# **California ESSA State Plan Glossary**

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

| **Acronym/Term** | **Definition** |
| --- | --- |
| ***CalEDFacts*** | *CalEDFacts* is a compilation of statistics and information on a variety of issues concerning education in California.  <http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/pn/fb/> |
| **California School Dashboard** | The California School Dashboard (Dashboard) is a Web site released in March 2017 that parents/guardians, educators, and the public can use to see how districts and schools are meeting the needs of California's diverse student population based on the concise set of measures included in the new accountability system, including test scores, graduation rates, English learner progress, and suspension rates. Additionally, the Dashboard includes reporting and evaluation of local indicators. The Dashboard is part of California's new school accountability system based on the Local Control Funding Formula, enacted in 2013. As provisioned in California *Education Code*, the Dashboard will be used to support local educational agencies (LEAs) in identifying strengths, weaknesses, and areas for improvement; to assist in determining whether LEAs and schools are eligible for technical assistance; and to assist the state in determining whether LEAs and schools are eligible for more intensive support/intervention.  <http://www.caschooldashboard.org/> |
| **CAASPP** | The California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) System was established on January 1, 2014. The CAASPP System replaced the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program, which became inoperative on July 1, 2013. The CAASPP system includes the Smarter Balanced summative assessments for English language arts/literacy and mathematics, the California Science Tests, the reading/language arts standards-based Tests in Spanish, and the California Alternative Assessments.  <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ca/> |
| **CCEE** | The California Collaborative for Educational Excellence (CCEE) was established pursuant to California *Education Code* Section 52074, which states that “[t]he purpose of the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence is to advise and assist school districts, county superintendents of schools, and charter schools in achieving the goals set forth in a local control and accountability plan.” The CCEE is a public agency that is governed by a five-member governing board composed of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction (or his or her designee), the president of the State Board of Education (or his or her designee), a county superintendent of schools appointed by the Senate Committee on Rules, a superintendent of a school district appointed by the Governor, and a teacher appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly.  <http://ccee-ca.org/> |
| **CDE** | The California Department of Education (CDE) oversees the state's diverse and dynamic public school system, which is responsible for the education of more than seven million children and young adults in more than 10,000 schools. The CDE and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction are responsible for enforcing education law and regulations and for continuing to reform and improve public elementary school programs, secondary school programs, adult education, expanded learning programs, and some preschool and child care programs. The CDE's mission is to provide a world-class education for all students, from early childhood to adulthood. The CDE serves the state by innovating and collaborating with educators, schools, parents, and community partners, preparing students to live, work, and thrive in a highly connected world.  <http://www.cde.ca.gov/> |
| **COE** | There are 58 county offices of education (COEs) in California that provide services to the state’s school districts. COEs have elected governing boards and are administered by elected or appointed county superintendents. The county superintendent is responsible for examining and approving school district budgets and expenditures and for reviewing and approving Local Control and Accountability Plans. COEs support school districts by performing tasks that can be done more efficiently and economically at the county level. COEs provide or help formulate new curricula, staff development and training programs, and instructional procedures; design business and personnel systems; and perform many other services to meet changing needs and requirements. When economic or technical conditions make county or regional services most appropriate for students, COEs provide a wide range of services, including special and vocational education, programs for youths at risk of failure, and instruction in juvenile detention facilities. In addition, several statutes give COEs responsibility for monitoring districts for adequate textbooks, facilities, and teacher qualifications.  <http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/sd/co/coes.asp> |
| **CPAG** | The California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG) provides input to the State Board of Education (SBE) on ongoing efforts to establish a single coherent local, state, and federal accountability system. This advisory committee also serves as the state’s committee of practitioners under Title I requirements. The purpose of this advisory committee is to provide input to the SBE on practical implications of decisions before the SBE, which includes providing input on decisions related to implementing the state's Local Control Funding Formula. The committee also reviews any state rules and regulations relating to Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act, in order to advise the state in carrying out its Title I responsibilities.  <http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/cc/cp/> |
| **CSMP** | The California Subject Matter Project (CSMP) is a network of nine discipline-based statewide projects that support on-going quality professional development. Activities and programs are designed by university faculty, teacher leaders, and teacher practitioners to improve instructional practices that lead to increased achievement for all students. The CSMP encompasses the course content represented in California’s K–12 standards and frameworks, and covers all of the academic disciplines required to meet college entrance (“a–g”) requirements. After completing a program, teachers are offered ongoing education resources and support through professional communities, and further, programs cultivate and emphasize teacher leadership. CSMP programs support teachers’ implementation of standards and literacy strategies in order to nurture the academic skills of English learners and students with low literacy and content area skills. The CSMP bolsters the state’s efforts to incorporate the new standards and assessments, while also addressing the needs of California’s diverse students to ensure they acquire the requisite content knowledge to succeed in college and beyond or in their chosen careers.  <https://csmp.ucop.edu/> |
| **CTC** | The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) is an agency in the Executive Branch of the California State Government that operates as an independent standards board and works in conjunction with the California Department of Education to serve California teachers. The CTC is statutorily responsible for the design, development, and implementation of standards that govern educator preparation for the public schools of California, for the licensing and credentialing of professional educators in California, for the enforcement of professional practices of educators, and for the review and discipline of applicants and credential holders in the State of California.  <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/> |
| **Curriculum Frameworks** | The California State Board of Education (SBE) adopts curriculum frameworks for kindergarten through grade twelve (K–12) in accordance with California *Education Code* (*EC*) Section 51002, which calls for the development of “broad minimum standards and guidelines for educational programs.” Curriculum frameworks are aligned to the SBE-adopted academic content standards. The SBE has adopted curriculum frameworks in various content areas, including English language arts/English language development, mathematics, history–social science, science, visual and performing arts, career technical education, health, world language, and physical education. The Instructional Quality Commission (IQC) develops the curriculum frameworks under the authority of *EC* Section 33538, in a process defined in the *California Code of Regulations*, Title 5, sections 9510–9516.  The process begins with the California Department of Education conducting four focus groups of educators to get input on improvements to an existing framework. The IQC recruits members for the Curriculum Framework and Evaluation Criteria Committee (CFCC). The CFCC is composed of a minimum of nine to a maximum of 20 members, at least half of whom are classroom teachers. The IQC makes recommendations to the SBE about the development of a curriculum framework and appointments to the CFCC.  Curriculum frameworks are developed in a public manner. The CFCC develops a draft document, and the IQC prepares the draft framework for field review and holds public meetings on the document. The IQC is responsible for the draft framework that is recommended to the SBE. After a 60-day public comment period, the SBE also holds a public hearing prior to considering the framework for adoption. After adoption, the frameworks are available for purchase through the CDE and may be viewed on the CDE All Curriculum Frameworks Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/allfwks.asp>.  Curriculum frameworks have drawn state and national recognition for focusing directly on the curriculum and for contributing substantively to the improvement of teaching and learning. Based on current research in education and the specific content area, the frameworks provide a firm foundation for curriculum and instruction by describing the scope and sequence of knowledge and the skills that all students are expected to master. The frameworks’ overarching dedication is to the balance of factual knowledge, fundamental skills, and the application of knowledge and skills. |
| **Curriculum Frameworks (continued)** | In addition, the frameworks establish criteria to evaluate instructional materials. These criteria are used to select, through the state adoption process mandated in *EC* sections 60200–60206, instructional materials for K–8. Frameworks also guide district selection of instructional resources for grades nine through twelve. Although curriculum frameworks cover the K–12 educational program, their effect can be seen in preschool programs, child-care centers, adult education programs, higher education instruction, and university entrance requirements. |
| **EL** | The Every Student Succeeds Act defines the term English learner (EL) as an individual:   1. who is aged 3 through 21; 2. who is enrolled or preparing to enroll in an elementary school or secondary school; 3. (i) who was not born in the United States or whose native language is a language other than English;   (ii)(I) who is a Native American or Alaska Native, or a native resident of the outlying areas; and  (II) who comes from an environment where a language other than English has had a significant impact on the individual’s level of English language proficiency; or  (iii) who is migratory, whose native language is a language other than English, and who comes from an environment where a language other than English is dominant; and   1. whose difficulties in speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language may be sufficient to deny the individual—    1. the ability to meet the challenging state academic standards;    2. the ability to successfully achieve in classrooms where the language of instruction is English; or    3. the opportunity to participate fully in society. |
| **Federal Program Monitoring** | California provides a coordinated and transparent federal program monitoring (FPM) process to ensure LEAs are meeting program requirements and spending program funds appropriately as required by law. All LEAs in the state are divided into four cohorts. Two cohorts are subject to review each year. Thus, the CDE’s FPM process includes a data review of 50 percent of the LEAs in the state to identify and conduct a total of 125 LEA on-site and online reviews during any given year. The remaining 50 percent of the LEAs in the state receive the data review the following year. A description of the FPM process, LEAs identified in each cohort, LEAs selected for online or on-site reviews, and program instruments can be found on the CDE Compliance Monitoring Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/cr/>. |
| **Golden State Seal Merit Diploma** | California Assembly Bill 3488, approved in July 1996, called for the development of the Golden State Seal Merit Diploma (GSSMD) to recognize public school graduates who have demonstrated their mastery of the high school curriculum in at least six subject matter areas, four of which are English-language arts, mathematics, science, and U.S. history, with the remaining two subject matter areas selected by the student. The GSSMD is awarded jointly by the State Board of Education and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction.  <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ca/meritdiploma.asp> |
| **LCAP** | The Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) is an important component of California’s Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF). The LCAP is a tool that California local educational agencies use to set goals, plan actions, and leverage resources to meet those goals to improve student outcomes with specific activities to address state and local priorities. The eight state priorities include the following:   1. Basic    1. Teacher assignment    2. Access to standards-aligned instructional materials    3. Facilities 2. Implementation of State Standards 3. Parental Involvement 4. Pupil Achievement 5. Pupil Engagement 6. School Climate 7. Course Access 8. Other Pupil Outcomes   ESSA local planning requirements are addressed in the LEA LCAP Addendum described below.  California *Education Code* requires that LCAPs be developed in a public process in consultation with teachers, principals, administrators, other school personnel, local bargaining units of the school district, parents, and pupils.  <http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/lc/> |
| **LCAP Addendum** | The Local Control and Accountability Plan Addendum (LCAP Addendum) is the mechanism by which local educational agencies will address local planning requirements of Every Student Succeeds Act programs within the LCAP development process. The addendum is intended to supplement the LCAP, just as ESSA funds are intended to supplement state funds. It addresses the local planning requirements for the following ESSA programs:   * Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by State and Local Educational Agencies * Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or  At-Risk * Title II, Part A: Supporting Effective Instruction * Title III, Part A: Language Instruction for English Learners and Immigrant Students * Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants |
| **LCFF** | California’s 2013–14 Budget Act enacted landmark legislation that greatly simplifies the school finance system and provides additional resources to local educational agencies serving students with greater educational needs. The changes introduced by the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) represent a major shift in how the state funds local educational agencies (LEAs), eliminating revenue limits and most state categorical programs. LEAs receive funding based on the demographic profile of the students they serve and gain greater flexibility to use these funds to improve student outcomes. More information regarding the LCFF is available on the California Department of Education (CDE) LCFF Overview Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/lcffoverview.asp>.  LEAs receive a base grant based upon average daily attendance with additional funds for students in certain grade spans. In addition, they receive a supplemental grant equal to 20 percent of the base grant based on the number of students eligible to receive free or reduced-price meals, English learners, and foster youth students, and a concentration grant equal to 50 percent of the adjusted base grant for these same students when exceeding 55 percent of an LEA’s enrollment. LEAs have broad discretion regarding use of the base grants but are required to develop, adopt, and annually update a three-year Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) which describes how they intend to meet annual goals for all pupils, with specific activities to address state and local priorities identified in LCFF statute. The law requires LEAs to increase or improve services for high-need students in proportion to the additional funding apportioned on the basis of the target student enrollment in the district. |
| **LEA** | In California, local educational agencies (LEAs) include county offices of education, school districts, and direct-funded charter schools. |
| **SBE** | The California State Board of Education (SBE) is the state’s 11 member K–12 policy-making body for academic standards, curriculum, instructional materials, assessments, and accountability. California *Education Code* 12032 officially designates the SBE as the state educational agency (SEA) for federally funded education programs, including the Every Student Succeeds Act. The SEA has the primary responsibility for overseeing the state’s full compliance with provisions of federal law including school accountability.  <http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/> |
| **SEA** | The state educational agency (SEA) is defined in ESSA as the agency primarily responsible for the state supervision of public elementary schools and secondary schools. California *Education Code* 12032 officially designates the State Board of Education as the SEA for federally funded education programs, including the ESSA. |
| **Seal of Biliteracy** | The State Seal of Biliteracy, codified in California *Education Code* sections 51460–51464, provides recognition to high school students who have demonstrated proficiency in speaking, reading, and writing in one or more languages in addition to English.  <http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/sealofbiliteracy.asp> |
| **TDG** | The Technical Design Group (TDG) is a group of experts in psychometric theory and education research that provide recommendations to the California Department of Education on matters related to the state and federal accountability system. |

# **Revised State Template for the Consolidated State Plan**

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

Official Seal of the U.S. Department of Education

**U.S. Department of Education   
Issued: March 2017**

OMB Number: 1810-0576

Expiration Date: September 30, 2017

## Introduction

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

## Completing and Submitting a Consolidated State Plan

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

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

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

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

### Alternative Template

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

1. Include the information on the Cover Sheet;
2. Include a table of contents or guide that clearly indicates where the SEA has addressed each requirement in its consolidated State plan;
3. Indicate that the SEA worked through CCSSO in developing its own template; and
4. Include the required information regarding equitable access to, and participation in, the programs included in its consolidated State plan as required by section 427 of the General Education   
   Provisions Act. See Appendix B.

### Individual Program State Plan

An SEA may submit an individual program State plan that meets all applicable statutory and regulatory requirements for any program that it chooses not to include in a consolidated State plan. If an SEA   
intends to submit an individual program plan for any program, the SEA must submit the individual   
program plan by one of the dates above, in concert with its consolidated State plan, if applicable.

### Consultation

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

### Assurances

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

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

## Cover Page

**Contact Information and Signatures**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SEA Contact** (Name and Position):  Karen Stapf Walters, Executive Director  California State Board of Education | Telephone:  916-319-0699 |
| Mailing Address:  California Department of Education  1430 N Street, Suite 5111  Sacramento, CA 95814 | Email Address:  [kstapfwalters@cde.ca.gov](mailto:kstapfwalters@cde.ca.gov) |
| By signing this document, I assure that:  To the best of my knowledge and belief, all information and data included in this plan are true and correct.  The SEA will submit a comprehensive set of assurances at a date and time established by the Secretary, including the assurances in ESEA section 8304.  Consistent with ESEA section 8302(b)(3), the SEA will meet the requirements of ESEA sections 1117 and 8501 regarding the participation of private school children and teachers. | | |
| **Authorized SEA Representative (Printed Name)**  Michael Kirst, President  California State Board of Education | Telephone:  916-319-0705 | |
| **Signature of Authorized SEA Representative**  /s/ | Date:  9/15/17 | |
| **Governor (Printed Name)**  Edmund G. Brown, Jr. | Date SEA provided plan to the Governor under ESEA section 8540:  August 11, 2017 | |
| **Signature of Governor**  /s/ | Date:  9/15/17 | |

## Programs Included in the Consolidated State Plan

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

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

**or**

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

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

☐ Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children

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

☐ Title II, Part A: Supporting Effective Instruction

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

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

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

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

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

### Instructions

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

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

* 1. Challenging State Academic Standards and Assessments *(ESEA section 1111(b)(1) and (2) and   
     34 CFR §§ 200.1−200.8.)*[[2]](#footnote-2)
  2. Eighth Grade Math Exception (*ESEA section* *1111(b)(2)(C) and 34 CFR § 200.5(b)(4))*:

1. Does the State administer an end-of-course mathematics assessment to meet the requirements under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) of the ESEA?

□ Yes

X No

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

□ Yes

□ No

1. If a State responds “yes” to question 2(ii), consistent with 34 CFR § 200.5(b)(4), describe,   
   with regard to this exception, its strategies to provide all students in the State the opportunity   
   to be prepared for and to take advanced mathematics coursework in middle school.
   1. Native Language Assessment*s (ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(F) and 34 CFR § 200.6(f)(2)(ii) ) and   
      (f)(4)*:
      1. Provide its definition for “languages other than English that are present to a significant extent   
         in the participating student population,” and identify the specific languages that meet that definition.

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

* + 1. Identify any existing assessments in languages other than English, and specify for which   
       grades and content areas those assessments are available.

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

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

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

* + 1. Indicate the languages identified in question 3(i) for which yearly student academic   
       assessments are not available and are needed.

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

(CSA). The State Board of Education (SBE)-approved purpose of the CSA   
is to measure a student’s competency in Spanish language arts in grades   
three through eight and high school for the purpose of: (1) providing   
student-level data in Spanish competency; (2) providing aggregate data that   
may be used for evaluating the implementation of Spanish language arts programs at the local level; and (3) providing a high school measure   
suitable to be used, in part, for the State Seal of Biliteracy.

* + 1. Describe how it will make every effort to develop assessments, at a minimum, in languages   
       other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student   
       population including by providing
       1. The State’s plan and timeline for developing such assessments, including a description of how it met the requirements of 34 CFR § 200.6(f)(4);

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

**Table 1. Timeline for Assessments in Languages Other Than**

**English**

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

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

* + - 1. A description of the process the State used to gather meaningful input on the need for assessments in languages other than English, collect and respond to public comment, and consult with educators; parents and families of English learners; students, as appropriate;   
         and other stakeholders; and

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

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

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

* + - 1. As applicable, an explanation of the reasons the State has not been able to complete the development of such assessments despite making every effort.

N/A

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

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

* Black or African American
* Asian
* Filipino
* Hispanic or Latino
* American Indian or Alaska Native
* Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
* Two or More Races
* White
  + - 1. If applicable, describe any additional subgroups of students other than the statutorily   
         required subgroups (*i.e.*,economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial   
         and ethnic groups, children with disabilities, and English learners) used in the Statewide accountability system.

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

* + - 1. Does the State intend to include in the English learner subgroup the results of students previously identified as English learners on the State assessments required under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I) for purposes of State accountability (ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(B))? Note that a student’s results may be included in the English learner   
         subgroup for not more than four years after the student ceases to be identified as an   
         English learner.

X Yes

□ No

* + - 1. If applicable, chooseone of the following options for recently arrived English learners in   
         the State:  
         X Applying the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(i); or  
         ☐ Applying the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(ii); or  
         ☐ Applying the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(i) or under ESEA   
         section 1111(b)(3)(A)(ii). If this option is selected, describe how the State will choose   
         which exception applies to a recently arrived English learner.
    1. Minimum N-Size *(ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A))*:
       1. Provide the minimum number of students that the State determines are necessary to be included to carry out the requirements of any provisions under Title I, Part A of the   
          ESEA that require disaggregation of information by each subgroup of students for accountability purposes.

California’s accountability system will be applied to all schools, including charter schools, and all student groups with 30 or more students. The   
same minimum n-size of 30 will be applied to alternative schools when   
the alternative indicators are produced for the fall 2018 California School Dashboard release.

* + - 1. Describe how the minimum number of students is statistically sound.

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

* + - 1. Describe how the minimum number of students was determined by the State, including   
         how the State collaborated with teachers, principals, other school leaders, parents, and   
         other stakeholders when determining such minimum number.

Statistical research overwhelmingly supports a minimum n-size of 30 to produce a mean, range, standard deviation, and even distribution (Mendenhall and Ott, 1980; confirmed in later years by Cohen, 2001;   
Cohen and Lea, 2004; Urdan, 2001; Vogt, 2005). Based on this   
research, the California Legislature established the n-size for   
accountability purposes in California *Education Code* (*EC*) Section   
52052. There was support from educational stakeholders and a general consensus regarding the established n-size of 30 when the legislation   
was introduced. In preparation for submission of the State Plan, over   
400 comments were received on the accountability section through the   
30-day public comment period through 13 stakeholder meetings, a   
public survey, and submitted written comments via letters and e-mails.   
These comments represent feedback from education administrators, teachers, parents, advocacy groups, and members of the public. The   
CDE’s Technical Design Group also concurred that the n-size required   
under *EC* Section 52052 was statistically valid and reliable.

* + - 1. Describe how the State ensures that the minimum number is sufficient to not reveal any personally identifiable information.[[3]](#footnote-3)

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

* + - 1. If the State’s minimum number of students for purposes of reporting is lower than the minimum number of students for accountability purposes, provide the State’s minimum number of students for purposes of reporting.

The minimum size for reporting is 11.

* + 1. Establishment of Long-Term Goals *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A))*:

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

An overview of the California accountability model (California Model) is   
provided on the CDE California Accountability Model & School Dashboard   
Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/cm/. Detailed information on the production of the indicators in the new California Model is provided in the “Technical Guide for the New Accountability System” available on the CDE   
Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/cm/ under the Data Files and   
Guide tab.

* + - 1. Academic Achievement. *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(aa))*

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

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

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

English language arts (ELA) baseline data uses the 2017 ELA   
assessment results for Status, compared to the 2016 ELA   
assessment results for Change. The baseline data was used to   
establish the five-by-five colored grid, which is shown below in Table   
2. <begin delete> ~~For the baseline, 6.9 percent of schools are in the   
Red performance level, 36.4 are in the Orange performance level,   
23.6 percent are in the Yellow performance level, 24.7 percent are in  
the Green performance level, and 8.4 percent are in the Blue   
performance level~~. <end delete>

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

~~For the baseline, 5.4 percent of schools are in the Red performance   
level, 33.2 percent are in the Orange performance level, 28.4 are in   
the Yellow performance level, 23.5 percent are in the Green   
performance level, and 9.5 percent are in the Blue performance   
level.~~ <end delete>

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

For ELA, only 28 percent of schools currently meet or exceed this   
goal; for mathematics, only 22 percent of schools currently meet or   
exceed this goal, making [begin delete] ~~the goal~~ [end delete] [begin   
add] it [end add] ambitious. <end add>

<begin delete> ~~The goal for all schools and all student groups is   
shown in the five-by-five colored grids below, with the orange solid   
bar showing the cell that is the goal and the dark dotted lines   
showing the cells that would exceed the goal. This means that the   
goal is for all students and student groups to be at least 10 points   
above the lowest possible scale score to achieve Level 3 (Standard   
Met) for ELA, with no more than a 3 point decline from the previous   
year. For math, the goal for all students and student groups to be at   
the lowest possible scale score to achieve Level 3 (Standard Met),   
with no more than a 3 point decline from the previous year. Schools   
and student groups that fall into the 6 cells exceeding this goal   
(marked with the dotted line in the five-by-five grids below) exceed   
the long term goal.~~ <end delete>

<begin add> For grade 11, the goal for all schools and student   
groups is to reach the “High” Status, as shown in the five-by-five   
colored grids below. This means that the goal for all students and   
student groups is to be at least 10 points above the lowest possible   
scale score and to achieve Level 3 (Standard Met) for ELA. For   
mathematics, the goal for all students and student groups is to be at   
the lowest possible scale score to achieve Level 3 (Standard Met).

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

For ELA, <begin delete> ~~only 22.0~~ <end delete> <begin add> 66   
<end add> percent of schools would currently meet or exceed this   
goal. <begin add> This is an ambitious goal because of the need for   
schools to improve their overall performance year after year and in   
light of the significant progress that some student groups need to   
make to meet the long-term goal and narrow performance gaps.   
<end add>For mathematics, only <begin add> 15.5 <end add>   
<begin delete>~~21.0~~ <end delete> percent of schools would currently   
meet or exceed this goal, making the goal ambitious.

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

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

**Table 2. Academic Indicator <begin add> (Grades 3-8) <end add>**

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

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

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

**Table 3. Math – Academic Indicator <begin delete> ~~Change~~ <end delete> <begin add>(Grades 3-8) <end add>**

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

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

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

<begin add>

**Table 4. ELA—Academic Indicator**

| **Levels** | Change:  Declined Significantly  **308 Schools**  By more than 15 points | Change: Declined  **360 Schools**  By 3 to 15 points | Change:  Maintained  **239 Schools**  Declined by less than 3 points or Increased by less than 3 points | Change:  Increased  **370 Schools**  By 3 to less than 15 points | Change:  Increased Significantly  **395 Schools**  By 15 points or more |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Status:  Very High  **545 Schools**  45 or more points above | 35  (2.1%)  Green | 108  (6.5%)  Green | 77  (4.6%)  Blue | 158  (9.4%)  Blue | 167  (10%)  Blue |
| Status:  High  **560 Schools**  10 points above to less than 45 points above | 90  (5.4%)  Green | 118  (7.1%)  Green | 83  (5.0%)  Green | 130  (7.8%)  Green | 139  (8.3%)  Blue |
| Status:  Medium  **215 Schools**  5 points below to less than 10 points above | 57  (3.4%)  Yellow | 55  (3.3%)  Yellow | 31  (1.9%)  Yellow | 31  (1.9%)  Green | 41  (2.5%) |
| Status:  Low  **321 Schools**  More than 5 points below to 70 points below | 114  (6.8%)  Orange | 73  (4.4%)  Orange | 44  (2.6%)  Orange | 45  (2.7%)  Yellow | 45  (2.7%)  Yellow |
| Status:  Very Low  **31 Schools**  More than 70 points below | 12  (0.7%)  Red | 6  (0.4%)  Red | 4  (0.2%)  Red | 6  (0.4%)  Orange | 3  (0.2%)  Orange |

| **# of schools** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1,672 | 22  (1.3%) | 231  (13.8%) | 233  (13.9%) | 636  (38.0%) | 541  (32.4%) |

Number of Schools without a color: 380  
Number of Schools with a color 1,672

**Table 5. Math—Academic Indicator**

| **Levels** | Change:  Declined Significantly  **xx Schools**  By more than 15 points | Change: Declined  **Xx Schools**  By 3 to 15 points | Change:  Maintained  **xx Schools**  Declined by less than 3 points or Increased by less than 3 points | Change:  Increased  **xx Schools**  By 3 to less than 15 points | Change:  Increased Significantly  **xx Schools**  By 15 points or more |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Status:  Very High  **xx Schools**  35 or more points above | 17  (1.0%)  Green | 22  (1.3%)  Green | 16  (1.0%)  Blue | 34  (2.0)  Blue | 23  (1.4%)  Blue |
| Status:  High  **xx Schools**  Zero points above to less than 35 points above | 16  (1.0%)  Green | 39  (2.3%)  Green | 22  (1.3%)  Green | 42  (2.5%)  Green | 28  (1.7%)  Blue |
| Status:  Medium  **xx Schools**  25 points below to zero | 25  (1.5%)  Yellow | 40  (2.4%)  Yellow | 28  (1.7%)  Yellow | 44  (2.6%)  Green | 33  (2.0%)  Green |
| Status:  Low  **xx Schools**  More than 25 points below to 95 points below | 180  (10.8%)  Orange | 248  (14.9%)  Orange | 111  (6.7%)  Orange | 158  (9.5%)  Yellow | 110  (6.6%)  Yellow |
| Status:  Very Low  **xx Schools**  More than 95 points below | 169  (10.1%)  Red | 115  (6.9%)  Red | 48  (2.9%)  Red | 63  (3.8%)  Orange | 35  (2.1%)  Orange |

Total Number of Schools: 2,052

| **# of schools** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1,666 | 332  (19.9%) | 637  (38.2%) | 361  (21.7%) | 235  (14.1%) | 101  (6.1%) |

Number of Schools without a color: 382

Number of Schools with a color

Total Number of Schools: 2,048 <end add>

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

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

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

**<end add>**

**Table 7: State Level Mathematics Data by Student Group <begin add> (Grades 3-8)**

| **Student Group** | **Status** | **Change** | **Color** | **Annual Average Improvement to Meet Goal** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All Students | -38.0 | 0.8 | Orange | 5 points |
| American Indian | -73.2 | -1.8 | Orange | 10 points |
| Asian | 49.9 | 3.1 | Blue | Increased from Baseline |
| Black or African American | -90.7 | -1.1 | Orange | 13 points |
| Filipino | 10.9 | 3.0 | Green | Increased from Baseline |
| Hispanic or Latino | -65.5 | 0.4 | Orange | 9 points |
| Pacific Islander | -50.5 | 0.8 | Orange | 7 points |
| Two or More Races | -2.5 | 1.4 | Yellow | 1 point |
| White | -5.0 | 0.9 | Yellow | 1 point |
| English Learner | -68.3 | -0.5 | Orange | 10 points |
| Foster Youth | -110 | 6.8 | Orange | 16 points |
| Homeless | -82.9 | -2.7 | Orange | 12 points |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | -68.6 | -0.3 | Orange | 10 points |
| Students with Disabilities | -125.0 | -.09 | Red | 18 points |

Note: Identical tables will be added prior to submission to the ED reflecting state-level baseline data for grade 11. <end add>

<begin delete> ~~The SBE is working to adopt performance standards (i.e., five-by-five grid) as soon as possible for the College/Career Indicator (CCI), which includes grade 11 assessment results for ELA and mathematics. This will occur prior to the initial year of school identification in 2018–19.~~

~~At the July 2016 SBE meeting, the SBE adopted the CCI as one of the state indicators in the new accountability system. The CCI was designed to include multiple measures which recognizes that students pursue various options to prepare for postsecondary, allowing for fair comparison across all schools.~~

~~Development of the CCI began in the spring of 2014, in response to state legislation that required the CDE to design an accountability measure, beyond test scores, that provides a comprehensive picture on whether students are receiving a rigorous and broad course of study that leads to likely success after high school graduation. The CDE received input from educational stakeholders through a series of regional meetings, statewide surveys, and statewide webinars, and also received feedback from various policy groups.~~

~~The CDE contracted with the Educational Policy Improvement Center, under the leadership of Dr. David Conley to conduct a literature review of valid and reliable college and career measures. Dr. Conley is the founder and president of EdImagine Strategy Group and a Professor of Education at the University of Oregon. He is known nationally for his research on college and career readiness. One conclusion reached by Dr. Conley, and his research team, is that using an indicator that incorporates multiple measures could be a more valid representation of college and career preparedness statewide than a single measure.~~

~~In addition, the Technical Design Group, which consists of statisticians and district representatives who advise the CDE on technical matters, reviewed research papers and numerous data simulations and determined that each measure included in the CCI was valid and reliable.~~

~~The CCI was given high praise in an independent review of California’s state plan by Bellwether Education Partners, “An Independent Review of ESSA State Plans: California” (December 12, 2017), which stated: “The state has a solid set of college and career readiness indicators, and intends to embark on further study to expand the list.” “Further, the state should receive special recognition for calculating this indicator using the four-year graduation cohort. This is the most robust approach for accurately representing students’ success in high school, and is a technical consideration that should be replicated in other states.”~~

~~California is the only state with such a robust college/career measure, making it one of most innovative and cutting edge approaches to better measure how well schools are preparing students for postsecondary success.~~ <end delete>

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

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

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

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

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

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

<begin add>

**Table 8. School Level Academic Indicator: ELA Student Group Results**

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

\*Total = Number of schools with 30 or more students at the school level and student group level taking the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments.

- = No data available due to less than 30 for that student group taking the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments.

**Table 9. School Level Academic Indicator: Math Student Group Results**

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

end add>

<begin delete>

**~~Table 6. School Level Academic Indicator: ELA Student Group Results~~**

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

~~Total = Number of schools with 30 or more students at the school level and student group level taking the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments.~~

~~- = No data available due to less than 30 for that student group taking the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments.~~

**~~Table 7. School Level Academic Indicator: Math Student Group Results~~**

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

<end delete>

The mathematics results immediately above show, as one example,   
that greater improvement among African American students   
statewide will be needed to make significant progress toward closing achievement gaps. Only 3.8 percent of schools are in the Green and   
Blue performance levels for this student group, which is more than   
25 percentage points lower than the percent of schools in those   
performance levels overall.

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

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

**<begin add> Table 10: State Level ELA Data by Student Group  
 (Grades 3-8)**

| **Student Group** | **Status** | **Change** | **Color** | **Average Annual Improvement to Meet Goal** | **Approximate Status After Year 3** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All Students | -17.0 | -0.5 | Orange | 4.0 | -5.0 |
| American Indian | -51.3 | -3.2 | Orange | 9.0 | -24.0 |
| Asian | 51.1 | 0.8 | Blue | Increased from Baseline | 51.2 |
| Black or African American | -60.9 | -1.9 | Orange | 10.0 | -31.0 |
| Filipino | 32.1 | 0.4 | Green | Increased from Baseline | 32.2 |
| Hispanic or Latino | -41.3 | -0.6 | Orange | 7.0 | -20.0 |
| Pacific Islander | -29.9 | -1.3 | Orange | 6.0 | -12.0 |
| Two or More Races | 16.7 | -0.7 | Green | Increased from Baseline | 16.8 |
| White | 15.1 | -0.5 | Green | Increased from Baseline | 15.2 |
| English Learner | -50.8 | -1.6 | Orange | 9.0 | -24.0 |
| Foster Youth | -86.9 | 4.0 | Orange | 14.0 | -45.0 |
| Homeless | -62.1 | -4.2 | Orange | 10.0 | -32.0 |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | -45.9 | -44.6 | Orange | 8.0 | -22.0 |
| Students with Disabilities | -104.7 | -2.5 | Red | 16.0 | -56.0 |

<end add>

**<begin add> Table 11: State Level Mathematics Data by Student   
Group (Grades 3-8)**

| **Student Group** | **Status** | **Change** | **Color** | **Average Annual Improvement to Meet Goal** | **Approximate Status After Year 3** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All Students | -38.0 | 0.8 | Orange | 5.0 | -23.0 |
| American Indian | -73.2 | -1.8 | Orange | 10.0 | -43.0 |
| Asian | 49.9 | 3.1 | Blue | Increased from Baseline | 50.0 |
| Black or African American | -90.7 | -1.1 | Orange | 13.0 | -52.0 |
| Filipino | 10.9 | 3.0 | Green | Increased from Baseline | 11.0 |
| Hispanic or Latino | -65.5 | 0.4 | Orange | 9.0 | -38.0 |
| Pacific Islander | -50.5 | 0.8 | Orange | 7.0 | -29.0 |
| Two or More Races | -2.5 | 1.4 | Yellow | 1.0 | 0.5 |
| White | -5.0 | 0.9 | Yellow | 1.0 | -2.0 |
| English Learner | -68.3 | -0.5 | Orange | 10.0 | -38.0 |
| Foster Youth | -110 | 6.8 | Orange | 16.0 | -62.0 |
| Homeless | -82.9 | -2.7 | Orange | 12.0 | -46.0 |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | -68.6 | -0.3 | Orange | 10.0 | -39.0 |
| Students with Disabilities | -125.0 | -.09 | Red | 18.0 | -71.0 |

Note: Identical tables will be added prior to submission to ED reflecting   
state-level baseline data for grade 11. <end add>

* + - 1. Graduation Rate. *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(bb))*
         1. Describe the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all   
            students and for each subgroup of students, including: (i) baseline data; (ii) the   
            timeline for meeting the long-term goals, for which the term must be the same multi-  
            year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State; and  
             (iii) how the long-term goals are ambitious.

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

The baseline data for graduation rate is based on the 2014–15 four-  
year cohort rate for Status <begin delete> ~~compared to the weighted   
average of the four-year cohort rates for 2011–12, 2012–13, and   
2013–14~~ <end delete>. The baseline data was used to establish the   
five-by-five colored grid, which is shown below. <begin add> The   
weighted average of the four-year cohort rates for 2011–12, 2012–  
13, and 2013–14 was used to determine Change in the five-by-five   
colored grid. <end add> <begin delete>~~The graduation rate baseline   
data produced 11 percent of schools in the Red performance level,   
6.9 percent in the Orange performance level, 15.8 percent in the   
Yellow performance level, 23 percent in the Green performance   
level, and 43.3 percent in the Blue performance level~~ <end delete>.

The goal for all schools and all student groups is <begin add> to   
reach the “High” Status, <end add> shown in the five-by-five colored   
grid below <begin delete> ~~with the orange solid bar showing the cell   
that is the goal. High (Status) and Maintained (Change) — and the   
dark dotted lines showing the cells that would exceed the goal~~ <end   
delete>This means that the goal is for all students and all student   
groups to <begin add> have <end add> <begin delete>~~meet~~ <end   
delete> at least <begin delete> ~~at~~ <end delete> a 90 percent   
graduation rate. <begin delete> ~~with no more than a 1 percent decline   
from the previous year. All of the Blue cells and the Green cell for   
High (Status) and Increased (Change) would exceed the goal.~~ <end   
delete>

For graduation rate, <begin delete> ~~59~~ <end delete> <begin add> 64   
<end add> percent of schools would currently meet or exceed this   
goal for all student performance. This is an ambitious goal because   
of the need for schools to <begin delete> ~~maintain or~~ <end delete>   
improve their overall performance year after year <begin add> and in   
light of the significant progress that some student groups need to   
make to meet the long-term goal and narrow performance gaps.   
<end add>

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

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

**Table 12. High School Graduation Rate Indicator**

| **Levels** | Change: Declined Significantly  **73 Schools**  Declined by greater than 5% | Change: Declined  **190 Schools**  Declined by 1% to 5% | Change: Maintained  **333 Schools**  Declined or increased by less than 1% | Change: Increased  **493 Schools**  Increased by 1%  to 5% | Change: Increased Significantly  **275 Schools**  Increased by 5% or greater |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Status: Very High  **520 Schools**  95% or more | N/A | 39  (2.9%)  Blue | 203  (14.9%)  Blue | 224  (16.4%)  Blue | 54  (4.0%)  Blue |
| Status: High  **354 Schools**  90% to less than 95% | 5  (0.4%)  Orange | 65  (4.8%)  Yellow | 71 (5.2%) Green | 142  (10.4%)  Green | 71  (5.2%) Blue |
| Status: Medium  **164 Schools**  85% to less than 90% | 6  (0.4%) Orange | 29  (2.1%) Orange | 28  (2.1%) Yellow | 55  (4.0%) Green | 46  (3.4%) Green |
| Status: Low  **204 Schools**  67% to less than 85% | 28  (2.1%)  Red | 33  (2.4%)  Orange | 21  (1.5%) Orange | 52  (3.8%) Yellow | 70  (5.1%) Yellow |
| Status: Very Low  **122 Schools**  Less than 67% | 34  (2.5%) Red | 24  (1.8%) Red | 10  (0.7%)  Red | 20  (1.5%) Red | 34  (2.5%) Red |

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

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

**<begin add> Table 13: State Level Graduation Rate by Student Group**

| **Student Group** | **3-Yr Avg. Grad Rate** | **Grade Rate (Status)** | **Change** | **Color** | **Average Annual Improvement to Meet Goal** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All Students | 86.7 | 88.4 | 1.7 | Green | 0.2% |
| American Indian | 82.3 | 82.9 | 0.6 | Orange | 1.0% |
| Asian | 93.5 | 94.1 | 0.6 | Green | Increased from Baseline |
| Black or African American | 78.4 | 81.5 | 3.1 | Yellow | 1.2% |
| Filipino | 93.5 | 94.7 | 1.2 | Green | Increased from Baseline |
| Hispanic or Latino | 83.7 | 86.3 | 2.6 | Green | 0.5% |
| Pacific Islander | 85.9 | 88.8 | 2.9 | Green | 0.2% |
| Two or More Races | 90.0 | 90.6 | 0.6 | Green | Increased from Baseline |
| White | 91.5 | 92.0 | 0.5 | Green | Increased from Baseline |
| English Learner | 72.2 | 77.7 | 5.5 | Yellow | 1.8% |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 82.8 | 85.3 | 2.5 | Green | 0.7% |
| Students with Disabilities | 66.7 | 69.0 | 2.3 | Yellow | 3.0% |

<end add>

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Table 14. School Graduation Rate Indicator, Performance Categories for Student Groups**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**<begin add> Table 15: State Level Graduation Rate by Student Group**

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

<end add>

<begin delete>

| ~~Student Group~~ | ~~3-Yr Avg. Grad Rate~~ | **~~Grade Rate (Status)~~** | **~~Change~~** | **~~Color~~** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ~~All Students~~ | ~~86.7~~ | **~~88.4~~** | **~~1.7~~** | **~~Green~~** |
| ~~American Indian~~ | ~~82.3~~ | **~~82.9~~** | **~~0.6~~** | **~~Orange~~** |
| ~~Asian~~ | ~~93.5~~ | **~~94.1~~** | **~~0.6~~** | **~~Green~~** |
| ~~Black or African American~~ | ~~78.4~~ | **~~81.5~~** | **~~3.1~~** | **~~Yellow~~** |
| ~~Filipino~~ | ~~93.5~~ | **~~94.7~~** | **~~1.2~~** | **~~Green~~** |
| ~~Hispanic or Latino~~ | ~~83.7~~ | **~~86.3~~** | **~~2.6~~** | **~~Green~~** |
| ~~Pacific Islander~~ | ~~85.9~~ | **~~88.8~~** | **~~2.9~~** | **~~Green~~** |
| ~~Two or More Races~~ | ~~90.0~~ | **~~90.6~~** | **~~0.6~~** | **~~Green~~** |
| ~~White~~ | ~~91.5~~ | **~~92.0~~** | **~~0.5~~** | **~~Green~~** |
| ~~English Learner~~ | ~~72.2~~ | **~~77.7~~** | **~~5.5~~** | **~~Yellow~~** |
| ~~Socioeconomically Disadvantaged~~ | ~~82.8~~ | **~~85.3~~** | **~~2.5~~** | **~~Green~~** |
| ~~Students with Disabilities~~ | ~~66.7~~ | **~~69.0~~** | **~~2.3~~** | **~~Yellow~~** |

<end delete>

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

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

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

<begin delete> ~~In California, LEAs generally review students’ English language progress in spring of every year to determine if the student   
met reclassification criteria. Once students are reclassified, their progress would not be captured if they are not included in the   
formula because they no longer take the language development assessment. Researchers were involved in determining the need to include reclassified students from the prior year in order to truly show growth. (See Saunders, W. M., & Marcelletti, D. J. (2013). The Gap   
That Can’t Go Away: The Catch-22 of Reclassification in Monitoring   
the Progress of English Learners.~~ *~~Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis~~* ~~(35)2, 139–156) If reclassified students are not added, by definition, the EL student group will not account for the growth   
students are making as they exit the student group.)~~

~~However,~~ <end delete> California is currently transitioning to a new   
English language proficiency test. The first operational administration   
of the new summative assessment, the English Language   
Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC), will occur in spring   
2018. Once the ELPAC is operational and the CDE has two years of   
results, the SBE will revisit the ELPI methodology, cut points, and   
timelines for English language proficiency.

The ELPI baseline data is based on student progress between the   
2014 and 2015 CELDT administrations <begin delete> ~~and the   
number of students reclassified for Status, compared to student   
progress between the 2013 and 2014 CELDT administrations and   
the number of students reclassified in 2013 for Change.~~ <end   
delete> The baseline data was used to establish the five-by-five   
colored grid, which is shown below. <begin add> The Change   
component is based on comparing the Status to student progress   
between the 2013 and 2014 CELDT administrations

The goal for all schools is to reach the “High” Status, as shown in the   
five-by-five colored grid below. <end add> <begin delete> ~~The   
baseline data using the CELDT produced 15.7 percent of schools in   
the Red performance level, 28.2 percent in the Orange performance   
level, 18.8 percent in the Yellow performance level, 27 percent in the   
Green performance level, and 10.3 percent in the Blue performance   
level.~~

~~The SBE has identified the cell for High (Status) and Maintained   
(Change) as the goal.~~

~~All of the Blue cells, the Green cell for High (Status) and Increased   
(Change), and the Green cell for Very High (Status) and Declined   
(Change) will exceed the goal.~~ <end delete> This means that the   
goal is for at least 75 percent of students to gain one performance   
level on the language proficiency assessment <begin add> annually   
<end add> <begin delete> ~~or be reclassified, with no more than a 1.5   
percent decline from the prior year in the percent of students that   
gain one performance level on the language proficiency assessment   
or were reclassified.~~

~~The goal is shown in the five-by-five colored grid below, with the   
orange solid bar showing the cell that is the goal and the dark dotted   
lines showing the cells that would exceed the goal. For the ELPI,~~   
<end delete> Only <begin delete> ~~23.1~~ <end delete> <begin add>   
17.1 <end add> percent of schools would currently meet or exceed   
this goal, making it ambitious for the state meet.

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

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

<begin add>

**Table 16. School English Learner Progress Indicator**

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

**Statewide Schools’ Performance**

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

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

Total Number of Schools: 8,424

Number of Schools without a Color: 1,987

Number of Schools with a Color: 6,437 <end add>

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

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

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

**Table 15: State Level English Learner Progress Performance Level <begin   
delete>**

| ~~Student Group~~ | ~~2013-14 ELPI Numerator~~ | ~~2013-14 ELPI Denominator~~ | ~~2014-15 ELPI Numerator~~ | ~~2014-15 ELPI Denominator~~ | ~~2013-14 ELPI Status~~ | **~~2014-15 ELPI Status~~** | **~~Change~~** | **~~Color~~** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ~~English Learners~~ | ~~872,110~~ | ~~1,263,289~~ | ~~859,128~~ | ~~1,250,884~~ | ~~69.0~~ | **~~68.7~~** | **~~-0.35~~** | **~~Yellow~~** |

<end delete> <begin add>

| Student Group | 2013-14 ELPI Status | **2014-15 ELPI Status** | Change | Color | Average Annual Improvement to Meet Goal |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| English Learners | 69.0 | **68.7** | -0.35 | Yellow | 1.0% |

Note: This table will be updated to reflect the calculation using progress on the assessment only. <end add>

1. Provide the measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goal for   
   increases in the percentage of English learners making progress in achieving English language proficiency in Appendix A.
   * 1. Indicators *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B))*
        1. Academic Achievement Indicator. Describe the Academic Achievement indicator,   
           including a description of how the indicator (i) is based on the long-term goals; (ii) is measured by proficiency on the annual Statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments; (iii) annually measures academic achievement for all students and   
           separately for each subgroup of students; and (iv) at the State’s discretion, for each public high school in the State, includes a measure of student growth, as measured by the annual Statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments.

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

<begin delete> ~~Additionally, participation lower than 95 percent on the CAASPP will be noted alongside results. LEAs and schools that do not   
meet the 95 percent participate rate will receive targeted support to   
increase participation levels. They will therefore be held accountable for meeting the participation rate threshold and, if they do not meet the   
threshold, will receive support designed to help them meet the threshold   
as part of California’s comprehensive school accountability system.~~<end delete>

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

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

<begin delete> ~~The CDE is researching the possibility of using an   
individual student growth model to determine the “Change” component.   
If the SBE adopts the growth model and the “Change” component, the   
average Distance from Level 3 will continue to be used to determine   
“Status.” If a student-level growth model is adopted, the CDE anticipates   
it can be in place for the 2018–19 accountability determinations.~~

~~For high schools, the grade 11 assessment results are incorporated into   
the academic Career/College Indicator (CCI), along with other robust measures of college/career readiness as described below. To further   
ensure transparency, grade eleven CAASPP results are also reported separately as the average distance from the lowest scale score   
associated with Level 3 (Standard Met/Proficiency) by schools and   
LEAs. The CCI is designed to include multiple measures in order to   
value the multiple pathways that students may take to prepare for postsecondary. The CCI currently has three levels (Prepared,   
Approaching Prepared, and Not Prepared) and is designed to allow new measures to be added when they become available. To determine how   
well schools have prepared students for postsecondary, the CCI   
evaluates all students in the four-year graduation cohort. The same   
calculation methodology is used for both the school level and the   
student group level.  
In consulting with the CDE’s Technical Design Group, it was determined   
that the following measures were valid and reliable measures of   
college/career readiness. These measures are proposed for inclusion   
(subject to SBE approval) in the Fall 2017 California School Dashboard release:~~

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

~~California added new data elements to California’s student-level data collection, the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS), in the 2016–17 school year. Once these new measures are collected and determined to be valid and reliable, they will be   
considered for inclusion in the CCI. These measures are:~~

* ~~State Seal of Biliteracy~~
* ~~Golden State Seal Merit Diploma~~
* ~~Articulated CTE Pathways~~

~~In addition, California has convened a work group that will make recommendations regarding how to incorporate more career measures   
in the CCI. Based on input from the CCI Work Group, the CDE will   
recommend to the SBE a three-year implementation plan on new   
measures for the CCI.~~

~~For the CCI, “Status” is determined using the current CCI rate and   
“Change” is the difference between the current rate and the prior year’s   
rate.~~

~~As stated in section A.4.iii.a.1 the CCI has been under development for several years. The CDE reviewed all significant research on college and career measures, obtained feedback from a substantial number of stakeholders and from multiple policy advisory groups. There has been   
an overwhelming support for the CCI in the new accountability system   
that was adopted by the SBE in September 2016.~~

~~In addition, the CDE contracted with the Educational Policy   
Improvement Center, under the leadership of Dr. David Conley to   
conduct a literature review of valid and reliable college and career   
measures. Dr. Conley is the founder and president of EdImagine   
Strategy Group and Professor of Education at the University of Oregon.   
He is known nationally for his research on college and career readiness.   
One conclusion reached by Dr. Conley, and his research team, is that   
using an indicator that incorporates multiple measures could be a more   
valid representation of college and career preparedness statewide than   
a single measure.~~

~~The CCI was given high praise in an independent review of California’s   
state plan by Bellwether Education Partners, “An Independent Review of ESSA State Plans: California” (December 12, 2017), which stated: “The   
state has a solid set of college and career readiness indicators, and   
intends to embark on further study to expand the list.” “Further, the state should receive special recognition for calculating this indicator using the   
four-year graduation cohort. This is the most robust approach for   
accurately representing students’ success in high school, and is a   
technical consideration that should be replicated in other states.”~~

~~California is the only state with such a robust college/career measure   
being used statewide, making it one of most innovative and cutting edge approaches to better measure how well schools are preparing students   
for postsecondary success within state accountability systems.~~ <end   
delete>

Detailed information on the production of the new indicators in the new California Model is provided in the “Technical Guide for the New Accountability System” available on the CDE Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/cm/documents/dashboardguidespring17.pdf>

* + - 1. Indicator for Public Elementary and Secondary Schools that are Not High Schools (Other Academic Indicator). Describe the Other Academic indicator, including how it annually measures the performance for all students and separately for each subgroup of students.   
         If the Other Academic indicator is not a measure of student growth, the description must include a demonstration that the indicator is a valid and reliable statewide academic   
         indicator that allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance.

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

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

LEAs reported chronic absence data to the state for the first time in CALPADS for the 2016–17 school year. Each LEA reported which   
students were chronically absent, which is defined in California   
Education Code Section 60901(c)(1) as “a pupil who is absent on 10 percent or more of the school days in the school year when the total   
number of days a pupil is absent is divided by the total number of days   
the pupil is enrolled and school was actually taught in the regular day schools of the district, exclusive of Saturdays and Sundays.” LEAs will report the second year of chronic absence data in CALPADS for the   
2017-18 school year, which will allow the SBE to establish color-coded performance levels for this indicator in time to be used for meaningful differentiation of schools for the 2018-19 school year, using the 2017-18   
data as the baseline year for status for this indicator. The color-coded performance levels will be established using the methodology described   
in section v.a below, which is the methodology used to establish the 5x5 grids for other indicators that are included throughout this state plan and   
will therefore ensure meaningful differentiation among the color-coded performance levels. Once approved, the five by five grids will establish   
the baseline performance levels for all students and student groups statewide and for schools.

<begin add> As noted in Section iv.a above, the academic indicator   
consists only of the “Status component of California’s Academic   
Indicator on the Dashboard for grades 3-8. The “Change” component of California’s Academic Indicator will serve as an additional academic indicator for grades 3-8. The method for calculating this indicator is as described in Section iii.A.1. <end add>

* + - 1. Graduation Rate. Describe the Graduation Rate indicator, including a description of (i)   
         how the indicator is based on the long-term goals; (ii) how the indicator annually   
         measures graduation rate for all students and separately for each subgroup of students;   
         (iii) how the indicator is based on the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate; (iv) if the State, at its discretion, also includes one or more extended-year adjusted cohort   
         graduation rates, how the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate is combined with that   
         rate or rates within the indicator; and (v) if applicable, how the State includes in its four-  
         year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation   
         rates students with the most significant cognitive disabilities assessed using an alternate assessment aligned to alternate academic achievement standards under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(D) and awarded a State-defined alternate diploma under ESEA section   
         8101(23) and (25).

<begin add> California’s <end add> <begin delete>The <end delete> Graduation Rate Indicator uses the four-year cohort graduation rate.   
The same calculation methodology is used at both the school level and   
the student group level. The four-year cohort graduation rate was used   
to establish the long-term goal for graduation rate described in section   
b.1 above, which applies to all schools and all student groups.

<begin add> For the purposes of the State Plan, graduation rate   
consists only of the Status component of California’s Graduation Rate Indicator on the Dashboard. <end add>

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

* + - 1. Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP) Indicator. Describe the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator, including the State’s definition of ELP, as   
         measured by the State ELP assessment.

California’s English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) <begin add> is   
based on <end add> <begin delete> ~~combines~~ <end delete>   
performance on the English language proficiency test, currently the   
CELDT <begin delete> ~~with reclassified EL student data.~~ <end delete>   
For accountability purposes, the CELDT has six performance levels.

The current ELPI calculation formula for “Status” is:

Annual CELDT Test Takers Who Increased at least 1 CELDT Level

*plus*

Annual CELDT Test Takers Who Maintained Early Advanced/Advanced English Proficient on the CELDT

<begin delete> *~~plus~~*

~~ELs Who Were Reclassified in the Prior Year~~ <end delete>

divided by

The Number of Annual CELDT Test Takers in the Current Year

<begin delete> *~~plus~~*

~~ELs Who Were Reclassified in the Prior Year~~ <end delete>

The ELPI calculation formula for “Change” is:

Current Year Status minus Prior Year Status

<begin delete> ~~In California, LEAs generally review students’ English   
learner progress in spring of every year to determine if the student met reclassification criteria. Once students are reclassified, their progress   
would not be captured if they are not included in the formula because   
they no longer take the language development assessment.   
Researchers consulted by CDE in this process helped determine the   
need to include reclassified students from the prior year in order to truly   
show growth. (See Saunders, W. M., & Marcelletti, D. J. (2013). The   
Gap That Can’t Go Away: The Catch-22 of Reclassification in Monitoring   
the Progress of English Learners.~~ *~~Educational Evaluation and Policy   
Analysis~~* ~~(35)2, 139–156) If reclassified students are not added, by   
definition, the EL student group will not account for the growth students   
are making as they exit the student group.)~~ <end delete>

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

<begin add> For the purposes of the State Plan, this indicator consists   
only of the Status component of California’s ELPI on the Dashboard.   
<and add>

<begin delete> ~~In accordance with the~~ *~~California Code of Regulations,~~*~~Title 5, Section 11303, the current standardized reclassification   
procedures for ELs are as follows, pursuant to California~~ *~~Education   
Code~~* ~~Section 313:~~

1. ~~Assessment of language proficiency using the state test of   
   English language proficiency;~~
2. ~~Teacher evaluation including a review of the student’s curriculum mastery;~~
3. ~~Parent opinion and consultation; and~~

~~Comparison of student performance in basic skills against an empirically established range of performance in basic skills based on the   
performance of English proficient students of the same age.~~ <end delete>California is currently transitioning to a new English language proficiency test. The first administration of the new assessment, the   
ELPAC, will occur in spring 2018.

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

* In January 2019, a study related to the use of the new English Language Proficiency Assessments for California(ELPAC)   
  scores will be presented to the State Board of Education to adopt   
  a new ELPAC reclassification criteria. The standardized   
  Language Observation Tool and Parent Involvement Protocol will   
  be developed in 2018–19 and piloted in 2019–20.
* In January 2019, work with the Legislature will begin to change   
  the reclassification criteria in California Education Code. This   
  process generally takes one year. Legislation will include the standardized, statewide Language Observation Tool and Parent Involvement Protocol.
* If the Legislature enacts law to change the reclassification criteria including the Language Observation Tool, and Parent   
  Involvement Protocol, the law goes into effect on July 1, 2020.
* The Regulatory Process would begin in 2020–21, and full implementation is expected in 2021–22. <end add>
  + - 1. School Quality or Student Success Indicator(s). Describe each School Quality or Student Success Indicator, including, for each such indicator: (i) how it allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance; (ii) that it is valid, reliable, comparable, and   
         statewide (for the grade span(s) to which it applies); and (iii) of how each such indicator annually measures performance for all students and separately for each subgroup of   
         students. For any School Quality or Student Success indicator that does not apply to all   
         grade spans, the description must include the grade spans to which it does apply.

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

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

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

**Table 17. Suspension Indicator (Elementary School)**

<begin add>

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

**Table 18. Suspension Indicator (Middle School)**

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

<end add>

**Table 19. Suspension Indicator (High School)**

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

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

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

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

In consulting with the CDE’s Technical Design Group, it was determined that the   
following measures were valid and reliable measures of college/career readiness.   
These measures are proposed for inclusion (subject to SBE approval) in the Fall 2017 California School Dashboard release:

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

California added new data elements to California’s student-level data collection, the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS), in the 2016–17   
school year. Once these new measures are collected and determined to be valid and reliable, they will be considered for inclusion in the CCI. These measures are:

* State Seal of Biliteracy
* Golden State Seal Merit Diploma
* Articulated CTE Pathways

For the CCI, “Status” is determined using the current CCI rate and “Change” is the difference between the current rate and the prior year’s rate. <end add>

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

California has developed a multiple measures accountability system that   
uses percentile distributions to create a five-by-five grid. This five-by-five   
grid provides 25 results that combine “Status” and “Change” to make an   
overall determination for each of <begin add> California’s Dashboard   
<end add> <begin delete> ~~the~~ <end delete> indicators.<begin delete>   
~~The accountability system provides equal weight to both~~ <end   
delete>“Status” and “Change”<begin add> receive equal weight in   
determining overall performance.<end add>

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

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

* Very High
* High
* Medium
* Low
* Very Low

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

* Increased significantly
* Increased
* Maintained
* Declined
* Declined significantly

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

* Blue
* Green
* Yellow
* Orange
* Red

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

**Table 20. Sample Five-by-Five Grid**

| **Levels** | **Change: Declined Significant ly** | **Change: Declined** | **Change: Maintained** | **Change: Increased** | **Change: Increased Significantly** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Status: Very High** | Yellow | Green | Blue | Blue | Blue |
| **Status: High** | Orange | Yellow | Green | Green | Blue |
| **Status: Medium** | Orange | Orange | Yellow | Green | Green |
| **Status: Low** | Red | Orange | Orange | Yellow | Yellow |
| **Status: Very Low** | Red | Red | Red | Orange | Yellow |

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

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

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

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

For each indicator, “Status” and “Change” have equal weight. In   
addition, each indicator is given equal weight when meaningfully differentiating schools, with ELA and Mathematics assessments considered as two separate indicators for school differentiation.<begin delete> Because six of the seven possible school-level indicators are academic and only one indicator (suspension rates) is a School Quality   
or Student Success Indicator<end delete>

<begin add> Seven of the eleven possible school-level indicators   
described in this plan are academic. Two of these represent the Status” component in determining a color-coded performance level on a   
Dashboard indicator, contributing half of the overall color-coded performance levels for two of California’s Dashboard indicators   
(Graduation Rate Indicator and English Learner Progress Indicator). The “Change” components of these two Dashboard indicators serve as   
student success indicators. Due to the combination of “Status” and “Change” to determine an overall color-coded performance level for   
each of California’s Dashboard indicators, two-thirds of<end add><begin delete>~~much more weight (i.e., 85 .7 percent of~~ <end delete>the overall performance determination within California’s system of meaningful differentiation is <begin add>therefore <end add>attributed to   
academics without devaluing the importance of school quality<begin   
delete~~> (i.e., suspension rates)~~.<end delete>

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

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

California will produce an accountability report for every public school in   
the state. <begin delete> ~~Traditional schools’ reports will be based on   
the indicators described in this document and alternative schools’   
reports will be based on comparable indicators that are more   
appropriate for their school mission.~~ <end delete>

Schools with less than 30 students will receive data; <begin delete> ~~on   
their Status and Change.~~ <end delete>however, they will not receive a performance level (i.e., a color) consistent with the requirement in   
ESSA, Section 1111(c)(3)(A)(i) that the state plan describe a minimum   
n-size to be used for any provisions requiring disaggregation of   
performance data by student groups and that the minimum n-size be the   
same for all students and student groups. This will provide small schools   
with data that they can use to improve student performance.

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

<begin add> For schools that are so small that they do not receive a   
color-coded performance level on the Dashboard (approximately 100   
students in 2017-18), the CDE will review their performance data and   
other relevant information annually and follow up based on any identified performance issues. <end add>

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

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

<begin delete> ~~For alternative schools, the SBE approved the   
development of modified measures to better assess the performance of   
these schools with more validity and accuracy. Alternative schools are designed to meet the needs of high-risk student group populations and   
include schools that serve students who are in custody in the juvenile   
court system or enrolled in drop-out recovery programs and continuation schools. These schools help students who are credit deficient make up   
credits and work toward graduation. Such schools often serve students   
for limited durations.~~

~~Alternative schools will be held accountable for the same indicators as   
non-alternative schools (i.e., Academic, graduation, English Learner   
Progress, Suspension, College/Career, and Chronic Absenteeism).   
However, when appropriate, modified methods will be applied. For  
example, instead of using a four-year cohort graduation rate, it is   
possible that alternative schools will be held to one-year graduation rate.   
This takes into consideration students who are credit deficient when   
they enroll in an alternative school. The CDE is currently working with   
the Advisory Task Force on Alternative Schools comprised of district,   
county, and school staff that have experience operating alternative   
schools to recommend modified methods to the SBE.~~

~~The SBE will consider the proposed modified measures for these   
schools in the spring and summer of 2018 for inclusion in the 2018 Dashboard.~~ <end delete>

1. Identification of Schools *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D))*
2. Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. Describe the State’s methodology for identifying not less than the lowest-performing five percent of all schools receiving Title   
   I, Part A funds in the State for comprehensive support and improvement, including the   
   year in which the State will first identify such schools.

<begin delete>~~Using the system of meaningful differentiation based on performance on the state indicators described in sections A.4.v.a and   
A.4.v.b above, California will identify the lowest-performing Title I   
schools beginning in fall 2018.~~<end delete>

<begin delete>~~In 2013–14 California enacted the Local Control Funding   
Formula (LCFF), which is the foundation for California’s integrated   
accountability system. Under LCFF, LEAs are the primary focus for   
improving outcomes and opportunities for students and addressing   
disparities, based on the recognition that LEAs play an essential role in supporting schools to sustain improvement. LCFF requires LEAs to   
adopt and annually update Local Control and Accountability Plans   
(LCAPs), which must identify goals and actions/services for all students   
and student groups within the priority areas identified in the LCFF   
statutes. These priority areas are the foundation of the new multiple   
measures accountability system for all schools.~~<end delete>

<begin delete> ~~LCFF also required the SBE to adopt criteria for   
identifying LEAs that will be offered technical assistance based on low performance by one or more student groups across the statutory priority   
areas. The SBE approved criteria tied to state and local indicators   
included in the California School Dashboard, and LEA assistance begin   
in the 2017–18 school year based on the Fall 2017 Dashboard release.   
The technical assistance provisions focus improvement efforts on local educational agencies rather than schools and through the emphasis on   
building local capacity to sustain improvement instead of dictating   
specific interventions centrally. Two hundred and twenty-eight LEAs, representing 54 percent of California’s non-charter Title I schools and   
over two million California students, have been identified for assistance   
under LCFF for the 2017-18 school year. LEAs will be identified for   
assistance under LCFF annually.~~<end delete>

<begin delete>~~California is committed to aligning state and federal   
education policies to the greatest extent possible to develop an   
integrated local, state, and federal accountability and continuous   
improvement system grounded in the LCFF. Accordingly, California will   
focus the identification of Title I schools in greatest need of support   
under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) within LEAs identified for   
support under LCFF.~~<end delete>

<begin delete>~~In the fall of 2018, California will begin the identification of   
the lowest performing schools for federal purposes. Using the 2018   
Dashboard results, California will again identify the lowest performing   
LEAs for technical assistance based on the LCFF statute. Building on   
this, California will then use the “baseline methodology” to identify Title I   
schools that are in greatest need of assistance. For the purposes of data simulations completed to date, greatest need of assistance is defined as   
schools with all Red indicators and schools with all Red indicators   
except for one Orange indicator.~~<end delete>

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

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

* Schools with all red indicators;
* Schools with all red but one indicator of any other color;
* Schools with all red and orange indicators; and
* Schools with five or more indicators where the majority are red.

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

<begin add> The Chronic Absence Indicator and College/Career   
Indicators will receive color-coded performance levels for the first time   
on the 2018 Dashboard, increasing the number of indicators for which   
schools can receive color-coded performance levels. Accordingly, when   
the color-coded performance levels for those indicators become   
available prior to the initial identification of schools for the 2018-19   
school year, the SBE will need to review the business rules, or color combinations, used to identify the Title I schools in greatest need of   
assistance for comprehensive support.<end add>

<begin delete>~~Any LEA that has a Title I school in greatest need of   
assistance, but is not identified for technical assistance under LCFF, will   
be identified for technical assistance.~~<end delete>

<begin delete>~~Under this approach, the technical assistance provided to   
LEAs that have an identified school will include working with the LEA on analyzing the needs of that school and its students and developing a   
plan for improvement, consistent with the ESSA’s school improvement requirements. Focusing assistance and support for schools within the   
LEAs identified for support under the state accountability system will:~~

* ~~Ensure that supports provided to schools are consistent and   
  aligned with the supports provided to the LEA;~~
* ~~Enable agencies providing support and LEAs receiving support to leverage all available resources;~~
* ~~Enhance the ability for all supports to focus on building the   
  capacity of LEAs to support~~ *~~all~~* ~~schools based on the differential   
  needs of students across school sites, as demonstrated by the   
  multiple measures within the LCFF priority areas; and~~
* ~~Ensure that assistance provided to identified schools builds on   
  the existing LCAP process within LEAs.~~

~~The SBE will consider a proposed plan supplement at its March 2018   
meeting for submission to the federal Department of Education that   
further describes the approach for identifying the lowest performing Title   
I schools.~~<end delete>

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

California will use <begin add>the average of <end add>three   
years of graduation rate data to identify schools with a high   
school graduation rate less than 67 percent. Any school with a   
graduation rate less than 67 percent<begin add> averaged   
over<end add><begin delete>in all<end delete> three years will   
be identified for comprehensive assistance.

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

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

California will determine whether any school identified for additional   
targeted support, as specified in section A.4.vi.f, did not meet the exit   
criteria specified in section A.4.viii.b within four years. The <begin add>earliest that the <end add>initial identification of any “additional   
targeted support” school that did not exit such status for comprehensive support and improvement will occur <begin add>is <end add><begin delete>~~in~~ <end delete>fall 202<begin delete>~~1~~<end delete><begin add>4<end add>.

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

California will identify schools once every three years for each type of   
school identified.

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

California’s definition of a school with one or more “consistently   
underperforming” student group” is a school in which any student group,   
on its own, meets the criteria for being identified for comprehensive   
support <begin add>pursuant to section vi(a) above in three out of four consecutive years (beginning with the 2018-19 school year).<end add>   
The methodology for identifying such schools is to determine whether   
any student group at a school has the color-coded performance levels   
on applicable indicators that match the color-coded performance levels   
used as criteria for identifying the lowest performing schools receiving   
Title I, Part A funds for comprehensive support <begin add>in three out   
of four consecutive years.<end add>

California will identify schools with one or more “consistently   
underperforming” student group <begin add>(i.e., schools that meet the   
specified criteria in three out of four consecutive years)<end add> annually.<begin delete>~~Because California will identify schools for comprehensive support every three years (see section vi.d above),   
those criteria will not be updated annually. California will use the most   
recent criteria for identifying schools for comprehensive support to   
identify any school with one or more “consistently underperforming”   
student group during the two years between identifying schools for comprehensive support within these three-year cycles~~.<end delete>

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

<begin add> Any school with a student group that meets the definition of “consistently underperforming” will be eligible for additional targeted   
support because the criteria used for the “consistently underperforming”   
definition are based on the criteria used to identify the lowest performing   
Title I schools for comprehensive support.<end add><begin delete>   
~~California will use the same methodology that is used to identify schools   
for comprehensive support for the lowest-performing 5 percent of all   
schools receiving Title I, Part A funds in the state. Any school that has a   
student group with one of the combinations of color-coded performance   
levels used in the determination of the lowest-performing 5 percent of   
schools will be identified for additional targeted support~~. <end   
delete>These <begin delete>~~additional~~ <end delete>schools will be   
identified <begin add>annually, with<end add><begin delete>beginning   
in the<end delete> 20<begin add>20<end add><begin delete>18–<end delete><begin add>21<end add><begin delete>~~19~~<end delete> <begin add>being the first year such schools can be identified based on the   
definition of “consistently underperforming.<end add><begin   
delete>”~~school year, and will be identified every three years~~.<end   
delete>

1. Additional Statewide Categories of Schools. If the State chooses, at its discretion, to   
   include additional statewide categories of schools, describe those categories.

Not applicable.

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

California will report through the California School Dashboard whether   
schools and student groups met the 95 percent participation requirement   
based on a set of four unique symbols (for example, a color coded image or   
icon specific to participation rate).

1. The first icon to indicate that the school and all student groups met   
   the 95 percent participation rate
2. A second icon to indicate that the schoolwide participation was met,   
   but one or more student groups did not meet the participation rate
3. A third icon to indicate that the participate rate is at least 85 percent   
   but less than 95 percent
4. A fourth icon to indicate the participation rate is less than 85 percent

Because California will report ELA and mathematics separately, each   
content area will have an icon for the participation rate.

<begin delete>~~California will offer assistance specific to meeting the 95   
percent participation rate to schools that do not meet that participation rate   
through the statewide system of support (described in A.4.viii.c). They will   
therefore be held accountable for meeting the participation rate threshold   
and, if they do not meet the threshold, will receive support designed to help   
them meet the threshold as part of California’s comprehensive school   
accountability system. The participation rate will not affect the calculation   
and determination of color-coded performance levels on the academic indicators.~~<end delete>

1. Continued Support for School and LEA Improvement *(ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A))*
2. Exit Criteria for Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. Describe the   
   statewide exit criteria, established by the State, for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement, including the number of years (not to exceed four) over which schools are expected to meet such criteria.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## California’s System of Support

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

**Table 21. Overview of California’s Support System**

| **Level of Support** | **Description of Supports Available** |
| --- | --- |
| Support for All LEAs and Schools  (Level 1) | Various state and local agencies provide an array of support resources, tools, and voluntary technical assistance that all LEAs may use to improve student performance at the LEA and school level and narrow disparities among student groups across the LCFF priorities, including recognition for success and the ability to share promising practices. |
| Differentiated Assistance  (Level 2) | County superintendents (or the Superintendent of Public Instruction/California Department of Education, when provided to county offices of education) and the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence provide differentiated assistance for LEAs and schools, in the form of individually designed technical assistance, to address identified performance issues, including significant disparities in performance among student groups. |
| Intensive Intervention  (Level 3) | The Superintendent of Public Instruction may require more intensive interventions for LEAs and/or schools with persistent performance issues and a lack of improvement over a specified time period. |

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

The second level of support will provide differentiated assistance to   
LEAs and schools that are identified for additional support (e.g., schools   
eligible for comprehensive and targeted support and intervention).

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

California’s educational system is founded on the belief that the LEA is   
the primary unit of change and plays the central role in supporting   
schools to implement and sustain improvement efforts. California’s   
diversity requires more than a “one size fits all solution” to help LEAs   
and schools successfully implement continuous improvement efforts and

meet the needs of all learners, particularly those students most in need.   
Although they will be differentiated to meet local needs to the greatest  
 extent possible, all of California’s supports and interventions for schools   
and districts will be implemented within the larger context of this   
statewide system of support.

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

## Intensive Interventions

Schools that are identified for comprehensive support and intervention   
(CSI) that do not meet exit criteria within four years from initial   
identification will be eligible for more rigorous, or intensive, interventions.   
The support provided will focus on building LEA capacity to identify   
issues that impact student learning and to implement interventions and   
strategies with only the strongest evidence that addresses those issues.   
This approach is grounded in working with local educators and   
stakeholders to analyze data and identify strengths, weaknesses, and   
goals, and provide ongoing performance and progress monitoring to   
build internal accountability with evidence of improvement.

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

* LEAs will partner with an external entity, agency, or individual to   
  conduct a new comprehensive and/or segmented **needs   
  assessment** that focuses on systemic factors and conduct a   
  deep **root cause analysis** that identifies gaps between current   
  conditions and desired conditions in student performance and   
  progress.
* LEAs will continue to partner with an external entity, agency, or   
  individual to utilize the results of the deep root cause analysis   
  along with stakeholder feedback to develop a **new improvement   
  plan** that includes a prioritized set of more rigorous interventions   
  and strategies that have demonstrated impact or that are   
  supported by the strongest or moderate levels of evidence. The   
  amended plan will include a **program evaluation** component   
  with support to conduct more rigorous **ongoing performance   
  and progress monitoring**, as well as to build internal   
  accountability with evidence of improvement.

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

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

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

* **Comprehensive Support and Improvement Review**: California   
  will review and approve initial CSI plans, including a review of   
  how the LEA will address identified resource inequities.
* **Targeted Support and Improvement Review Supports**:   
  California will provide guidance and templates to support   
  development, review, and approval of initial TSI plans, which may   
  be incorporated in the Single Plan for Student Achievement and   
  will include a review of how the LEA will address identified   
  resource inequities.
* **Consolidated Application Reporting System (CARS)**: The   
  CDE will revise and periodically review resource allocation pages   
  in the CARS for LEAs with a significant number of schools   
  identified for CSI and TSI.
* **Federal Program Monitoring**: The CDE will annually review   
  selected LEAs, including LEAs with a significant number of   
  schools identified for CSI and TSI, for resource allocation   
  inequities, strategies designed to resolve resource allocation   
  inequities, and progress in resolving resource allocation   
  inequities. This process may include technical assistance and   
  support for program strategies.
* **Differentiated Assistance**: California will provide assistance to   
  LEAs and schools identified for CSI and TSI with more intensive   
  and differentiated assistance focused on LEAs with a significant   
  number of schools identified for CSI and TSI with the intent to   
  build LEA capacity to identify, correct, and monitor the resolution   
  of resource inequities.

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

**Foundational Technical Assistance and Support**

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

### Supporting the Development of LCAP Addenda

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

### Reviewing LCAP Addenda

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

### Monitoring Title I LEAs

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

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

### Providing Technical Assistance

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

### Statewide Conferences and Local Institutes

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

### Online Collection of Resources and Strategies

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

### Targeted/Focused Technical Assistance and Support

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

### Needs Assessment and Root Cause Analysis

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

### Improvement Planning and Evidence-based Decision-making

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

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

### Performance and Progress Monitoring

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

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

Not applicable.

1. Disproportionate Rates of Access to Educators (*ESEA section* *1111(g)(1)(B)):* Describe how low-  
   income and minority children enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are not served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers, and the measures the   
   SEA will use to evaluate and publicly report the progress of the SEA with respect to such   
   description.[[4]](#footnote-4)

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

California’s 2016 State Plan to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators   
(2016 equity plan), available on the California Department of Education (CDE)   
Educator Excellence Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/pd/ee/>, includes   
California’s most recent data regarding the rates at which low-income and   
minority children enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are served at disproportionate rates by unqualified, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers  
The definitions provided in Table 11 below were used to collect relevant   
teacher and student data and calculate disproportionate rates of access to   
educators (or equity gaps) to meet requirements under the 2001   
reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, No Child Left   
Behind (NCLB).

**Table 22. California Definitions for Purposes of Collecting Equity Data   
Under NCLB**

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

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

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

A summary of disproportionate rates of access to educators as described in the   
2016 equity plan is provided in Table 12 below.

**Table 23. Summary of Equity Gaps Described in California’s 2016 Equity   
Plan**

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

## Evaluating and Reporting Equity Gaps Under the Every Student Succeeds Act

California’s Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), enacted in 2013,   
fundamentally changed how all local educational agencies (LEAs) in the state   
are funded, how they are measured for results, and the services and supports   
they receive to allow all students to succeed to their greatest potential.   
California is committed to aligning state and federal education policies to the   
greatest extent possible to develop an integrated local, state, and federal   
accountability and continuous improvement system grounded in the LCFF.

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

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

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

* The percent of teachers who are holding either preliminary or clear   
  credentials;
* The percent of teachers with intern credentials;
* The percent of teachers who are misassigned; and
* The percent of teachers with emergency permits, provisional permits, or   
  waivers.

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

**Table 24. California Definitions for Purposes of Collecting Equity Data   
Under ESSA[[5]](#footnote-5)**

| **Term** | **Definition** |
| --- | --- |
| Ineffective teacher | A teacher who is: (a) misassigned (placed in a position for which the employee does not hold a legally recognized certificate or credential or a certificated employee placed in a teaching or services position in which the employee is not otherwise authorized by statute to serve), or (b) teaching without a credential. |
| Out-of-field teacher | A teacher who has not yet demonstrated subject  matter competence in the subject area(s) or for the student population to which he or she is assigned. Under this definition, teachers with the following limited permits would be considered out-of-field:   * General Education Limited Assignment Permit (GELAP) * Special Education Limited Assignment Permit (SELAP) |
| Inexperienced teacher | A teacher who has two or fewer years of teaching experience. |
| Minority student | A student who is American Indian/Alaska Native,  Asian, African American, Filipino, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic, or Two or More Races Not Hispanic. |
| Low-income student | A student who is eligible to receive Free or Reduced-Price Meals. |

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

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

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

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

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

California’s Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF)-based system sets eight   
priorities for school districts and charter schools (ten for county offices of   
education) and places significant emphasis on the improvement of school   
conditions for student learning. State Priority 6 specifically focuses on School   
Climate and requires local educational agencies (LEAs) to support the   
development of positive school climate through their Local Control and   
Accountability Plans (LCAPs) while considering suspension rates, pupil   
expulsion rates, and other local measures, including surveys of pupils, parents,   
and teachers on the sense of safety and school connectedness.

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

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

**State Educational Agency Support for Title I LEAs**

### Supporting the Development of LCAP Addenda

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

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

### Reviewing LCAP Addenda

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

### Monitoring Title I LEAs

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

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

### Providing Technical Assistance

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

### Statewide Conferences and Local Institutes

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

### Online Collection of Resources and Strategies

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

### State Identified Strategies for Title I LEAs

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

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

### Strategies to Improve School Conditions for Student Learning

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

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

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

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

### Strategies to Reduce Incidences of Bullying and Harassment

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

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

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

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

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

**Additional Strategies to Promote Student Health and Safety**

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

* **Student Assistance Programs** **(SAPs)** address substance abuse and   
  a wide range of issues that impede adolescent academic achievement.   
  The goals of SAPs are to reduce students’ behavioral and disciplinary   
  violations and substance use habits while improving school attendance   
  and academic performance through the referral and facilitation of   
  appropriate services. More information and resources to assist in   
  establishing SAPS is available on the CDE Student Assistance   
  Programs Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/he/at/sap.asp>.
* **Mental health services** in schools include a broad range of services,   
  settings, and strategies. Resources to support mental health services   
  and programs can be found on the CDE Mental Health Resources Web   
  page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/cg/mh/mhresources.asp>.
* **Underage drinking prevention** resources provide a wide variety of   
  materials and information including state and nationwide reports, data, adolescent brain research, alcohol-related campaigns, contact   
  information, conferences and legislative initiatives. Resources are   
  available on the CDE Underage Drinking Prevention Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/he/at/preventionresguide.asp>.
* **The Tobacco Use Prevention Education (TUPE)** program provides   
  funding for programs in grades six through twelve to reduce youth   
  tobacco use by helping young people make healthful tobacco-related   
  decisions through tobacco-specific, research-validated educational   
  instruction and activities that build knowledge as well as social skills and   
  youth development assets. More information regarding the TUPE   
  program is available on the CDE TUPE Program Overview Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/he/at/tupeoverview.asp>.

## Continuous Improvement

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

1. School Transitions *(ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(D))*: Describe how the State will support LEAs   
   receiving assistance under Title I, Part A in meeting the needs of students at all levels of   
   schooling (particularly students in the middle grades and high school), including how the State   
   will work with such LEAs to provide effective transitions of students to middle grades and high   
   school to decrease the risk of students dropping out.

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

**State Educational Agency Support for Title I LEAs**

### Supporting the Development of LCAP Addenda

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

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

### Reviewing LCAP Addenda

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

### Monitoring Title I LEAs

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

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

### Providing Technical Assistance

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

**Statewide Conferences and Local Institutes**

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

**Online Collection of Resources and Strategies**

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

**State Identified Strategies for Title I LEAs**

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

**Table 25. California Strategies for Meeting Student Needs and Providing   
Effective Transitions**

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

***Across the Education Continuum***

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

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

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

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

California also has **statutory requirements regarding pupil promotion and   
retention** to support the use of appropriate promotion practices. California will   
support Title I LEAs through the processes described above to develop,   
implement, or evaluate promotion and retention policies.

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

***Dropout Prevention***

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

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

Title I LEAs will be supported to implement practices and effective strategies   
for dropout reduction included in California’s **School Attendance Review   
Board Handbook**, available at  
 <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/ai/sb/sarbhandbook.asp>. The State **School   
Attendance Review Board** (SARB) coordinates statewide policy and   
personnel training on the operation of county and local SARBs. SARBs provide   
intensive guidance and community services to meet the special needs of   
students with school attendance or school behavior problems. The State SARB   
is a partnership that includes representatives from school districts, parent   
groups, county probation departments, county welfare departments, county superintendents of schools, law enforcement agencies, community-based   
service centers, school guidance personnel, the health care and mental health professions, and state associations interested in youth with school attendance   
or behavioral problems. The State SARB makes annual recommendations   
regarding strategies to reduce the number of dropouts in the state’s public   
education system. The State SARB also coordinates the **Model SARB**   
Recognition Program to encourage best practices in dropout prevention and to encourage the development of effective strategies to prevent students from   
dropping out of California’s public schools.

***Early Education Transition to Elementary School***

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

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

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

Title I, Part A technical assistance will also support LEAs in evaluating and   
continuously improving **transitional kindergarten** (TK) programs. TK is the   
first year of a two-year kindergarten program that uses a modified kindergarten curriculum that is age and developmentally appropriate. A child is eligible for   
TK if they have their fifth birthday between September 2 and December 2. TK   
curriculum is aligned to the state-adopted academic content standards and   
frameworks, the California Preschool Learning Foundations, and California   
Preschool Curriculum Frameworks. Each elementary or unified school district   
must offer TK classes for all children eligible to attend. A child who completes   
one year in a TK program may continue in a kindergarten program for one   
additional year. Early research into TK programs has shown that TK   
participants are better prepared for kindergarten (Manship et al., 2015).

***Transitions Into and Out of Middle School***

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

*TCSII* is an online professional development publication developed   
collaboratively with educational experts across California and intended for use   
by middle level educators and schools. *TCSII* promotes, illustrates, and   
supports the concepts embedded in CDE’s 12 Recommendations for Middle   
Grades Success. It applies youth development and brain development   
research on young adolescents to identify transition-relevant educational   
strategies and practices. This Web portal (<http://pubs.cde.ca.gov/tcsii/recsforsuccess/recsforsuccessindx.aspx>) delivers developmentally responsive and research-based practices through videos,   
professional learning activities, and best practice vignettes focused on the   
young adolescent. *TCSII* contains a “Transitions” chapter which provides   
comprehensive background and identification of practices, approaches, and   
frameworks for transitions into and out of middle level schools on topics such   
as articulation agreements with elementary and high schools, academic   
counseling to prepare for transitions, the transition of at risk students,   
mentor/buddy programs, summer “bridge” programs, and family engagement.

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

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

***High School Transitions to College/Career***

California, through the processes, events, and resources described above, will   
support Title I schools to increase **Early Assessment Program** (EAP)   
participation and evaluate supports for students who have been deemed less   
than “Ready” for college-level coursework. Each spring, all grade 11 students   
in California take the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for English   
language arts and mathematics. These assessments also serve as an indicator   
of readiness for college-level coursework in English and mathematics and are   
used by the California State University (CSU) and participating California   
Community Colleges (CCCs) to determine (EAP) status. In addition to   
receiving a student’s results on the ELA and mathematics assessments, parents/guardians also receive their student’s EAP status, which is one of four   
levels: Ready, Conditionally Ready, Not Yet Ready, and Not Ready. “Ready”   
students are considered ready for English and/or mathematics college-level   
coursework. These students are able to register in college degree-bearing   
courses upon enrolling in a CSU or a participating CCC. Providing this   
information to students before they begin grade 12 has been shown to   
decrease the need for college remediation. The EAP program demonstrates   
the continuous partnership between the SEA and California universities and   
colleges to ensure articulation of the pre-kindergarten–grade 12 system with   
the postsecondary education system.

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

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

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

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

**Continuous Improvement**

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

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

1. **Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children** 
   1. Supporting Needs of Migratory Children *(ESEA section 1304(b)(1))*: Describe how, in planning, implementing, and evaluating programs and projects assisted under Title I, Part C, the State and   
      its local operating agencies will ensure that the unique educational needs of migratory children, including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school,   
      are identified and addressed through:
      1. The full range of services that are available for migratory children from appropriate local, State, and Federal educational programs;

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

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

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

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

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

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

* + 1. Joint planning among local, State, and Federal educational programs serving migratory children, including language instruction educational programs under Title III, Part A;

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

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

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

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

* + 1. The integration of services available under Title I, Part C with services provided by those other programs; and

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

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

* + 1. Measurable program objectives and outcomes.

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

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

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

**Table 26. California MEP Outcomes and Measurable Program   
Objectives**

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

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

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

Title I, Part C funded subgrantees utilize the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) and the MSIN to promote interstate and intrastate   
coordination of services for migratory children and the timely transfer of   
pertinent school records. The MSIX is a federally funded national data   
collection system that ensures greater continuity of educational services for migratory children by providing a mechanism for all states to exchange   
education-related information on migratory children who move from one state   
to another. The MSIN is the California state equivalent to the MSIX and   
provides a mechanism for exchanging education-related information on   
migratory children who move within the state and assists the CDE-funded subgrantees in locating migrant students throughout the state using the Migrant Student Locator. Both the MSIX and the MSIN help to improve the timeliness of school enrollments, the appropriateness of grade and course placements, and   
the sharing of immunization information of migratory children. Lastly, the CDE   
and subgrantees collaborate with other states serving the same migratory   
students to ensure these eligible students receive services as they migrate.   
The CDE and subgrantees participate in interstate organizational meetings and conferences with the Interstate Migrant Education Council and the National Association of State Directors of Migrant Education.

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

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

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

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

California will provide funded agencies with professional development and   
training targeting transitional planning for youth, relationship building with workforce and post-secondary institutions, data management, program evaluation, and implementing evidence-based and outcome driven strategies that are aligned   
to college and career readiness standards. California will continue to build statewide partnerships with the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s   
Office, California Workforce Investment Board, and California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation to support local level planning and coordination   
with external partners. California will ensure that funded agencies are   
complying with federal, state, and local laws and regulations by conducting on-  
site and online reviews through the annual federal program monitoring review process that is conducted on an annual basis as described in A.4.viii.e.

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

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

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

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

In addition to the program evaluation conducted by the COEs, which evaluates   
the program’s impact on their students’ ability to improve their educational achievement, accrue school credits, transition to regular school, complete high school and obtain employment and as appropriate, participate in   
postsecondary education or job training, <begin add> California will <end add> also increase annually its pre- and post-testing of youth in Title I, Part D   
programs in reading and mathematics. California will also increase the number   
of students who earn a high school diploma or pass a high school equivalency exam, and increase the enrollment of students in career-related programs or in programs to continue their education. These goals and objectives are aligned   
and built upon the U.S. Department of Education’s leading indicators and will   
be used to assess the effectiveness of Title I, Part D programs in California.   
The CDE will develop and implement required regional training and technical assistance to funded agencies to support local and state level implementation   
of Title I, Part D requirements in alignment with the emerging statewide system   
of support as described in A.4.viii.c.

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

**Implementation of State Academic Content Standards and Curriculum Frameworks**

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

SBE-adopted curriculum frameworks (frameworks), described in greater detail in section D.4 below, provide guidance for implementing SBE-adopted standards.

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

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

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

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

**Support for School Leaders**

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

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

* Utilizing California’s standards and frameworks to build instructional   
  leadership capacity to meet the needs of all students;
* Collecting and analyzing data related to student achievement and well-  
  being;
* Implementing cycles of continuous improvement based on data;
* Making evidence-based decisions to solve problems of practice;
* Establishing and maintaining evidence-based professional learning opportunities focused on building instructional capacity to improve student outcomes;
* Developing cultural competence and improving access to instructional resources;
* Implementing strategies to support equitable distribution of the educator workforce and labor-management collaboration; and
* Implementing strategies for establishing and supporting distributed or   
  shared leadership at the school site that includes teacher leaders and site administrators in communities of practice.

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

**California Subject Matter Project**

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

**Equitable Services**

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

**Administration and Technical Assistance**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Figure 1. Chapter at a Glance of “Chapter 9: Access and Equity” of the   
*English Language Arts/English Language Development Framework for California Public Schools Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve, p. 879[[6]](#footnote-6)***



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

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

**Supporting Educators to Identify and Meet the Needs of English Learners**

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

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

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

Concurrently, special education program standards will be revised to include additional preparation to serve general education students, resulting in a   
broadened credential authorization that will allow special educators to serve   
general education students. As a result, special education expertise will be   
available through intervention and remediation activities to assist general   
education students who are struggling to overcome barriers to improved   
academic performance. These efforts to recognize the needs of students with disabilities in general education classrooms, and the challenges of the teachers   
who serve them, were inspired by the groundbreaking work of California’s   
Statewide Special Education Task Force and their summary report, “One   
System: Reforming Education to Serve All Students,” available at [http://www.smcoe.org/about-smcoe/statewide-special-education-task-force/.](http://www.smcoe.org/about-smcoe/statewide-special-education-task-force/)

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

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

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

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

**Continuous Improvement**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

For this initial assessment, California is administering the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) in the 2017–18 school year while field   
testing the new English Language Proficiency Assessments for California   
(ELPAC) initial assessment. In 2018–19, the ELPAC initial assessment will   
replace the CELDT as the state’s initial ELP assessment. Regulations for the implementation of the ELPAC initial assessment will be finalized in October   
2017 and contain detailed updated entrance procedures. Validity of the ELPAC   
is assured through the processes used to develop the assessment instrument including content review, alignment studies, standard setting procedures, and comparison studies.

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

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

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

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

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

<begin delete>~~In accordance with the California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Section 11303, the current standardized reclassification procedures for ELs are as follows, pursuant to California Education Code Section 313:~~

1. ~~Assessment of language proficiency using the state test of English language proficiency;~~
2. ~~Teacher evaluation including a review of the student’s curriculum mastery;~~
3. ~~Parent opinion and consultation; and~~
4. ~~Comparison of student performance in basic skills against an empirically established range of performance in basic skills based on the performance of English proficient students of the same age.~~<end delete>

<begin delete>~~California ensures that the same standardized procedures are used for exiting students from the EL subgroup as are used for Title I reporting and accountability purposes. The ELPAC annual summative assessment will be administered as an operational assessment statewide in spring 2018. To ensure that exit from EL status is conducted in a valid and reliable manner, a cut-score validation study and multi-method exit criterion study will be conducted based on data received from the ELPAC summative assessment.~~<end delete>

<begin delete>~~The California legislature is considering legislation to further define the implementation of the teacher evaluation and parent consultation criteria, which are not required in ESSA, but are of interest to the State.~~<end delete>

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

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

The State Board of Education (SBE) has adopted state academic   
standards, including the English Language Development Standards, and   
has defined the EL subgroup in each of the state accountability   
indicators required under ESSA Section 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii).

**State Standards**

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

**State Assessments**

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

**Accountability System**

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

The English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) measures the percent of   
EL students who are making progress toward English language   
proficiency from one year to the next on the CELDT and the number of   
ELs who were reclassified from EL to fluent English proficient in the prior year. The CELDT has five performance levels, and the interim goal for   
every EL student is to progress at least one ELD performance level   
each year. Therefore, the benchmark for all students is to advance one performance level a year. The long-term goal for the newcomer EL with beginning-level initial English proficiency is to achieve English   
proficiency within five years. The entry performance level determines the number of years expected to reach proficiency, and at a minimum one   
year’s progress is expected. As noted above, California will transition to   
full implementation of the ELPAC in the 2018–19 school year, replacing   
the CELDT. The ELPI is reported on the California School Dashboard,   
which can be found on the CDE California Accountability Model &   
School Dashboard Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/cm/>.   
Progress on the California School Dashboard as well as local metrics   
will be used to measure interim progress and achievement of the   
academic goals for ELs.

**Supporting the Development of LCAP Addenda**

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

**Reviewing LCAP Addenda**

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

**Developing Resources for LEAs to Support ELs**

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

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

**Continuous Improvement**

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

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

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

**Monitoring Title III LEAs**

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

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

**Providing Technical Assistance**

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

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

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

**Continuous Improvement**

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

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

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

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

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

1. Calculate the percentage of each LEA’s Title I, Part A allocation from the   
   total amount of Title I, Part A funding allocated to all LEAs by the state   
   during the prior fiscal year.
2. Compute each LEA’s share of the Title IV, Part A allocation by applying  
   the above calculated percentage to the total amount of Title IV, Part A   
   funds available for allocation.
3. If there are insufficient Title IV, Part A funds resulting in LEAs not   
   receiving the minimum-allowed amount of $10,000, California will ratably reduce the LEA allocations of Title IV, Part A funding. This will involve a calculation by which a certain proportionate amount of each LEA   
   allocation is reduced so that every applying LEA may receive at least   
   the minimum allotment of $10,000 as pursuant to ESSA Section   
   4105(a)(2).
4. **Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers**
   1. Use of Funds *(ESEA section 4203(a)(2))*: Describe how the SEA will use funds received under   
      the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program, including funds reserved for State-level activities.

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

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

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

California has developed, in collaboration with stakeholders, Quality Standards   
for Expanded Learning Programs, available on the California Department of Education (CDE) Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/ba/as/documents/qualstandexplearn.pdf>. These standards are the foundation that the SSEL uses to provide support to ELPs. A portion of the state-level reservation will be used for administration of Title IV,   
Part B funds: awarding and monitoring grants; providing technical assistance, evaluation, and training services; and providing local assistance funds to   
support continuous quality improvement.

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

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

California has posted its 21st Century Request for Applications (RFA) for funds allocated beginning in the 2017–18 fiscal year to align with the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) requirements on the CDE 21st CCLC Funding and Fiscal Management Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/ba/cp/funding.asp>.   
Consistent with federal requirements, California will award 21st CCLC funds in   
a competitive grant application process.

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

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

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

1. That propose to target services to students (and their families) who   
   primarily attend schools that:
   1. Are implementing comprehensive support and improvement   
      activities or targeted support and improvement activities under Section 1111(d) or other schools determined by the LEA to be in   
      need of intervention and support to improve student academic achievement and other outcomes; and
   2. Enroll students who may be at risk for academic failure, dropping   
      out of school, involvement in criminal or delinquent activities, or   
      who lack strong positive role models;
2. Are submitted jointly by eligible entities consisting of at least one:
   1. LEA receiving funds under of Title I, Part A; and
   2. Another eligible entity[[7]](#footnote-7);

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

1. Demonstrate that the activities proposed in the application:
   1. Are, as of the date of the submission of the application, not accessible to students who would be served; or
   2. Would expand accessibility to high-quality services that may be available in the community.
2. Replace an expiring grant. (This is a general state funding priority requirement.)
3. Will provide year-round expanded learning programming. (This is a state middle and elementary funding priority requirement.)
4. Have programs that have previously received funding, but are not   
   currently expiring. (This is a state high school funding priority   
   requirement.)
5. Propose expansion of existing grants up to the per site maximum. (This   
   is a state high school funding priority requirement.)

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

These funding priorities will be additive. The proposed sites with the highest   
number of priorities will be funded first. High quality grant applications with an   
equal number of state and federal priorities will be selected for funding based   
on the highest percentage of school level poverty. All grantees will be required   
to sign assurances that they will comply with all ESSA and state requirements.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

To facilitate best practices regarding the assessment of the needs of homeless students, California will continue to support LEAs to conduct data analyses for   
their homeless students, implement case management models, and   
collaborate with relevant agencies to coordinate services.

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

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

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

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

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

The current process is posted on the CDE Resources for Homeless Children   
and Youths Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/hs/cy/disputeres.asp>.   
California will continue to provide professional development and technical   
assistance to LEAs regarding the dispute resolution process to ensure effective implementation, as well as continue the monitoring of LEAs through the FPM process (described under I.6). This process includes the review of the dispute resolution process, identification, implementation of federal and state laws, use   
of Title I, Part A reservation funds, parent/guardian involvement, and   
professional development.

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

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

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

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

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

California will continue to collect and post annually a database of LEA liaisons   
and their contact information through the CDE Resources for Homeless   
Children and Youths Web page to enable school personnel to contact LEA   
liaisons for specific information and resources as needed. This list of LEA   
liaisons becomes the basis for the Homeless Education Resources Listserv,   
which allows the State Homeless Coordinator to disseminate resources,   
materials, updates, and training modules.

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

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

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

* 1. Access to Services *(722(g)(1)(F) of the McKinney-Vento Act)*: Describe procedures that ensure   
     that:
     1. Homeless children have access to public preschool programs, administered by the SEA or LEA, as provided to other children in the State;

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

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

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

* + 1. Homeless youth and youth separated from public schools are identified and accorded   
       equal access to appropriate secondary education and support services, including by identifying and removing barriers that prevent youth described in this clause from   
       receiving appropriate credit for full or partial coursework satisfactorily completed while attending a prior school, in accordance with State, local, and school policies; and

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

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

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

* + 1. Homeless children and youth who meet the relevant eligibility criteria do not face   
       barriers to accessing academic and extracurricular activities, including magnet school, summer school, career and technical education, advanced placement, online learning, and charter school programs, if such programs are available at the State and local levels.

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

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

* 1. Strategies to Address Other Problems *(722(g)(1)(H) of the McKinney-Vento Act)*: Provide   
     strategies to address other problems with respect to the education of homeless children and youth, including problems resulting from enrollment delays that are caused by—
     1. requirements of immunization and other required health records;
     2. residency requirements;
     3. lack of birth certificates, school records, or other documentation;
     4. guardianship issues; or
     5. uniform or dress code requirements.

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

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

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

California, through the CARS Homeless Education Implementation and Policy   
page, continues to collect the number of LEAs that have an approved   
homeless education board policy and the date in which it was last approved. Technical assistance is offered to those LEAs that do not have an approved homeless education board policy. California requires those LEAs that are   
applying for the federal supplemental EHCY grant funding to submit their   
approved homeless education board policies and administrative regulations.   
The CDE and the CSBA work closely together to ensure that the CSBA sample board policies meet all requirements. Finally, California continues to monitor   
LEAs for homeless education compliance, including approved homeless   
education board policies, through the FPM process.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

# **Appendix A: Measurements of interim progress**

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

1. **Academic Achievement**

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

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

**Table 26: State Level ELA Data by Student Group (Grades 3-8)**

| **Student Group** | **Status** | **Change** | **Color** | **Average Annual Improvement to Meet Goal** | **Approximate Status After Year 3** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All Students | -17.0 | -0.5 | Orange | 4.0 | -5.0 |
| American Indian | -51.3 | -3.2 | Orange | 9.0 | -24.0 |
| Asian | 51.1 | 0.8 | Blue | Increased from Baseline | 51.2 |
| Black or African American | -60.9 | -1.9 | Orange | 10.0 | -31.0 |
| Filipino | 32.1 | 0.4 | Green | Increased from Baseline | 32.2 |
| Hispanic or Latino | -41.3 | -0.6 | Orange | 7.0 | -20.0 |
| Pacific Islander | -29.9 | -1.3 | Orange | 6.0 | -12.0 |
| Two or More Races | 16.7 | -0.7 | Green | Increased from Baseline | 16.8 |
| White | 15.1 | -0.5 | Green | Increased from Baseline | 15.2 |
| English Learner | -50.8 | -1.6 | Orange | 9.0 | -24.0 |
| Foster Youth | -86.9 | 4.0 | Orange | 14.0 | -45.0 |
| Homeless | -62.1 | -4.2 | Orange | 10.0 | -32.0 |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | -45.9 | -1.3 | Orange | 8.0 | -22.0 |
| Students with Disabilities | -104.7 | -2.5 | Red | 16.0 | -56.0 |

**Table 27: State Level Mathematics Data by Student Group (Grades 3-8)**

| **Student Group** | **Status** | **Change** | **Color** | **Average Annual Improvement to Meet Goal** | **Approximate Status in Year 3** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All Students | -38.0 | 0.8 | Orange | 5.0 | -23.0 |
| American Indian | -73.2 | -1.8 | Orange | 10.0 | -43.0 |
| Asian | 49.9 | 3.1 | Blue | Increased from Baseline | 50.0 |
| Black or African American | -90.7 | -1.1 | Orange | 13.0 | -52.0 |
| Filipino | 10.9 | 3.0 | Green | Increased from Baseline | 11.0 |
| Hispanic or Latino | -65.5 | 0.4 | Orange | 9.0 | -38.0 |
| Pacific Islander | -50.5 | 0.8 | Orange | 7.0 | -29.0 |
| Two or More Races | -2.5 | 1.4 | Yellow | 1.0 | 0.5 |
| White | -5.0 | 0.9 | Yellow | 1.0 | -2.0 |
| English Learner | -68.3 | -0.5 | Orange | 10.0 | -38.0 |
| Foster Youth | -110 | 6.8 | Orange | 16.0 | -62.0 |
| Homeless | -82.9 | -2.7 | Orange | 12.0 | -46.0 |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | -68.6 | -0.3 | Orange | 10.0 | -39.0 |
| Students with Disabilities | -125.0 | -.09 | Red | 18.0 | -71.0 |

Note: Identical tables will be added prior to submission to ED reflecting state-level   
baseline data for Grade 11.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**~~Table 26. ELA – Academic Indicator~~**

| **~~Levels~~** | ~~Declined Significantly~~  ~~by more than 15 points~~ | ~~Declined~~  ~~by 3 to 15 points~~ | ~~Maintained~~  ~~Declined by less than 3 point or Improved by less than 3 points~~ | ~~Increased~~  ~~by 3 to less than 15 points~~ | ~~Increased Significantly~~  ~~by 15 points or more~~ |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ~~Very High~~  ~~45 or more points above~~ | ~~Green~~ | ~~Green~~ | ~~Blue~~ | ~~Blue~~ | ~~Blue~~ |
| ~~High~~  ~~10 to 44.9 points~~ | ~~Green~~ | ~~Green~~ | ~~Green~~ | ~~Green~~ | ~~Blue~~ |
| ~~Medium~~  ~~-5 points to +9.9 points~~ | ~~Yellow~~ | ~~Yellow~~ | ~~Yellow~~ | ~~Green~~ | ~~Green~~ |
| ~~Low~~  ~~-5.1 to -70 points~~ | ~~Orange~~ | ~~Orange~~ | ~~Orange~~ | ~~Yellow~~ | ~~Yellow~~ |
| ~~Very Low~~  ~~-70.1 points or lower~~ | ~~Red~~ | ~~Red~~ | ~~Red~~ | ~~Orange~~ | ~~Orange~~ |

**Table 27. Math – Academic Indicator Change**

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

**B. Graduation Rates**

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

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

**Table 28: State Level Graduation Rate by Student Group**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Table 29. Graduation Rate Indicator**

| Level | Declined Significantly  by greater than 5.0% | Declined  by 1.0% to 5.0% | Maintained  Declined or increased by less than 1.0% | Increased  by 1.0%  to less than 5.0% | Increased Significantly  by 5.0% or greater |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Very High  95.0% or greater | N/A | Blue | Blue | Blue | Blue |
| High  90.0% to less than 95.0% | Orange | Yellow | Green | Green | Blue |
| Medium  85.0% to less than 90.0% | Orange | Orange | Yellow | Green | Green |
| Low  67.0% to less than 85.0% | Red | Orange | Orange | Yellow | Yellow |
| Very Low  Less than 67.0% | Red | Red | Red | Red | Red |

**C. Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency**

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

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

**Table 30: State Level English Learner Progress Performance Level**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Table 31. English Learner Progress Indicator**

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

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

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

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

* Section 200: It is the policy of the State of California to afford all persons in   
  public schools, regardless of their disability, gender, gender identity, gender expression, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, or any   
  other characteristic that is contained in the definition of hate crimes set forth in Section 422.55 of the Penal Code, equal rights and opportunities in the   
  educational institutions of the state. The purpose of this chapter is to prohibit   
  acts that are contrary to that policy and to provide remedies therefor.
* Section 201(a): All pupils have the right to participate fully in the educational process, free from discrimination and harassment.
* Section 220: No person shall be subjected to discrimination on the basis of   
  disability, gender, gender identity, gender expression, nationality, race or   
  ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, or any other characteristic that is   
  contained in the definition of hate crimes set forth in Section 422.55 of the   
  Penal Code in any program or activity conducted by an educational institution   
  that receives, or benefits from, state financial assistance or enrolls pupils who receive state student financial aid.
* Section 250: Prior to receipt of any state financial assistance or state student financial aid, an educational institution shall provide assurance to the agency administering the funds, in the manner required by the funding agency, that   
  each program or activity conducted by the educational institution will be   
  conducted in compliance with the provisions of this chapter and all other   
  applicable provisions of state law prohibiting discrimination. A single   
  assurance, not more than one page in length and signed by an appropriate responsible official of the educational institution, may be provided for all the programs and activities conducted by an educational institution.
* Section 260: The governing board of a school district shall have the primary responsibility for ensuring that school district programs and activities are free   
  from discrimination based on age and the characteristics listed in Section 220   
  and for monitoring compliance with any and all rules and regulations   
  promulgated pursuant to Section 11138 of the Government Code.

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

OMB Control No. 1894-0005 (Exp. 04/30/2020)

**NOTICE TO ALL APPLICANTS**

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

**To Whom Does This Provision Apply?**

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

(If this program is a State-formula grant program, a State needs to provide this description only for projects or activities that it carries out with funds reserved for State-level uses. In addition, local school districts or other eligible applicants that apply to the State for funding need to provide this description in their applications to the State for funding. The State would be responsible for ensuring that the school district or other local entity has submitted a sufficient section 427 statement as described below.)

**What Does This Provision Require?**

Section 427 requires each applicant for funds (other than an individual person) to include in its application a description of the steps the applicant proposes to take to ensure equitable access to, and participation in, its Federally-assisted program for students, teachers, and other program beneficiaries with special needs. This provision allows applicants discretion in developing the required description. The statute highlights six types of barriers that can impede equitable access or participation: gender, race, national origin, color, disability, or age. Based on local circumstances, you should determine whether these or other barriers may prevent your students, teachers, etc. from such access or participation in, the Federally-funded project or activity. The description in your application of steps to be taken to overcome these barriers need not be lengthy; you may provide a clear and succinct description of how you plan to address those barriers that are applicable to your circumstances. In addition, the information may be provided in a single narrative, or, if appropriate, may be discussed in connection with related topics in the application.

Section 427 is not intended to duplicate the requirements of civil rights statutes, but rather to ensure that, in designing their projects, applicants for Federal funds address equity concerns that may affect the ability of certain potential beneficiaries to fully participate in the project and to achieve to high standards. Consistent with program requirements and its approved application, an applicant may use the Federal funds awarded to it to eliminate barriers it identifies.

**What are Examples of How an Applicant Might Satisfy the Requirement of This Provision?**

The following examples may help illustrate how an applicant may comply with Section 427.

(1) An applicant that proposes to carry out an adult literacy project serving, among others, adults with limited English proficiency, might describe in its application how it intends to distribute a brochure about the proposed project to such potential participants in their native language.

(2) An applicant that proposes to develop instructional materials for classroom use might describe how it will make the materials available on audio tape or in braille for students who are blind.

(3) An applicant that proposes to carry out a model science program for secondary students and is concerned that girls may be less likely than boys to enroll in the course, might indicate how it intends to conduct "outreach" efforts to girls, to encourage their enrollment.

(4) An applicant that proposes a project to increase school safety might describe the special efforts it will take to address concern of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender students, and efforts to reach out to and involve the families of LGBT students

We recognize that many applicants may already be implementing effective steps to ensure equity of access and participation in their grant programs, and we appreciate your cooperation in responding to the requirements of this provision.

**Estimated Burden Statement for GEPA Requirements**

**According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1.5 hours per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The obligation to respond to this collection is required to obtain or retain benefit (Public Law 103-382. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20210-4537 or email** [**ICDocketMgr@ed.gov**](mailto:ICDocketMgr@ed.gov) **and reference the OMB Control Number 1894-0005.**
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1. Unless otherwise indicated, citations to the ESEA refer to the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The Secretary anticipates collecting relevant information consistent with the assessment peer review process in 34 CFR § 200.2(d). An SEA need not submit any information regarding challenging State academic standards and assessments at this time. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Consistent with ESEA section1111(i), information collected or disseminated under ESEA section 1111 shall be collected and disseminated in a manner that protects the privacy of individuals consistent with section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g, commonly known as the “Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974”). When selecting a minimum n-size for reporting, States should consult the Institute for Education Sciences report “Best Practices for Determining Subgroup Size in Accountability Systems While Protecting Personally Identifiable Student Information” to identify appropriate statistical disclosure limitation strategies for protecting student privacy. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Consistent with ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B), this description should not be construed as requiring a State to develop or implement a teacher, principal or other school leader evaluation system. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. California *Education Code (EC)* Section 47605(l) states that teachers in charter schools shall hold a CTC certificate, permit, or other document equivalent to that which a teacher in other public schools would be required to hold. However, *EC* Section 47605(l) grants charter schools credentialing flexibility with regard to non-core, non-college preparatory courses. Therefore, the ESSA required definitions and approach to reporting data for ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers will account for the statutory flexibility afforded to charter schools under state law. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Available at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/rl/cf/elaeldfrmwrksbeadopted.asp>. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Eligible entities include LEAs, community based organizations, Indian tribes or tribal organizations, another public or private entity, or a consortium of two or more such agencies or organizations or entities. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)