctions (CMIS) program, included in the California State Budget since 2009. Due to the reauthorization of the ESEA in December of 2015, the activities associated with the CMIS program have changed. In response, and to comply with the

ESSA, the CDE has developed a draft program plan to replace the CMIS program and to provide the technical assistance related to the equitable distribution of teachers, specifically among poor and minority students, as provided in the ESSA. This draft program plan is currently called the California Educator Equity Technical Assistance Program (CEETAP).

Because the CDE received commendations for the early identification and proactive technical assistance elements of its original CMIS program from ED staff during a September 2014 Title II Part A monitoring visit, the draft CEETAP plan also provides a proactive approach to the technical assistance provided by the program. More information regarding the CEETAP will be provided in future EEP reports once it has been approved by the SBE.

## Section 5: Ongoing Monitoring and Public Report of Progress

California is committed to ensuring the long-term success of its EEP by providing the necessary mechanisms for ongoing technical assistance, monitoring, and feedback according to the ESSA requirements. The State has clearly defined its commitments to ensuring educational equity, and improving teaching quality and instructional leadership. However, even with expanded implementation of the LCFF, the revised CMIS program, and the recommendations made in *GbD*, due to the increasing teacher shortage and aging of the California teacher workforce, California's issuance of provisional licenses and intern credentials, and therefore its equity gaps in the distribution of high quality teachers, will likely increase. It is, and will continue to be, increasingly important to carefully analyze data and convene stakeholder groups annually to discuss State strategies for addressing equity gaps.

To measure the success of these efforts, the CDE will develop an annual data profile that provides information regarding the rates at which poor and minority children are taught by inexperienced, unqualified, out-of-field, and intern teachers compared to the rates at which other children are taught by these teachers and convene stakeholders annually to present this new data on equitable access to quality teachers, the identified root causes of these inequities, and state strategies to address these issues. In addition, the CDE will convene stakeholders to begin the conversation around the ESSA requirement of providing state guidelines for the definition of "ineffective teacher". Participants will provide their feedback regarding the root causes and strategies as well as the guidelines for the definition of "ineffective teacher", thus continuing an annual cycle of improvement toward greater equitable access to quality teachers across the state.

Using this information, the CDE will prepare a report on the progress of the EEP and present it to the SBE on an annual basis. For transparency, the CDE will post the EEP on its Web pages annually.

California shares ED's goal of ensuring that every student has equitable access to excellent educators. We appreciate having had the opportunity to re-examine and evaluate our work to date and look forward to continued collaborative conversations as we proceed with the implementation of this plan. Table 12 below provides a timeline outlining the progress and implementation of the strategies proposed in this plan to date.

Table 12: Educator Equity Plan Implementation Timeline

<b>Strategy</b>		<b>Responsible Parties</b>	<b>2014–15</b>	<b>2015–16</b>	<b>2016–17</b>
1A	Implement updated Teaching Performance Assessments (TPAs)	CTC	Adopt revised Assessment Design Standards and secure funding	Begin updating the state TPA model	Prepare to field test revised TPAs in 2017–18, operational in 2018–19
1B	Strengthen and streamline accreditation system	CTC with assistance from Accreditation Advisory Panel members	Convene workgroups of experts to examine and streamline accreditation processes	Integrate work group recommendations into policies	Provide Technical Assistance to all institutions to support the transition to the revised system in 2017–18
1C	Increase support for teacher induction	CTC with assistance from Induction task group members	Convene workgroup to propose revised induction standards and requirements	Commission adopted revised standards	Provide Technical Assistance to all institutions to support the transition to the new standards
1D	Include cultural awareness and responsive teaching principles and practices within teacher preparation programs and local induction	CTC with assistance from Preliminary Standards Task Group members	Convene workgroup to propose revised performance expectations and program standards, including enhanced focus on inclusive practices, restorative justice	Adopt revised program standards by end of 2015. Begin supporting transition of preparation programs to new standards	Provide Technical Assistance to all institutions to support the transition to the new standards. All programs must meet the revised standards in 2017–18

Table 12: Educator Equity Plan Implementation Timeline

	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Responsible Parties</b>	<b>2014–15</b>	<b>2015–16</b>	<b>2016–17</b>
			and cultural competency		
2A	Update the California Professional Standards for Education Leaders (CPSEL) Descriptions of Practice (DOP)	CTC with assistance from WestEd, the CDE and expert panel members	Convene expert panel to craft new structures and language for the DOP to reflect the refreshed CPSEL	Publication and dissemination of the refreshed CPSEL DOP	
2B	Develop and disseminate modules to support administrator induction	CTC with assistance from WestEd, the CDE, and expert panel members	Convene expert panel to design modules	Administrator induction modules available on CTC Web site, statewide training of trainers	Support statewide transition
2C	Develop an Administrator Performance Assessment (APA)	CTC with assistance from the CDE	Conduct RFA process for CA Education Leadership Professional Learning Initiative (CELPLI) grant	Monitor implementation of CELPLI grant	CTC contracts with assessment developer to develop APA using products of CELPLI grant
3A	Disseminate and promote The Superintendent's Quality Professional Learning Standards (QPLS)	CDE with assistance from WestEd	SBE adoption of the QPLS	Continued dissemination and promotion	Assess effectiveness of strategy and adapt and expand as necessary
3B	Promote and disseminate Integrated Professional Learning	CDE	Monitor implementation of grants	Promote T-BAR prototypes and products on Web	Promote online tools and materials including

Table 12: Educator Equity Plan Implementation Timeline

<b>Strategy</b>		<b>Responsible Parties</b>	<b>2014–15</b>	<b>2015–16</b>	<b>2016–17</b>
	System work products			pages	observation protocols, calibration materials, and effective feedback materials
4A	Provide additional resources to schools serving SED and minority students	California LEAs	Continued implementation of the LCFF	Continued implementation of the LCFF	Continued implementation of the LCFF
5B	Promote and disseminate parent resources	CDE	Continue to build collection of resources to support parent engagement	Explore creation of dissemination strategy	Assess effectiveness of strategy and adapt and expand as necessary
6A	Implement and potentially expand the Compliance Monitoring, Intervention, and Sanctions (CMIS) program	CDE and LEAs	Implement the CMIS program to support LEAs to equitably distribute HQTs, consistent with ESEA Title II Part A requirements.  Ongoing (since 2007)	Refine the CMIS program so that it supports the provision of technical assistance to LEAs in their effort to equitably distribute teachers and leaders, specifically as it applies to poor and minority students.	Implement refined CMIS program when approved

Table 12: Educator Equity Plan Implementation Timeline

<b>Strategy</b>		<b>Responsible Parties</b>	<b>2014–15</b>	<b>2015–16</b>	<b>2016–17</b>
	Monitor State-level data regarding equitable distribution of inexperienced, unqualified, and out-of-field teachers	CDE and the CTC	Prepare data profile spring 2015	Prepare data profile spring 2016	Prepare data profile spring 2017
	Convene annual Educator Equity Plan (EEP) stakeholder meeting	CDE, with the assistance of the CTC and WestEd (SBE, LEAs, parents, teachers, Administrators, pupil services personnel, community groups)	Convene stakeholder meetings to inform development of the EEP	Convene stakeholders to review data, explore equity gaps, and inform update of EEP strategies as appropriate	Convene stakeholders to review data, explore equity gaps, and inform update of EEP strategies as appropriate
	Prepare and present to the SBE an annual report of implementation progress regarding the California State Plan to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators	CDE	2015 California State Plan to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators presented to SBE at its July 2015 meeting	2016 California State Plan to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators presented to SBE as a Board memo in October 2016	2017 California State Plan to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators presented to SBE at its July 2017 meeting

## Appendix A: Stakeholder Meeting Agenda and Participant Lists

# Agenda

- Welcome and Introductions
- Background
- Implementation Update
  - Data
  - Strategy Implementation
  - Stakeholder Feedback
- Breakout Groups
  - Root Cause and Strategy Discussion
  - Feedback Session
- Next Steps

**2016 California Title 1 Conference**  
**March 1, 2016**  
**Session: 4:05-5:35 p.m.**  
**California Educator Equity Plan: 2016 and Beyond**  
**Participant Sign-in Sheet**

	<b>Name</b>	<b>District or Organization*</b>	<b>Role*</b>
1.	Melissa Murray	Heritage Peak Charter School Twin Rivers, USD	High school teacher English/Algebra Title I Compliance Manager
2.	Jose Gomar	Migrant Education	IPS
3.	Siu Lau	Berkeley Unified School District – Categorical Programs	District staff
4.	Ruby McDowell	Heritage Peak Charter	Principal
5.	Christina Farlow	Alabama County Office of Education	Director of Accountability
6.	Avo Atocita	MCOE	County Administrator
7.	Debbie Herzog	Chowchilla Union High	Director, Special Projects and Assessment
8.	Suzanne Borucki	San Bernardino City USD	Title I categorical Program Facilitator
9.	Antoinette Gutierrez	San Bernardino HS	Principal
10.	Deanna Brownlee	Vacaville	Principal
11.	Elva Hennessee	Delano Union Elementary	Director EDL
12.	Jeff Tresemen	California Education Authority	Program Coordinator
13.	Melissa Bazanos	Riverside County Office of Education	Director, Acct & Assessment
14.	Rosa Mercado	Merced County Office of Education	Migrant Education Coordinator
15.	Heather Bolles	Sweetwater Union High School	TOSA with State and Federal Programs
16.	Leah Shields	Kern County Superintendent of Schools	Program Specialist, Mathematics
17.	Patty Cordova	El Monte City Schools	Fiscal Program Analyst
18.	Tom Judd	CUSD	Principal
19.	Jim Sullivan	Visalia Unified	Director State and Federal Programs
	Name	District or Organization	Role
20.	Christine Schieferle	Santa Paula Unified	Assistant Superintendent, Education Services

21.	Cyndi Paik	Westminster School District	Assistant Superintendent
	Name	District or Organization	Role
22.	Jeanne Keith	LACOE	Consultant II, LCAP/ Federal and State Education Programs
23.	Jeanette Spencer	Butte County Office of Education	Director of LCAP and RSDSS
24.	Esther Moosbrugger	San Diego Unified School District	Budget Analyst
25.	Sarah Kidder	San Diego Unified School District	Financial Analyst
26.	Vikki Henton	San Diego Unified School District	Director Financial Planning
27.	Harry Sullivan	San Diego Unified School District	Financial Analyst
28.	Mary Johnson	San Diego Unified School District	Finance
29.	Danielle Storey	Vacaville USD	Assistant Superintendent, Ed Services
30.	Tracy Battson	Temple City Unified School District	Title I, Program Improvement
31.	Regina Green	Tehachapi Unified School District	Chief Academic Officer of Instruction and Technology
32.	Poppy Hill	Anaheim Union High School District	TOSA – Title I
33.	Manuel Colon	Anaheim Union High School District	Chief Academic Officer
34.	Janet Simons	Palmdale School District	Coordinator, State and Federal Accountability + Parent/Community Outreach

\*This sign-in sheet replicates the direct responses from conference participants

**2016 California Association of African-American Superintendents and Administrators**  
**March 3, 2016**  
**Session III: 10:30 - 11:45 a.m.**  
**California Educator Equity Plan: 2016 and Beyond**  
**Participant Sign-in Sheet**

	<b>Name</b>	<b>District or Organization*</b>	<b>Role*</b>
1.	Pam Magee	Palisades Charter H.S.	Executive Director
2.	Colette Rudd	California State PTA	Vice President for Family Engagement
3.	Yvonne McFadzea	Corona Norco Unified	Special Education Coordinator
4.	Robert Archer	Silicon Valley United Nations	Vice President
5.	Michi Clowney	MUUSD	Parent
6.	Marilyn DeRou	SCCOE	FYS Liaison
7.	Nancy Smith	Palmdale School District	Board Member
8.	Shelley Hart	Fontana	Deputy Chief
9.	Eric Gob	Riverside Unified	Assistant Principal
10.	Char Starks, Ed.D.	Elk Grove	Program Specialist
11.	Eric Andrew	Campbell Union School District	Superintendent
12.	David Gomez	ACSA past president + AALRR	Superintendent (retired)
13.	Cassandra Wills	CNUSD	Coordinator, Student and Family Support Services

\*This sign-in sheet replicates the direct responses from meeting participants

**California Association for Bilingual Education, The CAFE Legacy**  
**March 24, 2016**  
**Session III: 1:30 - 3:00 p.m.**  
**California Educator Equity Plan: 2016 and Beyond**  
**Participant Sign-in Sheet**

	<b>Name</b>	<b>District or Organization*</b>	<b>Role*</b>
1.	Juan D. Garcia	Delhi Unified School District	EL Program & Assessment
2.	LaTonya Derbigny	Pittsburg Unified School District	Assistant Superintendent
3.	Elizabeth Gordon-Stoll	Santa Clara USD	Coordinator of Data & Assessment
4.	Claudia Garcia	Sweet Water High District	Categorical Coordinator
5.	Suki Mozenter	Stanford University	Doctoral Student
6.	Martha Martinez	Alvord USD	Director of EL Services
7.	Katherine Connaughton	Rowland Unified School District	Teacher
8.	Imelda Trinklein	Antelope Valley Unified School District	Director
9.	Ginger Dall	Windsor USD	Retired
10.	Chris Haggard	Antelope Valley H.S.	Counselor
11.	Librada Murillo	Moreno Valley Unified School District	Parent
12.		RUSD	Principal
13.	Simon Santana	Mt. Diablo Unified School District	Teacher

\*This sign-in sheet replicates the direct responses from conference participants

**Corona- Norco Parent Engagement Event**  
**May 24, 2016**  
**California Educator Equity Plan: 2016 and Beyond**  
**Participant Sign-in Sheet**

	<b>Name</b>	<b>District or Organization*</b>	<b>Role*</b>
1.	Maria Orozco	Garretson Elementary	Mama
2.	Jordana Moreno	CNUSD-DO	Parent
3.	Mystii Morris	CNUSD-DO Board	Chair/Parent
4.	Maria Munoz	Garretson	Mama
5.	Jennifer Back	CNUSD Lincoln Alternative	Mom
6.	Julieta Ponce	Corona Norco	Parent
7.	Maria Magana	Anburndale	Parent
8.	Saul Gallardo	CH	Papa
9.	Norma Paz	Garretson	Mama
10.	Caroline Paz	Jefferson	Staff
11.	Jenny Zaragoza	Jefferson	Mama
12.	Renee Curtin	Garretson	Mom
13.	Martha A Campos	Jefferson	Mama
14.	Daisy Soriano	Auburndale	Comm Asst.
15.	Esmeralda Caraveo	Auburndale	Mom
16.	Irma R Casteneda	Parkridge	Mama
17.	Lupe Aguilar Ochoa	CFIS	Parent
18.	Susette Reyes	CN Parkridge	PTA Secretary-Parent
19.	Linda Escobar	Parkridge	Parent
20.	Lourdes Orellana	Parkridge	Parent
21.	Marisela Ibarra	Parkridge	Parent
22.	Brenda Middleton	Corona Fund	Parent
23.	Evelyn Ramos	Auburndale	Parent
24.	Alicia Sanchez	Garretson	Parent
25.	Maria Dybala	Corona Fundamental	PTSA
	Name	District or Organization	Role

	<b>Name</b>	<b>District or Organization*</b>	<b>Role*</b>
26.	Jessica Hernandez	Parkridge	Parent
27.	Alia Morales	Parkridge	TSA
28.	Edwin Clement	Parkridge	Principal
29.	Jay Jensen	DAL	Council
30.	Hortencia Gonzalez		
31.	Elena Avila	Auburndale	Mama Voluntaria
32.	Imelda Garcia	Corona	Representante
33.	Julia Alonzo	Ranex Corona	
34.	Iris Duarte	John Adams Elementary	
35.	Jesus Ruiz		
36.	Victor Esteves		
37.	Mayra Padilla	Jefferson	Visitor
38.	Maria Lopez	Garretson	Padre
<b>NOTE: FORMAT CHANGE ON SIGN IN SHEET</b>			
Duplicate	Maria Orozco		
39.	Maria Perez		
Duplicate	Jennifer Back		
Duplicate	Mystie M. Mornis		
40.	Jordana Moreno		
41.	Maria Munz		
Duplicate	Ruby Salas		
42.	Nicole Segreto		
43.	Kat Korte		
Duplicate	Julieto		
44.	Mayra Martinez		
45.	Olivia Jimenez		
46.	April Bohena		
47.	Cristina Virvega		
48.	Yolanda Guerra		
49.	Narda Diaz		
50.	Nicholo Neuman		

	<b>Name</b>	<b>District or Organization*</b>	<b>Role*</b>
	Name	District or Organization	Role
51.	Adriana Perez		
52.	Maria Alcancer		
Duplicate	Renee Curtin		
53.	Adriana Mendez		
54.	Maggi Arendnis		
55.	Maria Arrezola		
56.	Flavia Solano		
57.	Petra Casas		
58.	Hilda Carrilo		
59.	Maria Villanueva		

\*This sign-in sheet replicates the direct responses from event participants

**California Plan to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators  
Stake holder Meeting  
June 23, 2016  
Participant Sign-in Sheet**

	<b>Name</b>	<b>District or Organization*</b>	<b>Role*</b>
1.	Carrie Roberts	CDE	Director PLSD
2.	Heather Mattson	California Comprehensive Center at WestEd	Senior Research Associate
3.	Brad Strong	Children Now	
4.	Serette Kaminski	CCSESA	Consultant
5.	Jacqueline Nader	Independent Consultant	Consultant
6.	Danielle DeSantis	Educators for Excellence	Managing Director of Outreach
7.	Daisy Gonzales	PACE	Associate Director
8.	Jane Robb	CTA	Regional Staff
9.	Nancy Tseng	CTC	Consultant
10.	Jonathan Travers	ERS	Listener
11.	Carrie Hahnel	Ed Trust West	
12.	Tammy Duggan	CTC	Consultant
13.	Debra Watkins	CAAEE	Executive Director
14.	Shelly Spiegel-Coleman	California Together	Executive Director
15.	Tara Kini	Learning Policy Institute	Senior Policy Advisor
16.	Sarah Lillis	CA Voice	Institute Director
17.	Rigel Massaro	Public Advocate	Staff Attorney
18.	Louis Freedberg	Ed Source	Executive Director
19.	Hayin Kim	Opportunity Institute	Project Director

\*This sign-in sheet replicates the direct responses from meeting participants