CALIFORNIA'S
CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION
for

NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND

(2001 Reauthorization of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act)

Submitted by
the California State Board of Education
in association with the
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Sacramento, CA
June 12, 2002

G:\Legal\NCLB\NCLB State Appl\ 06.12.02

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION

Executive Signature Page

In lieu of an electronic signature,
a hard copy of the completed form
is being mailed to Marcia Kingman.

In the event of questions,
please contact
Rick Brandsma,
Executive Director of the
California State Board of Education,
at
(916) 657-5478.

SAFE AND DRUG FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT
"CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER COVER SHEET"

Note:
In lieu of electronic signature, the signed hard copy of this form is being mailed to Marcia Kingman.

Please contact Rick Brandsma, Executive Director for the State Board of Education, at (916) 657-5478, in the event of questions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ESEA Programs Included in the Consolidated State Application . . .. ……..… 5

SEA Contacts for ESEA Programs . . . .……... . . .6

Introduction . . . .…... . . . 7

Part One: Goals, Performance Indicators, and Performance Targets: California's Framework for NCLB Accountability . . . ……... 10

Part Two: State Activities to Implement NCLB Programs . . . ……. 15

Part Three: ESEA Key Programmatic Requirements and Fiscal Information . . . .…….. .103

Assurances and Certifications

General and Cross-cutting Assurances . . . .…….. . 183

"Persistently Dangerous Schools" Certification . . . .…….. 199

ADDENDUM

Abbreviations Key . . . .…….. 201

ESEA PROGRAMS INCLUDED IN

THE CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION

Checklist

The State of California requests funds for the programs indicated below:

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

__X__ Title I, Part B, Subpart 3: Even Start Family Literacy

__X___ Title I, Part C: Education of Migrant Children
__X__ Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk
__X___ Title I, Part F: Comprehensive School Reform
__X___ Title II, Part A: Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund
__X___ Title II, Part D: Enhancing Education Through Technology
__X___ Title III, Part A: English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement
__X__ Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1: Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities
__X___ Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2: Community Service Grants
__X___ Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers
__X___ Title V, Part A: Innovative Programs
__X___ Title VI, Part A, Subpart 1, Section 6111: State Assessment Program
__X___ Title VI, Part A, Subpart 1, Section 6112: Enhanced Assessment Instruments Competitive Grant Program
__X___ Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income Schools

SEA Contacts for ESEA Programs

ESEA Program Title	SEA Program Contact		
	Name	Phone	E-Mail address
Title I, Part A	Hanna Walker	(916) 657-2577	HWalker@cde.ca.gov
Title I, Part B, 3	Andrew Andreoli	(916) 657-5450	AAndreoli@cde.ca.gov
Title I, Part C	Larry Jaurequi	(916) 657-2561	LJaurequi@cde.ca.gov
Title I, Part D	Valta Adger	(916) 657-3747	Vadger@cde.ca.gov
Title I, Part F	Wendy Harris	(916) 657-3351	WHarris@cde.ca.gov
Title II, Part A	Bill Vasey	(916) 323-6440	BVasey@cde.ca.gov
Title II, Part D	Nancy Sullivan	(916) 323-5715	NSulliva@cde.ca.gov
Title III, Part A	Jan Mayer	(916) 657-4683	JMayer@cde.ca.gov
Title IV, Part A	Wade Brynelson Mary Weaver	(916) 653-3314 (916) 323-1117	WBrynels@cde.ca.gov MWeaver@cde.ca.gov
Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2	Wade Brynelson	(916) 653-3314	WBrynels@cde.ca.gov
Title IV, Part B	Pat Rainey	(916) 657-3558	PRainey@cde.ca.gov
Title V, Part A	Jerry Cummings	(916) 654-3487	JCumming@cde.ca.gov
Title VI, Part A, Subpart 1, 6111	Paul Warren	(916) 657-4748	PWarren@cde.ca.gov
Title VI, Part A, Subpart 1, 6112	Paul Warren	(916) 657-4748	PWwarren@cde.ca.gov
Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2	Keric Ashley	(916) 657-4332	KAshley@cde.ca.gov

INTRODUCTION

The California State Board of Education (SBE) and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction are pleased to submit the Consolidated State Application for "No Child Left Behind," the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Since 1995, California has been building an educational system of five components: rigorous content standards; standards-aligned instructional materials; standards-based professional development; standards-aligned assessment; and an accountability structure that measures school effectiveness in light of student achievement. As a result, California is well positioned to implement the new federal law. The state has begun to communicate with districts and schools across California about their new responsibilities under the law and is pursuing the new programs with vigor.

State- and federally funded initiatives aimed at improving student achievement must complement each other and work in tandem to have the greatest impact on improving student achievement. In California, the state and federal consolidated applications, the state accountability system, the Coordinated Compliance Review process, local improvement plans, professional development opportunities, and technical assistance all will be aligned to provide a cohesive, comprehensive, and focused effort for supporting and improving the state's lowest-performing schools.

The state awaits further direction and guidance on key provisions of the law while also anticipating critical areas for which there will need to be a focus on resources, management effort, and policy development to ensure full compliance with the new federal law. These areas include assessment and accountability; data availability, collection, and reporting; and the requirements for a highly qualified teacher in each classroom. In general, however, the progress made thus far by the state will facilitate an effective implementation of NCLB.

California's Consolidated State Application is presented as directed in the approved Consolidated State Application package dated May 7, 2002. The major pieces of the application are described immediately following this introduction: Goals, Performance Indicators and Performance Targets (California's Framework for NCLB Accountability); State Activities to Implement NCLB Programs; and ESEA Key Programmatic Requirements and Fiscal Information. The assurances and certifications follow these sections, along with California's definition of "highly qualified teacher" and a key to abbreviations used herein. The URL listings for key documents are indicated in the text rather than included as attachments to this application.

As indicated elsewhere in this Application, California is applying for the Competitive grant under Title VI, Part A, Subpart 1, Section 6112: "Enhanced Assessment Instruments." In accordance with the *Federal Register* Notice of May 22, 2002, California will provide all remaining required information no later than September 15, 2002.

The key contacts for NCLB and all Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs in California are Rick Brandsma, Executive Director of the State Board of Education, who can be reached at 916-657-5478, and Donald Kairott, the California Department of Education's (CDE's) Administrator for NCLB Programs, at 916-657-2563.

PART ONE:

Goals, Performance Indicators, and Performance Targets: California's Framework for NCLB Accountability

On May 30, 2002, the California State Board of Education (SBE) adopted the five goals and twelve performance indicators for No Child Left Behind, as set forth in the *Federal Register* Notice of May 22, 2002. (Page 35968 of the *Federal Register* notwithstanding, USDE has specified *twelve* performance indicators on pages 35973-35974, consistent with pages 11-12 of the Consolidated State Application package dated May 7, 2002.) The SBE may adopt additional goals and performance indicators sometime during the next twelve months.

The SBE's adoption of the specified goals and performance indicators represents California's commitment to the development of an accountability system to achieve the goals of NCLB. Performance targets, to be developed for each indicator, will be adopted by the SBE by May 2003.

Collectively, NCLB's goals, performance indicators, and performance targets will constitute California's framework for ESEA accountability. This framework will provide the basis for the state's improvement efforts, informing policy decisions by the SBE and implementation efforts by the California Department of Education to fully realize the system envisioned by NCLB; it will provide a basis for coordination with the State Legislature and the Governor's Office.

California's NCLB Performance Goals and Performance Indicators

***Performance Goal 1*: All students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading and mathematics by 2013-2014.**

1.1 **Performance indicator:** The percentage of students, in the aggregate and for each subgroup, who are above the proficient level in reading on the State's assessment. (These subgroups are those for which the ESEA requires State reporting, as identified in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i).)

1.2 **Performance indicator:** The percentage of students, in the aggregate and in each subgroup, who are at or above the proficient level in mathematics on the State's assessment. (These subgroups are those for which the ESEA requires State reporting, as identified in section 1111(h)(C)(i).)

1.3 **Performance indicator:** The percentage of Title I schools that make adequate yearly progress.

***Performance Goal 2*: All limited-English-proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.**

2.1. **Performance indicator:** The percentage of limited-English-proficient students determined by cohort, who have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year.

2.2 **Performance indicator:** The percentage of limited-English-proficient students who are at or above the proficient level in reading/language arts on the State's assessment, as reported for performance indicator 1.1.

2.3 **Performance indicator:** The percentage of limited-English-proficient students who are at or above the proficient level in mathematics on the State's assessment, as reported for performance indicator 1.2.

Performance Goal 3: **By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.**

3.1 **Performance indicator:** The percentage of classes being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in "high-poverty" schools (as the term is defined in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA).

3.2 **Performance indicator:** The percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development. (See definition of "professional development" in section 9101 (34).)

3.3 **Performance indicator:** The percentage of paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parent involvement assistants) who are qualified. (See criteria in section 1119(c) and (d).)

***Performance Goal 4*: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.**

4.1 **Performance indicator:** The percentage of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the State.

***Performance Goal 5*: All students will graduate from high school.**

5.1 **Performance indicator:** The percentage of students who graduate from high school, with a regular diploma,

- disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged; and,
- calculated in the same manner as used in National Center for Education Statistics reports on Common Core of Data.

5.2 **Performance indicator:** The percentage of students who drop out of school,

- disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged; and,
- calculated in the same manner as used in National Center for Education Statistics reports on Common Core of Data.
-

[**Note:** ESEA section 1907 requires States to report all LEA data regarding annual school dropout rates in the State disaggregated by race and ethnicity according to procedures that conform with the National Center for Educational Statistics' (NCES) Common Core of Data. Consistent with this requirement, States must use NCES' definition of "high school dropout," i.e., a student in grades 9-12 who (a) was enrolled in the district at sometime during the previous school year; (b) was not enrolled at the beginning of the succeeding school year; (c) has not graduated or completed a program of studies by the maximum age established by the State;

(d) has not transferred to another public school district or to a non-public school or to a State-approved educational program; and (e) has not left school because of death, illness, or school-approved absence. (Note: As it develops regulations or guidance for the Title I, Part A program, the Department will determine what, if any, modifications to Indicators 5.1 and 5.2 are needed to ensure conformance with Title I requirements.)]

PART TWO:
State Activities to Implement NCLB Programs

> …provide a timeline of major milestones, for either:
> --adopting challenging content standards in reading/language arts and mathematics at each grade level for grades 3 through 8, consistent with section 1111(b)(1) or
> --disseminating grade-level expectations for reading/language arts and mathematics for grades 3 through 8 to LEAs and schools if the State's academic content standards cover more than one grade level (consistent with final regulations, expected to be released in August 2002).

California Education Code Section 60605, as added by Assembly Bill 265 (Chapter 975, Statutes of 1995), called for the development of academic content standards in core subject areas. To generate and oversee the development process for these standards, California's Academic Standards Commission was convened.

California's implementation and use of challenging academic content standards began in December 1997, when the SBE adopted content standards for English-language arts and mathematics. These standards contain coherent and rigorous content and specify what students are expected to know and be able to do. Copies of these standards were distributed to districts, schools, and county offices of education in 1998-99.

California's world-class content standards have been developed for *all* students and can be attained by *all* students given the appropriate standards-aligned

instruction, sufficient time, and intervention when necessary. (The California Department of Education (CDE) publications of *English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve* [1997]) and *Mathematics Content Standards for California Public Schools, Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve* [1997] may be viewed on the CDE web site at: http://www.cde.ca.gov/standards/.)

These standards are incorporated into California's corresponding curriculum frameworks, which guide the design of instructional materials; curriculum; classroom instruction and assessment; intervention; and professional development. The frameworks for both mathematics and reading/language arts can be viewed on the CDE Web site
http://www.cde.ca.gov/cfir/.

> 1.b. Provide a timeline of major milestones for adopting challenging academic content standards in science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).

Following a development and approval process similar to that used for the English-language arts and mathematics standards, content standards in science were adopted by the SBE in October 1998. (The California Department of Education's publication *Science Content Standards for California Public Schools, Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve* can be viewed on the CDE Web site at: http://www.cde.ca.gov/standards/.)

Subsequent to the adoption of the science standards was the development and publication of a new corresponding science curriculum framework. This framework, adopted in February 2002, provides a blueprint for organizing science

instruction so that every child can meet or exceed the science content standards. In addition, the framework guides the implementation of the standards by specifying the design of instructional materials; curriculum; classroom instruction and assessment;, intervention; and professional development. The new science framework can be viewed on the CDE Web site at: http://www.cde.ca.gov/cfir/.

California will develop science assessments for the 6-9 and 10-12 grade spans. Currently, science is tested in grades 9-11 as a part of the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program California Standards Tests. In grades 9-11, these California Standards Tests in science are administered as end-of-course exams in that the standards for science are subject specific (e.g., earth science, biology, chemistry, and physics). A test will be added in 2004 in grade 5 under the provisions of Senate Bill 233. Science standards are already in place in grades 2-8, and they do not require any revisions to comply with NCLB.

California intends to identify "core" science standards for grades 9-11 in order to comply with NCLB. An assessment for implementation by 2007-08, aligned with the core science standards, will be developed and administered by 2007-08. Evidence of these standards and the assessment will be submitted to the USDE by December 2008.

1.c. Provide a timeline of major milestones for the development and implementation, in consultation with LEAs, of assessments that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required subjects and grade levels.

California's assessment system already reflects most of the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of NCLB. The state has developed standards-aligned

assessments in mathematics and reading/language arts in the required grades. These assessments are used to evaluate the academic progress of all children in the state and provide annual information on student achievement to students, parents, schools, districts, and the state. It should be noted that a few of the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) are issues that the state has committed in its approved Title I Assessment and Accountability timeline waiver to review and make appropriate modifications as needed. California is committed to resolving these issues within the timelines identified in its waiver.

Assessments:

Mathematics: grades 3-8. California has developed and implemented these assessments, effective 2000.

Reading/language arts: grades 3-8. California has developed and implemented these assessments, effective 2000.

Science: elementary, middle, and high school: California plans to develop an elementary-grades science test by 2005. This test will be administered in grade 5 and will cover the fourth and fifth grade science content standards. The required middle grades and high school science tests will be developed and implemented by 2007-08. (See timeline in the response to Question 1.d. below.)

1.d. Provide a timeline of major milestones for setting, in consultation with LEAs, academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).

California has developed achievement standards consistent with the requirements of Section 1111(b)(1) for its mathematics and reading/language arts assessments.

Specifically, California has adopted a system of five performance levels to describe the range of student performance. The five levels are "advanced," "proficient," "basic," "below basic," and "far below basic." These levels were developed with broad input from teachers, administrators, and higher education representatives in a manner consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical standards.

Academic Achievement Standards (i.e., Performance Standards)

Mathematics: grades 3-8. California has developed and implemented these standards using the five-level system described above, effective 2002.

Reading/language arts: grades 3-8. California has developed and implemented these standards using the five-level system described above, effective 2001.

Science: elementary, middle, and high school. California plans to develop achievement standards for the elementary-grades science test by 2005.

Achievement standards for the required middle grades and high school science tests will be developed by 2008.

Timeline for Development of Science Assessments

Grade	Blueprint Development	Item Field Test	Form Field Test	Set Achieve-ment Levels
5	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2004-05
6-8	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2007-08
10-12	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2006-07

Note: This is a preliminary schedule. Legislative authorization for science tests in grades 6-8 is required. In addition, the SBE must approve blueprints and achievement levels.

1.h. Provide a plan for how the State will implement a single accountability system that uses the same criteria, based primarily on assessments consistent with section 1111(b), for determining whether a school has made adequate yearly progress, regardless of whether the school receives Title I, Part A or other federal funds.

California has a single accountability system designed to include all children. In 1999, the state enacted the Public Schools Accountability Act (PSAA), which provides an Academic Performance Index (API) for each school with a population of sufficient size to create a valid and reliable index. Details of the PSAA can be found at http://www.cde.ca.gov/psaa. California's accountability system is used for schools that receive Title I funds as well as for schools that do not receive such funds. For the past two years, the API has been used to identify Title I schools that fail to make adequate yearly progress (as measured by API growth targets), and thus become eligible for Program Improvement (PI) status.

The state assessments used to construct the API are largely consistent with the requirements of Section 1111(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act as reauthorized by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. The California Department of Education is currently operating under a timeline waiver from the USDE on certain technical issues with respect to its assessment system. The timeline waiver runs through Fall 2003. Over the next 12 to 18 months, the state will be making modifications to its assessment and accountability system, as outlined in the timeline waiver, with the goal of further aligning the state system with federal requirements. It is also anticipated that results of the negotiated rulemaking panel and the proposed regulations will further delineate requirements, and may require

additional modifications to California's accountability system.

California's accountability system does the following:

- Includes long-term goals for a fixed level of achievement for all schools and subgroups, and measures annual progress against those goals;
- Is based on the California academic content standards (i.e., *California Standards Tests* or CSTs) and also includes a norm-referenced test that allows for national benchmarking (i.e., *California Achievement Test* or *CAT-6*, which California will begin using in 2002-03);
- Is applied to all of the state's schools for which results are valid (i.e., schools with more than three valid test scores);
- Includes sanctions and incentives, with sanctions closely aligned with those required under the school improvement provisions of Title I;
- Disaggregates data at the school level to ensure all students are improving their academic achievement levels; and
- Includes the state's charter schools; and
- Disaggregates data for specified subgroups.

1.i. Identify the languages present in the student population to be assessed, languages in which the State administers assessments, and languages in which the State will need to administer assessments. Use the most recent data available and identify when the data were collected.

In the 2000-01 school year, there were 1,512,655 English learners enrolled in California public schools — an increase of about 32,000 students (2.1 percent) from the previous year. The English learner student population constitutes more than 25 percent of the total enrollment in California public

schools. The majority of English learners (70 percent) are enrolled in kindergarten through grade 6. English learners come from many language groups, but approximately 95 percent come from homes where a language other than English is spoken: Spanish (83.4 percent or 1,261,139 students), Vietnamese (2.5 percent), Hmong (1.8 percent), Cantonese (1.7 percent), Filipino (1.2 percent), Khmer (1.0 percent), Korean (1.1 percent), Armenian (0.8 percent), and Mandarin (0.7 percent). Other primary languages of English learners in California public schools include: Arabic, Albanian, Assyrian, Bosnian, Burmese, Cebuano (Visayan), Chaldean, Chamorro (Guamanian), Chaozhou (Chiuchow), Croatian, Dutch, Farsi (Persian), French, German, Greek, Gujarati, Hebrew, Hindi, Hungarian, Ilocano, Indonesian, Italian, Japanese, Khmu, Kurdish, Lahu, Lao, Marshallese, Mien (Yao), Mixteco, Pashto, Polish, Portuguese, Punjabi, Rumanian, Russian, Samoan, Serbo-Croatian (Serbian), Taiwanese, Thai, Tigrinya, Toishanese, Tongan,Turkish, Ukranian, and Urdu.

In general, California's assessment system tests students in English. Currently, the *California English Language Development Test* (CELDT) — an assessment of English language proficiency for limited-English-proficient (LEP) students — is administered in English. The *California High School Exit Examination* (CAHSEE) is administered in English as required by state law (California Education Code Section 60852). In the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) program, the *California Standards Tests* and the norm-referenced test are administered in English. Accommodations specific to English learners are available on the California Standards Tests. During

the next 6 to 12 months, the SBE will be evaluating the accommodation policies for each test to maximize accessibility to English learners.

California awaits additional information or guidance from USDE on this question, specifically with regard to the "…languages in which the State *will need* to administer assessments…" (italics added).

> 1j. Provide evidence that, beginning not later than the school year 2002-2003, LEAs will provide for an annual assessment of English proficiency that meets the requirements of section 1111(b)(7), including assessments of the domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing comprehension. Identify the assessment(s) the State will designate for this purpose.

California currently meets this requirement through the administration of the *California English Language Development Test* (CELDT). This is a custom state assessment that tests the domains of reading and comprehension, writing, listening, and speaking. The test results are reported based on five performance levels: "beginning," "early intermediate," "intermediate," "early advanced," and "advanced." All LEP students are required to take the CELDT during an annual testing window (July through October). Students are also required to take the CELDT when a district needs language proficiency information for possible LEP identification. The CELDT was administered statewide for the first time in fall 2001.

1.k. Describe the status of the State's effort to establish standards and annual measurable achievement objectives under section 3122(a) of the ESEA that relate to section 1111(b)(1) of the ESEA. If they are not yet established, describe the State's plan and timeline for completing the development of these standards and achievement objectives.

California currently has fully developed English Language Development (ELD) standards (www.cde.ca.gov/statetests/celdt). The ELD standards cover the domains of reading, writing, listening, and speaking. These standards are the foundation for the CELDT, which is described in (i) above. The CELDT satisfies the NCLB requirements for measuring students' English proficiency. The remaining step needed to comply with NCLB is the development of "annual measurable objectives." California will develop these objectives consistent with the objectives required of the academic achievement standards of Title I. A full plan will be developed by May 2003.

PROPOSED TIMELINE

Summer 2002:	Examine achievement and English proficiency scores
Fall 2002:	Recommend annual measurable objectives to the SBE for approval

2. Describe the process for awarding competitive sub-grants (or contracts) for the programs listed below. In a separate response for each of these programs, provide a description of the following items, including how the State will address the related statutory requirements: (a) timelines; (b) selection criteria and how they promote improved academic achievement; and (c) priorities and how they promote improved academic achievement. The programs to be addressed are:

- Even Start Family Literacy (Title I, Part B)
- Education of Migrant Children (Title I, Part C)
- Prevention and Intervention for Children Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk—Local Agency Programs (Title I, Part D, Subpart 2)
- Comprehensive School Reform (Title I, Part F)
- Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund—subgrants eligible to partnerships (Title II, Part A, subpart 3)
- Enhanced Education Through Technology (Title IV, Part B)
- Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities—Reservation for the Governor (Title IV, Part A, section 4112)
- Community Service Grants (Title IV, Part A, section 4126)
- 21st Century Community Learning Centers (Title IV, Part B)

The guiding principle for the awarding of competitive subgrants or contracts is that categorical programs must be aimed at improving student achievement in the regular school program. These programs should provide for clear articulation between the categorical program itself and what the child is going to learn in school.

1) Even Start Family Literacy (Title I, Part B)

California will implement the Even Start statute, including all of its key procedures. Scientifically based reading research will be the basis for Even Start instructional programs in reading. The program will integrate aspects of early childhood education, adult education, and parenting education into a unified family literacy program. Sections 1231-1240 of the law will be implemented through an annual competitive request for application process.

Eligible applicants are LEAs in partnership with community-based organizations, institute of higher educations, non-profit organizations or city agencies. Per Section 1238, the first priority for awards will go to applicants with high percentages or large numbers of children and families who are in need of services as indicated by high levels of poverty, illiteracy, unemployment, limited English proficiency, parents who have been victims of domestic violence, parents who are receiving assistance under a state program funded under Part A of Title IV of the Social Security Act. The second priority goes to applications that are designated Empowerment and Enterprise Zones. The state has discretion to award grants in new geographical locations where there has not been an Even Start project. (Empowerment Zones include Los Angeles, Oakland, Santa Ana, and Riverside County. Enterprise communities are Los Angeles, Huntington Park, San Diego, San Francisco, Bayview, Hunter's Point, Watsonville, Orange Cove, and Imperial County.)

In awarding *continuation grants*, the Even Start program applies its Program Quality/Performance Indicators, via the annual evaluation report, to determine eligibility for continued funding. On August 15, 2002, the projects submit their evaluation reports and thereafter will be informed if they are making sufficient or insufficient progress.

In awarding competitive subgrants for Even Start, the following timeline, selection criteria, and priorities will be used:

Timeline: Funding Time Period

Applicants may be funded up to four years. The William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Program grant is annually competitive and does not provide a permanent funding source. For continuation of funding beyond year one, grantees are required to show satisfactory results and progress toward meeting program objectives based on the Indicators of Program Quality/Performance Standards for both children and adults. At the end of the fourth year, grantees can compete for a second cycle of funding at 50 percent of the grant; a ninth year project can be funded at 35 percent.

DATE	**EVENT**
June 2002	Solicit input from the Title I Committee of Practitioners in the development of the application, procedures, and priorities
November 2002	Even Start Application revised for the 2003-04 funding cycle
March 1, 2003	General Request for Application (RFA) Released
March 11, 2003	Technical Assistance provided during California Family Literacy Conference in Santa Clara
April 1, 2003	Letter of Intent due
May 3, 2003	Deadline for New Subgrantee Applications due by 5 p.m. (close of business)
May 20-24, 2003	Review and selection of New Subgrantee Applications
May 24, 2003	Notification of Intent Not to Award Grants Mailed
Thirty Days After Notification of Intent Not to Award	End of Grant Award Appeal Process
May 31, 2003	Initial Notification of Intent to Award Grants
June 14, 2003	Final Subgrantee Notification Award Letter

CDE will select a review panel consisting of at least one early childhood professional, one adult education professional, and one individual with expertise in family literacy programs.

Selection criteria that promote academic achievement for students and appropriate training for parents include:

- The program's implementation through collaborative partners that build on existing high-quality community resources to create a new range of services;
- The encouragement of participating families to attend regularly and to remain in the program a sufficient amount of time to meet program goals;
- The assurance that the program will serve those families most in need of the activities and services;
- The use of instructional programs based on scientifically based reading research, according to the SBE-adopted criteria for reading/language arts instructional materials, and the prevention of reading difficulties for children and adults;
- The inclusion of reading-readiness activities for preschool children based on scientifically based reading research, to the extent available, to ensure that children enter school ready to learn;
- The teaching and support necessary to help children achieve the state's rigorous content and student achievement standards;
- The assistance of adults to meet Adult Basic Education standards;
- The provision and monitoring of integrated services to participating parents and children through home-based programs;

- The inclusion of special training for all staff to develop the necessary skills to work with parents and young children in the full range of instructional services;
- The operation of the program on a year-round basis, including the provision of some program services as well as instructional and enrichment services during the summer months;
- The provision for an independent evaluation of the program to be used for program improvement;
- The identification and recruitment of families most in need of Even Start Services;
- The screening of families for readiness to ensure that they will benefit from Even Start;
- The coordination with relevant programs;
- The provision of high-quality intensive instructional programs by requiring all four core components of Even Start;
- The provision of flexible scheduling and support services;
- The provision of "high-quality" staff development and "highly qualified staff" based on the requirements of NCLB.

The request for applications will require each applicant to document that it has qualified personnel to develop, administer, and implement an Even Start program and to provide access to the special training necessary to prepare staff for the program, as described in section 1237(b). (As an example, the

Even Start application used for the 2002-03 funding cycle contains requirements for qualified personnel and may be viewed at the following web site address:
http://www.cde.ca.gov/iasa/evenstart/rfa.html; see pages 7-8, beginning with #2, second full paragraph.)

The RFA also will require applicants to provide a plan of operation and continuous improvement for the Even Start project that includes the items as described in section 1237(c)(A-G). In the request for applications, CDE will provide information about startup funds to eligible recipients.

Priorities for Services

Per Section 1238, the *first priority* for awards will go to applicants with high percentages or large numbers of children and families in need of services as indicated by high levels of poverty, illiteracy, unemployment, limited English proficiency, parents who have been victims of domestic violence, and parents who receive assistance under a state program funded under Part A of Title IV of the Social Security Act. The *second priority* will go to applications from designated Empowerment and Enterprise Zones. The state has discretion to award grants in new geographical locations where there has not been an Even Start project. (Empowerment Zones include Los Angeles, Oakland, Santa Ana, and Riverside County. Enterprise communities are Los Angeles, Huntington Park, San Diego, San Francisco, Bayview, Hunter's Point, Watsonville, Orange Cove, and Imperial County.)

Indicators of Program Quality/Performance Indicators, and Present Revision, per NCLB

California is in the process of revising its existing Even Start Indicators of Program Quality/Performance Indicators to reflect NCLB goals and Performance Indicators, thereby better promoting academic achievement. CDE will use the newly revised indicators on an annual basis, beginning Fall 2002, to determine whether subgrantees are making satisfactory progress. All continuing Even Start projects will be required to submit an annual evaluation report 30 days after the end of the fiscal year, based upon the revised indicators. The State will develop a system to monitor the progress of the Even Start program with benchmarks to determine interventions for local projects

CDE Activities and Procedures for Even Start

CDE will use the 3 percent of grant funds authorized under NCLB section 1233 to provide technical assistance for projects to improve and replicate, and carry out sections 1240 and 1234 (c) which states that a portion of these funds may be used to improve the quality of family literacy services, priority given to projects of low quality based on the indicators of program quality, and to help local projects raise additional funds to expand services and reducing waiting lists.

CDE assists Even Start mentors in providing technical assistance to new project directors for implementing the Even Start program. The state will:

- Meet with mentors five times per year;
- Assist mentors in becoming trainers in Desired Results and the National Center for Family Literacy trainers; and
- Facilitate these trainings for all Even Start projects.

Further, to assist grantees in meeting NCLB goals and objectives and local objectives, CDE will:

- Provide information workshops to Even Start projects during directors' meetings and through mentors;
- Encourage projects to attend information workshops on the NCLB goals;
- Coordinate with other offices that provide training or workshops; and,
- Align the Even Start performance indicators with NCLB goals.

2) Education of Migrant Children (Title I, Part C)

California Education Code, sections 54440-54445, establish the administrative framework for delivering services within the State of California. The Migrant Education Program (MEP) grant monies are awarded to regions (county offices of education and school districts), less 1% for administrative costs to subgrantees at the local level, based on migrant children enrollment counts. Note: In California, awards are made to each region based on a funding formula.

The primary goal of this program is to identify and serve at-risk migratory children and their families. Objectives are tied to all 5 performance goals with a focus on high academic standards (emphasis on reading and math); increased English proficiency, where appropriate; use of highly qualified teachers and staff with the use of appropriate assessment tools; safe learning environments conducive to learning; and a sustained high rate of graduation from high school.

The MEP Office staff will review annually the effectiveness of local programs through a new application process, which incorporates an overall emphasis on the performance goals, and subsequent review process of operating agencies (regions) and school districts. Orientations and information sessions will be held to exchange information and feedback on the success of the prior year's objectives. Parents also will be asked annually to provide comments on the overall success of the program through local and state parent advisory councils. Data from State Testing and Reporting System (STAR) will be used during the coming year by operating agencies (regions) to evaluate program plans. In addition to the Annual State Migrant Parent Advisory Conference, which includes over 1,300 participants in a professional development activity, CDE's Migrant Education/International Office provides technical assistance to the field in all academic areas, including health and parent involvement activities.

School-wide programs shall meet the needs of migratory children prior to implementation of the plan and the subsequent use of MEP funds. CDE will conduct State Coordinated Compliance Reviews (CCRs) and fiscal reviews.

The MEP Office staff will provide technical assistance leading to compliance with the performance goals and objectives of NCLB. Staff also will investigate and share the best scientifically based practices in the areas of instruction.

MEP is committed to ensuring that all migrant students will be included within the state assessment process, with test results made available to migrant parents. Migrant children will be expected to meet the same high academic standards (English-language arts, mathematics, science, and history-social science) as the general student population. Furthermore, students identified as English learners will be assessed for English proficiency in keeping with an increased emphasis on reading achievement. Student records will be made available at no cost to other states, thus maintaining a seamless education plan addressing the mobility of migrant children. Although the definition of "Adequate Yearly Progress" does not list migrant students as a subgroup, the progress for these students is obtained annually and included in the Consolidated Performance Report for migrant education that is submitted to the USDE.

3) Prevention and Intervention for Children Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk--Local Agency Programs (Title I, Part D, Subpart 2)

The Neglected or Delinquent (N or D) Program is aimed at providing Title I services to improve the academic achievement (specifically in mathematics, reading, and language arts) of neglected or delinquent students who reside in

24-hour residential and institutional care. California operates the N or D Program as a formula-driven grant, and consequently there are no selection criteria. (Funding for the Neglected portion of the program is issued as a part of the Title I, Part A Basic Grant.)

A timeline for the making of subgrants is provided below.

August 30, 2002	Mail Annual Survey of Children in Neglected and Delinquent Institutions Data Collection forms to Local Education Agencies (LEAs) (Form ND-1, 08-02)
October 30, 2002	Mail Annual Survey of Children in Delinquent Institutions Data Collection Form to State Agencies (California Youth Authority and California Department of Corrections) (Adopted from Form 4376)
November 12, 2002	Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 (N or D for State Agencies) – First Apportionment (50%) to California Youth Authority and Department of Corrections
November 15, 2002	Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, (Delinquent for Local Education Agencies) - First Apportionment (40%) to LEAs
November 22, 2002	Title I, Part A, Subpart 2, (Neglected for Local Education Agencies) - First Apportionment (40%) to LEAs
December 20, 2002	Due Date for Annual Survey of Children in Neglected and Delinquent Institutions Data Collection Forms from Local Education Agencies (LEAs)
December 31, 2002	Due Date for Annual Survey of Children in Delinquent Institutions Data Collection Forms from State Agencies (California Youth Authority and California Department of Corrections)
March 21, 2003	Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, (Delinquent for Local Education Agencies) - Second Apportionment (40%) to LEAs
March 28, 2003	Title I, Part A, Subpart 2, (Neglected for Local Education Agencies) - Second Apportionment (40%) to LEAs
May 19, 2003	Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 (N or D for State Agencies) – Second Apportionment (50%) to California Youth Authority and Department of Corrections
May 23, 2003	Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, (Delinquent for Local Education Agencies) - Third Apportionment (20%) to LEAs
May 23, 2003	Title I, Part A, Subpart 2, (Neglected for Local Education Agencies) - Third Apportionment (20%) to LEAs

The Local Education Agencies (LEAs) do not submit detailed program descriptions as a part of the annual application process due to the large number of active facilities involved; however, demographic data is submitted as a part of the application process. California has up to 115 LEAs participating in its Neglected or Delinquent (N or D) Program. This accounts for approximately 850 active sites throughout the State. Each LEA is required to submit a description of its N or D Program goals and objectives as a part of the Local Improvement Plan. Detailed individual site descriptions that would satisfy [§1423] are required to be kept on file at the administrative office by each LEA and these are reviewed during the on-site monitoring and Coordinated Compliance Review visits by State Education Agency (SEA) staff.

The state agencies, California Youth Authority and California Department of Corrections, are required to submit detailed program descriptions, goals, and objectives in July of each year for review and approval by the SEA.

California has one staff person responsible for on-going program accountability and monitoring for both the LEA and State Agencies for all N or D Program throughout the entire state. Therefore, coordination between LEA and State Agency programs is encouraged and accomplished through staff development activities that are provided during on-site monitoring visits and as a part of annual statewide N or D Program Conferences. Additionally, information that facilitates cooperative coordination among other state and local programs based on availability in each of the local areas

is also presented by agencies such as Social Services, Mental Health, Workforce Investment Board, and Probation Departments.

The services that are available to students in institutions providing N or D Program services can vary based sometimes on what is most effective in the type of institutional setting (i.e., group home, county shelter school, or juvenile or adult correctional facility). Students residing in group homes typically receive extended-day services in the form of tutoring, computers assisted learning through instructional software, and assistance from Reading Specialists. Students enrolled in school settings in both neglected and delinquent designated facilities receive classroom instruction and assistance from Title I teachers and teaching assistants. Educational materials and equipment for Title I instruction are also provided and would include books, computers, and audio-visual equipment and supplies. The allowable increase in spending for transitional programs allows for more funds to be spent on classroom materials for vocational and technical training. Additionally, students participate in employment and career related activities, and information and orientations are presented regarding college, vocational, and technical school selection and registration.

Priorities

All LEAs are required to meet all of the rigorous requirements of the law. In support of the aim of academic achievement, the following priorities for California's formula grant N or D Program will be implemented:

1. N or D students must meet the same content and achievement standards as all other students in the state. Therefore, the curricula,

textbooks, and instructional resources will be aligned to state standards in all institutions and facilities providing instruction.

2. Through a refined and more sensitive component of the California's Public Schools Accountability Act, the Alternative Schools Accountability Model, pre- and post- assessment instruments are being identified for use with highly mobile student populations in alternative schools, such as court schools and community day schools. Upon final selection of assessment instruments, this component of the accountability system will allow California to measure student achievement for this student population. Individual student learning plans must be developed based on initial assessment results to ensure that students are engaged in focused learning.
3. The law requires that students participating in N or D Programs accrue credits toward grade promotion and graduation. To properly implement this provision of the law, transcripts will be obtained and evaluated from all schools attended by these students. The credits from these transcripts then will be applied to the credits earned while in the N or D facilities and institutions. Cumulative credits will be forwarded to the schools in which these students will transition. This process will ensure that all credits earned by students while transferring between regular and alternative schools, facilities, and institutions will be applied toward their promotion and graduation.
4. Transition programs are key to the success of students after leaving the N or D facilities and institutions. Program staff will be supported in the use of SBE-adopted instructional materials, including textbooks, high school standards maps, and SBE intervention

5. programs. In addition, students will be provided with information and services that will help them effectively transition back into regular education programs, higher education programs, vocational and technical training, and employment.

CDE monitors N or D sites through California's annual Coordinated Compliance Review (CCR) process, verifying that programs use SBE-adopted instructional materials that are aligned with state standards (currently being revised to reflect NCLB goals and performance indicators). Ten percent of the total N or D sites receive individual CCR site validations and technical assistance reviews annually. It also will further the understanding and implementation of NCLB performance goals and indicators through N or D programs, including the alignment of local goals and objectives.

SBE has adopted a set of "standards maps," per California Education Code section 60119, which is a tool allowing local school districts to evaluate the degree to which a publisher of instructional materials has achieved alignment with SBE-adopted content standards. Program staff will use these maps as part of their technical assistance to the field.

4) Comprehensive School Reform (Title I, Part F)

California will continue to use a competitive process through a Request for Applications (RFA) to award subgrants to schools and districts throughout the state. These awards will be made on an annual basis, with continuation

grants for a second and third year. Districts with schools participating in CSR will receive 5-10 percent above the school grant amount for their participation and support of the school program.

Schools invited to apply for CSR are limited to those in the first five deciles of California's Academic Performance Index (API), and the failure by the school to meet its API growth target in the preceding year. Under the current RFA, the following schools are eligible: 1) schools in deciles 2-5 that are in Cohort 3 of the Immediate Intervention/Underperforming Schools Program (II/USP) program (these are schools that scored in the lower half of the statewide distribution of the STAR test and that fail to make growth on the API); 2) Title I Program Improvement schools; 3) schools that applied for II/USP but did not receive funding; and 4) schools in decile 1 that applied for the High Priority Schools Grant Program. Because there is intense concern in California about the state's lowest performing schools, future cohorts of CSR will likely include stronger representation of schools in decile 1. However, California will continue to strive for a representative mix of schools funded through CSR; that is, rural/ suburban/urban schools and districts, demographic diversity, grade span, and large/medium/small schools.

Priorities under CSR include schools in Cohort 3 of the II/USP program in deciles 2-5, and Title I Program Improvement schools in deciles 2-5. However, California is sensitive to the needs of decile 1 schools and may in the future choose to fund these schools on a priority basis.

The design of CSR in California will align with the Federal mandate of scientifically based models of systemic school-wide reform. In addition to meeting the state standards, more than one model may be used; or a locally developed model (backed by appropriate research) may be used. Technical assistance is provided to schools and districts prior to applying for a CSR grant. Workshops are held in various locations of the state to ensure a common level of understanding of the components and other aspects of CSR. Additional one-on-one technical assistance is provided as requested by individual schools and/or districts. End-of-year evaluation reports assist CDE in determining school progress in implementing CSR and ensure that schools have addressed all 11 required components in the CSR plans.

CDE has provided website addresses which contain resources for successful implementation of CSR, including lists of model providers, and booklets and pamphlets relating to CSR. This information will be updated periodically to reflect the latest programs and practices supported by scientifically based research.

Timeline: An RFA was distributed in January 2002. CSR grants will be awarded in July 2002. A new RFA will be issued in Fall 2002, and new grants will be awarded in 2003.

5) Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund—sub-grants to eligible partnerships (Title II, Part A, Subpart 3)

As specified in Title II, Part A, Subpart 3, eligible partnerships must be comprised of an institution of higher education and its teacher preparation division; a school of arts and sciences; a high-need local educational agency; and a fourth member that represents one of a variety of private or public education entities.

California's state agency for higher education, the California Postsecondary Education commission (CPEC), and CDE have worked collaboratively to develop and support high quality professional development programs for local education agency staff. This process will continue with an increased focus on serving low-performing schools and districts. In particular, the University of California (UC) and the California State University (CSU) systems will participate in the collaborative state-level leadership team that will oversee use of these funds to ensure that all California students have the opportunity to develop proficiency in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science.

Subgrants will be competitively awarded by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (the SAHE) to eligible partnerships on the basis of the partnership's capacity to provide professional development activities aligned with the state's academic content standards and curriculum frameworks. CDE will develop a grant application for approval by SBE.

Services offered through the subgrants may include providing professional development, training trainers to increase local educators' capacity to promote high-quality professional development and high-quality classroom instruction, or training and support to site and district administrators to enable them to support high-quality, standards-based instructional programs.

Successful proposals will include the following: capacity to reflect California's standards for high quality professional development; ability to effectively train teachers in the specific subject-matter area(s) such that teachers can assess and teach toward the state's academic content standards; and capability to work closely with LEAs to identify needs and target technical assistance and professional development accordingly. CPEC, furthermore, will ensure that the distribution of subgrants equitably serves the various geographic areas of California.

6) Enhanced Education Through Technology (Title II, Part D)

Title II, Part D funding will be allocated via formula-funded grants and competitive grants. Timelines, selection criteria, and priorities for these grants are described below.

Timelines: LEAs in California will apply for the formula-funded grants through the State's consolidated application. This process was begun in the spring of 2002 and will conclude in the fall of 2002. The application for the competitive grants will be a separate application, but will be structured to

coordinate with the formula-funded grants as described in the "Selection Criteria" section below. The grant process will be coordinated with the SBE.

The timeline for awarding the competitive subgrants for Enhancing Education Through Technology will depend upon whether or not the California State Legislature decides to enact legislation on the competitive grants. If the required approval is limited to the SBE, CDE anticipates releasing the RFA shortly after school begins in fall 2002, with applications due in December (approximately) and grants awarded in early winter 2003. However, if State legislation is needed, it is likely that the RFA will not be released until December, with grants awarded in the spring of 2003.

The California Technology Assistance Project (CTAP) will provide assistance to LEAs interest in applying for funds under Title II, Part D. For formula-funded grants, assistance will be provided on an as-needed basis with the intent to help all qualified applicants receive formula funding. Once the Request for Applications is released for the competitive grants, CTAP will hold regional workshops to explain the competition and the requirements for funding. Grant-grooming assistance will be provided, and LEAs with the highest need will be provided targeted assistance.

Selection Criteria: For both the formula-funded and competitive grants, eligible entities will be defined in a manner consistent with federal law. LEAs will be eligible for funding if they are a high-need LEA or an eligible local partnership as defined by law. High-need LEAs will be LEAs with the

highest numbers or percents of children from families with incomes below the poverty line that operate one or more schools in need of improvement or corrective action and/or have a substantial need for assistance in acquiring and using technology. For both the competitive and formula-funded grants, LEAs will be required to have district technology plans that meet federal and state requirements. Specifically, the plans will be required to include all of the following:

- Strategies for using technology to improve academic achievement and teacher effectiveness

- Goals aligned with challenging state standards for using advanced technology to improve student academic achievement

- Steps the applicant will take to ensure that all students and teachers have increased access to technology and to help ensure that teachers are prepared to integrate technology effectively into curricula and instruction

- Promotion of curricula and teaching strategies that integrate technology that are based on a review of relevant research and leading to improvements in student academic achievement

- Ongoing, sustained professional development for teachers, principals,

- administrators, and school library media personnel to further the effective use of technology in the classroom or library media center

- A description of the type and costs of technology to be acquired with Ed Tech funds, including provisions for interoperability of components

- A description of how the applicant will coordinate activities funded through the Ed Tech program with technology-related activities supported with funds from other sources

- A description of how the applicant will integrate technology into curricula and instruction, and a time line for this integration

- Innovative delivery strategies - a description of how the applicant will encourage the development and use of innovative strategies for the delivery of specialized or rigorous courses and curricula through the use of technology, including distance learning technologies, particularly in areas that would not otherwise have access to such courses or curricula due to geographical distances or insufficient resources

- A description of how the applicant will use technology effectively to promote parental involvement and increase communication with parents

- Collaboration with adult literacy service providers

- Accountability measures - a description of the process and accountability measures that the applicant will use to evaluate the extent to which activities funded under the program are effective in integrating technology into curricula and instruction, increasing the ability of teachers to teach, and enabling students to reach challenging state academic standards

- Supporting resources - a description of the supporting resources, such as services, software, other electronically delivered learning materials, and print resources, that will be acquired to ensure successful and effective uses of technology.

The application for the competitive grants will be a separate application from the formula-funded application as described above, but will be structured to coordinate with the formula-funded grant in two ways. First, the LEAs that receive grants of less than $10,000 through the formula-funded grants will receive additional points in the competitive grant process. In addition, the competitive grant scoring process will be structured so as to give competitive advantage to LEAs that plan to coordinate the use of the formula-funded grant with the competitive grant funds.

The competitive grants will focus on using technology as a tool to promote improved academic achievement, as well as development of skills that

prepare students for the 21st Century, such as problem-solving, communication, and collaboration. Although the details of the competitive grants are still being developed at this time, CDE anticipates that the selection process will include the following components:

- Advantage will be given to applicants with inadequate access and high need.
- Advantage will be given to applicants that make technology and technology-assisted learning opportunities, including distance learning, available beyond the regular school day.
- Advantage will be given to applicants that focus efforts on using technology to support helping students reach or exceed state standards; the curriculum and promotion of student achievement will be at the heart of these competitive grants, not plans to simply acquire more computers.
- Advantage will be given to applicants that provide students and teachers with adequate access to technology, including both hardware and Internet access.
- Advantage will be given to applicants that provide specific information about how they will collect data to monitor the impact of the program on technology use by teachers and students and how this technology use contributes to helping students reach or exceed state standards. Competitive advantage will be given to applicants with a well-defined plan to monitor successful implementation and that will make mid-course corrections as necessary to ensure that the project focuses on using technology to improve student achievement.

- Applicants will be required to provide timely technical support to ensure that the technology works whenever teachers, students, and administrators use it; advantage will be given to applicants with plans for adequate technical support.
- Advantage will be given to applicants that will provide professional development for teachers and administrators that is focused on integrating technology into the curriculum in a manner that promotes technology literacy and the effective use of technology to improve teaching and promote student achievement.
- Advantage will be given to applicants that ensure administrators understand how to use technology to make informed decisions and how to support acquisition and deployment of technology to improve teaching and learning.
- Advantage will be given to applicants that, in addition to complying with federal and State Board education technology plan requirements, plan to coordinate the use of any EETT funding received with other school improvement efforts and funding, such as efforts funded via Title I and other *No Child Left Behind* federal programs.
- Funds will be awarded in each of the CTAP regions based upon a formula that considers the proportionate share of Title I funding received in each region, as well as the percent of and enrollment in high-need LEAs in each region. This distribution will ensure that both urban and rural sections of the state receive funding and will ensure an equitable distribution of funding throughout all regions of the state.

Priorities: The priorities for competitive grants will focus on using technology as a tool to promote improved academic achievement. Although the details are still being developed, CDE anticipates that the priorities will include:

- A focus on grades 4-8 since California has invested significant state resources at the high school level but has not had adequate state resources to address technology needs in grades 4-8
- A focus on reading/language arts and/or mathematics and using technology as a tool to improve student academic achievement and teaching in these content areas
- A focus on providing funding to low-performing schools with inadequate technology
- A focus on providing technology in the classrooms (as opposed to computer labs) so that teachers and students have access to technology tools whenever needed
- A focus on providing ongoing high-quality professional development for administrators and teachers that helps them effectively use technology as a tool to improve student achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics, as well as the development of skills that prepare students for the 21st Century, such as problem-solving, communication, and collaboration. In addition, priority will be given to projects that provide ongoing support and coaching to teachers and that monitor changes in teaching practice over time. In

this way, teachers can implement what they learn through professional development in a manner that actually focuses on using technology to support improved student performance in reading/language arts and/or mathematics.

These priorities will promote improved academic achievement in a number of ways. By selecting grant recipients with the highest needs, funds will be targeted to those who can benefit most from additional support. Grants will focus on using technology as a tool to support improved student achievement in reading/language arts and/or mathematics and will include both a coaching model for teachers. Since the grants will address all aspects of a comprehensive education technology program (infrastructure, technical support, professional development, adequate access, and administrative support), grant recipients will be able to address all the elements needed for success. Grants will be of sufficient size, scope, and duration to make a difference in teaching and learning. Because grant recipients will be required to do ongoing monitoring and action if they are not achieving results, and because the CTAP staff will be available to provide ongoing technical assistance to grant recipients, the entire grant efforts will focus on improved academic achievements. Grant recipients will be encouraged and coached to coordinate the activities funded through Title II, Part D with other school reform efforts and with other federally and state-funded projects aimed at improving student achievement.

Monitoring: CDE and CTAP will monitor the implementation of the competitive grants to ensure that grant recipients are making sufficient progress toward project and State goals. Projects will be required to monitor their progress on a ongoing basis and to provide data to CDE and CTAP on a quarterly basis. CTAP will provide assistance to any grant recipients not making adequate progress and CDE will assist in this effort if intervention by CTAP is not effective. In addition, both competitive and formula-funded grant recipients will be required to report expenditures to ensure that at least 25 percent of the funding is spent on ongoing high-quality professional development.

7) Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities--reservation for the Governor (Title IV, Part A, section 4112)

Title IV, Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act (SDFSCA), begins with the funding reserved for California's Governor; he has selected the California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs (ADP) to administer this program.

The ADP will ensure that SDFSCA funds for services, programs and activities are distributed competitively through grants and/or contracts. ADP will publish announcements of ADP-administered Requests for Proposals (RFP) in the *California State Contract Register* and post them electronically. An evaluation team will review proposals based on the quality of the proposed programs or activities, how the programs or activities meet the

Principles of Effectiveness, and how activities complement and support local educational agencies and coordinate with related Federal, State, school, and community efforts. Only those proposals meeting the highest standards on a specific point system will be selected.

In awarding contracts and grants:

- Priority will be given to programs and activities that prevent illegal drug use and violence for children and youth who are not normally served by state educational agencies or local educational agencies or populations that need special services or additional resources, such as seriously emotionally disturbed children.
- Special consideration will be given to grantees that pursue a comprehensive approach to drug and violence prevention that includes providing and incorporating mental health, related to drug and violence prevention, in their programs.
- Programs are expected to use funds to implement activities that complement and support local educational agencies, disseminate information about drugs and violence prevention, and focus on community-wide drug and violence prevention planning and organizing.

Using these criteria and priorities, programs and activities funded by SDFSCA Governor's funds will promote improved academic achievement by:

- Helping individuals choose to forego or quit use of alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs (ATOD);

- Fostering safe and drug-free learning environments;
- Supporting well-run mentoring programs (there is solid evidence that such programs can reduce ATOD use, as well as involvement in gangs and related violence, and can promote academic involvement); and,
- Conducting youth development programs, such as Friday Night Live, which builds partnerships for positive and healthy youth development, engaging youth as active leaders and resources in their communities. These types of programs not only can save lives and reduce other catastrophic injuries that would preclude or impair learning, but also promote safer communities. When children and young people feel safe, they can concentrate more on learning.

ADP may provide funding to counties and other entities that will distribute funds through competitive grants or contracts. The same grants or contract priorities described above would apply.

ADP staff will monitor contracts and grants on an ongoing basis by assessing information gathered from various required reports, audits, frequent contact with contractors and grantees, and site visits when necessary.

Each of the grants/contracts will be monitored to ensure quality programs, coordination of efforts, and compliance with the Principles of Effectiveness. If programs/activities are not meeting the requirements of the SDFSCA or

the grant/contract, the grantee/contractor will be provided technical assistance to achieve compliance.

The information derived from monitoring contracts and grants will be used to refine, improve, and strengthen the process. ADP will incorporate this knowledge to identify and continue effective practices that comply with NCLB and make improvements or changes as necessary.

Staff Resources

ADP staff stay apprised of the most recent trends in scientific research and its implications and applicability to programs that promote safe and drug-free schools and communities. Staff provides and discusses this information with grantees/contractors. ADP will coordinate its programs and activities with CDE on ATOD and violence prevention efforts. This collaboration extends to other agencies and other programs at local and state levels, as appropriate.

The ADP Resource Center maintains a comprehensive collection of ATOD information for use by California communities, families, individuals, and organizations, along with a referral system for those seeking prevention and treatment program services. The materials in the Clearinghouse and Library, which are part of the Resource Center, are continually updated as new information is identified and outdated information is discontinued. Attention is given to meeting the needs of organizations that would include grantees/contractors that provide services to specific populations, including young people. The Resource Center's Web Site provides easy access to

information about the Clearinghouse and Library, the Publications and Videocassette Catalogs, many downloadable documents, and ATOD-related web sites. Conferences, media, technical assistance contractors, and other means are used to promote the Center among families, communities, work sites, etc.

Information and access to the Resource Center, RFPs, and the technical assistance contractors/grantees is available through ADP's Web Site: http://www.adp.cahwnet.gov , which also will be another avenue for making information available to the public, including data collected under the Uniform Management Information Reporting System required by Section 4112(3).

8) Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities—Community Service Grants (Title IV, Part A, section 4126)

In California, students may be suspended from one day up to 20 days per school year. Students who are expelled from school are typically transferred to a community day school or county court and community school for rehabilitation. In addition, students who have been expelled may have their expulsions "suspended" (the enforcement of the expulsion is suspended and the student is placed on probation) and may remain in continuation schools or comprehensive schools.

This program will be re-aligned to support NCLB Performance Goal #4 ("All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug-

free, and conducive to learning") and Performance Goal #5 ("All students will graduate from high school"), with the aim that through community service learning students will be engaged in the educational system until they graduate.

The Title IV Community Service Grant funding will allow greater numbers of suspended or expelled students to participate in community service-learning programs in a comprehensive coordinated strategy. Through the establishment of a county or regional consortium, LEAs and community-based organizations (CBOs) will develop a community service-learning component to be included in their rehabilitation plans for students who are suspended or expelled. Community service-learning programs can be an important component of effective rehabilitation plans.

In awarding contracts, CDE will notify all district and county superintendents of the availability of funding and the release of an RFA, which will be developed with consultation from CDE and from a focus group of field representatives. The application reviewers will be selected from both CDE and the field (including CBO representatives) and will be trained in the application process for the purpose of inter-rater reliability.

Applications will be scored on a four-point scale, with 4 being "Compelling" and 1 being "Unacceptable." Applications will be screened by CDE staff for completeness and read and scored against a rubric by teams of reviewers.

The selection criteria will include the following:

- Vision and benchmarks;
- High quality service-learning (Note: As part of this section the service activities are well-linked to the district content standards, thereby promoting improved academic achievement);
- Training and professional development;
- Organizational capacity;
- Resource development; and
- Evaluation.

Applications will be ranked by score and awarded accordingly.

The county offices of education (COEs) should be the primary eligible applicants. The contractor will be required to form a regional consortium to be comprised of district(s) and the COE, community day schools, and court and community schools; they also may include continuation schools. The consortium also will include community-based organizations (CBOs) interested in offering community service-learning opportunities to suspended or expelled youth. Additional consideration will be based upon achieving a geographic and socioeconomic distribution across the state.

Contracts will be monitored by CDE staff through quarterly reports and visits to the contractor and school sites. Professional development will be provided though a contract with a selected statewide professional development and technical assistance provider and through the existing

Regional Service Learning Leads (a statewide infrastructure aligned with the County Superintendent Regions).

CDE will provide resource materials and program implementation guidelines to assist contractors and technical assistance providers. CDE also will work with the Statewide System of School Support Regional Coordinators to ensure that services are coordinated and aligned with the goals of each program.

In an effort to promote improved academic achievement of students, CDE will enhance the community service-learning opportunities for suspended or expelled youth by linking aspects of service with state-adopted academic content standards.

The contractor coordinator will oversee the local evaluation process and report to CDE three times a year. In their reports, coordinators will address how local programs' degree of success is contributing toward the attainment of NCLB Performance Goals #4 and #5. The state will compile data on the impacts that have occurred for students, schools, and communities. These data will be used to inform the state on ideas for future program implementation. The state will identify exemplary models and share them with LEAs across the state. Should a contractor demonstrate a lack of progress toward meeting the local and state goals, the state will provide technical assistance; if unsuccessful, funding will be withheld for future program implementation.

9) 21st Century Community Learning Centers (Title IV, Part B)

As a result of NCLB, 21st Century Learning Centers (21st CCLC) appear in State ESEA plans for the first time. State-level implementation efforts necessarily involve new groundwork and initiation responsibilities. Consequently, more detail is provided here for this program than in the descriptions for ESEA programs of longer standing.

CDE will administer the 21st CCLC Program through its Healthy Start and After School Partnerships Office (HSASPO). The HSASPO will apply the procedures, criteria, and priorities detailed below to award the 21st CCLC grants through a competitive RFA. The RFA will specifically include every requirement detailed under Title IV Part B of the No Child Left Behind Act. Based on the recommendations of the 21st CCLC Program grant application reviewers, the Deputy Superintendent of the Child, Youth, and Family Services Branch in CDE will select applications for funding.

The plan for California's 21st CCLC Program was developed in consultation and coordination with a wide variety of stakeholders, statewide. For example, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, California's AfterSchool Partnership (comprised of the Foundation Consortium, CDE, and the Governor's Office of the Secretary for Education), prominent legislators, and CDE's AfterSchool Statewide Advisory Committee (including representatives for the State health and mental health agencies,

teachers, parents, students, the business community, and CBOs) played an active role in developing the proposed 21st CCLC program.

CDE will announce the availability of the RFA for the 21st CCLC Program on a widespread basis. This notification effort will include posting an announcement on the CDE Web site, issuing a listserv announcement to reach stakeholders interested in after school and integrated service programs for children and families, and notifying CDE's AfterSchool Statewide Advisory Committee, whose members include representatives of all of the entities eligible to apply for and receive a grant. CDE will issue the RFA by posting it on the CDE web site as a downloadable document, and will release a hard copy on a request basis. The RFA will specify all instructions, timelines, and requirements as well as provide background information on effective after school program practices and helpful resources.

ESTIMATED TIMELINE (2002):

July 1:	RFAs made available
July 10-17:	RFA information sessions conducted
August 30:	Application deadline (must be postmarked or received by CDE)
October 25:	Announcement of grant awards

Selection Criteria and Priorities; Screening and Scoring

Selection of 21st CCLC grantees will be limited to those applicants that propose to primarily serve students who attend schools identified as Title I schoolwide schools in which at least 40 percent of the students qualify to receive free or reduced-cost meals through the National School Lunch

Program under the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Competitive priority will be given to applications that propose to serve children in schools designated in need of improvement under Title I (Section 1116) *and* that are submitted jointly by school districts and community-based organizations. Given this requirement and priority, the quality of the application will be the primary criterion for selection. In addition, grants will be distributed equitably to applicants in northern, central, and southern California and in urban, suburban, and rural areas, to the extent possible.

The initial ranking of applications will be conducted by qualified community representatives including city and county staff, teachers, administrators, board members, parents, staff of children's service groups, after-school program providers, private and community-based organizations, faith-based organizations, and CDE staff.

A threefold means of soliciting grant reviewers will assure broad-based representation from a variety of stakeholder groups and geographic areas statewide. First, each member of CDE's Statewide AfterSchool Advisory Committee will be asked to solicit reviewers from its member organizations. Second, CDE will solicit reviewers from current, state- and federally-funded before and after school grantees, their partners, and CDE's network of regional leads. Third, CDE will invite reviewers from among those people who have contacted CDE requesting information about 21st CCLC grants during the past several months.

All reviewers will receive extensive training focused on the application scoring process. Readers will be trained using several pre-selected "anchor" application papers that represent each score point of the four-point rubric. Readers from the northern part of the state will be selected to review applications from the southern half of the state and vice versa. Thus, reader bias will be minimized, and reader interpretations will be fully calibrated prior to actually reading and reviewing assigned applications at the 21st CCLC readers' conference.

The key concepts of the 21st CCLC program, as described in the RFA, will form the basis for the scoring criteria. The scoring rubric's four-point scale will be applied to each application, reflecting how well an application incorporates essential requirements and characteristics. The scoring rubric specifically allocates points to address academic improvement, quality, and need of the program proposed. It includes four separate sections or categories of criteria on which each application will be evaluated. The four categories will include: 1) Programmatic Components describing the proposed Academic/Education, Enrichment, and Family Literacy activities and programs; 2) Effective Collaboration and Partnerships; 3) Program Administration; and 4) Effective Evaluation. These categories reflect core elements of the 21st CCLC Program. The elements included in the Programmatic Components section of the rubric directly reflect characteristics and practices that are integrally related to improved academic achievement. A draft of the scoring rubric is available for review on request.

Determination of Award Amounts; Appeal Process

California grant awards will comply with the $50,000 per year grant minimum specified in federal legislation. In addition, grant awards will be subject to a maximum of $2 million per application. Successful grant applications will be funded at the level requested if the program application is well-justified and the budget submission is realistic and well-supported. However, CDE will reserve the right to fund applications at a lesser amount if the application can be implemented with less funding, or if federal funding is not sufficient to fully fund all applications that merit award. Notification of awards will be made in writing to applicants on or before a date specified in the RFA.

Applicants wishing to appeal a grant award decision will be directed to submit a letter of appeal to CDE's Healthy Start and After School Partnerships Office. Appeals will be limited to the grounds that CDE failed to correctly apply the standards for reviewing the applications, as specified in the RFA. All appellants will be asked to file a full and complete written appeal, including the issue(s) in dispute, the legal authority or other basis for the appeal position, and the remedy sought. Incomplete or late appeals or appeals that refute only the readers' comments (provided to applicants for technical assistance alone) will not be considered.

Applications under appeal will be re-evaluated by CDE staff or designees. A final decision will be made in writing by CDE's Deputy Superintendent of

the Child, Youth, and Family Services Branch; that decision will be the final administrative action afforded the appeal.

Monitoring, Professional Development, and Technical Assistance

California has a well-established partnership in place that will provide both the mechanism and statewide infrastructure to monitor and provide professional development and technical assistance to grantees operating 21st CCLCs. The Foundation Consortium/California Department of Education/Governor's Office of the Secretary for Education Public-Private Partnership (AfterSchool Partnership) was established in 1999 as an outgrowth of work completed by a design team of after-school stakeholders. The mission, values, and functions of that team became the basis for this infrastructure strategy. The California AfterSchool Partnership's purpose is threefold: (1) to make certain that local after school programs are directly connected to a school's regular instructional program (e.g., encouraging articulation among after school program staff and classroom teachers so that after school programs can have a direct effect on increasing student achievement); (2) to promote systematic, cross-cutting site level technical assistance, training, and support; and (3) to provide a voice for local programs in the development and implementation of statewide policy.

The infrastructure of the AfterSchool Partnership includes the staff of CDE's Healthy Start and After School Partnerships Office (HSASPO), a Statewide Advisory Committee, and an intermediary group of educators who have practical experience and expertise in after-school programs (mentors). The focus of the Advisory Committee brings together a wide range of

stakeholders in before and after school programs to discuss the needs of the field and to determine how various sectors can collaborate in this endeavor. The intermediary group is charged with designing, developing, and implementing approaches that result in achievement of the goals of the Partnership and the Advisory Committee.

Additional resources supporting before and after school programs within the state include a statewide network of Regional Leads serving each of the eleven California County Superintendents Educational Services Association regions. Together, these three groups comprise California's statewide system of field support for before and after school programs, including the 21st CCLC Program.

The positive impact of California's statewide system of field support has been significant. Outcome assessments of student academic performance, positive behavioral changes, and attendance during the regular school day for the state-funded *After School Learning and Safe Neighborhoods Partnerships Programs* have shown dramatic improvements in a recently conducted, independent, statewide evaluation by the University of California, Irvine.

California's system of field support will be a component of a coordinated system of professional development. The system will be tailored to encompass and address NCLB Performance Goals 1, 2, 4, and 5 so that the focus of support is directly connected to the aims of NCLB. California will provide immediate and ongoing statewide support to 21st CCLC Programs

in urban, suburban, and rural areas. Support will focus on identifying needs and providing relevant, ongoing training and professional development; building capacity of local 21st CCLC providers; and providing access to and interface with experts, scientifically based research, statewide resources, and promising practices. This system of support will be revised, consistent with California's systematic approach to professional development and technical assistance:

- **Training and Technical Assistance: Program and School/Site-Based Support**

  California grantees will have ready access to a broad network of resources providing direct program and school/site-based support. The intermediary group of mentors, CDE staff, and statewide network of Regional Leads will conduct school/site visits, mentorship visits, workshops, partnership meetings, and staff training at least three times per year. CDE, Regional Leads, and intermediary mentors will coordinate provisions of trouble-shooting, resource development, and referrals through telephone and email support. CDE will maintain Web-based communications to provide access to resources and facilitate information sharing.

  CDE will work with intermediary mentors to maintain a regularly updated online communication system to facilitate the process of routine monitoring of grantees. Information to be shared will include school/site visit schedules and reports, issues and follow-up logs, work plans, professional development opportunities offered and accepted,

instructional programs and materials, and so forth. In addition, mentors and CDE staff will review proposed practices and instructional programs to ensure that effective, research-based materials and programs are implemented.

CDE will ensure that California's 21st CCLC grantees are apprised of the continued role that the National Center for Community Education (NCCE) will play in providing national training. CDE will encourage grantees to attend an annual meeting of the 21st CCLC Program in Washington, D.C., each year of the project. Further, in the RFA, CDE will include encourage grantees to include sufficient training travel in their proposal budgets to attend at least two national, state, or regional training activities each year of the project.

- **Dissemination of Promising Practices to Promote Student Achievement**

  CDE is committed to making grantees aware of effective practices in before and after school programs. During the past year before- and after-school programs that have demonstrated promising practices have been identified in each of California's 11 county regions. The California AfterSchool Partnership is in the process of making a significant investment in transforming these promising practices and programs into Regional Learning Centers for the purpose of capitalizing on their strengths; linking after school instruction with SBE-adopted instructional materials that are standards-based; exploring and understanding *how* and *why* successful approaches are working; and identifying which elements

need improvement. At the heart of this strategy, which also supports the 21st CCLC Program, is a mentorship system that strengthens the prospects for deepening regional capacity building and long-term program success. CDE expects that 21st CCLC grantees will have the opportunity to join the program representatives of the current, state-funded Before and After School Learning and Safe Neighborhoods Partnerships Program (B/ASLSNPP), intermediary mentors, CDE staff, and Regional Leads in bimonthly "learning community" sessions to share information and learn about opportunities for program improvement.

In addition, CDE provides all grantees with after school resources on an ongoing basis. For example, the 21st CCLC RFA provides a listing of relevant Web sites and resources, including <*http://www.afterschool.gov*> and <*http://www.nga.org*>. Further, CDE encourages grantees to subscribe to the after-school list serve at <*http://www.afterschool-subscribe@topica.com*>.

- **Opportunities for Program Development**

  CDE staff, together with CDE's partners, provides periodic training opportunities that are designed to support both prospective grantees and new grantees. Shortly after the 21st CCLC RFA is released to the field, a series of RFA information sessions will be conducted around the state. These sessions will serve the purpose of providing an overview of the new program, the RFA, and its requirements. The sessions provide an opportunity for those persons who are interested in submitting a proposal to ask for clarification of any issues or questions.

Once grantees have been awarded the 21st CCLC grants, CDE and the California AfterSchool Partnership will conduct special orientation sessions at locations around the state. These orientation sessions are designed to introduce new grantees to CDE staff, identify other regional supports and resources, and provide technical assistance as new grantees assume responsibility for reporting, budgetary, and programmatic requirements of the 21st CCLC Program. In addition, these sessions will offer new and ongoing 21st CCLC grantees information and support for developing and maintaining programs that meet the required principles of effectiveness. Grantees will be encouraged to connect with and participate in national, state, and regional opportunities for professional development.

- **Developing Resources and Links**

  California's statewide system of field support includes participation on regional, state, and national advisory committees. Such opportunities have strengthened relationships and resulted in the production of a variety of materials, including start-up guides, assessment tools, and educational curricula. These materials and others that are developed will be shared with and available for use by 21st CCLC grantees. Currently, the state's After School Network project is focusing on creating new community/program partnerships in a growing number of regions throughout the state. California's statewide system of field support will introduce the 21st CCLC grantees to these partnerships in the interest of broadening support for program efforts and sustainability.

- **Evaluation**

  As an additional tool to ensure that 21st CCLC programs implement effective strategies and evaluation, CDE will require grantees to submit an annual report and annual outcome-based data. Improvement of student academic performance, attendance, and positive behavioral changes will be measured and will support both a comprehensive statewide evaluation and a periodic, criteria-based review. CDE will establish specific criteria and will determine eligibility for full or partial funding for subsequent years as well as appropriate interventions, based on periodic review of each program's evaluation.

<u>System of Support, Student Achievement, and Assistance to Low-Performing Schools</u>

The 21st CCLC Program (Title IV B) is one programmatic resource that school support teams may wish to consider when designing a plan to improve student performance and to help low-performing schools meet their goals for improvement. The 21st CCLC Program focuses on helping children and youth in high-poverty schools succeed academically. The authorizing statute provides *principles of effectiveness* to guide local grantees to identify and to implement programs and activities that can directly enhance student learning. These activities must address the needs of the schools and communities; be continuously evaluated using performance measures; and, if appropriate, be based on scientific research. Under the 21st CCLC Program, grantees are required to provide opportunities for academic enrichment as well as a broad array of additional services to reinforce and

complement the academic program. These academic and educational activities are expected to help students in low-performing schools meet state and local standards in core content areas, such as reading, math, and science.

Coordination with Other Programs, Activities, Agencies

The 21st CCLC Program will be administered by CDE's Healthy Start and After School Partnerships Office (HSASPO). HSASPO also administers California's primary, state-funded before and after school program, known as the Before and After School Learning and Safe Neighborhoods Partnerships Program. This office is in the Learning Support and Partnerships Division, which also coordinates other youth development and learning support programs, including the ESEA-funded Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Program (Title IV, Part A.)

The 21st CCLC Program and other ESEA-funded programs and state-level activities are coordinated at the division level in CDE. Division directors meet on a weekly basis to share all relevant programmatic information, encouraging the coordination of planning, communication, scheduling, and administrative efforts, whenever possible. This management level internal coordination of ESEA-funded programs and other programs promotes effective coordination and planning, as well as efficient communication with entities external to CDE.

Because grant recipients are likely to propose the use of technology to support student achievement, internal coordination also will include ongoing communication and collaboration with CDE's Education Technology Office.

This collaboration will help ensure appropriate leveraging of resources and consistent advice to grant recipients in terms of best practices with respect to technology use to support student achievement.

Determining Progress, Setting or Revising Interventions

The State will conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the effectiveness of the 21st CCLC Program, aggregating and analyzing required data submitted by grantees at the state level to determine the effectiveness of the program across the state. In addition, CDE will monitor the periodic self-evaluations of local programs and will determine on a regular basis whether 21st CCLC grantees are making satisfactory progress toward achieving state and local goals and desired program outcomes. This review process will require grantees to submit an annual report, which includes an analysis of outcome-based data and the grantees' progress toward meeting state and local goals. Required data will include measures for academic performance, attendance, and positive behavioral changes, including, but not limited to the following:

- Student-level data from the annual Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) program;
- Student-level data on attendance and enrollment in the regular school day program and in the after school or the before and after school program (including Saturday, summer, and holiday attendance);
- School and program-level data from the California Healthy Kids Survey;
- Qualitative data describing the program, including operational changes, staffing, and a discussion of the ways in which the program is meeting its objectives as stated in the application.

CDE will establish criteria and determine eligibility for full or partial funding for subsequent years based on a review of each program's evaluation.

3. Describe how the State will monitor and provide professional development and technical assistance to LEAs, schools, and other sub-grantees to help them implement their programs and meet the States' (and those entities' own) performance goals and objectives. This description should include the assistance the SEA will provide to LEAs, schools, and other subgrantees in identifying and implementing effective instructional programs and practices based on scientific research.

California intends to use its existing system to monitor and provide professional development and technical assistance to LEAs, schools, and other subgrantees to help them implement their programs and meet the state's and the subgrantee's own performance goals and objectives. This system will be revised to be consistent with California's systematic approach to professional development and technical assistance.

Currently, the system provides professional development through county offices of education, institutions of higher education (IHEs), and independent providers. The state has made a significant investment in improving the teaching of both reading and mathematics and through its professional development institutes continues to build upon recent reforms. In a continued commitment to improve and support reading instruction, the State Legislature passed Assembly Bill 466 (Education Code sections 44579.5; 99220-99227; and 99230-99242), which is designed to provide a cohesive and comprehensive professional development program for teachers in kindergarten through grade 12.

The SBE and CDE understand the importance of using NCLB funds to ensure a highly qualified teacher in each classroom, and they have been working collaboratively with the Commission on Teacher Credentialing and statewide interest groups to ensure that the definition is sound and is communicated to schools and districts. The agencies will encourage the use of federal and state funds to facilitate the credentialing and coursework or exam requirements, including Title II, Part A. The availability of federal funding provides the means for California to build upon, strengthen, and extend professional development opportunities in scientifically based content and instructional methodologies; the flexibility permits California to expand upon existing programs in other areas, such as class-size reduction.

CDE coordinates several focused efforts to assist LEAs, schools, and other subgrantees to implement programs and meet NCLB and local performance goals and objectives. To maximize progress towards meeting all five federal and state performance goals, CDE offices with NCLB responsibilities will coordinate their monitoring and technical assistance activities to ensure that LEAs receive a clear and consistent message about California's education priorities. As LEAs identify their starting points with regard to the five education goals, the integrated CDE-sponsored technical assistance would result in district-specific plans that address multiple goals simultaneously. For example, planned professional development activities would advance the LEAs' status with regard to both student academic achievement and its proportion of highly qualified teachers.

Key participants in the cross-CDE NCLB team are the "Title I team" members who serve as conduits for providing information and technical assistance to LEAs and schools sites; and the Professional Development and Curriculum Support staff who have expertise in subject-matter pedagogy and responsibility to ensure all students have highly qualified teachers. Title I members of this team (CDE staff members who represent the major programmatic components of Title I), are assigned to serve specific regions around the state. Professional Development staff facilitates access to staff development funds, SBE-approved professional development providers, and assistance meeting credentialing requirements as administered by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Another effort, the Schoolwide System of School Support (S^4) was formed in 1994-95 when the ESEA was reauthorized as IASA. The S^4 system is explained in greater detail below in response to Question 4.

4. Describe the Statewide system of support under section 1117 for ensuring that all schools meet the State's academic content and student achievement standards, including how the State will provide assistance to low-performing schools.

A regional approach, with a local presence to support and communicate the state and federal programs to school and district personnel, is critical to the success of these programs in a state as large and diverse as California. Developing an ongoing relationship with a school or district in need of improvement will be critical to ensuring that long-term gains in student

achievement are realized; such a relationship must be developed locally so that periodic support is available to individual schools.

The Statewide System of School Support (S^4) has been California's initial approach to the implementation of sections 1116 and 1117 of NCLB. It has been developed under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act as previously authorized and was formed in 1994-95. Through this network, California can begin to align state and federal laws regarding low-performing schools and can continue the previous efforts of S^4 to support schoolwide Title I implementation. It is the intent of the SEA to revisit this effort to effectuate a more effective regional approach.

The existing system consists of 11 Regional School Support and Improvement Centers (RSSIC)—one in each of 11 regions defined through the California County Superintendents Educational Service Areas (CCSESA), which serve as the State's intermediate service agencies in California; two Comprehensive Assistance Centers; CDE; and a fourth component that supports districts in providing technical assistance to schools identified for improvement under Title I law (in California, "Program Improvement" Schools).

Consistent with Title I requirements as specified in Section 1117(a)(2)(A), California has prioritized assistance to LEAs as follows: first, to those LEAs with schools in corrective action; second, to those LEAs with schools identified in need of improvement; and finally, to those LEAs with schools participating in Schoolwide and Targeted Assistance Programs.

Using the guidance provided by NCLB, California currently has 1027 schools in Program Improvement. These schools will transition in 2002-03 as follows:

- 454 schools will be in Year One
- 542 schools will be in Year Two
- 3 districts, with 13 schools, are subject to corrective actions with the state through 2002-03, and
- An additional 14 districts, with 18 schools, may be added to the state corrective action group and will be in Year 3 if they fail to make AYP in 2002-03 school year.

In addition to the efforts to improve low-performing schools authorized under federal law, California in 1999 legislated an accountability system through the Public Schools Accountability Act. This system includes a program for low-performing schools known as Immediate Intervention/Underperforming Schools Program (II/USP) under which schools that fail to make "significant growth" in student achievement are subject to potential state sanctions. The state will reach the end of the first 24-month implementation period for the first cohort of participating schools in fall 2002 with the release of 2001-02 testing results and their compilation into the state's Academic Performance Index.

California also authorized a new program in 2001 known as the "High Priority Schools Grant Program." This program funds schools with the

lowest Academic Performance Indexes for school improvement, and enters them automatically into the II/USP program, which may result in sanctions if there is a failure to meet achievement targets.

Through these programs, and in particular through the Scholastic Audit used for the state corrective action under previously authorized federal law, California is defining its essential elements for school reviews and interventions. These include a focus on a local knowledge of state-adopted curriculum standards, with a clearly stated goal that the standards be achieved by all students; standards-aligned and SBE-adopted instructional materials; professional development tied to the standards and instructional resources; practical use of state and local assessments to inform instruction; and accountability for student achievement at both the district and the school level.

These essential elements will form the core of the School Assistance and Intervention Teams (SAITs), which are available under state law as an intervention in an underperforming II/USP school and also will serve to fulfill the requirements of School Support Teams under NCLB. Through these common expectations for each school site and through focused support and technical assistance delivered through the S^4 system, state and federal programs will be aligned and will result in an integrated system of support for low-performing schools.

In addition to SAITs, California provides support to low-performing schools through other federal (e.g., Reading First) and state programs, including county-based school support and intervention teams, the state's compliance

monitoring efforts, and program-based support and technical assistance. The SBE and CDE are working assiduously across all programs to ensure that they are based on state curriculum standards and standards-aligned instructional materials, and that whenever professional development is available through a program that the content is aligned with standards. As a result of these efforts, all children in California will have access to a standards-based education and a highly qualified teacher.

While the existing S^4 infrastructure will serve to facilitate the immediate implementation of NCLB funds and programs, in particular those focused on low-performing schools, SBE and CDE will continue to develop a more effective regional approach building on the work accomplished under the previous authorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. These tasks will include:

- Developing a request for information or proposals to define the necessary efforts under NCLB to be provided by the RSSICs;
- Creating a pool of providers for SAITs and providing training and state representatives to the teams to ensure a common focus on the most important school site issues;
- Convening and training RSSIC staff for focused collaboration and implementation of standards-based instructional support.
- Exploring collaborative regional partnerships within the S-4 structure with postsecondary educational institutions to provide educational outreach services in high schools tailored to meet the particular needs of the county, districts and schools in that region, which are aligned to the State Board adopted content standards.

5. Describe the activities the State will conduct to--
   a. Help Title I schools make effective use of school-wide programs to improve the achievement of all students, including specific steps the SEA is taking and will take to modify or eliminate State fiscal and accounting barriers so that schools can easily consolidate federal, State, and local funds for schoolwide programs.

California will conduct activities to help Title I schools make effective use of school-wide programs to improve the achievement of all students and modify or eliminate fiscal and accounting barriers to schools. In California, CDE's Title I Schoolwide Program (SWP) facilitates the effective use of school-wide programs by responding to field inquiries; reviewing and renewing applications; providing a technical assistance program to assist the field in understanding how to apply Title I funding to SWP; preparing reports and policy guidance on the implementation of SWP; updating LEAs about the new provisions of SWP under NCLB; and disseminating SWP guidelines.

The school-wide approach has become a major strategy for systemic school change, and the transition means introducing new and expanded roles. The focus on academics, accountability, leadership, planning, communication, and flexibility are but a few of the critical factors that will ensure the success of SWPs. These SWPs vary in structure since the program is tailored to meet the needs of a particular school. However, all SWPs require:

- A focus on the effective implementation of the five components of California's education system, i.e., rigorous content standards; standards-aligned instructional materials; standards-based professional

- development; standards-aligned assessment; and an accountability structure that measures school effectiveness in light of student achievement;
- Plans for assisting preschool children in the transition from early childhood programs to kindergarten;
- Professional development to inform teachers' understanding of how academic assessments can be used for curriculum planning and instruction;
- Activities to ensure that students who experience difficulty mastering the "proficient" or "advanced" levels of academic achievement standards are provided with effective, timely interventions; and
- Coordination and integration of federal, state, and local services.

CDE will ensure that those schools applying for Schoolwide status are notified on a timely basis whether they are eligible for a Schoolwide Project under Title I, Part A.

5.b. …Ensure that all teachers, particularly those in high-poverty areas and those in schools in need of improvement, are highly qualified. This description should include the help State will provide to LEAs and schools to--

(i) Conduct effective professional development activities;
(ii) Recruit and hire highly qualified teachers, including those licensed or certified through alternative routes; and
(iii) Retain highly qualified teachers.

California ensures that all teachers, particularly those in high poverty areas and those in schools in need of improvement, are highly qualified. In addition to the high level of coordination described between the Title I and

Professional Development and Curriculum Support (Title II) offices (see the response to Question 3), CDE intends to focus Title II, Part A funding on meeting the goal that every student is taught by a highly qualified teacher. California recognizes that being highly qualified is a minimum standard for teachers and will encourage its LEAs and professional associations to embody the values of teaching excellence and continued professional growth. Toward that end, CDE will continue to implement SBE policy by providing leadership within the state by:

1. Developing and refining the definition of high quality professional development for California, based on Section 9109 of the NCLB;
2. Developing standards for high quality professional development (by January 2003), compliant with California Education Code Section 44470;
3. Working with the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing in finalizing and disseminating standards of program quality for teacher preparation and induction programs to increase the number of highly qualified teachers in the state; and
4. Supporting the recruitment, retention, and development of highly qualified teachers and administrators by collaborating with the following CDE offices and state agencies:

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC): to partner in developing and implementing standards for teachers and administrators, teacher and administrator preparation programs, and professional development programs, and to review and develop (as necessary) options for giving

under-prepared teachers credit toward credentials for participating in technical assistance center-reviewed professional development (PD).

CDE's Specialized Programs (including categorical program offices) and School Improvement Divisions: to coordinate technical assistance as it relates to training, recruiting, and retaining highly qualified teachers, to help assist schools and LEAs as they complete processes for a comprehensive needs assessment and plan development, and to support the identification and utilization of high quality professional development.

CDE's Technology Services Division: to support the expansion of on-line and distance-education PD services and to support professional development that ensures that teachers are prepared to fully integrate technology into the curriculum as a tool to improve teaching and student achievement.

California Postsecondary Education Commission: to review current mechanisms for recruiting undergraduate students for credential programs and supporting them throughout the process, including placement, financial aid, and alternative credential options. This collaboration will include private colleges and universities.

State-sponsored, high quality PD, including offerings by California Professional Development Institutes (CPDIs) and approved LEAs, is made available credit in order to bring under-prepared teachers to full certification.

CDE will work with LEAs to ensure that they complete the following required tasks:

1. Satisfy Title I Section 1119 by identifying all under-prepared teachers (including mis-assigned but certificated teachers) and creating mechanisms to help those teachers become highly qualified through LEA-run pre-internship or internship programs, or agreements with IHEs to provide the necessary courses;
2. Ensure that all paraprofessionals are trained to meet the requirements of Section 1119;
3. Continue implementation of a plan to recruit highly qualified teachers:
    a. through California's established teacher recruitment centers;
    b. by recruiting teachers from states with credentialing requirements at least as rigorous as California's;
    c. that addresses factors that make that LEAs' schools unappealing to highly qualified teachers;
    d. that partners with the local business community to identify mid-career professionals with strong subject-matter skills; and
4. Make use of and publicize school and district report cards. These report cards inform the LEA's stakeholders of that agency's

5. effectiveness at addressing the requirement for highly qualified teachers and at retaining highly qualified teachers within the LEA.

5.c. …Ensure that all paraprofessionals (excluding those working with parents or as translators) attain the qualifications stated in Sections 1119(c) and (d) by the 2005-06 school year.

California ensures that all paraprofessionals, excluding those working with parents or as translators, attain the qualifications stated in Sections 1119(c) and (d) by the 2005-06 school year. On January 11, 2002, CDE sent a memorandum to all county offices of education, districts, and charter schools, apprising them of the new NCLB requirements for paraprofessionals.

To help LEAs make progress toward this aim, the CDE, in partnership with SBE and CCTC, will review currently available subject-matter and teaching-skills assessment instruments to determine their appropriateness for assessing paraprofessionals' knowledge of subject matter and their ability to help students learn.

CDE will require LEAs to report the qualifications of paraprofessionals on their annual Consolidated Applications and Local Education Application in Spring 2003. CDE will use its Coordinated Compliance Review process to monitor whether the requirements for the paraprofessionals, according to the definition in sections 1119(c) and (d), have been met.

5.d. …Help LEAs with a high need for technology, high percentages or numbers of children in poverty, and low-performing schools to form partnerships with other LEAs, institutions of higher education (IHEs), libraries, and other private and public profit and non-profit entities with technology expertise to improve the use of technology in instruction.

By May 2003, California will consider a number of steps for assisting LEAs that meet the above description. CDE will develop a definition for "LEAs with high need for technology" through the Title II, Part D, Enhancing Education Through Technology (EETT) grant process and will identify schools meeting this definition. When using this information, there will be a means of identifying "levels of need," pinpointing worst-to-better conditions that exist among schools (e.g., expertise at school site; capacity; Internet connectivity; services already provided to schools; any previously existing partnerships). These LEAs will be encouraged to form partnerships with other LEAs, institutions of higher education, libraries, and other private and public profit and non-profit entities with technology expertise. Data from California Basic Educational Data System (CBEDS) will be used to identify those schools with a school library staffed by a credentialed, library media teacher/specialist that may be available to form partnerships with the high-need LEAs. The California Technology Assistance Project will work with high-need LEAs to assist them in forming partnerships to improve the use of technology in instruction; at a minimum all high-need LEAs will have the opportunity to partner with the California Technology Assistance Project.

Another avenue that will be explored by CDE is the prospect of working with statewide organizations to devise a registry of LEAs, institutions of

higher education, libraries, and other private and public profit and nonprofit entities with technological expertise that are capable of forming school partnerships that will render positive, substantial results by improving instruction through technology.

5.e. …Promote parental and community participation in schools.

California currently provides LEAs with technical assistance and monitoring for compliance with state and federal regulations through the Coordinated Compliance Review (CCR) process. Each year, one fourth of the LEAs receive specialized technical assistance regarding legal requirements of the programs they operate. During the technical assistance year, the LEA performs a comprehensive self-review for compliance with legal requirements and submits the results to CDE. The following year, CDE selects a portion of the districts to be visited by a team to validate the results of the previous year's self-review. By August 2002, the CCR will be rewritten to conform to the new requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. The review will specify requirements for parent involvement, including:

- A district parent involvement policy
- A school parent involvement policy
- Meetings and dissemination of information
- A written school-parent compact jointly developed with parents for all students participating in Title I which outlines how the parents and school staff will work together to support academic achievement

- Preparation and dissemination of an annual local educational agency report cards
- An itemized list of capacity building activities including:
    - Providing assistance to parents in understanding the state's academic content and achievement standards
    - Providing materials and training to help parents work with their children to improve academic achievement
    - Providing training for school staff in the value and utility of contributions of parents and how to reach out to, communicate with, and work with parent as equal partners
    - Ensuring that information about the school and school and parent programs, meetings, other activities, school reports, and district and school report cards is sent to the parents in a format and, to the extent practical, in a language the parents can understand
- Support for participating students attending private schools
- Disseminating information regarding the State's Parental Information and Resource Center (PIRC), the California Parent Center, 1-800-877-9PARENT, http://parent.sdsu.edu/
- Parents right-to-know information regarding
    - achievement of the child in each of the required State academic assessments
    - grades 2-11, the school's program improvement status
    - any failure to make progress

- professional qualifications of the child's teachers

In May 2002, California disseminated to LEAs a policy letter describing the requirements for school choice and supplemental services. In addition, a Request for Proposal (RFP) for Supplemental Services Providers was sent to all LEAs, Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) and other providers. School districts will report on the Consolidated State Application how they use the funds to meet these requirements.

By May 2003, California will have developed processes and procedures for collecting and disseminating effective practices for parental involvement to LEAs and schools. Through the work of CDE's Title I Policy and Partnerships Office, the latest research in parent/family involvement will be reviewed in order to develop a rubric that will highlight parent/family involvement practices across the state with proven success in fostering improved academic achievement by all students, lowering barriers to parent involvement and in increasing parent participation in school planning, review and improvement. This rubric will be developed with assistance from the California's Parent Information and Resource Center, the Northern and Southern California Comprehensive Assistance Centers, the California Family Area Network, the Title I Committee of Practitioners and institutions of higher education. Information about these successful practices will be disseminated throughout the state through publications, electronic media and through technical assistance presentations at conferences, regional meetings, County Offices of Education, school districts and schools.

Through its Public Schools Accountability Act, California already has in place procedures for disseminating and publicizing results and information regarding the single, statewide, state accountability system as required by Section 1111(b)(2) of NCLB. Currently, information is sent to each LEA about schools within their district that are not meeting their annual growth targets, and this information is posted on CDE's Web site and disseminated in the media. Letters are sent to parents regarding their child's individual testing results. By the beginning of the 2002-2003 school year, California will have a plan for blending the existing system with the new NCLB requirements.

By May 2003, all LEAs will submit to the state a Local Educational Agency Plan (LEAP) which will include assurances and plans describing how parents, with respect to the parent right-to-know provisions, in the language that parents understand to the extent practicable how:

- the achievement of their child in the required state academic assessments,
- the Program Improvement status of the child's school,
- school choice and supplemental services available for parents of children attending Program Improvement schools,
- the verification of professional qualifications of the child's teachers (the Parents' Right to Know),
- information about any language instruction program for English Learners, including the right of parent to dis-enroll their child in said programs.

The Local Educational Agency Plans will be reviewed and approved by the SEA by June 2003.

As of May 2002, California adopted the criteria and procedures for identification of supplemental educational service providers. An application was made available in May 2002 for the potential providers. The list of providers approved by California State Board of Education will be made available via mailings and electronic media by the beginning of the 2002-03 school year.

5.f. …Secure the baseline and follow-up data for the core ESEA accountability system described in Part One.

California is in the process of securing baseline and follow-up data for the core ESEA accountability system described in Part One. The California Standards Tests (CSTs) in reading and mathematics are being offered in the spring of 2002. Results will not be available for the entire state and for all schools until the final updated data sets are available from the testing contractor late this calendar year. The SEA will determine how these results integrate into the full accountability system by January 2003 once further guidance is forthcoming from USDE regarding AYP. The California baseline will be available to USDE by May 2003.

6. Describe:
6a. …How SEA officials and staff consulted with the Governor's Office in the development of the State plan…

During the development of this State Application, SBE and CDE staff consulted with the Governor's Office in drafting passages related to Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities (Title IV, Part A, section 4112) and the Reading First initiative. SBE members (who are gubernatorial appointees) and SBE staff (who serve at the pleasure of the Governor) solicited comments and input from the Governor's Office, as well from the Department of Finance, an agency within the Governor's administration. SBE will continue to consult with the Governor's Office and other gubernatorial appointees throughout the implementation of NCLB.

6b. ...How state officials and staff will coordinate the various ESEA-funded programs with State-level activities the State administers….

State officials will coordinate as prescribed in statute. In addition, long and short-term coordination efforts by CDE will be geared to the schedule of deadlines established by USDE in the Consolidated State Application package. One means of coordinating the ESEA-funded programs with state-level activities will be through the development of Performance Targets, work plans, and their relationship to NCLB Goals and Performance Indicators.

6c. …How state officials and staff will coordinate with other organizations, such as businesses, IHEs, nonprofit organizations…

Through direct and electronic communication and through conferences and meetings, SBE and CDE will continue to coordinate with the organizations

listed below, soliciting input on substantive policy issues including the development of the State Plan, regulations, services to the field, and technical assistance:

California's Education Coalition, consisting of representatives from the California Federation of Teachers, California Teachers Association, California County Superintendents Educational Services Association, Association of California School Administrators, California Association of School Business Officials, California School Boards Association, California State Employees Association, California State Parent Teachers Association, and the Service Employees International Union;

The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing;

California Institute for School Improvement,

Representatives from the California State Legislature, specifically from the Education Committees of the Assembly and Senate;

Representatives from the Office of the Governor, including the Education Secretary's office;

California Department of Finance;

California State University system;

University of California system;

California Department of Human Services;

Children and Families First Commission;

California Alcohol and Drug Program;

The Title I Committee of Practitioners;

California Association of Private School Organizations;

Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities;

and other organizations as appropriate.

CDE is informing local education agencies of the requirements through the consolidated application for federal funds, and through separate correspondence sent to districts. CDE is meeting with representatives of the California Association of Private School Organizations to ensure private schools are included in NCLB implementation.

6d. …How state officials and staff will coordinate with other State agencies, including the Governor's office, and with other Federal programs (including those authorized by Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act, the Head Start Act, the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, and the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act).

As NCLB is implemented, CDE will promote the alignment of other federal programs with NCLB goals and accountability measures by local education agencies. Such alignment will help ensure consistency in program operation and measurement of student achievement. For instance, the approved Perkins State Plan allows districts to use Perkins funding for the planning and implementation of school-wide high school reform projects. This approach would allow low-performing schools to maximize the resources from both federal sources to achieve common purposes.

The reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 1997 allowed SEAs and their partners to submit a competitive grant proposal to expand and broaden the "comprehensive system of personnel development," which has been a requirement of the law since 1975. CDE's Partnership Committee on Special Education, which consists of more than 80 entities, developed the work plan for the grant, in compliance with IDEA Section 1452(b) and with input from parents, educators, and interested community members from around the state. The goals, objectives, and activities in the plan incorporate the ten "required elements of an effective educational system" outlined in IDEA Section 1451(a)(6), incorporating the elements into goals, objectives, and activities. By May 2003, CDE staff members will have worked to coordinate NCLB goals and performance indicators with the forthcoming IDEA reauthorization.

The Education for Homeless Children and Youths (EHCY) program is intended to ensure that homeless children and youths have access to the same free, appropriate public education, including public preschool, as

provided to other children and youths. NCLB calls on states to review and revise their laws and policies to eliminate barriers to enrollment, attendance, and success in school of children and youths experiencing homelessness and provide such children and youths with the opportunity to meet the same challenging student academic achievement standards as other students. In working toward the NCLB aims, the CDE's EHCY program (as outlined in its state plan which was due to USDE by May 31, 2002) will require all LEAs to designate a liaison for their homeless programs. In this way, the CDE's EHCY program will be better able to work with liaisons in linking EHCY technical assistance, professional development, and coordination activities with the aims of NCLB.

NCLB requires states to consult with appropriate representative from the various private school organizations throughout the state whose children are eligible under the new reauthorization. California proposes to consult with such representatives in a timely and meaningful way, to ensure the equitable participation of eligible private school children as outlined in Sections 1120 and 9500 of NCLB.

During coming months, CDE will continue its coordination efforts with other agencies and among other federally funded programs (e.g., Head Start, the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act) in order to achieve consistency and complementary support of the aims of No Child Left Behind.

7. Describe the strategies the State will use to determine, on a regular basis, whether LEAs, schools, and other subgrantees are making satisfactory progress in meeting State and local goals and desired program outcomes. In doing so, the SEA should also describe how it will use data it gathers from subgrantees on how well they are meeting State performance targets, and the actions the State will take to determine or revise interventions for any LEAs, schools, and other subgrantees that are not making substantial progress.

California will use regularly collected data in determining subgrantees' progress toward performance goals. In addition, these data will be used to determine appropriate interventions or to *modify* interventions midcourse, based upon the degree of school improvement. In addition to the information outlined below, the response provided for Question 4 addresses the issues of satisfactory progress, data, and interventions.

SEA Responsibility for LEA and School Academic Progress

California's Public Schools Accountability Act (PSAA), signed into law in 1999, authorized the creation of a new educational accountability system for all California public schools. Beginning in 2000 California completely aligned its identification of School Improvement (Program Improvement) schools with the state accountability system. This state law, in Education Code Section 52052 (c), requires schools to meet annual growth targets for the school as a whole and for all "numerically-significant ethnic and socioeconomically disadvantaged subgroups." As defined in state law, "numerically significant" means that the subgroup has: (1) at least 30 pupils with valid STAR scores and at least 15 percent of a school's tested enrollment; or (2) at least 100 pupils with valid STAR scores (even if they

constitute less than 15 percent of the school's tested enrollment). The state annually makes public the academic status of all schools through the Academic Performance Index (API) Reports. The API reporting cycle consists of (1) base year information, including a ranking of all schools in the state in deciles 1-10, with 10 indicating the highest-achieving schools; and (2) growth information. The growth reports are issued in the fall, usually in October; base reports are provided each January.

Identification of PI Schools

Schools receiving Title I funds that do not meet the Academic Performance Index (API) growth targets for two consecutive years are identified as School Improvement schools (known as "Program Improvement" (PI) in California). Schools make adequate yearly progress (AYP) if they meet both their schoolwide growth targets and significant subgroup targets. CDE annually issues a report of academic progress for all Title I schools, including PI schools, and identifies new PI schools. Alternative schools that receive Title I funds will be identified as PI for the first time in Fall 2004.

Currently, there are 1,027 PI schools in California in five cohorts of schools, representing about one-eighth the total number of schools in the state. Cohorts 1 and 2 were identified by local school districts in 1997 and 1998 on the basis of local assessments that identified schools in which fewer than 40 percent of students were meeting locally developed standards. Cohorts 3-5 have been identified by the state on the basis of the STAR system. In addition, over 900 schools have exited PI status in 2000 and 2001 by making AYP for two out of three years. NCLB will allow a school to exit PI after

two consecutive years of making AYP. School choice, supplemental services, and other options made available through NCLB will be made available to parents whose children are attending schools that are not making progress.

State Intervention in PI Schools Consistently Not Meeting API Growth Targets

In Fall 2000, CDE took corrective action against 3 districts with 13 PI Cohort 1 schools that had four years of not making adequate yearly progress. CDE developed a comprehensive school review process, and trained Scholastic Audit Teams (SATs) of seven to eight members led by CDE staff, to conduct five-day reviews of the schools. The SATs were composed of field educators with grade span expertise appropriate to the school being reviewed in such areas as: standards-based instruction in reading and mathematics; effective teacher professional development strategies aligned to the standards-based materials used by the school; successful parent involvement efforts; and comprehensive student support systems. CDE and those school districts entered into joint agreements that included the SAT recommendations and ways in which the district/school would ensure successful implementation. The SAT leaders will continue to work with these districts and schools over an 18-month period to ensure successful implementation of the joint agreement. The 13 schools must meet the API growth targets in 2002 and 2003 or face severe corrective actions, including the possibility of state take-over or closure.

In addition, CDE has identified 14 districts with 18 PI Cohort 2 schools that will be potential candidates for state corrective action and joint agreements in Fall 2002 if the schools do not meet their API targets in 2002.

Placement of PI Schools in New Identification System Under NCLB Act of 2001

On the basis of the new system of categorizing consistently failing PI schools under NCLB, California will place current PI schools in the following categories:

NCLB School Improvement Year	*California PI Cohorts*	*Number of Schools*	*Requirements for 02-03 Under NCLB*
1	Cohorts 4 and 5	454	Schools will have to offer choice options to parents to transfer the pupil to a non-PI school in the district.
2	Cohorts 1-3	542*	Schools will have to offer choice options and supplemental services (tutoring) to select Title I students.
3	Cohorts 1 and 2	31	3 districts with 13 schools are currently under state corrective action as stipulated in joint agreements entered into during 01-02; 14 districts with 18 schools are potential candidates for state corrective action.
Total Schools		1,027	

* This number does not include 3 districts with 13 state corrective action schools in Cohort 1 and 14 districts with 18 potential corrective action schools in Cohort 2.

Alignment of the State and Federal Processes for Identifying Low Performing Schools and Supporting Improvement

In 1999, as part of the PSAA, California established the Immediate Intervention/Underperforming Schools Program (II/USP). Schools that do not meet their growth targets in one year and are in deciles 1-5 are eligible to apply for and receive state grants for two years. Once schools meet AYP for two years, they exit II/USP. Schools that do not meet their API target but that make "significant growth" are eligible to receive a third year of funding; schools that do not make significant growth or API are identified for state intervention/corrective action. Annually the state selects 430 schools to receive II/USP funding, and three cohorts of schools have been selected to date. Of the 1,027 schools in Program Improvement, 431 receive II/USP funds to engage in activities that will lead to improved academic achievement.

Because of the overlap between Program Improvement and II/USP schools, CDE will be actively analyzing key elements of the two programs and proposing specific changes to state law and/or policy to bring greater alignment. The targeted areas for alignment include the identification of schools, exit criteria, and state interventions and sanctions. The goal is to complete the review and to make any necessary legislative or administrative changes by May 2003.

PART THREE:
ESEA Key Programmatic Requirements and Fiscal Information

The California State Board of Education and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction reaffirm their respective legislated authorities for ensuring the programmatic and fiscal integrity of the NCLB programs. The USDE has indicated that before it would award FY 2002 program funds, it would need to review and approve information on how California would comply with a few key requirements of the individual ESEA programs included in the application. The information provided in this section is in response to the questions posed in the Consolidated Application Packet dated May 7, 2002.

1. Title I, Part A--Improving Basic Programs Operated By LEAs

a. Identify the amount of the reservation in section 1003(a) for school improvement that the State will use for State-level activities and describe those activities.

Subject to appropriation by the State Legislature, the state will set aside two percent for the purpose of state-level activities. A general proposal for allocation of NCLB federal funds appropriated for support of Title I: Section 1117 School Support and Recognition ($29.1 million) appears on the following page.

1. Fund any *No Child Left Behind* Year 3 federal corrective action school that is not receiving, nor scheduled to receive, Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSR), Immediate Intervention/Under-performing Schools (II/USP), or High Priority (HP) resources. In 2001, CDE intervened in 3 districts, conducting Scholastic Audits in 13 schools. In 2002, an additional 14 districts with 18 schools may require intervention. Of these 31 schools, ten are not receiving, nor are they scheduled to receive any categorical funds identified in the list above; this would fund them @ $400 ADA with funds to support recommended corrective action.	$7.1 million
2. Fund lowest-performing federal Year 1 and Year 2 Program Improvement schools to help support costs of supplemental services, and technical assistance. At $400 per student, we could fund around 27 of the lowest-performing decile one Program Improvement schools not currently receiving funding to revise and implement their school plan in alignment with High Priority Schools planning requirements.	$10.175 million
3. Fund Local Education Agencies (LEAs) with schools identified for interventions to contract with School Assistance and Intervention Teams (SAIT). For purposes of estimation, we predict that 50% of the 140 schools at risk will make negative API growth in 2002, requiring seventy teams at a cost of $75,000 each for personnel time, training and travel costs. (In 2000, 71% of schools made growth targets; in 2001, 57% made growth targets; in 2002, if the trend holds, only 46% will make target.)	$ .525 million
4. Fund existing Regional School Support and Improvement Centers [NCLB Sec. 1117(a)(4)] via the eleven California County Superintendents' Educational Service Areas (CCSESA) to provide greater intensive and sustained support and improvement for local education agencies to increase the opportunity for students and schools to meet the state's academic content and achievement standards. The work of the regional statewide system of school support based in the CCSESA will be more narrowly focused on building (1) school and district capacity to use data to assess needs and develop plans; provide focused professional development in core curricular areas; develop, recruit, and retain highly qualified teachers; develop skilled paraprofessionals; and provide school coaching in the use of assessment in instruction, and (2) district services for Program Improvement schools required to provide supplemental educational services and technical assistance.	$7.5 million
5. Fund CCSESA Regions to establish, support and monitor School Assistance and Intervention Teams (SAIT), (NCLB 1117 (a) (5) and California Education Code 52055.51) and coordinate those teams. Based on number of schools requiring interventions, resources will be allocated to selected CCSESA regions to support initial team formation, participation in training, brokering of resources and technical assistance to support recommendations of the SAIT for the school, and monitoring to ensure that technical assistance is provided to identified schools. While county offices will not be the only SAIT providers, it is important to build the infrastructure to support the primary providers now, given the numbers of schools that may eventually need teams in the "out" years. Regions with as few as seven schools may receive $ 75,540; regions with as many 33 schools, may receive $356, 136 @ $10,781 per school.	$1.5 million
6. Fund Comprehensive Assistance centers to provide support and assistance in standards-based core curriculum, summarization of scientifically based research, use of data, co-development and training with CDE for SAIT Providers and RSSIC staff and assistance in conducting forums to design alternative governance models for potential state corrective action in School Improvement districts.	$ .800 million
7.Five percent of the 2% School Improvement set aside for state administration, included under sec. 1116.(B) (c) (3) (14) is targeted to development of technical assistance for schools identified for school improvement, administration of the statewide system of school support, and state interventions and sanctions for districts in Corrective action and districts with School Improvement schools required to provide Supplemental Services, Choice, Transportation and Technical Assistance. Under Corrective Action Sec. 1116 (b)(c) (3) (10) (c) the SEA may be required to defer programmatic funds, institute and implement a new curriculum, replace LEA personnel, remove jurisdictional authority of LEAs, appoint alternative governance, and abolish and restructure the LEA.	$ 1.5 million

b. For the 95 percent of the reservation in section 1003(a) that must be made available to LEAs, describe how the SEA will allocate funds to assist LEAs in complying with the school improvement, corrective action, and restructuring requirements of section 1116 and identify any SEA requirements for use of those funds.

The 95 percent is reflected in Numbers 1 through 6 in the above chart that shows California's proposed allocation (pending legislative and budget discussions later this spring).

c. Identify what part, if any, of State administrative funds the SEA will use for assessment development under section 1004 of the ESEA, and describe how those funds will be used.

CDE intends to use approximately $800,000 to support additional staff positions for assessment administration activities.

d. Describe how the State will inform LEAs of the procedures they must use to distribute funds for schools to use for supplemental services under section 1116(e)(7), and the procedures for determining the amount to be used for this purpose.

The funding sources that can be used to support the services for Section 1116(e)(7) are:

a. Title I, Part A
b. Title V, Part A

These funds are distributed on a formula basis to LEAs through the California Consolidated Programs Funding Application. Part II of the Consolidated Application for Funding Categorical Programs is completed by all LEAs and contains information related to entitlements, allocations, and

numbers of participants in specified programs; the Consolidated Application for Funding Categorical Program is, therefore, the means used by CDE to inform LEAs.

The amount the LEA is required to spend on supplemental services is determined by Section 1116(b)(10), which requires 20 percent (unless a lesser amount is needed) of LEA allocation from Title I, Part A for transportation and/or supplemental educational services.

e. Describe how the State will use funds awarded under section 6113(b)(1) for the development and implementation of State assessments in accordance with section 6111.

California will use funds awarded under section 6113(b)(1) for the development and implementation of State assessments in accordance with section 6111. A preliminary plan has been submitted to the State Department of Finance and the State Legislature for their review and approval. In addition to the development and refinement of assessments, the plan would support data collection to meet federal data reporting requirements, including the development of a longitudinal database to track student academic progress.

Approval of the plan for the use of Title VI funds is expected in July 2002. The proposed plan appears on the following page:

TITLE VI—Assessments and Accountability

TITLE	*FUNDS (in thousands)*	*PYs*
Alternative Accountability Model	$1,445	0.0
Special Education	500	0.0
High School Exit Exam	3,000	0.0
Fifth Grade Standards-based Science Test	800	0.0
California English Language Development Test	1,000	0.0
Assessments and Accountability Public Awareness	900	0.0
Assessment Data Collection/Pre ID	300	0.0
Assessment Division Staff Adjustment	694	5.0
STAR Growth and COLA	1,851	0.0
Data Collection	10,524	
Set-Aside for Additional Assessment Changes	7,924	0.0
TOTAL	$28,938	5.0

2. Title I, Part B, Subpart 3--Even Start Family Literacy

a. Describe how the SEA will use its indicators of program quality to monitor, evaluate, and improve its projects, and to decide whether to continue operating them.

California will implement the indicators of program quality, also referred to as performance indicators, found under section 1240 of the Even Start statute to monitor, evaluate, and improve projects. CDE will use the performance indicators to monitor the Even Start projects by requiring an annual evaluation report that reflects growth on the indicators of program quality and other related indicators, such as: intensity of services; service to families in poverty with low-literacy skills; retention of families; visit first-year projects; visit projects having difficulties implementing the four components; and sending letters to the superintendent/executive director of projects making sufficient or insufficient progress.

CDE will use three types of evaluations: (1) *continuous improvement* to answer questions about how to improve services and guidance in order to achieve objectives; (2) *performance data* to determine if the program is working; and (3) *implementation studies* to determine how well programs are being implemented. The state will continue to require Even Start projects to submit an annual evaluation report that indicates whether the project is meeting its objectives and achieving student outcomes based on the performance indicators. CDE will continue to require that projects serve a minimum of 30 families, with assessment data for 85 % of families and

showing progress on the performance indicators. The state will develop a rubric to assess growth and an intervention plan on assisting projects that are not making sufficient progress.

CDE will provide technical assistance to projects for program improvement by providing training on effective practices for evaluators and project staff. This training will include ways to improve the content of the local evaluations as well as how to use the local evaluation report to improve program quality. CDE will provide professional development funds in order to have qualified staff and effective Even Start projects. The state also will continue to provide technical assistance in: (a) site validation visits to all 3rd, 6th, and 9th year projects; (b) continue to provide mentors to assist new directors; (c) establish a cadre of National Center for Family Literacy trainers to train new directors on implementing an effective Even Start program; (d) conduct two directors' meetings, and conduct an annual Family Literacy Conference; and (e) train on *Desired Results for Children and Families* through a cadre of trainers.

b. Describe what constitutes sufficient program progress when the SEA makes continuation awards.

"Sufficient progress" will be demonstrated when each local program:

1) serves 30 families;

2) provides pre- and post-test data in the areas of adult education; early childhood education; parenting education; and parent and child

interactive literacy activities on 85% of the adults and children on the Even Start Performance Indicators;

3) shows "significant" growth based on the annual evaluation report on the Performance Indicators done by the local evaluators;

4) provides intensity of services, defined as three to four times per week, three hours per day in the four Even Start components described in Part Two, Question 2 (adult education, early childhood education, parenting education, parent and child interactive literacy activities);

5) demonstrates an annual retention rate of families at 65% or above in the program;

6) implements the aforementioned four required components;

7) provides year-round services;

8) implements *Parents as Teachers, Desired Results for Children and Families*;

9) meets all the Even Start Family Literacy statutes.

c. Explain how the State's Even Start projects will provide assistance to low-income families participating in the program to help children in those families to achieve to the applicable State content and student achievement standards.

The State's Even Start projects will provide assistance to low-income families participating in the program to help children in those families to achieve to the applicable State content and student achievement standards. All Even Start projects have been provided with CDE documents for pre-kindergarten through grade 2 related to student achievement. Projects provide parents with the state's academic content standards for kindergarten

through grade 2, which are explained for parents' understanding. Even Start projects are in alignment with pre-kindergarten CDE documents, such as *Desired Results* and *Pre-Kindergarten Guidelines*. Programs are aimed to lead toward student achievement on state assessments.

d. Identify the amount of the reservation under subsection 1233(a) that the State will use for each category of State-level activities listed in that section, and describe how the SEA will carry out those activities.

The state plans to use the 3% of grant funds authorized under section 1233 for the following purposes: (1) to provide technical assistance for the improvement of projects and to allow local entities to replicate their projects in another community; (2) to carry out section 1240 and 1234 c, which states that a portion of these funds may be used to improve the quality of family literacy services, with priority given to projects of low-quality based on indicators of program quality; and (3) to help local projects raise additional funds to expand services and reduce waiting lists. An RFA or contract process aligned to NCLB goals will be used for the process. An additional 3% will be used to staff the Even Start Program at the state level so that the program is effectively administered statewide.

3. Title I, Part C--Education of Migrant Children

a. Describe the process the State will use to develop, implement, and document a comprehensive needs assessment that identifies the special educational and related needs of migrant children.

The State will develop, implement, and document a comprehensive needs assessment that identifies the special educational and related needs of migrant children. At the present time, California relies on LEAs to identify

those migrant students who are most in need. By May 2003, California will have reviewed its current system of collecting information; the state will determine steps toward realigning its annual migrant application with NCLB goals and performance indicators. The Migrant Education Program (MEP) will require the annual disaggregation of assessment data by all participating operating agencies (regions) and school districts. These data will be used in determining the academic improvement of migrant children, per the Performance Indicators, and efforts by CDE to reach performance targets.

On the following page is a proposed and tentative outline for actions during the coming months.

PROPOSED TIMELINE for MIGRANT EDUCATION

Tentative Date	CDE/MEIO Planned Activity	22 Regions	Districts	Parents/SPAC
May 2002	CDE notification of stakeholders regarding NCLB performance goals for a planned conversion of MEP to a comprehensive needs assessment.	Yes	Yes	Yes
June 2002	Meetings are held, or site visitations made, to confer with stakeholders and to complete a survey (feedback) for the purpose of adapting MEP to NCLB.	Yes	Yes	Yes
July 2002	Address issues of data collection planning and implementation with WestEd and CDE (data collection/CBEDS).	Yes	No	No
August 2002	Confer with Directors regarding proposal by WestEd and CDE, including issues of cost implementation.	Yes	No	No
Sept. 2002	CDE makes final adjustments to the proposal based on feedback from the Regions and other interested parties (USDE, etc.).	Yes	Yes	Yes
October 2002	CDE legal staff reviews proposal for any legal ramifications.	No	No	No
January 2003	If proposal accepted, initiate the plan at the state level.	No	No	No
Feb. 2003	Technical advice provided to LEA'S on the comprehensive needs assessment plan.	Yes	Yes	Yes
March 2003	CDE corrects any system faults.	No	No	No
April 2003	Notification and full plan implementation.	Yes	Yes	Yes
May 2003	The continued coordination and collaboration with all stakeholders.	Yes	Yes	Yes

b. Describe the State's priorities for the use of migrant education program funds in order to have migrant students meet the State's performance targets for indicators 1.1 and 1.2. in Part One (as well as 5.1 and 5.2 that expressly include migrant students), and how they relate to the State's assessment of needs for services.

By May 2003, CDE's MEP Office will identify necessary steps toward developing performance targets for key performance indicators. Further, migrant children will continue to be expected to meet the same high academic content standards (English/language arts, mathematics, science, and history-social science) as adopted by SBE for the general student population and will have access to the same resources and highly qualified teachers as other students. Migrant children identified as English learners will be assessed for English proficiency in keeping with an increased emphasis on reading achievement (at grade level). A family literacy focus will emphasize parents as the child's first teacher and provide parents with access to educational resources within their local community.

Although the definition of "Adequate Yearly Progress" does not list migrant children as a subgroup, it is the intent of MEP to focus on measured progress for all migrant students. In addition, migrant parents and their families will be kept informed with regard to the progress of the state's overall initiative to meet performance goals. "Schools in need of improvement" will be determined once AYP and "proficiency" are clearly established.

c. Describe how the State will determine the amount of any subgrants the State will award to local operating agencies, taking into account the numbers and needs of migratory children, the statutory priority for service in section 1304(d), and the availability of funds from other Federal, State, and local programs.

The Migrant Education grant monies awarded, less 1 percent for administrative costs to CDE, are distributed to subgrantees at the local level. 75 percent is based on migrant children enrollment counts for the regular school year. A portion of the regular year dollars is divided among the following factions (local input): mobility; migrant children identified ages 3-4; out-of-school migrant youth, ages 19-21; and over-age for grade. The remaining 25 percent is allocated using the summer/intersession count for participants.

d. Describe how the State will promote continuity of education and the interstate and intrastate coordination of services for migratory children.

The State will promote continuity of education and the Intranet or Internet coordination of services for migratory children in several ways. Student records will be made available at no cost to other states. The Migrant Education/International Office (MEIO) data system, the Migrant Education Program Student Information System (MEPSIS), provides for the transfer of migrant student records. The MEPSIS report also will assist Regional and School District staff to enroll migrant students; provide them with appropriate services; avoid redundant testing; develop a baseline for assessing progress; and subgrant migrant funds to implement program activities. In addition, MEPSIS will provide accurate data and unduplicated student counts to the federal government; provide timely access to and transfer of migrant student records; offer an electronic means to collect and report uniform migrant student program data for program and migrant student analysis; and assess student outcomes.

For example, one of the services offered through MEPSIS is the tracking of inoculations for migrant children. The MEPSIS will operate as part of (and in conjunction with) the California School Information System (CSIS). The MEPSIS is designed to provide a centralized distribution database management system statewide from WestEd, Inc., and software program developed by TROMIK Technology Corporation COEStar for inputting Certificates of Eligibility and student data information.

e. Describe the State's plan to evaluate the effectiveness of its migrant education program and projects.

CDE's MEP office will annually review the effectiveness of local programs through the application and subsequent review process of operating agencies (regions) and school districts. Orientations and information sessions will be held to exchange information and feedback on the success of the prior year's objectives. Parents also will be engaged annually to provide comments through their local and state parent advisory councils on the overall success of the program. Data from STAR will be used during the coming year by operating agencies (regions) to evaluate future program plans.

f. Identify the amount of funds that the SEA will retain from its Migrant Education Program (MEP) allocation, under section 200.41 of the Title I regulations (34 CFR 200.41), to carry out administrative and program functions that are unique to the MEP, and describe how the SEA will use those funds.

CDE retains one percent overall of grant monies for administrative purposes of MEP. An additional 15 percent of the remaining total dollars are reserved for statewide projects within California. Currently, five Migrant Education projects address such issues as high school graduation for migrant students;

student and family literacy instruction or assistance; recruitment of college students to serve as teacher assistants; and recruitment of instructors who are prepared to teach children who are learning English. Each of these existing projects will be screened for effectiveness, based on the availability of scientifically based research. All current MOUs will be reviewed in light of NCLB aims, priorities, and goals.

4. Title I, Part D--Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk

a. Describe the program goals, performance indicators, performance objectives, and data sources that the State has established for its use in assessing the effectiveness of the program in improving the academic and vocational and technical skills of students participating in the program.

The goals of the Neglected or Delinquent (N or D) Program are to:

- Improve educational services to children enrolled in N or D Programs in county offices of education, school districts, and State institutions so that such children and youth have the opportunity to meet the same challenging State content and student performance standards that all children in the State are expected to meet;
- Provide children and youth with the services needed to make a successful transition from institutionalization to further schooling and employment;
- Provide students at risk of dropping out of school, students who have dropped out, and youth returning from institutions with a support system to ensure their continued education;
- Ensure that curricula and course work lead to completion of secondary school requirements.

Current performance objectives for the N or D Program are:

- To ensure that students meet the same state content and performance standards as that of all students in the state;
- To ensure that secondary-level students participating in N or D Programs accrue credits toward grade promotion.

The current performance indicators for the N or D Program predate NCLB. Some indicators were developed to reflect increased student performance on the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program; earned credits toward graduation; grade promotion rates, high school graduation rates, and G.E.D. records; California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE) completion rate; and successful transition to vocational or technical training, postsecondary education, or employment.

As part of the Public Schools Accountability Act (PSAA), a PSAA committee develops and addresses appropriate assessment tools to be used with highly mobile student populations in alternative schools. Upon final selection of assessment instruments and methodologies, a system will be implemented throughout N or D facilities and institutions that will adequately measure progress in student achievement;

The data sources used to assess the effectiveness of the program are:

- Annual Coordinated Compliance Reviews;

- Individual site validation and monitoring reviews of approximately 10 percent of total sites annually;
- Cumulative data collection through the Consolidated Application process;
- Federally mandated three-year evaluations of each state's N or D Program;
- Local Improvement Plans; and
- A periodic, comparative analysis of data contained in the annual State Plan submitted to USDE, to ascertain the degree to which programs are improving student achievement.

The goals, performance indicators, and data sources are (with minor exceptions) the same for the State Agency programs (Part D, Subpart 1) as for Local Agency Programs (Part D, Subpart 2).

b. Describe how the SEA is assisting projects funded under the program in facilitating the transition of children and youth from correctional facilities to locally operated programs.

State assistance for the above purpose is provided in the following ways:

- Transcripts are obtained and evaluated from all schools that students have previously attended;
- Contacts are made with schools that the students will be transitioning into to determine, based on transcripts, what the areas of focus should

be to meet the requirements of the receiving school;

- Students are given pre-tests to determine their level of performance and curricula are developed based on individual performance. These curricula are designed to bring students up to the level of the requirements in the regular schools to which they will return.

Efforts are made to coordinate with other programs that serve similar needs and may provide additional resources and options, including, but not limited to, the School-based Pupil Motivation and Maintenance Program and Dropout Recovery Act, California Education Code section 54720-54734.

c. Describe how the funds reserved under Section 1418 will be used for transition services for students leaving institutions for schools served by LEAs, or postsecondary institutions or vocational and technical training programs.

NCLB allows up to 30 percent of the funds to be used for transitional services. A major aim of the N or D Program is that children and youth will re-enter regular schools successfully, transition into higher education and vocational programs, and become familiar with career choices or find employment after leaving the facilities and institutions. The funds are used to provide such services as:

- Career Day presentations featuring professionals sharing expertise in various occupations;
- Computer software that includes vital information on a vast number of occupations and career choices (information is included describing

salaries, job duties, educational requirements, and skill requirements);

- Staff from local colleges, universities, and vocational schools (i.e., administrators, counselors, and so forth) provide details on majors offered and how to apply to college, obtain financial assistance, and select appropriate courses;
- Referrals to transitional living programs;
- Job placement-related activities;
- Resource directories of available social services, mental health services, housing options, and emergency services;
- Video tapes depicting actual on-the-job experiences and which are designed to assist students in making career decisions and successful transitions to employment.

5. Title I, Part F--Comprehensive School Reform

a. Describe the process the State educational agency will use to ensure that programs funded include and integrate all eleven required components of a comprehensive school reform program.

California will ensure that programs funded under this title include and integrate all 11 required components of a comprehensive school reform program. CDE will require subgrantees to certify that they have addressed all eleven components of CSR, as soon as this is required by USDE, possibly as soon as July 2002. New subgrantees who submitted proposals as of May 15, 2002 *and* continuing subgrantees in their second year of implementation will be advised of the additional two components that must

be included and integrated in a comprehensive reform program. Subgrantees will be required to revise implementation plans, demonstrating that the two new components of CSR have been addressed and integrated with the original nine components on which their plans were based.

California has set such a high standard in its previous application cycles for CSR that all subgrantees should be able to integrate the new components without difficulty. For example, one of the new components of CSR is "proven methods and strategies based on scientifically based research." Schools implementing CSR in California have been required to demonstrate their program "is adapted to the needs of the students and school community to support the attainment of standards adopted by the State Board of Education, as well as frameworks, reading and mathematics initiative, and companion documents." Since California content standards and curriculum frameworks are derived from scientifically based research, CSR subgrantees will be able to certify that their programs include this new component.

b. Describe the process the State will use to determine the percentage of schools that participate in the Comprehensive School Reform program (CSR) meeting or exceeding the proficient level of performance on State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics.

The process California will use to determine the percentage of schools that participate in a Comprehensive School Reform program meeting or exceeding the "proficient" level of performance on state assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics is as follows: California has 127 schools in two cohorts currently participating in the federal CSR program. A third cohort of schools will be funded in Fall 2002 to begin the three-year,

research-based reform process. The tracking and evaluation of these schools is no different from that of all other public schools in the state. These schools participate in the statewide accountability system and receive API scores. Once the statewide definition of Adequate Yearly Progress is developed, it will be applied equally to all schools in the state, including federally funded CSR schools. Data on the proportion of schools that are increasing the percentage of students at or above the designated "proficient" level on statewide assessments will be included in California's annual evaluation report to the USDE.

6. Title II, Part A--Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund

a. If not fully addressed in the State's response to the information on performance goals, indicators, and targets in Part One, describe the remainder of the State's annual measurable objectives under section 1119(a)(2).

California plans to report progress toward its goal that every student is taught by highly qualified teachers by including the following information in its state report card:

- the number and proportion of highly qualified teachers: (a) across the state; (b) in high poverty schools; and (c) in low-performing schools; *and*
- the number and percentage of teachers who received high quality professional development (as defined in NCLB section 9101(34)): (a) across the state; (b) in high poverty schools; and (c) in low-performing schools.

In addition (as stated in the response to Question b, below), the State Report Card will identify LEAs that have not met their growth targets.

b. Describe how the SEA will hold LEAs accountable both for (1) meeting the annual measurable objectives described in section 1119(a)(2) of the ESEA, and (2) ensuring that the professional development the LEAs offer their teachers and other instructional staff is consistent with the definition of "professional development" in section 9101(34).

CDE will hold LEAs accountable for both (1) meeting the annual measurable objectives described in Section 1119(a)(2) of the ESEA, and (2) ensuring that the professional development the LEAs offer their teachers and other instructional staff is consistent with the definition of professional development in section 9101(34). CDE will hold LEAs accountable by using the following strategies:

a. Designated authorities will sign assurances contained in the consolidated application for federal education funds for 2002-03. In order to receive Title I, Part A funds for the 2002-03 school year, LEA leaders must sign a set of assurances that they will comply with the requirements contained in NCLB. Adherence to the assurances will be reviewed during the regularly scheduled coordinated compliance reviews.

b. One of the assurances requires LEAs to develop local plans for using NCLB funds. Within that plan, LEAs must define their district-wide and school-site-specific professional development plans. Such plans must identify how LEAs will assess teachers' needs and how they propose to provide appropriate, high quality professional development.

(Note: To date, California has no state-adopted standards for high-quality professional development; however, the state is in the process of developing such standards in response to California Education Code Section 44470. Currently, those standards include improving teachers' content area knowledge; strengthening content area pedagogical skills; providing high quality, sustained, intensive, and classroom-focused training; and aligning curricular planning with California's content and performance standards.)

c. With input from local educators and professional associations, CDE will continue to develop the state's professional development standards and associated indicators.

d. Currently, CDE collects data on every teacher and administrator in its public schools. Despite recent improvements, the data collection procedures (and forms) are not sufficient to identify, with certainty, the training and certification area(s) of teachers. Consistent with the requirements in NCLB, the CDE Professional Development Division will work with the Education Demographics Office to redesign the data collection forms and to determine how best to collect valid and reliable data from teachers.

e. CDE will review all school and district report cards to determine whether adequate progress is being made toward meeting the NCLB goals. The Professional Development Division will focus on the following goals and reports of progress toward those goals:

- Students' academic achievement and growth toward local targets;
- District, county, and regional proportions of highly-qualified teachers, and the distribution of highly-qualified teachers across high-poverty and low-achieving schools; and
- Teachers' use of high-quality professional development programs.

The Professional Development Division will work closely with other CDE divisions (i.e., Standards and Assessment, Policy and Evaluation, and Education Demographics) to create and use a reporting system to ensure that all LEAs can accurately and efficiently report data on teachers' qualifications, use of professional development, and associated student academic growth.

Until those changes have been made, CDE will utilize several proxy indicators of teacher quality and certification. Results of those analyses (and a measure of our confidence in the data) will be reported on the school and LEA report cards, as well as the state report card.

c. Describe the State Educational Agency and the State Agency for Higher Education's agreement on the amount each will retain under section 2113(d) of ESEA. Section 2113(d) allows for one percent of the State's program allocation for administration and planning costs.

The California Postsecondary Education Commission (the SAHE) will choose the newly available, hold harmless option for the SAHE's administration and planning.

7. Title II, Part D--Enhanced Education Through Technology

a. Describe the program goals, performance indicators, performance objectives, and data sources that the State has established for its use in assessing the effectiveness of the program in improving access to and use of educational technology by students and teachers in support of academic achievement.

California ensures that program goals, performance indicators, performance objectives, and data sources will be used in assessing the effectiveness of the program in improving access to and use of educational technology by students and teachers in support of academic achievement.

Goal #1: Teachers will be qualified to use technology as a tool to improve teaching and learning.
Performance Indicator: The percentage of teachers qualified to use technology for instruction.
Performance objectives: Performance objectives will be established by spring of 2003 and will be focused on ensuring that teachers are well prepared to use technology as a tool to improve student academic achievement.

Data sources that the state has established for use in assessing the effectiveness of the program: CDE will use the existing California Technology Assistance Project Technology Assessment Profile ($CTAP^2$) to determine the percentage of teachers qualified to use technology for instruction. This website contains an on-line, self-assessment tool that allows educators to determine their level of technology proficiency: “introductory,” “intermediate,” or “proficient.” The self-assessment is based on rubrics established in each area of technology competency and aligned with the

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) "Factors to Consider," which is the Technology Standard for a California K-12 Preliminary Teaching Credential. The website for the project is http://ctap2.iassessment.org/. All schools are encouraged to have staff complete this assessment each year, but EETT grant recipients will be required to complete this data collection.

Currently, this site returns data on the average proficiency level of teachers and indicates that most teachers in the state are still in the "introductory" level in terms of effectively integrating technology into the curriculum. The site will be modified to identify the percentage of teachers who are qualified to use technology for instruction. In addition, California will use other locally obtained and reported data to determine the percentage of teachers qualified to use technology for instruction. The local data will include samples of student work products, lesson plans that have been submitted for review to the California Learning Resources Network (CLRN), and other items to be determined. EETT grant recipients will be required to set annual growth targets for the percentage of teachers who are qualified to use technology for instruction and to monitor and report progress toward meeting these targets.

Goal #2: Students will have increased access to up-to-date technology tools. Performance Indicators: (1) An increase in the percentage of schools with a student-to-multimedia computer ratio of 5-to-1 or less; and (2) an increase in the percentage of schools with Internet access in all instructional classrooms.

Performance objectives: Performance objectives will be established by the Fall of 2002.

Data sources that the state has established for use in assessing the effectiveness of the program: CDE annually collects data on the status of technology in its schools through two mechanisms: the California Basic Education Data System (CBEDS) and the annual California School Technology Survey. The California School Technology Survey contains more detailed information. All schools are encouraged to complete this survey each year, but EETT grant recipients will be required to complete this data collection. Data collection for 2002 was recently completed and CDE is in the process of analyzing the data. The spring 2002 data will be used to set the performance objectives. It should be noted that CDE will disaggregate data based on school type, eligibility for free or reduced-price meals, and region in the state so that any inequities in access to technology can be identified and addressed.

Goal #3: Teachers participating in professional development on education technology will increase their use of technology as a tool to support student academic achievement.

Performance Indicators: The percentage of teachers who participate in professional development funded by Title II, Part D who incorporate into their classrooms research-based practices on using technology to support students to meet state standards.

Performance objectives: Performance objectives will be established by the spring of 2003.

Data sources that the state has established for use in assessing the effectiveness of the program: Multiple data sources will be used to assess progress toward this goal. First, CDE will use data collected in the California Technology Assistance Project Technology Assessment Profile (CTAP[2]). This website contains a technology-use survey to collect data both on teacher and student technology use. Data are also collected on a schoolwide basis on the California School Technology Survey. In addition, the EETT grant recipients will be required to collect data to monitor growth in this area. Details are still being developed, but possible data sources include observation records, lesson plans submitted to the California Learning Resources Network, and student work products showing progress over time. Data collection from EETT competitive grant recipients will focus on how technology is used in the classroom to help students meet state standards.

b. Provide a brief summary of the SEA's long-term strategies for improving student academic achievement, including technology literacy, through the effective use of technology in the classroom, and the capacity of teachers to integrate technology effectively into curricula and instruction.

As California implements No Child Left Behind, research-based practices with respect to technology will be included in the education technology competitive grants and will be encouraged in other No Child Left Behind grants as well. These guidelines will ensure that technology use is consistent

with the State's strategies for improving student academic achievement through the effective use of technology in classrooms throughout the State, including improving the capacity of teachers to integrate technology effectively into curricula and instruction.

California will also encourage districts to develop or update their district technology plans in alignment with the State Board of Education's Education Technology Planning: A Guide for School Districts. These guidelines encourage districts to focus on using technology to improve student achievement and to develop the components of the technology plan, (including curriculum; professional development; infrastructure, hardware, technical support and software; funding and budget; and monitoring and evaluation) in such a way as to keep student achievement at the heart of the plan.

California's strategies for improving student academic achievement through effective use of technology also include efforts to leverage statewide education technology services, regional services, grant administration, and outreach efforts so that all efforts focus on promoting research-based proven practices. Specific, California's efforts will include the following:

i. **Statewide education technology services**: CDE funds statewide services designed to promote effective use of technology in the classroom. CDE will continue to provide

statewide services that are more efficiently and effectively offered at the state level so that districts may have easy access

to best practices and resources to help them effectively deploy and use technology to improve teaching, learning, and overall school management. Statewide projects will be refined to completely align with No Child Left Behind as well as to maintain the focus on standards, assessment, accountability and promotion of best practices. New projects may be added and old projects may be discontinued, if warranted, based on the needs of California's LEAs. The current services are:

Technology Information Center for Administrative Leadership (TICAL): TICAL provides resources, professional development, and a web portal designed to help district and site administrators lead the effective use of technology to improve teaching, learning, and overall school management. The portal for the project is www.portical.org. The professional development and resources provided include the following topics:

1. technology planning;
2. operating and maintaining systems;
3. meeting professional development needs of technical support staff, certificated staff, and support staff with respect to technology;
4. financial planning for technology; and integrating technology into the curriculum to support standards-driven teaching and learning.

California Learning Resources Network (CLRN): CLRN reviews supplemental electronic learning resources for alignment with state content standards and other criteria adopted by SBE. The criteria are research-based and designed to identify electronic learning resources that promote effective use of technology to improve student achievement. Standards-aligned resources are listed on the CLRN web site and are searchable by various characteristics, including specific standards. The website for CLRN is www.clrn.org. The CLRN site also includes a lesson plan builder that allows teachers to develop standards-aligned lesson plans that incorporate the use of standards-aligned technology tools. Teachers will be able to access and search the CLRN site for high-quality, standards-based, online lesson plans that use the reviewed electronic learning resources. The goal of this project is to provide a comprehensive instructional delivery package that combines standards-aligned resources and standards-based lesson plans in a single, easy-to-use access point.

Technical Support for Technology in Schools (TechSETS): This service is designed to provide support, resources, and access to professional development for technology support personnel in districts and schools. The website for the project

is www.techsets.org. Specifically, the project has developed a matrix of technology skills needed for technology support personnel in districts and schools, and has displayed these skills along with appropriate professional development in a user-friendly matrix. The project is collaborating with stakeholders to identify cost-effective sources of training aligned to the matrix of skills and also is providing resources and support for California school technologists through an online interactive help desk.

California Technology Assistance Project Technology Assessment Profile (CTAP^2): This website contains two modules:

(a) an on-line, self-assessment tool that allows educators to determine their level of technology proficiency: "introductory," "intermediate," or "proficient." The self-assessment is based on rubrics established in each area of technology competency and aligned with the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) "Factors to Consider," which is the Technology Standard for a California K-12 Preliminary Teaching Credential. Based on the results of the assessment, educators can view and select training opportunities that will advance their proficiency level.

(b) a Technology Use Survey that allows site, district, county, and state administrators to gather information regarding

(c) certificated staff's use of technology tools. The survey addresses four areas of teacher technology usage: (1) use of technology tools for classroom management and instruction; (2) their student's use of technology tools for classroom assignments; (3) their professional development preferences; and (4) their technical support experiences. The website for the project is http://ctap2.iassessment.org/.

These statewide services will improve the capacity of teachers to integrate technology effectively. CLRN will help teachers identify standards-aligned electronic learning resources, CTAP^2 will help professional developers know how to best meet the needs of teachers in planning professional development, and TICAL will help administrators support teachers as they work to use technology to improve teaching and learning. TechSETS will help ensure that the technology works when teachers use it.

ii. **Regional education technology services**: CDE funds the California Technology Assistance Project (CTAP), a regional support structure designed to provide technical assistance, coordination, and services focused on effective use of education technology based upon local needs in each of the eleven regions in California. Each CTAP region has developed and is implementing a plan to provide technical assistance and

services in six key areas:

- staff development;
- learning resources;
- hardware and telecommunications infrastructure;
- operating and maintaining education technology infrastructure, including improving student record keeping and tracking related to instruction;
- coordination with other federal, state and local programs consistent with State Board-adopted Content Standards; and
- funding for technology.

CTAP is designed to promote effective used of technology in teaching, learning, and overall school management. Professional development provided by CTAP helps schools promote technology literacy for staff and students and helps develop the capacity of teachers to integrate technology effectively into the curriculum. CDE meets with CTAP directors on a regular basis to coordinate regional services and to ensure that CTAP is promoting best practices and providing services based on local needs. CTAP services have effectively helped districts and schools develop technology plans focused on using technology as a tool to improve teaching, student

achievement, and the local education agencies' abilities to collect and use data in school and classroom management.

iii. **Grant administration**: CDE administers various state education technology grants and will coordinate the administration of these grants with the new EETT grants to consistently focus efforts on effective use of technology to improve student achievement. Specifically, to the extent allowable by law, each grant program is designed to ensure that:

- students and teachers have adequate access to technology, including both hardware and Internet access;
- timely technical support is available to ensure that the technology works whenever teachers, students, and administrators use it;
- professional development is provided to help teachers integrate technology into the curriculum in a manner that promotes technology literacy and effective use of technology to improve teaching and student achievement; and,
- administrators understand how to use technology to make informed decisions and how to support acquisition and deployment of technology to improve teaching and learning.

iv. **Outreach**: CDE's Education Technology Office will continue efforts to reach out within CDE and to LEAs, higher education,

professional organizations, the business community, and parents and community members to promote the effective use of technology in K-12 education. Information about topics such as best practices, technology planning, the status of education technology in California, and the need for ongoing technical support and professional development will be shared via meetings, presentations, articles, and ongoing collaboration. The purpose of these interactions will be to promote consistent messages regarding the use of technology to support California's system of standards, assessment, and accountability focused on improving student achievement, as well as to increase access to education technology, especially for those students who currently do not have access or who are attending low-performing schools. Outreach efforts will also focus on helping all stakeholders understand the importance of a quality district education technology plan. Stakeholders will be encouraged to understand federal requirements and the State Board guidelines for district technology plans and to be involved in the development and implementation of district technology plans that focus on using technology to improve teaching, student achievement, and overall school management.

c. Describe key activities that the SEA will conduct or sponsor with the funds it retains at the State level. These may include such activities as provision of distance learning in rigorous academic courses or curricula; the establishment or support of public-private initiatives for the acquisition of technology by high-need LEAs; and the development of performance measurement systems to determine the effectiveness of educational technology programs.

Funding will be used for the follow activities:

i. Grant administration: Funding will be used for staff in CDE's Education Technology Office to administer both the formula-funded and competitive grants. The work to be performed includes designing the RFA, scoring, providing technical assistance during and after the application process, awarding the grants, processing payments, monitoring compliance with grant conditions, and monitoring the impact of the grant on teaching and learning.

ii. Technical assistance: Funding will be used for CDE's Education Technology Office as well as for CTAP to provide technical assistance to LEAs on the effective use of technology to improve teaching, learning, and school management. Technical assistance will be provided to EETT grant recipients as well as recipients of other No Child Left Behind funding so as to maximize the effective use of technology in education. Funding will also be used for technical assistance on E-rate applications and to encourage eligible LEAs to apply for E-rate discounts.

iii. Promotion of best practices and use of effective resources: Funding will be used to support statewide efforts to promote research-based best practices and the identification and use of effective technology-based resources and practices, including distance learning. For example, work will be done to help identify sources of ongoing, high-quality, research-based professional

development on effective integration of technology into the curriculum. These efforts will also include a focus on collaboration among stakeholder groups, including, but not limited to, higher education, business and community members, parents, professional organizations, and other government agencies so that all stakeholders have input into how California moves forward to increase access to technology and to use technology to support improved teaching, learning, and school management.

iv. Evaluation: Funding will be used to evaluate EETT grants as well as to evaluate California's broader efforts to improve access to technology, to promote technology literacy, and to use technology as a tool in improved teaching, learning, and school management.

d. Provide a brief description of how—
i. The SEA will ensure that students and teachers, particularly those in the schools of high-need LEAs, have increased access to technology…

The EETT grants administered by CDE, as well as various other state grants, will be designed to increase access to technology. As defined by the law, the EETT grants will be available only to high-need local educational agencies. In terms of the competitive EETT grants, advantage will be given to those with inadequate access and high need. In addition, the Education Technology Office will work with other CDE offices to ensure that additional grant opportunities administered by CDE allowing expenditures on technology focus on best practices and give consideration to schools with inadequate access. When possible, grants also will be tailored to give

advantage to districts that make technology available to staff and students beyond the regular school day.

California conducts an annual survey on the status of technology in its schools. This survey will be continued and will allow CDE to monitor access to technology as well as technology use in its schools. High-need districts with inadequate access will be assisted in applying for E-rate as well as state and federal technology grants. Districts not using technology in instruction or that need assistance in better integrating technology into the curriculum will have access to regional and statewide services designed to help them infuse best practices into their schools. Use of regional and statewide services will be monitored on an ongoing basis and services will be tailored and improved based on feedback.

d.ii. …and how the SEA will coordinate the application and award process for State discretionary grant and formula grant funds under this program.

The competitive and formula-funded grants will be coordinated in a number of ways. In terms of the application process, after the initial year, CDE plans to offer districts the opportunity to apply for both types of grants via the same application. Applications will be reviewed using the same criteria in terms of whether or not districts have adequate technology plans to guide effective use of technology. CTAP will provide assistance to districts on technology planning and will help districts with inadequate plans to revise them to come into compliance with federal requirements and state guidelines. CTAP also will provide focused technical assistance to high-

need LEAs and will work to ensure that they have support in applying for both the formula funded and the competitive grants. LEAs that receive grants of less than $10,000 through the formula-funded grants will receive additional points in the competitive grant scoring process. In addition, the competitive grant scoring process will be structured so as to give competitive advantage to LEAs that plan to coordinate the use of the formula-funded grant with the competitive grant funds. Visitations will be conducted by CTAP and CDE staff to ensure that grant funding is used as described in the application. Monitoring and evaluation data will be collected on an ongoing basis and will be reviewed to determine if the grants are effectively improving the ability of students and staff to use technology in teaching, learning, and school management. Follow-up support will be provided to districts not successfully integrating the use of technology into classroom practice.

8. Title III, Part A--English Language Acquisition and Language Enhancement

a. Describe how SEA will ensure that subgrantees use program funds only to carry out activities that reflect scientifically based research on the education of limited English proficient children while allowing those grantees flexibility (to the extent permitted under State law) to select and implement such activities in a manner that they determine best reflects local needs and circumstances.

California ensures that subgrantees use program funds only to carry out activities that reflect scientifically based research on the education of limited English proficient children while allowing those grantees flexibility (to the extent permitted under State law) to select and implement such activities in a

manner that they determine best reflects local needs and circumstances. The state will require that in order to receive Title III funds each subgrantee must provide assurances and evidence that its proposed plan includes activities founded upon scientifically based research (as defined by Section 9101 of NCLB).

The state will allow subgrantees flexibility to select and implement such activities in a matter that they determine best reflects local needs circumstances.

In California students with "less than reasonable English fluency" must be enrolled in Structured English Immersion programs. Flexibility for enrollment in alternative programs is allowable to the extent permitted by California Education Code Section 300-340.

For fiscal year 2002, LEAs will be applying for funds to CDE through a Consolidated Application or through an LEP and Immigrant Program Application. For fiscal year 2003, LEAs will be asked to provide a Local Education Agency Plan to qualify for the following four years of funding. The LEA Plan shall contain assurances that the eligible entity is not in violation of the state law regarding the education of limited-English-proficient children, per California Education Code 300-340.

b. Describe how the SEA will hold sub-grantees accountable for meeting all annual measurable achievement objectives for limited-English-proficient children, and making adequate yearly progress for limited-English-proficient children.

CDE will hold subgrantees accountable for meeting all annual measurable achievement objectives for limited-English-proficient children, and making adequate yearly progress for limited-English-proficient children. Each eligible entity that receives a subgrant from the state under subpart 1 shall provide CDE, at the conclusion of every second fiscal year during which the subgrant is received, with an evaluation in a form prescribed by the state that includes, but is not limited to:

(1) a description of the progress made by students in learning the English language as determined by the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) and in meeting challenging State academic content standards.

STAR data will be used to track AYP of LEP students as a subgroup on the API.

(2) The CELDT will be used for determining the number and percentage of students in the programs and activities who attain English proficiency by the end of each school year.

California does not yet provide a definition of adequate yearly progress for LEAs regarding the educational achievement of limited English proficient children as a subgroup. As explained in the response to question "c," below, AYP will be defined in accordance

with the state's accountability system. This system may be modified over the next twelve months to become better aligned with Title II and Title I requirements. Modifications will take place after the USDE publishes regulations in Fall 2002.

c. Specify the percentage of the State's allotment that the State will use for each of the following categories of State-level activities: professional development; planning, evaluation, administration, and interagency coordination; technical assistance; and providing recognition to subgrantees that have exceeded their annual measurable achievement objectives. A total amount not to exceed 5 percent of the State's allotment may be reserved by the State under section 3111(b)(2) to carry out one or more of these categories of State-level activities.

California's estimated allotment is $115.2 million. The state will reserve 5 percent of its allotment for the activities cited in the question above. The current version of the state budget proposed by the Governor and being considered by the Legislature appropriates Title II dollars to the following purposes:

- $2.3 million to provide LEAs with technical assistance (developing English proficiency measures and curriculum or parental involvement for implementing the new federal requirements);
- $1.5 million to provide a higher level of oversight and compliance monitoring for English Language Learners; and
- $1.8 million for activities that are currently funded with expiring federal funds (administration duties and functions)

After the final enactment of a state budget appropriating these funds, the SEA will provide an update to USDE.

d. Specify the percentage of the State's allotment that the State will reserve for subgrants to eligible entities that have experienced a significant increase in the percentage or number of immigrant children and youth. A total amount not to exceed 15 percent of the State's allotment must be reserved by the State under section 3114(d)(1) to award this type of subgrant.

The state will reserve 11.3 percent of its allotment for the immigrant subgrants. Based on the per pupil amount, the total amount of funds available for LEP student formula grants is $96.4 million; for immigrant student set-aside grants, the amount is $13.1 million, or 11.3 percent.

e. Describe the process that the State will use in making subgrants under section 3114(d) to eligible entities that have experienced a significant increase in the percentage or number of immigrant children and youth.

Under Title III of the No Child Left Behind Act, CDE is required to set aside funds to provide subgrants awards to LEAs that have experienced a significant increase in the enrollment of eligible immigrant students in the most current school year as compared to the average enrollments over the previous two school years.

CDE will notify LEAs of their eligibility to receive a Title III Immigrant Education Program subgrant. If the amount is greater than $10,000, the LEAs are eligible to apply directly to CDE; if the amount is less than $10,000, the LEAs are advised to apply as a member of a consortium with one or more LEAs. In the 2002-03 school year, the amount of the subgrant is based on the total enrollment of eligible immigrant students in each LEA based on the spring 2001 Student National Origin Report (SNOR) and

calculated at the estimated rate of $63.70 per eligible immigrant student.

The SNOR data include enrollments of eligible immigrant students in non-public schools located in the geographic jurisdiction of public school agencies. LEAs are required to serve non-public school students whenever non-public schools request to participate in the Immigrant Education Program.

The Immigrant Education Program subgrant will be awarded for a rolling three-year period, from July 1, 2002, to June 2005. Funding will continue during each of the two subsequent years and will be calculated based on the enrollment of eligible immigrant students. An LEA's subgrant may be terminated before the completion of the three-year period if in any subsequent year, the LEA's enrollment of eligible immigrant students does not generate a subgrant of $10,000 or more. However, whenever a subgrant falls below $10,000, an eligible LEA must apply for Title III funds as part of a consortium.

f. Specify the number of limited-English-proficient children in the State. (See definitions of "child" in section 3301(1), and "limited English proficient" in section 9101(25).)

The number of limited-English-proficient students in California based on the 2001 Language Census R-30 report is 1,512,655. CDE conducts the R-30 survey in March of each year. There may be a need to move this date to January in future years in order for the data to be available in sufficient time

to determine Title III grants for the following school year. For FY 2002-03, the state will use the certified R-30 data from March 2001 to determine Title III LEP student subgrants.

g. Provide the most recent data available on the number of immigrant children and youth in the State.
[**Note:** Section 3111 of the ESEA requires that State allocations for the Language Acquisition State grants be calculated on the basis of the number of limited English proficient children in the State compared to the number of such children in all States (80 percent) and the number of immigrant children and youth in the State compared to the number of such children and youth in all States (20 percent).
The Department plans to use data from the 2000 Census Bureau to calculate State shares of limited English proficient students. However, these data on limited English proficient students will not be available for all States until September 2002. To ensure that States have access to funds as soon as they are available, the Department proposes, for FY 2002 only, to provide an initial distribution of 50 percent of the funds under the limited English proficient portion of the formula based on State-reported data. As soon as Census data become available, the Department will recalculate and make final State allocations using Census data. For the 20 percent of formula funds distributed to States based on State shares of immigrant children and youth, the Department intends to use State-reported data in allocating these funds. Census does not collect data that can be used to calculate State allocations for this part of the formula.]

The number of immigrant children and youth in California based on the 2001 Student National Origin Report (SNOR) administered by CDE is 205,201. CDE already conducts an annual SNOR count, usually during the month of March of each year. Beginning this year, the count will be collected from all schools in the state as well as non-public schools (not just those schools that wish to obtain an immigrant student set-aside subgrant).

9. Title IV, Part A--Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities

a. Describe the key strategies in the State's comprehensive plan for the use of funds by the SEA and the Governor of the State to provide safe, orderly, and drug-free schools and communities through programs and activities that--
i. Complement and support activities of LEAs under section 4115(b) of the ESEA:

The state's key strategies for Title IV, Part A include:

- allocating entitlement and grant funds to 1,055 school districts serving 6,050,895 K-12 students;
- monitoring LEA budget and fiscal reporting requirements through the LEA consolidated application (the SDFSC program shares the consolidated application with the other NCLB-funded and state-funded programs);
- supporting program planning requirements through a Local Improvement Plan developed jointly with other NCLB-funded and state-funded programs;
- providing alcohol, tobacco, and other drug (ATOD) and violence prevention and intervention program technical assistance directly to LEAs organized into the 11 county superintendents' service regions;
- contracting with county offices of education prevention coordinators who will provide program technical assistance directly to LEAs (64 coordinators in 58 counties);
- contracting with local community organizations to apply the Governor's portion to programs, activities, and services that will work in collaboration with LEAs;

- providing guidance in implementing effective research-based prevention programs and strategies in schools and communities;
- building school partnerships with, and encouraging LEA referral to, ADP contractors, mental health programs, law enforcement, and community leaders; and developing local plans and processes;
- sponsoring statewide and regional school conferences and workshops with educators, law enforcement personnel, community members, parents, and others; and developing and disseminating resource materials;
- leading task forces and advisory groups to establish policies that promote effective models, programs, and strategies to improve school climate and decrease prevalence of illegal drugs and violent behavior;
- participating in coordinated compliance reviews of school districts and county offices of education to ensure policy, program, and fiscal compliance with federal and state laws (follow-up ensures compliance issues are resolved);
- disseminating information about results-based prevention and intervention programs and comprehensive counseling and student support models;
- collecting student data over multiple years to measure the immediate and long-term impact of prevention/intervention programs. CDE currently collects school crime data via the California Safe Schools Assessment (CSSA) and student drug-use

- prevalence, and school climate data via the California Healthy Kids Survey (CHKS). Program and curriculum use information will continue to be obtained from the District Annual Report;
- assisting LEAs to fully implement the California Health Framework;
- providing professional development for school district and community based organizations to continue the implementation of effective strategies, ensure cultural competency among staff, and build capacity among local staff who have responsibility for Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) programs;
- assisting LEAs to increase the number of student support personnel and to provide comprehensive student support programs and services; and,
- providing statewide training and awareness workshops on hate-motivated violence prevention (including strategies to build cultural competency), crisis response planning, classroom management, and bullying prevention.

a.*ii.* …Comply with the principles of effectiveness under section 4115(a):

California will comply with the principles of effectiveness under section 4115(a):

- CDE and the Governor's program, managed by ADP, will use the CHKS and CSSA to support LEAs and community programs in developing programs based on an assessment of objective data

regarding the incidence of violence and illegal drug use in schools and communities. The assessment will consider such factors as the cultural diversity of the state's student population. Each LEA receiving SDFSC funds will be required to participate in the CHKS.

- ADP will base services on established performance measures that relate to supporting a safe, orderly, drug-free learning environment through services that promote community health and safety.
- CDE will require every LEA receiving SDFSC funds to adopt a set of performance indicators that will identify specific and measurable outcomes for their program and activities.
- CDE will support LEAs in adopting programs that are based on scientifically based research through a series of publications and staff development opportunities under the title *Getting Results*, which is a collection of documents designed to help California school districts use research-based strategies in designing and implementing their alcohol, tobacco, and other drug prevention programs, as well as their youth violence prevention programs.
- CDE will also support LEAs in adopting research-validated programs and materials through the services of the California Healthy Kids Resource Center. California's LEAs and ADP-funded community programs will have access to sophisticated web-based information resources and be able to borrow research-validated programs materials, descriptions, and research summaries. The information is designed to help LEAs and

communities identify programs with evidence of effectiveness that address students' specific needs and particular environment.

- At the end of each year, county offices of education and LEAs will be required to complete the Alcohol, Tobacco, Other Drug, Violence, and Health Prevention Programs Annual Report (Annual Report). The report will be used by LEAs to satisfy the reporting requirements under the SDFSC program. As part of completing the Annual Report, LEAs will be required to conduct an analysis of prevalence of risk factor data, including protective factors, assets, or other variables in schools and communities as part of a periodic evaluation to assess progress toward reducing violence and illegal drug use in schools. The results will be used to refine, improve, and strengthen the program, and shall be made available to the public upon request through the Annual Report.
- ADP and CDE will support prevention services founded upon scientifically based research that provides evidence that the services and/or the underlying theoretical framework may reduce illegal or inappropriate use of ATOD.
- ADP and CDE have jointly developed the state application and will administer the SDFSC programs or activities with meaningful and ongoing consultation with and input from parents.
- CDE will support LEAs in adopting programs and activities based on meaningful and ongoing consultation with and input from parents or guardians in the development of the application and administration of their program or activity. CDE will impose related program assurances through the LEA Consolidated

- Application. The Local Improvement Plan will require a narrative section describing how parents or guardians contributed to the development of the program, and how parents or guardians will be involved in the implementation of the proposed program.

a.*iii*. …Otherwise are in accordance with the purpose of Title IV, Part A.
[***Note***: The reauthorized provisions of the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) Program clearly emphasize well-coordinated SEA and Governors Program activities. The statute requires that significant parts of the program application be developed for each State's program, not for the SEA and Governors Programs individually. For this reason, each State must submit a single application for SDFSC SEA and Governors Program funds. States may choose to apply for SDFSC funding through this consolidated application or through a program-specific application.]

The Title IV, Part A portion of the state Consolidated State Application was jointly developed by CDE and ADP through an Inter-Agency Planning Team. This workgroup, comprised of members of both agencies, met on four occasions and conducted further work during intervening periods. Advice and comments from other state agency leaders and from networks of parents and students were incorporated into the Application. The Inter-Agency Planning Team will continue to meet throughout the life of the program and to solicit the involvement of other agency leaders, parents, and students.

In accordance with the purpose of Title IV, Part A:

- CDE Executive Committee, Leadership Team, and special meetings of administrators responsible for ESEA-funded programs will meet to

ensure that the ESEA-funded programs and State-level activities are coordinated.

- At a minimum annually, CDE and ADP (as the Governor's designee), Title IV administrators will hold meetings with other organizations such as businesses, IHEs, nonprofit organizations, and other Federal programs to discuss implementation of the Title IV plan and activities, and related issues.
- ADP prevention programs and services, in concert with those supported by CDE, will undergo periodic evaluation to assess progress toward reducing illegal or inappropriate use of ATOD. This state assessment will be informed by CDE data collection systems and will include LEA performance measures. Data are public and will be analyzed to make program quality improvements.
- CDE will ensure that LEA programs or activities undergo periodic evaluation to assess their progress toward reducing violence and illegal drug use based on adopted performance measures and indicators. The Local Improvement Plan will require a narrative section describing the local process.
- CDE will support a process by which LEAs may apply for a waiver of the requirement that programs must be based on scientific research providing evidence that the program to be used will reduce violence and drug use in order to allow innovative activities or programs that demonstrate substantial likelihood of success. The approval of Local Improvement Plans will be based on the proposed use of scientific validated programs and activities with proven effectiveness. In order to adopt innovative programs or activities, LEAs will be required to

submit a request for waiver to the State Board of Education. Waivers will not release the LEA from the obligation to implement all programs and activities proposed in the Local Improvement Plan.

b. Describe the State's performance measures for drug and violence prevention programs and activities to be funded under Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1. These performance measures must be focused on student behaviors and attitudes. They must consist of performance indicators for drug and violence prevention programs and activities and levels of performance for each performance indicator. The description must also include timelines for achieving the performance goals stated, details about what mechanism the State will use to collect data concerning the stated indicators, and provide baseline data for indicators (if available).

CDE proposes to adopt the following performance measures for drug and violence prevention programs and activities to be funded under Title IV, Part A. A level of performance for each performance indicator has been specified based on an anticipated progressive change in the prevalence reported for each indicator by students at three grade levels (7th, 9th, and 11th grades). Prevalence based performance levels are specified as a change in the percent of students reporting the behaviors or attitude identified by each specific indicator.

Alcohol and Other Drug Use Prevention Performance Indicators	Annual Performance Level Goal	1999 8th Biennial CA Student Survey Baseline Data
The percentage of students that think extremely frequent use (daily or almost daily) of marijuana is harmful will **increase** annually by:	7th 1.0 % 9th 1.0 % 11t 2.0 %	7th 80.5 % 9th 72.5 % 11th 61.6 %
The percentage of students that have used marijuana within the past 30 days will **decrease** annually by:	7th 1.0 % 9th 1.0 % 11th 1.0 %	7th 5.0 % 9th 12.7 % 11th 23.8 %
The percentage of students that have ever been drunk or high ***at school*** will **decrease** annually by:	7th 1.0 % 9th 1.0 % 11th 1.0 %	7th 3.9 % 9th 13.0 % 11th 26.7 %
The percentage of students that have used alcohol within the past 30 days will **decrease** annually by:	7th 1.0 % 9th 1.0 % 11th 2.0 %	7th 15.9 % 9th 29.2 % 11th 43.8 %
The percentage of students that have ever used marijuana will **decrease** annually by:	7th 1.0 % 9th 1.0 % 11th 2.0 %	7th 8.4 % 9th 23.8 % 11th 44.9 %
The percentage of students that have ever used inhalants will **decrease** annually by:	7th 1.0 % 9th 1.0 % 11th 2.0 %	7th 5.6 % 9th 8.0 % 11th 13.8 %

California school districts receive additional state funds to support tobacco prevention programs. Accordingly, the state establishes the following tobacco prevention performance indicators, as part of overall state goals and performance measures consistent with the purposes of the NCLB Title IV, Part A – SDFSC program.

Tobacco-Use Prevention **Performance Indicators**	**Annual Performance Level Goal**	**1999 8th Biennial CA Student Survey Baseline Data**
The percentage of students that think frequent use (daily or almost daily) of tobacco is harmful will **increase** annually by:	7th 1.0 % 9th 1.0 % 11th 1.0 %	7th 66.4 % 9th 62.4 % 11th 62.9 %
The percentage of students that have used tobacco ***at school*** within the past 30 days will **decrease** annually by:	7th 1.0 % 9th 1.0 % 11th 1.0 %	7th 3.9 % 9th 5.2 % 11th 6.8 %
The percentage of students that have used cigarettes within the past 30 days will **decrease** annually by:	7th 1.0 % 9th 1.0 % 11th 2.0 %	7th 6.9 % 9th 12.9 % 11th 21.3 %
The percentage of students that have used chewing tobacco or snuff within the past 30 days will **decrease** annually by:	7th 1.0 % 9th 1.0 % 11th 1.0 %	7th NA % 9th NA % 11th NA %
The percentage of students that have ever used cigarettes will **decrease** annually by:	7th 1.0 % 9th 1.0 % 11th 2.0 %	7th 9.4 % 9th 23.9 % 11th 41.4 %
The percentage of students that have ever used chewing tobacco or snuff will **decrease** annually by:	7th 1.0 9th 1.0 11th 1.0	7th 2.8 % 9th 5.7 % 11th 12.4 %

Incident based performance levels are specified as a change in the number of incidents reported by schools for the specific indicators listed below. A level of performance for each performance indicator has been specified based on an anticipated progressive change in the rate of incidence reported by each school district.

Safe Schools and Violence Prevention **Performance Indicators**	**Annual Performance Level Goal**	**1999 8th Biennial** **CA Student Survey** **Baseline Data**
The percentage of students that have been in a physical fight will **decrease** annually by:	7th 1.0 9th 1.0 11th 1.0	7th NA % 9th NA % 11th NA %
Safe Schools and Violence Prevention **Performance Indicators**	**Annual Performance Level Goal**	**2001 CA Safe Schools Assessment** **2000-01 Baseline Data**
The rate of violent criminal incidents (Crimes Against Persons) occurring on campus will **decline** annually by:	2%	5.54 / 1000
The number of weapons (firearms, knives, and other types of weapons) confiscated from students at school will **decline** annually by:	2%	1.58 / 1000
The rate of violent incidents (Crimes Against Persons) occurring on campus with certificated employees as victims will **decline** annually by:	2%	0.27 / 1000

The state will monitor performance level progress for prevalence-based indicators through the *Biennial Statewide Survey of California Students* (CSS). The CSS is used to assess substance use and other behaviors among California public and private secondary school students. The most recent CSS was administered to 12,777 students in grades 7, 9 and 11 from a randomly selected, representative sample of 115 schools. The CSS is integrated with the local school-based California Healthy Kids Survey (CHKS). Participation in the CHKS will be required of all school districts receiving Title IV, Part A – SDFSC grant funds. The CSS and CHKS integration ensure that data on a wide range of student alcohol, tobacco, and other drug use and violence related behavior, as well as data related to,

buffers, assets, and resilience traits is collected and aggregated at the state level. As a result of the CSS and CHKS merger the most recent survey administered provides a new baseline from which to continue monitoring adolescent health-related behavior.

The state will monitor performance level progress for incident-based indicators through the California Safe Schools Assessment (CSSA). The CSSA is the school crime reporting system implemented by the California Department of Education in accordance with California *Penal Code* Section 628 et seq. The purpose of CSSA is to provide objective information for local and state school officials to use in assessing the safety of public schools in California. With the exception of charter schools, all California public schools, school programs, school districts, and county offices of education serving kindergarten through grade twelve are required to collect data on and report incidents of school crime as defined by CSSA. The program offers training and technical assistance to all reporting agencies to ensure data are collected completely and consistently throughout the state. It also performs a three-part validation process to determine whether the data are reliable and to improve the statewide reporting system. Validation procedures include quality control of all forms submitted, site visits at selected reporting agencies, and a crosscheck of certain CSSA data with student suspension data. See “Baseline Data” charts which follow on the next page:

Baseline Data from the California Student Survey on State-Identified Substance-Use Performance Indicators

Trends in Current Use of Alcohol and Drugs (Past 30 Days), since 1995

	7th Grade			9th Grade			11th Grade		
	1995 (%)	1997 (%)	1999 (%)	1995 (%)	1997 (%)	1999 (%)	1995 (%)	1997 (%)	1999 (%)
Alcohol, any	23.2	21.7	—	39.2	37.5	—	47.7	46.9	—
Alcohol, drink	—	—	15.9	—	—	29.2	—	—	43.8
Marijuana	6.2	7.5	5.0	23.6	18.1	12.7	25.9	25.7	23.8

[a] In 1997 provided examples of types but in 1999 this was added to survey instructions to simplify the question. [b]1999 dropped reference to "or amphetamines." [c] Includes LSD.

Trends in Lifetime Use, since 1995

	7th Grade			9th Grade			11th Grade		
Drug	1995-96 (%)	1997-98 (%)	1999-00 (%)	1995-96 (%)	1997-98 (%)	1999-00 (%)	1995-96 (%)	1997-98 (%)	1999-00 (%)
Marijuana	10.9	11.3	8.4	35.0	32.8	23.8	46.9	46.3	44.9
Inhalants[a]	18.2	16.9	5.6	26.7	24.9	8.0	22.6	20.2	13.8
Ever drunk/high at school	7.6	8.3	3.9	23.3	19.9	13.0	32.1	31.3	26.7

[a] In 1997 provided examples of types but in 1999 this was added to survey instructions to simplify the question.
[b] In 1995 and 1997 read, "About how old were you the first time you did any of these things? …Had an alcoholic drink." In 1999, response changed to read "Had a full alcoholic drink."

Perceived Harm of Frequent and Occasion use of Alcohol and Marijuana

	Alcohol			Marijuana		
	7th (%)	9th (%)	11th (%)	7th (%)	9th (%)	11th (%)
Frequent Use						
Extremely Harmful	63.7	58.0	55.2	80.5	72.5	61.6
Harmful	21.8	26.0	27.6	10.7	15.9	18.8
Somewhat Harmful	8.5	10.7	12.0	3.7	5.9	11.3
Harmless[a]	6.1	5.3	5.2	5.1	5.7	8.3

Trends in Perceived Harm of Frequent Use of Alcohol and Cigarettes

Harmful ratings	Alcohol 7th (%)	Alcohol 9th (%)	Alcohol 11th (%)	Marijuana 7th (%)	Marijuana 9th (%)	Marijuana 11th (%)
Extremely Harmful						
1995-96	35.3	28.4	36.4	80.6[b]	64.1[b]	66.0[b]
1997-98	45.8	34.7	35.8	73.2	49.8	43.5
1999-00	63.7	58.0	55.2	80.5	72.5	**61.6**
Harmless[a]						
1995-96[a]	10.2	12.4	7.1	4.0	5.9	5.7
1997-98[a]	8.2	10.6	7.3	4.2	11.8	14.6
1999-00[a]	6.1	5.3	5.2	5.1	5.7	8.3

[a]Derived by combining the percentage of respondents who selected the "Mainly harmless" and "Harmless."
[b]1995, read “marijuana and other drugs”

Trends in Cigarette Smoking, since 1995

	7th Grade			9th Grade			11th Grade		
	1995 (%)	1997 (%)	1999 (%)	1995 (%)	1997 (%)	1999 (%)	1995 (%)	1997 (%)	1999 (%)
Lifetime									
Puff or more	30.5	25.5	23.5	50.6	52.2	41.4	60.1	56.4	58.0
Whole Cigarette	—	—	9.4	—	—	23.9	—	—	41.4
Smokeless Tobacco	8.1	6.7	2.8	13.9	9.7	5.7	21.3	14.9	12.4
Past 30 days									
Current smoking	15.2	13.4	6.9	28.2	29.0	12.9	30.5	29.3	21.3
Daily smoking	2.0	2.0	0.4	8.4	7.2	1.7	11.6	11.0	5.6
Smoking at school	—	—	3.9	—	—	5.2	—	—	6.8

In 1999 the item used to assess current cigarette smoking was changed from “In the last month, how often have you smoked tobacco cigarettes?” to “During the past 30 days, on how many days did you smoke cigarettes?”

Perceived Harm of Cigarettes

	Cigarettes 7th (%)	Cigarettes 9th (%)	Cigarettes 11th (%)
Frequent Use			
Extremely Harmful	66.4	62.4	62.9
Harmful	22.3	26.2	26.6
Somewhat Harmful	6.4	7.6	7.0
Harmless[a]	4.9	3.7	3.4

Harmful ratings	Cigarettes 7th (%)	9th (%)	11th (%)
Extremely Harmful			
1995-96[a]	42.8	32.4	41.6
1997-98[a]	49.9	40.5	43.4
1999-00[a]	66.4	62.4	62.9
Harmless[a]			
1995-96[a]	5.6	7.7	4.6
1997-98[a]	4.4	5.3	3.7
1999-00[a]	4.9	3.7	3.4

[a]Derived by combining the percentage of respondents who selected the "Mainly harmless" and "Harmless."
*Written parent consent required for participation.

c. Describe the steps the State will use to implement the Uniform Management Information and Reporting System (UMIRS) required by section 4112(c)(3). The description should include information about which agency(ies) will be responsible for implementing the UMIRS, a tentative schedule for implementing the UMIRS requirements, as well as preliminary plans for collecting required information.

CDE already collects most of the data requested through UMIRS. Data on the (ii) "frequency, seriousness, and incidence of violence and drug-related offenses resulting in suspensions and expulsions" is collected through the California Safe Schools Assessment (CSSA). Information regarding the "types of curricula, programs, and services provided by the chief executive officer, the state educational agency, local education agencies (LEAs) and other recipients of funds under this subpart" (iii) is collected through the LEA Annual Report. Data regarding the "incidence and prevalence, age of onset, perception of health risk, and perception of social disapproval of drug use and violence by youth…" (iv) are collected through the California Healthy Kids Survey. The one missing piece—truancy rates—will be added

to the LEA Annual Report. As part of that report, LEAs will be required to submit the number of truants on a school-by-school basis. Those numbers will then be divided by the enrollment figures for each school, resulting in the truancy rate by school.

Two CDE offices – the Healthy Kids Program Office and the Safe Schools and Violence Prevention Office – will be responsible for collecting and reporting the UMIRS data.

Timeline: Since all but one requirement of the UMIR System is already in place, California will have its UMIRS requirements complete by spring 2003. CDE will add the new truancy requirement to the 2002-03 LEA Annual Report that will go online in January 2003. LEAs will be required to submit their reports by June 2003.

[**Note**: As this Application is being written, the California State Legislature is considering a proposal to suspend the California Safe Schools Assessment for the 2003-04 year. During this year, CDE would redesign CSSA in view of the new UMIRS requirements. If this proposal is enacted, data collection on violence and drug-related offenses resulting in suspensions and expulsions will begin with the 2003-04 fiscal year.]

10. Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1, Section 4112(a)--Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities: Reservation of State Funds for the Governor

a. The Governor may reserve up to 20 percent of the State's allocation under this program to award competitive grants or contracts. Indicate the percentage of the State's allocation that is to be reserved for the Governor's program.

The Governor designates the Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs (ADP) to receive and administer the 20 percent of the State's SDFSC allocation.

b. The Governor may administer these funds directly or designate an appropriate State agency to receive the funds and administer this allocation. Provide the name of the entity designated to receive these funds, contact information for that entity (the name of the head of the designated agency, address, telephone number), and the "DUNS" number that should be used to award these funds.

- Contact information for Alcohol and Drug Programs:

  Kathryn P. Jett, Director

  California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs

  1700 K Street, 5th Floor

  Sacramento, CA 95814-4037

  (916) 445-1943

"DUNS" number: **949088447**

11. Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2, Section 4126--Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities: Community Service Grants

Describe how the SEA, after it has consulted with the Governor, will use program funds to develop and implement a community service program for suspended and expelled students.

The SEA, after it has consulted with the Governor, will use program funds to develop and implement a community service program for suspended and expelled students. In California, expelled students are transferred to community day schools or county community schools for rehabilitation. In addition, students with suspended expulsions may remain in continuation schools or comprehensive schools. Community service grants would allow greater numbers of these suspended or expelled students to participate in community service-learning programs in a comprehensive coordinated strategy. In collaboration with LEAs and community-based organizations (CBOs), entities receiving funds will develop a community service-learning component to their rehabilitation plans for students who are expelled or who are on suspended expulsions.

As provided in the statute, CDE is requesting funding to support "the integration of these program funds into a more comprehensive, coordinated strategy." CDE proposes that Community Service Grant funding will be allocated through an RFP process to community-based organizations (CBOs) and LEAs that are currently implementing district-wide community service-learning programs and to other CBOs and LEAs interested in offering community service-learning opportunities to suspended and

expelled youth. (Community service-learning is an instructional method that links community service experiences to classroom instruction by engaging students, teachers, and community members in collaborations that provide service to their communities while students learn the academic content standards.) These funds will be used to administer the contracts and to evaluate the program. Contractors will use funding to provide staff development for teachers and others, pay for staff time to develop lesson plans, and pay for materials and supplies necessary to conduct the community service-learning activities.

CDE will request a waiver to award subgrants to LEAs rather than contracts. Under California's contracting policy, it would be inappropriate to award contracts for the kind of activities that are proposed in this application. Contracts are used to procure specific goods and services that can be well defined and have a specific deliverable. The awarding of grants to support the kind of activities described in this Consolidated State Application is consistent with CDE's subgranting policy. If funding is provided directly to CBOs by CDE, then a contracting process may be appropriate.

A timeline for awarding contracts for the Community Service Grant Program appears below.

Timeline for Awarding Contracts for the Community Service Grant Program

DATE	ACTIVITY	LEAD
August-September ’02	Convene an RFP Workgroup and develop RFP	CDE
November ’02	Release RFP and conduct outreach workshops	CDE, in collaboration with Regional Leads and county offices of education
February-March ’03	Read, score, and award contracts	CDE, with partner agencies and field representatives

The CDE CalServe Initiative currently receives federal funding from the Corporation for National and Community Service (Learn and Serve America) to support community service-learning in K-12 LEAs across the state. One of the areas of great promise for this instructional strategy is its use with students of highest need. Research exists to suggest that this group of students will become more engaged in school and will demonstrate improved sense of self-esteem when they engage in community service-learning activities.

Subgrantees will provide service opportunities to suspended and expelled youth in which those youth give back to their communities while they engage in academic learning. Suspended youth will participate in community service-learning activities that are individualized to meet their personal and academic needs. For example, key among these academic needs is in the area of English-language arts. Working under the supervision of certificated staff, a student could develop a presentation to elementary youth that would advocate for the reduction of violence in the school or community. The presentation would be linked to specific content standards for writing and oral presentation. The writing produced by the student could be assessed and the student could be given course credit for completing the assignment. Students who are expelled from their regular LEA program can experience community service-learning activities as part of their reassigned instructional program.

This example brings together a number of community partners to turn traditional punitive community service (compensatory service) into a positive youth development opportunity that is a “win-win-win situation” for the student, school, and the community. Key among these community partners are the Volunteer Centers of California. Currently, the county-based Volunteer Centers provide a wide array of services to the youth targeted in this proposal. They are well placed to collaborate in the development and implementation of this kind of school/community-based program. The LEA will be responsible for identifying the personal and academic needs of the student and should collaborate with the community-based organization to develop appropriate community service-learning activities.

CDE has been in contact with the Governor's Office through the Office of the Secretary for Education. The Secretary's Office has reviewed and approved this proposal. CDE will consult with the Governor's Office prior to the development of the request for proposals.

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

Identify the percentage of students that participate in the 21st Century Community Learning Centers who meet or exceed the proficient level of performance on State assessments in reading and mathematics. The State must collect baseline data for the 2002-03 school year, and submit all of these data to the Department no later than early September 2003 by a date the Department will announce.

California will be able to identify the percentage of students participating in the 21st Century Community Learning Centers who meet or exceed the proficient level of performance on State assessments in reading and mathematics. California's comprehensive evaluation will require 21st CCLC grantees to submit annual data for evaluation, including measures for academic performance, attendance, and behavioral changes. The required academic performance data will include student level data from the annual Standardized Testing And Reporting (STAR) program.

It is anticipated that the first cohort of 21st CCLC grantees will begin implementation sometime during the 2002-2003 school year. CDE will collect the relevant baseline data for the 2002-2003 school year through the evaluation reports due in fall 2003. Testing will have occurred in California schools during spring 2003, and results will be available to schools during summer 2003. CDE will ask the schools to make a priority of aggregating

the STAR testing results on students participating in the 21st CCLC, and then submitting the data to CDE. CDE will then aggregate the data and submit it to USDE no later than early September 2003, or by a date USDE will announce.

13. Title V, Part A--Innovative Programs

a. In accordance with section 5112(a)(1) of the ESEA, provide the SEA's formula for distributing program funds to LEAs. Include information on how the SEA will adjust its formula to provide higher per-pupil allocations to LEAs that have the greatest numbers or percentages of children whose education imposes a higher-than-average cost per child, such as--

i. Children living in areas with concentrations of economically disadvantaged families;
ii. Children from economically disadvantaged families; and,
iii. Children living in sparsely populated areas….

In accordance with Section 5112(a)(1) of the NCLB Act of 2001, the following formula (see below for the Title V formula) is used to distribute funds to LEAs. The funds to support Title V, Part A Innovative Programs are distributed on a formula basis to LEAs through the California Consolidated Programs Funding Application. This application contains information related to entitlements, allocations, and numbers of participants in the Title V Innovative Program. Funds made available to LEAs can be used for any of the 27 innovative assistance programs listed in Section 5131 of the NCLB Act of 2001.

Title V Formula

California will use a point system to distribute the local assistance portion of its Title V, Part A allocation. LEAs receive one point for each of their public

schools students and one point for each student enrolled in a private nonprofit school that participates in programs or projects under Title V. The calculation is based on the prior year's enrollment. One point is assigned for each enrolled student, and additional points (ranging from 1 to 3.5) are assigned on the basis of quartile rankings of CalWORKs and/or Free and Reduced Price Meals student. This approach meets the requirement to provide local assistance to LEAs that have "the greatest percentage of children whose education imposes a higher than average cost per child."

The sum of points for each LEA is multiplied by a statewide allocation. The rate is determined by dividing the total local assistance portion of the state's Title V allocation by the total number of LEA points in the state. Each LEA's entitlement is subsequently determined by multiplying its number of points by the statewide allocation. The point rate for fiscal year 2001-02 was $4.35. The federal allocation for Title V for 2002-03 will be the same as in the previous year. Therefore the point rate will remain about the same depending on the number of student participants.

Finally, to assist districts located in sparsely populated regions or that have very small student enrollment, a minimum funding level or "floor" is applied so that no LEA will receive less than $3,889. State Agency special schools however are not "floored."

iv. Identify the amount the State will reserve for State-level activities under section 5121, and describe the activity.

The state-level activities will support statewide education reform programs, the implementation of challenging state academic achievement standards, and other school improvement programs to assist local educational agencies (NCLB Act, Section 5121, State Uses of Funds). The activities listed below are consistent with the ESEA Performance Goals. California will reserve an amount for state-level activities for 2002-03 that is similar to the amount for 2001-02 ($585,000). The following types of projects or similar projects will be supported by these funds:

- Private Schools Project: to support a Statewide Private School Advisory Committee and professional development activities for teachers and administrators in private schools. ESEA Performance Goal # 3;
- Constitutional Rights Foundations: to provide civic education programs and materials for students and professional development for teachers. ESEA Performance Goals #3 and #4;
- Center for Law Related Education: to provide professional development activities and materials related to law related education curriculum for teachers and administrators that are aligned to state standards and state adopted curriculum documents. ESEA Performance Goals #3 and #4.

14. Title VI, Part A, Subpart 1, Section 6111—State Assessments Formula Grants

Describe how the State plans to use formula funds awarded under section 6113(b)(1) for the development and implementation of State assessments in accordance with section 6111(1) and (2).

The State plans to use the formula grant under Title VI, Part A, Subpart 1, Section 6111 to continue the refinement of the statewide assessment system currently in place. These efforts will include investing in standards-aligned assessments required under Title I, including the development of a new fifth grade science assessment and continuing improvement of the California English Language Development Test. The State also intends to use Title VI funds to improve and expand data collection in order to meet the requirements of NCLB. Funds will support the development of a longitudinal data system on student achievement through the use of a unique student identifier. In addition, funds are proposed to improve the collection of quality data as part of alternative assessments for students otherwise unable to be tested, and the State's alternative accountability model.

The California Legislature is currently considering these funds as a part of the state budget. At the time of this writing, the State Board of Education and California Department of Education anticipate appropriation of these funds consistent with the proposals described herein.

15. Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2--Rural and Low-Income School Program

a. Identify the SEA's specific measurable goals and objectives related to increasing student academic achievement; decreasing student dropout rates; or improvement in other educational factors the SEA may elect to measure, and describe how Rural and Low-Income School Program funds will help the SEA meet the goals and objectives identified.

The focus of accountability is an increase in student achievement. After the third year of participation in the Rural and Low-Income School Program, the state must determine whether the LEA has made adequate yearly progress. Contingent upon USDE approval, California's determination of AYP for fiscal year 2002-03 will be consistent with meeting the AYP targets as measured by the State's Academic Performance Index. This approach to AYP will be revised, based on negotiations with USDE following the submission of this application.

b. Describe how the State elects to make awards under the Rural and Low-Income School Program:

i. By formula proportionate to the numbers of students in eligible districts;

ii. Competitively (please explain any priorities for the competition); or

iii. By a State-designed formula that results in equal or greater assistance being awarded to school districts that serve higher concentrations of poor students.

(Note: If a State elects this option, the formula must be submitted for ED approval. States that elect this option may submit their State-designed formulas for approval as part of this submission.)

CDE intends to distribute awards under the Rural and Low-Income School Program to the 80 eligible districts by ADA proportionate to the numbers of students in each eligible district. These districts will be tracked for adequate yearly progress over three years. Continued participation will be dependent on districts meeting their AYP growth targets. CDE will take steps to ensure

that all children served by this program are part of the statewide accountability system.

GEPA (General Education Provisions Act), Section 427

All applicants for new awards must include information in their applications to address GEPA, Section 427 in order to receive funding under this program. GEPA 427 requires a description of the steps the applicant proposes to take to ensure equitable access to, and participation in, its Federally-assisted programs for students, teachers, and other program beneficiaries with special needs. For a State-formula grant program, a State needs to provide this description only for projects or activities that it carries out with funds reserved for State-level uses. In addition, local school districts or other eligible applicants that apply to the State for funding need to provide this description in their applications to the State for funding. The State would be responsible for ensuring that they school district or other local entity has submitted a sufficient section 427 to the State.

Section 427 of GEPA requires that this Consolidated State Application for federal funding includes a description of the steps the State proposes to take to ensure equitable access to, and participation in, its federally assisted programs.

The activities that California will use to ensure equitable access include the following:

1. Revisit and readopt, modify, or replace a comprehensive vision statement adopted by the SBE in November 1995 that states:

   "All California students of the 21st Century will attain the highest level of academic knowledge, applied learning and performance skills

to ensure fulfilling personal lives and careers, and contribute to civic and economic progress in our diverse and changing democratic society."

2. Ensure that the instructional resources used in California's public schools comply with Education Code sections 60040-60044 as well as SBE guidelines in the document, "Standards for Evaluation of Instructional Materials with Respect to Social Content." An extensive review process is used by SBE to ensure that all instructional resources used in California will "portray in a realistic manner democratic values, cultural pluralism, and diversity of our population."

3. Use the "Integrated Programs Items" of the State's Coordinated Compliance Review process to ensure that multifunded students (i.e., those participating in state and federally supported programs) are receiving the district's core curriculum and instructional delivery as well as support from supplementary funds to help them master standards. Reviewers to examine the core curriculum and standards, analyze the sequential nature of supplementary services, and determine whether students are receiving a coherent and coordinated program. This review will focus on SBE-adopted curriculum standards, frameworks, and instructional materials; and on SBE-approved training.

4. Ensure that eligible students in California have equitable access to and participation in federally assisted programs that:

- actively promote the belief that every student can succeed in school;
- support measurable, high quality, rigorous standards and assessments to define what students should know and be able to do;
- provide access for all students to high quality teachers;
- support dropout prevention and recovery efforts so that all students can remain in school and attain expected levels of performance;
- establish strong linkages among parents, families, and the school community that result in partnerships that help in meeting the needs of a diverse student population;
- recruit and retain highly qualified and effective teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals;
- provide increased opportunities for parents to make decisions about their child's educational options, including choice and supplemental services, enabling them to assume greater responsibility in the education of their children;
- provide safe, secure, clean, well-lit, and drug free schools where children have the opportunity to learn and adults can teach; and
- provide assistance to LEAs that results in the consolidation and coordination of various State and federally funded programs to promote the integrated delivery of services to students.

Consolidated Administrative Funds

1.a. Does the SEA plan to consolidate State-level administrative funds?
If yes, please provide information and analysis concerning Federal and other funding that demonstrates that Federal funds constitute less than half of the funds used to support the SEA….

The SBE is the state education agency under current procedures of the USDE. $112 million of federal funds support the SEA in the California Department of Education. $80 million of state funds support the rest of CDE operations. In addition to the $80 million in state funds, another $55.9 million is provided to support the state-level activities directed by or aligned with the goals of the SEA as follows:

Teacher recruitment centers	$ 9.4 million
Student Information System implementation	16.1 million
School district fiscal oversight	6.0 million
School administrator training	1.6 million
STAR/CAHSEE test development	12.0 million
Fiscal crisis and management assistance	4.0 million
Assessment review and reporting	3.8 million
CAHSEE workbook development	3.0 million

In the past with CDE applying as the SEA, California operated under a waiver for consolidating funding. With clarification that the State Board of Education is the SEA, we believe a broader review and inclusion of funding sources is appropriate, as specified above. Although the State Board of Education has authorized a request for a waiver to allow consolidation of funding as was done in the past, the State Board does not believe that this waiver is necessary in light of the total funding available to support state

operations. The SBE and CDE will reply to any requests for additional information on consolidated funding.

…If yes, are there any programs whose funds are available for administration that the SEA will not consolidate?

Yes. Funds available for administration that CDE will not consolidate:

- Title I, Part B, Subpart 1 Reading First State Grants
- Title V, Part B, Subpart 1 Charter Schools
- Title VI, Part A, Subpart 1 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities
- Title X, Part C, Subtitle B McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

b. Please describe your plans for any additional uses of funds

CDE plans to use additional funds for:

- the fulfillment of administrative requirements associated with new programs such as Title III English Language, Reading First, 21st Century Community Learning Centers and Improving Teacher Quality;
- additional workload associated with competitive grant increases such as Charter Schools, Enhancing Education Through technology, Even Start, etc.;
- low-performing school support activities;
- state interventions and sanctions;
- data collection and validation activities;
- developing alternative assessment instruments; and
- integrating state and new federal accountability requirements.

Transferability

Does the State plan to transfer non-administrative State-level ESEA funds under the provisions of the State and Local Transferability Act (sections 6121 to 6123 of the ESEA)? If so, please list the funds and the amounts and percentages to be transferred, the program from which funds are to be transferred, and the program into which funds are to be transferred.

Note: If the State elects to notify ED of the transfer in this document, the plan described in response to provisions of appendix B should be that in effect after the transfer. If the State does not plan to transfer funds at this time, it may do so at a later date. To do so, the State must (1) establish an effective date for the transfer, (2) notify the Department (at least 30 days before the effective date of the transfer) of its intention to transfer funds, and (3) submit the resulting changes to the plan as discussed in this appendix C by 30 days after the effective date of the transfer.

If CDE staff correctly interprets the transferability section of the law, then California is permitted to transfer up to 50 percent of the non-administrative funds allocated to the state for state-level activities between the following programs:

- Improving Teacher Quality
- State and Local Technology Grants
- Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities
- 21st Century Community Learning Centers
- Title V Innovative Programs

Further, staff understands that the reference to non-administrative state level dollars pertains to the set-aside provisions for technical assistance, evaluations, and so forth.

It is CDE's understanding that the state may also transfer funding from the aforementioned programs to Title I; however, it is unclear to staff if these must go out on a formula basis or if they can be used for school support purposes.

At this time, California does not intend to take advantage of the transferability provision *but retains the option of electing to do so at a later date*. (Final decision must be deferred until the California State Legislature and the California Department of Finance make final decisions regarding CDE augmentation requests.)

ASSURANCES and CERTIFICATIONS

The Consolidated State Application Signature Page, signed by the authorized representative of the State Board of Education, certifies California's agreement to the following sets of assurances, the crosscutting certification, and the requirements of GEPA, Section 427.

GENERAL AND CROSS-CUTTING ASSURANCES

In accordance with Section 9304(a), California herewith submits to the US Secretary of Education a single set of assurances, applicable to each program included in the Consolidated State Application. We assure that:

1. Each such program will be administered in accordance with all applicable statutes, regulations, program plans, and applications;
2. The control of funds provided under each such program and title to property acquired with program funds will be in a public agency, a nonprofit private agency, institution, or organization, or an Indian tribe, if the law authorizing the program provides for assistance to those entities; and
3. The public agency, nonprofit private agency, institution, or organization, or Indian tribe will administer those funds and property to the extent required by the authorizing law;
4. The State will adopt and use proper methods of administering each such program, including—

a. The enforcement of any obligations imposed by law on agencies, institutions, organizations, and other recipients responsible for carrying out each program;
b. The correction of deficiencies in program operations that are identified through audits, monitoring, or evaluation; and
c. The adoption of written procedures for the receipt and resolution of complaints alleging violations of law in the administration of the programs;

5. The State will cooperate in carrying out any evaluation of each such program conducted by or for the Secretary or other Federal officials;
6. The State will use such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as will ensure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State under each such program;
7. The State will—
   a. Make reports to the Secretary as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to perform the Secretary's duties under each such program; and
   b. Maintain such records, provide such information to the Secretary, and afford such access to the records as the Secretary may find necessary to carry out the Secretary's duties; and
   c. Before the plan or application was submitted to the Secretary, the State afforded a reasonable opportunity for public comment on the plan or application and considered such comment.

ESEA Program Specific Assurances

California herewith provides an assurance that it will comply with all requirements of the ESEA programs included in their consolidated applications, whether or not the program statute identifies these requirements as a description or assurance that States would address, absent this consolidated application, in a program-specific plan or application. California will maintain records of its compliance with each of those requirements. (Note: For the Safe and Drug Free Schools programs, California has all appropriate assurances from the Governor on record.)

Through the general assurance and assurance (1) in section 9304 (a), California agrees to comply with all requirements of the ESEA and other applicable program statutes. California agrees to the key requirements of each program specified by USDE in the Consolidate State Application package of May 7, 2002, and those required elsewhere in law. While the following list of program-specific requirements is not exhaustive, California herewith provides a general assurance of:

1. **Title I, Part A – Improving Basic Programs Operated By LEAs**

California herewith assures that:

a. The State plan for the implementation of Title I, Part A was developed in consultation with LEAs, teachers, principals, pupil services personnel, administrators, other staff and parents and that the plan for Title I, Part A coordinates with other programs under this Act, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Carl D. Perkins

Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998, the Head Start Act, the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, and the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act.

b. The SEA has a plan for assisting LEAs and schools to develop capacity to comply with program operation and for providing additional educational assistance to students needing help to achieve State standards, including:
   i. the use of schoolwide programs;
   ii. steps to ensure that both schoolwide program and targeted assisted program schools have highly qualified staff (section 1111);
   iii. ensuring that assessments results are used by LEAs, schools, and teachers to improve achievement (section 1111);
   iv. use of curricula aligned with state standards (section 1111);
   v. provision of supplemental services, including a list of approved service providers and standards and techniques for monitoring the quality and effectiveness of services (section1116);
   vi. choice and options (section 1116);
   vii. the state support system under section 1117; and
   viii. teacher and paraprofessional qualifications (section 1119).

c. The State has a strategy for ensuring that children served by Title I, Part A will be taught the same knowledge and skills in other subjects and held to the same expectations as all children.

d. The State will implement the accountability requirements of section 1116(f) regarding schools identified for improvement prior to the passage of NCLB.
e. The State will implement the provisions of section 1116 regarding LEAs and schools in improvement and corrective action.
f. The State will produce and disseminate an annual State Report Card in accordance with section 1111(h)(1) and will ensure that LEAs that receive Title I, Part A funds produce and disseminate annual local Report Cards in accordance with section 1111(h)(2).
g. The SEA will ensure that LEAs will annually assess English skills for all limited-English proficient students.
h. The SEA will coordinate with other agencies that provide services to children, youth and families to address factors that have significantly affected the achievement of students.
i. The SEA will ensure that assessment results are promptly provided to LEAs, schools, and teachers.
j. The State will participate in State academic assessments of 4th and 8th grade reading and mathematics under NAEP if the Secretary pays the cost of administering such assessments, and will ensure that schools drawn for the NAEP sample will participate in all phases of these assessments, including having results published.
k. The SEA, in consultation with the Governor, will produce a plan for carrying out the responsibilities of the State under sections 1116 and 1117, and the SEA's statewide system for technical assistance and support of LEAs.

l. The SEA will assist LEAs in developing or identifying high-quality curricula aligned with State academic achievement standards and will disseminate such curricula to each LEA and local school within the State.

m. The State will carry out the assurances specified in section 1111(c).

Title I, Part B – Even Start Family Literacy

California herewith assures that:

a. The SEA will meet its indicators of program quality developed in section 1240.

b. The SEA will help each project under this part to fully implement the program elements described in section 1235, including the monitoring of the projects' compliance with staff qualification requirements and usage of instructional programs based on scientifically based reading research for children and adults.

c. The SEA collaborated with early childhood specialists, adult education specialists, and others at the State and local level with interests in family literacy in the development and implementation of this plan.

Title I, Part C – Education of Migrant Children

In addition to meeting the seven program assurances in Section 1304(c), California herewith assures that–

a. Special educational needs of migratory children, including preschool migratory children, are identified and addressed through

– (a) the full range of services that are available for migratory children from appropriate local, State, and Federal educational programs; (b) joint planning among local, State, and Federal educational programs serving migrant children, including language instruction educational programs under part A or B of title III; and (c) the integration of services available under this part with services provided by those other programs, a (d) measurable program goals and outcomes.

b. State and its local operating agencies will identify and address the special educational needs of migratory children in accordance with a comprehensive State plan as specified in section 1306 (a).
c. State will provide for educational continuity through the timely transfer of pertinent school records in a manner consistent with procedures the Secretary may require.

Title I, Part D – Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent or At-Risk

California herewith assures that the State –

a. Will ensure that programs will be carried out in accordance with the State plan.
b. Will carry out the evaluation requirements of section 1431.
c. Has collaborated with parents, correctional facilities, local education agencies, public and private business and other state and federal technical and vocational programs in developing and

implementing its plan to meet the educational needs of neglected, delinquent, and at-risk children and youth.

d. Conducts a process to award Subpart 2 subgrants, to programs operated by local education agencies and correctional facilities.
e. Will integrate programs and services for neglected, delinquent, and at-risk children and youth with other programs under this Act or other Acts.

Title I, Part F – Comprehensive School Reform

California herewith assures that the State will --

a. Fulfill all requirements relating to the competitive subgranting of program funds.
b. Awards subgrants of not less than $50,000 and of sufficient size and scope to support the initial costs of the program.
c. Award subgrants renewable for 2 additional one-year periods if the school is making substantial progress.
d. Consider the equitable distribution of subgrants to different geographic regions in the State, including urban and rural areas and to schools serving elementary and secondary students.
e. Reserve not more than five (5) percent of grant funds for administrative, evaluation, and technical assistance expenses.
f. Use funds to supplement, and not supplant, any other funds that would otherwise be available to carry out these activities.
g. Report subgrant information, including names of LEAs and schools, amount of award, and description of award.
h. Provide a copy of the State's annual program evaluation.

Title II, Part A – Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund

California herewith assures that –

a. The SEA will take steps to ensure compliance with the requirements for "professional development" as the term is defined in section 9101(34).
b. All funded activities will be developed collaboratively and based on the input of teachers, principals, administrators, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel.
c. The SEA will implement the provisions for technical assistance and accountability in section 2141 with regard to any LEA that has failed to make adequate yearly progress for two or more consecutive years.

Title II, Part D – Enhanced Education Through Technology

California herewith assures that the State --

a. Will ensure that each subgrant awarded under section 2412 (a)(2)(B) is of sufficient size and duration, and that the program funded by the subgrant is of sufficient scope and quality, to carry out the purposes of this part effectively.
b. Has in place a State Plan for Educational Technology that meets all of the provisions of section 2413 of ESEA.

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

California herewith assures that --

a. Subgrantees will be required to use their subgrants to build their capacity to continue to provide high-quality language instruction educational programs for LEP students once the subgrants are no longer available.
b. The State will consult with LEAs, education-related community groups and non-profit organizations, parents, teachers, school administrators, and researchers in developing annual measurable student achievement objectives for subgrantees.
c. Each subgrantee will include in its plan a certification that all teachers in a Title III language instruction educational program for limited English proficient children are fluent in English and any other language used for instruction.
d. In awarding subgrants to eligible entities that have experienced a recent significant increase in the percentage or number of immigrant students, the State will equally consider eligible entities that have limited or no experience in serving immigrant children and youth, and consider the quality of each local plan.
e. Subgrants will be of sufficient size and scope to support high-quality programs.

f. Subgrantees will be required to provide for an annual reading or language arts assessment in English of all children who have been in the United States for three or more consecutive years.
g. Subgrantees will be required to assess annually the English proficiency of all LEP children.
h. A subgrantee plan will not be in violation of any State law, including State constitutional law, regarding the education of LEP children.
i. Subgrantee evaluations will be used to determine and improve the effectiveness of subgrantee programs and activities.
j. Subgrantee evaluations will include a description of the progress made by children in meeting State academic content and student academic achievement standards for each of the two years after these children no longer participate in a Title III language instruction educational program.
k. A subgrantee that fails to make progress toward meeting annual measurable achievement objectives for two consecutive years will be required to develop an improvement plan that will ensure the subgrantee meets those objectives.
l. Subgrantees will be required to provide the following information to parents of LEP children selected for participation in a language instruction educational program:
    1) How the program will meet the educational needs of their children;

2) Their options to decline to enroll their children in that program or to choose another program, if available;
3) If applicable, the failure of the subgrantee to make progress on the annual measurable achievement objectives for their children.

m. In awarding subgrants, the State will address the needs of school systems of all sizes and in all geographic areas within the State, including school systems with urban and rural schools.

Title IV, Part A – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities

California herewith assures that --

a. The State has developed a comprehensive plan for the use of funds by the State educational agency and the chief executive officer of the State to provide safe, orderly, and drug-free schools and communities through programs and activities that complement and support activities of local educational agencies under section 4115(b), that comply with the principles of effectiveness under section 4115(a), and that otherwise are in accordance with the purpose of this part.
b. Activities funded under this program will foster a safe and drug-free learning environment that supports academic achievement.
c. The application was developed in consultation and coordination with appropriate State officials and others, including the chief executive officer, the chief State school officer, the head of the State alcohol and drug abuse agency, the heads of the State health

and mental health agencies, the head of the State child welfare agency, the head of the State board of education, or their designees, and representatives of parents, students, and community-based organizations.

d. Funds reserved under section 4112(a) will not duplicate the efforts of the State education agency and local educational agencies with regard to the provisions of school-based drug and violence prevention activities and that those funds will be used to serve populations not normally served by the State educational agencies and local educational agencies and populations that need special services, such as school dropouts, suspended and expelled students, youth in detention centers, runaway or homeless children and youth, and pregnant and parenting youth.

e. The State will cooperate with, and assist, the Secretary in conducting data collection as required by section 4122.

f. LEAs in the State will comply with the provisions of section 9501 pertaining to the participation of private school children and teachers in the programs and activities under this program.

g. Funds under this program will be used to increase the level of State, local, and other non-Federal funds that would, in the absence of funds under this subpart, be made available for programs and activities authorized under this program, and in no case supplant such State, local, and other non-Federal funds.

h. A needs assessment was conducted by the State for drug and violence prevention programs, which shall be based on ongoing State evaluation activities, including data on the incidence and

prevalence of illegal drug use and violence among youth in schools and communities, including the age of onset, the perception of health risks, and the perception of social disapproval among such youth, the prevalence of protective factors, buffers, or assets and other variables in the school and community identified through scientifically based research.

i. The State will develop and implement procedures for assessing and publicly reporting progress toward meeting the performance measures.

j. The State application will be available for public review after submission of the application.

k. Special outreach activities will be carried out by the SEA and the chief executive officer of the State to maximize the participation of community-based organizations of demonstrated effectiveness that provide services such as mentoring programs in low-income communities.

l. Funds will be used by the SEA and the chief executive officer of the State to support, develop, and implement community-wide comprehensive drug and violence prevention planning and organizing activities.

m. The State will develop a process for review of applications from local educational agencies that includes receiving input from parents.

Title IV, Part B – 21st Century Community Learning Centers

California herewith assures that the State will –

a. Write the State application in consultation and coordination with appropriate State officials, including the chief State school officer, and other State agencies administering before and after school programs, the heads of the State health and mental health agencies or their designees, and representatives of teachers, parents, students, the business community, and community-based organizations.
b. Award subgrants of not less than three years and not more than five years that are of not less than $50,000 and of sufficient size and scope to support high quality, effective programs.
c. Fund entities that propose to serve students who primarily attend schools eligible for school-wide programs under section 1114 or schools that serve a high percentage of students from low-income families, and the families of such students.
d. Require local applicants to submit a plan describing how community learning centers to be funded through this grant will continue after the grant period.
e. Require local applicants to describe in their applications how the transportation needs of participating students will be addressed.

Title V, Part A – Innovative Programs

California herewith assures that --

a. The State has set forth the allocation of funds required to implement section 5142 (participation of children enrolled in private schools).
b. The State has made provision for timely public notice and public dissemination of the information concerning allocations of funds required to implement provisions for assistance to students attending private schools.

Apart from providing technical and advisory assistance and monitoring compliance with this part, the SEA has not exercised, and will not exercise, any influence in the decision making processes of LEAs as to the expenditure made pursuant to the LEAs' application for program funds submitted under section 5133.

Certification of Compliance with Unsafe School Choice Option Requirements

California herewith certifies that it has established and implemented a statewide policy requiring that students attending persistently dangerous public elementary or secondary schools, as determined by the State (in consultation with a representative sample of local educational agencies), or who become victims of violent criminal offenses, as determined by State law, while in or on the grounds of public elementary and secondary schools that the students attend, be allowed to attend safe public elementary or secondary schools within the local educational agency, including a public charter school.

California's policy pertaining to "persistently dangerous schools" was adopted by the SBE on May 30, 2002.

ADDENDUM

Abbreviations Key

ABBREVIATIONS KEY

ADP	Alcohol and Drug Prevention
API	Academic Performance Index
ATOD	alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs
AYP	adequate yearly progress
BTSA	Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment
CAC	Comprehensive Assistance Center
CA-ESPIRS	California Even Start Performance Information Reporting System
CAHSEE	California High School Exit Examination
CASAS	Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System
CBEDS	California Basic Educational Data System
CBO	community-based organization
CCR	Coordinated Compliance Review
CCSESA	California County Superintendents Educational Service Areas

CCSSO	Council of Chief State School Officers
CCTC or CTC	California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
CDE	California Department of Education
CELDT	California English Language Development Test
CHKS	California Healthy Kids Survey
CLRN	California Learning Resources Network
COE	county offices of education
CPEC	California Postsecondary Education Commission
CSIS	California School Information System
CSR or CSRD	Comprehensive School Reform
CSS	Biennial Statewide Survey of California Students
CSSA	California Safe Schools Assessment
CST	California Standards Test(s)
CTAP	California Technology Assistance Project

CTAP2	California Technology Assistance Project Technology Assessment Profile
DRDP	Desired Results for Children Development Profile
E rate	a telecommunications discount for schools and libraries
EETT	Enhancing Education Through Technology
EHCY	Education for Homeless Children and youth
ELP	English Language Proficient
ESL	English as a Second Language
GED	General Education Development equivalency diploma
HSASPO	Healthy Start and After School Partnerships Office
IASA	Improving America's Schools Act
IDEA	Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
IHE	institution of higher education
II/USP	Immediate Intervention and Underperforming Schools Program
LEA	local education agency
LEP	Limited English Proficient

MEES	Migrant Education Even Start
MEIO	Migrant Education/International Office
MEPSIS	Migrant Education Program Student Information System
N or D	neglected or delinquent
NCLB	No Child Left Behind (ESEA Reauthorization of 2001)
OLE	Optimal Learning Experience Project
PASS	Portable Assisted Study Sequence Program
PAT	Parents as Teachers program
PD	professional development
PI	Program Improvement school
PSAA	Public Schools Accountability Act
RSSIC	Regular School Support and Implementation Centers
RFA	request for applications
RFP	request for proposals
S4	Schoolwide System of School Support

SAHE	state agency for higher education
SAIT	School Assistance and Intervention Team
SAT	Scholastic Audit Team
SAT9	Stanford Achievement Test, Ninth Edition
SBE	State Board of Education of California
SDFSC	Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities
SEA	state education agency
SNOR	Student National Origin Report
STAR	State Testing and Reporting system
SWP	Schoolwide Program
TechSETS	Technical Support for Education Technology in Schools
TICAL	Technology Information Center for Administrative Leadership
21stCCLC	Twenty-first Century Community Learning Centers
UMIRS	Uniform Management Information and Reporting System
USDE	United States Department of Education