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## Executive Summary

In March of 2019, the SBE approved a revised self-reflection tool for Priority 3 (Parental Involvement and Family Engagement). At this meeting, the SBE communicated their desire to learn from the first year’s implementation.

In response to the SBE’s request, the CDE, in partnership with Region 15 and REL West, both at WestEd, conducted a formative analysis of data reported in the 2019 Dashboard.

It is important to note that the purpose of this study was to learn from the first year of implementation rather than to evaluate the effectiveness of family engagement strategies throughout California; however, there are important findings that may support the improvement of family engagement across California.

The methodology involved a quantitative analysis of the ratings reported by 2,361 LEAs across California as well as a qualitative analysis of the narratives from a stratified sample of 198 LEAs, randomly selected from every region of the state to represent all LEAs. The design and methodology were developed by the CDE and vetted by Region 15 and REL West prior to the qualitative approach being approved by the IES.

The analysis of ratings submitted by LEAs in the 2019 Dashboard, shows that:

* **LEAs tended to rate themselves at the higher end of the rating scale** with Practice 2(creating welcoming environments for all families in the community) being the practice with the highest percentage of LEAs rating themselves at a 4 or 5.
* **The practice with the highest percentage of LEAs rating themselves at a 1 or 2 was Practice 12 (**progress in providing opportunities to have families, teachers, principals, and district administrators work together to plan, design, implement and evaluate family engagement activities at school and district levels).

Narratives from a stratified random sample of 198 LEAs show that:

* LEAs were more apt to write about their strengths as opposed to identifying focus areas and how they would work with underrepresented families.
* Across all narratives, between 46 and 48 percent of LEAs address engagement of underrepresented families within their narratives.
* The top strength identified within each narrative section was:
	+ Narrative 1: Two-way communication with families;
	+ Narrative 2: Providing families with information and resources to support student learning at home; and
	+ Narrative 3: Engaging families and encouraging them to provide input.
* The top focus area for improvement identified within each narrative section was:
	+ Narrative 1: To support underrepresented students and families;
	+ Narrative 2: To engage underrepresented families; and
	+ Narrative 3: To provide families with opportunities to provide input.

Based on the learnings from this study, the report identifies the following needs:

* Revise the instructions for the self-reflection tool to clarify that the ratings and narrative responses provided an LEA must be based on an analysis of stakeholder input and local data.
* Revise the narrative prompt. The narrative prompt for each of the three sections currently requires an LEA to describe: (1) its current strengths and progress, (2) its focus area(s) for improvement, and (3) how it will improve engagement of underrepresented families. Based on lessons learned from the report the CDE recommends that the current narrative prompt be broken out into three narrative prompts, with each prompt addressing a component of the current narrative prompt.

* Require LEAs to provide an appropriate response within each field of the Dashboard.
* Update Dashboard functionality related to the Priority 3 local indicator to:
	+ Establish business rules to avoid nulls and zeros in the ratings section and no responses (i.e. blank narrative boxes) in the narrative section; and
	+ Update the self-reflection tool in the Dashboard to incorporate revisions adopted by the SBE.

## Introduction

Family engagement is an essential strategy for building pathways to college and career readiness for all students and is an essential component of a systems approach to improving outcomes for all students. More than 30 years of research has shown that family engagement can lead to improved student outcomes, including attendance, student engagement, academic outcomes, and social emotional learning.

The Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) legislation recognized the importance of family engagement by identifying parental involvement and family engagement (Priority 3) as one of the 10 priorities to be addressed in an LEA’s Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) and measured and reported annually in the Dashboard.

## Background

### State Board Approved Standards for Local Indicators

In 2016, the SBE approved standards for the LCFF priorities for which there is no data collected at the state level. Priority 3 is one of these local indicators. The standards for local indicators support LEAs in measuring and reporting their progress within the appropriate priority area. For each local indicator, the standards require LEAs to:

1. Measure LEA progress on the local indicator based on locally available information;
2. Report the results to the LEA's local governing board at a regularly scheduled meeting of the local governing board; and
3. Report to stakeholders and the public through the Dashboard.

The collection and reflection on locally available data supports LEAs in completing the self-reflection tools, reporting in the Dashboard, and in local planning and improvement efforts.

### First Self-Reflection Tool for Priority 3 (Parental Involvement and Family Engagement)

The SBE adopted the first self-reflection tool for Priority 3 (Parental Involvement and Family Engagement) at their January 2017 meeting. This tool asked LEAs to provide a narrative summary of their progress toward: (1) seeking input from parents/guardians in school and district decision-making; and (2) promoting parental participation in programs. The summary of progress was to be based either on information collected through surveys of parents/guardians or other local measures. Under either option, the LEA was to briefly describe why it chose the selected measures, including whether the LEA expected that progress on the selected measure was related to goals it had established for other LCFF priorities in its LCAP. Family engagement practitioners in California as well as advocacy groups and others recognized the limitations of the first self-reflection tool. LEAs were given the option to develop their own measure of progress or use a survey of parents and guardians. Each LEA selected its own survey or local measure, and there was no way to determine the quality of the survey or the rate of response.

At the recommendation of the School Conditions and Climate Workgroup, the Superintendent established the Ad Hoc Family Engagement Workgroup composed of practitioners, family engagement experts, advocacy groups, and representatives from the CDE. The Workgroup met for over a year to identify current challenges and barriers to family engagement and review research and best practices. The Workgroup built on the CDE’s Family Engagement Toolkit, published in 2017, and Assembly Bill 2878 (Chapter 826, Statutes of 2018), enacted in September of 2018, which updated the definition of family engagement to align with current research. The culmination of the Workgroup’s efforts was the recommendation to the SBE to adopt a revised self-reflection tool for Priority 3 (Parental Involvement and Family Engagement).

### Overview of Current Self-Reflection Tool for Priority 3 (Parental Involvement and Family Engagement)

In March 14, 2019, the SBE approved the revised self-reflection tool for Priority 3 (Parental Involvement and Family Engagement) as recommended by the Ad Hoc Family Engagement Workgroup. The SBE directed LEAs to use the new tool for reporting in the 2019 Dashboard.

The current self-reflection tool asks LEAs to engage stakeholders in a self-reflection process that helps them determine their stage of implementation in 12 research-based practices, describe their strengths and progress in three areas of family engagement, and identify focus areas for improvement, including how the LEA will improve the engagement of underrepresented families.

As shown in Table 1, this self-reflection tool is organized into three sections: In each section, there are four research-based practices that contribute to equitable and authentic family engagement and building partnerships between educators and families. LEAs are to rate their implementation stage on each of the practices using a scale of 1 to 5, then respond to the narrative prompt.

Table 1:List of the 12 research-based practices within the self-reflection tool

| **Section 1:** Building Relationships between School Staff and Families | **Section 2**: Building Partnerships for Student Outcomes | **Section 3**: Seeking Input for Decision-making |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Practice 1**: Developing the capacity of staff (i.e. administrators, teachers, and classified staff) to build trusting and respectful relationships with families.**Practice 2:** Creating welcoming environments for all families in the community. **Practice 3:** Supporting staff to learn about each family’s strengths, cultures, languages, and goals for their children.**Practice 4:** Developing multiple opportunities for the LEA and school sites to engage in two-way communication between families and educators using language that is understandable and accessible to families. | **Practice 5:** Providing professional learning and support to teachers and principals to improve a school’s capacity to partner with families.**Practice 6:** Providing families with information and resources to support student learning and development in the home**Practice 7:** Implementing policies or programs for teachers to meet with families and students to discuss student progress and ways to work together to support improved student outcomes.**Practice 8:** Supporting families to understand and exercise their legal rights and advocate for their own students and all students. | **Practice 9:** Progress in building the capacity of and supporting principals and staff to effectively engage families in advisory groups and with decision-making.**Practice 10:** Progress in building the capacity of and supporting family members to effectively engage in advisory groups and decision-making.**Practice 11:** Progress in providing all families with opportunities to provide input on policies and programs, and implementing strategies to reach and seek input from any underrepresented groups in the school community.**Practice 12:** Progress in providing opportunities to have families, teachers, principals, and district administrators work together to plan, design, implement and evaluate family engagement activities at school and district levels. |

As described in the introduction to the self-reflection tool, for each practice, an LEA is expected to:

* **Identify the diverse stakeholders that need to participate in the self-reflection process** in order to ensure input from all groups of families, staff and students in the LEA, including families of unduplicated students, families of individuals with exceptional needs, as well as families of underrepresented students.
* **Engage stakeholders in determining what data and information will be considered** to complete the self-reflection tool. LEAs should consider how the practices apply to families of all student groups, including families of unduplicated students, families of individuals with exceptional needs, as well as families of underrepresented students.
* **Based on the analysis of data, identify the rating number which best indicates the LEA's current stage of implementation for each practice** using the following rating scale (lowest to highest):[[1]](#footnote-1)

1: Exploration and Research Phase

2: Beginning Development

3: Initial Implementation

4: Full Implementation

5: Full Implementation and Sustainability

* **Respond to the narrative prompt at the end of each section of the tool.** Essentially, the narrative prompt calls on LEAs to briefly describe the LEA’s current strengths and progress with respect to the applicable section of the tool and to identify a focus area for improvement specific to the applicable section of the tool, including how the LEA will improve the engagement of underrepresented families.
* **Use the information from the self-reflection process to inform the LCAP and the LCAP development process**, as well as the development of other school and district plans.

Once the LEA has completed the self-reflection process using the tool, the LEA reports the results to the local board and posts the results in the Dashboard, following the SBE standards for all local indicators. The report in the dashboard includes selecting whether the LEA fulfilled the SBE standard, by selecting “met, not met, or not met for two or more years” as well as the ratings for each of the 12 practices and the narratives for each of the three sections.

The self-reflection tool is designed to enable an LEA to engage in continuous improvement and determine next steps to strengthen implementation of the research-based practices in the tool as well as to make identified improvements in the areas identified in the tool. The results of the self-reflection process are to be used to inform the LCAP and the LCAP development process; for example, to assess prior year goals, actions and services, as well as to plan or modify future goals, actions, and services in the LCAP. Additionally, the results of the self-reflection process should be taken into consideration when developing other school level and LEA level plans.

### Technical Assistance to Support Implementation of the Self-Reflection Tool

To support the implementation of the tool, the CDE offered presentations at multiple venues and provided technical assistance to individual LEAs. Presentations included a statewide webinar on May 26, 2019 attended by 421 participants, and presentations at state conferences, including the Multi-Tier Systems of Support conference, the California Educational Research Association, and the CDE Equity Summit, all in 2019. Presentations were made at national venues which were also attended by participants from California. These included the Rise up for Equity Conference hosted by the Institute for Educational Leadership (IEL) and the Coalition for Community Schools, as well as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) conference. Further, the tool was shared and promoted at the Community Engagement Initiative meeting. Support to LEAs was provided on a 1:1 basis upon request.

At the recommendation of the SBE, technical assistance suggested that LEAs:

* Use language that is accessible and understandable to parents
* Include an explanation of how the LEA arrived at conclusions reported on the self-reflection tool; for example, what evidence was considered, how the LEA arrived at the ratings/based the ratings on local data/evidence/information within their narrative descriptions

## Purpose of Study

When the SBE approved the revised self-reflection tool for Priority 3 (Parental Involvement and Family Engagement), they stated their desire to learn about the first year of the self-reflection tool’s implementation.

In response to the SBE’s request, the CDE conducted a study of the data reported by LEAs in the 2019 Dashboard. The purpose of the study is to gain an understanding of the data reported during the first year of the tool’s implementation. It is not considered an evaluative study but rather a description of findings related to how LEAs rated themselves on each of the 12 practices included in the revised tool, and how LEAs responded to the narrative prompts.

The study was framed around the following overarching questions:

1. How many LEAs reported meeting the SBE standard for local indicators (required for 2019) in the Dashboard?
2. How did LEAs rate themselves across each of the 12 practices?
3. To what extent did LEAs address the prompt for the three narratives, including identifying strengths and areas of focus?
4. To what extent did LEAs address the SBE guidance (e.g. mentioned using evidence to determine ratings)
5. How did LEAs engage stakeholders in completing the self-reflection process?

The design of the study was developed with technical assistance from the R15 CC and REL West, both at WestEd.

## Study Design/Methodology

The design for this study was developed in response to the SBE’s request to learn more about the first year of implementation of the revised self-reflection tool. Using the guiding questions above, the CDE developed a draft proposal with technical assistance from the R15 CC and REL West at WestEd.

The study involved three parts:

1. An analysis of how many LEAs reported meeting the SBE standards for local indicators (See Appendix D, Data and Methodology)
2. An analysis of the rating data submitted by LEAs in the 2019 Dashboard for Priority 3 (Parental Involvement and Family Engagement)
3. An analysis of the narrative descriptions submitted by a scientifically-selected sample of 198 LEAs which included looking at how LEAs:
	1. Described a strength and/or progress;
	2. Identified a focus area for improvement;
	3. Addressed engagement of underrepresented families;
	4. Referred to evidence that informs the narratives/ratings; and
	5. Described how the LEA engaged stakeholders.

A mixed-method approach was used to explore how LEAs in California rated themselves on the implementation of the research-based practices in family engagement. First, for the ratings of the 12 practices on a five-point Likert scale, descriptive analysis was conducted to identify the frequencies of the five ratings on each of the 12 practices. This analysis included the full population of such LEAs (n=2136[[2]](#footnote-2)).

Second, for the narrative responses aligned to the three sections areas (i.e., Building Relationships, Building Partnerships for Student Outcomes, and Seeking Input for Decision-making), qualitative analysis was conducted on a representative sample of LEAs to identify the strengths and focus areas for improvement reported by LEAs. The sample of 198 LEAs was selected through a stratified random sampling method, drawing on California’s 11 service regions, defined by the California County Superintendents Education Services Association (CCSESA). Within each region, 18 LEAs were selected, consisting of 5 types of LEAs, namely, county office of education (COE), charter school, unified school district, elementary school district, and high school district. This sampling method ensures the representativeness of the selected data, both in terms of geography and in types of LEAs. Thus, the analysis results based on these 198 LEAs could be considered as generalizable to all LEAs reporting on Priority 3 (Parental Involvement and Family Engagement).

CDE staff collaborated with WestEd staff to develop an initial set of codes for the qualitative data, based on theory and knowledge of the field. Then CDE staff contributed expertise and knowledge of the field to refine and finalize the codes in an iterative process with the WestEd staff. Focused coding techniques were used to elaborate and connect themes, and to delineate potential sub-themes within the broader topics.

The qualitative methodology for this study was reviewed and approved by the IES. For details on the study methodology, see Appendix D, Data and Methodology.

## Limitations of the Study

Self-reported measures are subjective to many biases, such as bias due to social desirability, or bias due to interpretation of questions. This tool is no exception for such a limitation. Some ways in which the instructions intended to minimize bias are by requiring LEAs to engage stakeholders:

* In the self-reflection process in order to ensure input from all groups of families, staff, and students in the LEA is collected; and
* To determine the data/information to consider in completing the self-reflection process.

However, as this was the first year of implementation of this tool, we recognized that there were variances in the way LEAs interpreted these instructions, how they rated themselves, as well as how they answered the prompts. As we continue improving the instructions of the tool to ensure its accuracy and clarity, further investigation (e.g., focus group, interviews, etc.) would be helpful to understand how LEAs approach the tool, interpret the instructions, and rate themselves.

## Findings

The 2019 Dashboard data for Priority 3 (Parental Involvement and Family Engagement) provides California with a rich body of information regarding how LEAs view their progress in each of the three major concepts that frame the self-reflection tool: (1) building relationships between school staff and families; (2) building partnerships for student outcomes; and (3) seeking input for decision-making. This information is enhanced through the provision of narrative descriptions which identify an LEA’s strengths, focus area(s), and consideration of underrepresented families.

The findings for this study are organized by the three sections of the self-reflection tool. In each section, answers to the following questions are provided:

1. How LEAs rated themselves on each of the four practices in the section (based on the full population of LEAs) using the following rating scale (lowest to highest):

1: Exploration and Research Phase

2: Beginning Development

3: Initial Implementation

4: Full Implementation

5: Full Implementation and Sustainability

1. How LEAs responded to the narrative prompts (based on 198 LEAs, selected through stratified sampling)
	1. The number and percentage of LEAs that described the following: a strength or area of progress; a focus area for improvement; engagement of underrepresented families; evidence that informed the ratings or narratives; how the LEA engaged stakeholders.
	2. Themes that emerged from the analysis of the narratives in the section.

### Findings for Section 1 (Building Relationships between School Staff and Families)

Section 1 of the self-reflection tool focuses on a foundational element of **strong family school partnerships, that of building relationships**. Within this section, LEAs rated their progress using a scale of 1 to 5 for the following four practices:

* **Practice 1**: Developing the capacity of staff (i.e. administrators, teachers, and classified staff) to build trusting and respectful relationships with families.
* **Practice 2**:Creating welcoming environments for all families in the community.
* **Practice 3**:Supporting staff to learn about each family’s strengths, cultures, languages, and goals for their children.
* **Practice 4**:Developing multiple opportunities for the LEA and school sites to engage in two-way communication between families and educators using language that is understandable and accessible to families.

In addition, LEAs responded to the following narrative prompt: Briefly describe the LEA’s current strengths and progress in this area, and identify a focus area for improvement, including how the LEA will improve the engagement of underrepresented families.

#### Ratings

Chart 1 provides a graphic representation of the ratings reported by LEAs on each of the four practices within Section 1.

Chart 1: Percentage of LEAs on each rating of the four practices within Section 1



[Chart 1 Long Description](#_Appendix_G:_Resources_1)

For practices in Section 1, the data indicates that:

* The most frequent rating was 4 (Full Implementation).
* The majority of LEAs rated themselves at 4 (Full Implementation) or 5 (Full Implementation and Sustainability)
	+ For Practices 1, 2, and 4, 70 percent or more of LEAs rated themselves at either 4 (Full Implementation) or 5 (Full Implementation with Sustainability).
	+ For Practice 3, 53 percent of LEAs rated themselves at either 4 (Full Implementation) or 5 (Full Implementation with Sustainability).
* Very few LEAs felt that they were in the 1 (Exploration and Research) stage.
	+ Less than 1 percent of LEAs rated themselves at 1 (Exploration and Research) stage for Practices 1, 2, and 4.
	+ It is noteworthy that for Practice 3, 2 percent of LEAs rated themselves at 1 (Exploration and Research) stage, and 8 percent of them rated themselves at a 2 (Beginning Development) stage.

#### Narratives

In addition to self-rating the four practices within Section 1, LEAs responded to the following narrative prompt: Briefly describe the LEA’s current strengths and progress in this area, and identify a focus area for improvement, including how the LEA will improve the engagement of underrepresented families.

Further, LEA responses to the narrative prompt describe practices being implemented at the local level, as related to building relationships.

Table 2 provides an overall description of the percentage of LEAs that addressed the prompt for the Narrative 1:

Table 2: Number and percentage of LEAs that addressed prompts for Narrative 1

| **How LEAs Addressed the Prompt** | **Total Number and Percent of LEAs****(n=198)** |
| --- | --- |
| Described a strength and/or progress | 184 (93%) |
| Identified a focus area for improvement | 105 (53%) |
| Addressed engagement of underrepresented families | 91 (46%) |
| Referred to evidence that informs the narratives/ratings | 97 (49%) |
| Described how the LEA engaged stakeholders  | 65 (33%) |

The analysis of data reported for Narrative 1 shows that of the 198 LEAs in the stratified sample:

* Almost all LEAs (93%) described a strength and/or progress in their narrative.
* Slightly over half of LEAs (53%) described a focus area for improvement and slightly less than half of LEAs (46%) addressed the engagement of underrepresented families.
* Slightly less than half (49%) of LEAs referred to evidence that informed their ratings or narratives. (Given the guidance provided in the instructions for the self-reflection tool as well as guidance provided through presentations to the field, the study also looked for indications of whether the LEA referred to evidence used to inform the ratings and/or narrative responses.)
* Further, one-third (33%) of LEAs described how they engaged stakeholders, the process of using the self-reflection tool described in the instructions.

##### Narrative Themes

In addition to seeking to gain a sense of whether LEAs address the prompts in the narrative section, the study looked at the responses provided to identify themes in the stratified sample.

* The analysis of narratives from the 93 percent of LEAs that described a strength or progress with respect to building relationships, resulted in five themes which are presented in the table below.
* The analysis of narratives from the 53 percent of LEAs that described a focus area with respect to building relationships, resulted in the emergence of four themes.

Table 3 shows the number of LEAs that reported having each of the specific strengths or focus areas followed by a bulleted list of practices that were included in the theme. Note the following:

* Themes are listed in the table in the order of their frequencies.
* An LEA was counted for the theme if they reported at least one of the practices listed under the theme; On the other hand, an LEA that reported more than one practice under a theme was only counted once for each theme. In other words, the sum of the frequencies of the sub-themes is usually bigger than the frequency of the theme in Table 2. The reason is that the LEAs may report practicing several sub-themes within one theme.

Table 3: Number of LEAs that reported having specific strengths, focus areas, referring to evidence to inform their ratings, and using various methods to engage stakeholders, with regards to building relationship with families (Narrative 1)

| **Strengths, Focus Areas, and how LEAs Use Evidence and Engage Stakeholders** | **Total LEAs****(n =198)** |
| --- | --- |
| **Strength 1**: **Two-way communication with families*** Individual communication by various formats: phone calls, text messages, parent portal, ParentSquare, in person meeting, etc.
* Joint meetings, e.g., town hall meetings, advisory group meetings, meetings with stakeholders, etc.
* Social/informal events, e.g., community dinner, coffee with principal, etc.
* Making system-level information accessible and comprehensible/digestible to all families
 | 130 (66%) |
| **Strength 2**: **Building trusting relationships with and building capacity of families*** Creating staff positions specifically for family and community engagement, e.g., parent liaison, coordinator, parent education consultant, family ambassador, family community liaisons, etc.
* Connecting with individual families, e.g., parent teacher home visits, home visits, individual intake meetings, individual learning plans, etc.
* Not limited to school site; occurs in a place that is comfortable for families, e.g., field trip, parent resource center, etc.
* Open door policies
* Parent project courses; parent training/workshops
 | 115 (58%) |
| **Strength 3**: **Welcoming environment** * Environment is safe, respectful, nurturing, inclusive, and supportive
* Environment is linguistically and culturally sensitive
 | 76 (38%) |
| **Strength 4: Engaging underrepresented families*** Cultural recognition and cultural celebrations
* Providing interpretation services/materials in multiple languages
* Removing barriers, such as providing transportation, providing childcare during meeting
* Supporting homeless youth, foster youth, students with disabilities, and other underrepresented students
 | 58 (29%) |
| **Strength 5: Educator capacity building*** Staff/teachers are trained to provide individual connections with families/students
* Providing professional development (PD) on cultural sensitivities
* Other capacity building practices, e.g., including family engagement in job duties or responsibilities of staff
 | 38 (19%) |
| **Focus area 1: To support underrepresented students and families*** To provide language and cultural support, e.g., translation services
* To minimize barriers through individual outreach to underrepresented families
* To support homeless youth, foster youth, students with disabilities, and other underrepresented students
 | 51 (26%) |
| **Focus area 2: To improve two-way communication with families*** To increase and improve methods of communication with families
* To provide more events/opportunities to communicate with families and to increase the parent participation/involvement
 | 46 (23%) |
| **Focus area 3:** **To build capacities of educators and staff to partner with families*** To provide cultural proficiency PD; to provide PD for best practices for working effectively with underrepresented families
* To help teachers/staff learn about the individual strengths of each family as well as their culture, language, and goals for their children
 | 34 (17%) |
| **Focus area 4: To create positive school climate/environment** * To provide safe, inclusive, and welcoming school and office environments
 | 10 (5%) |
| **How LEAs refer to evidence** to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings* Survey data to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings
* Other forms of evidence to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings
 | 97 (49%) |
| **How LEAs use various methods to engage stakeholders*** Feedback loops, focus groups, interviews, surveys, etc.
 | 65 (33%) |

For the details of the narrative results by LEA types (i.e., COE, charter, and district) as well as specific examples of narrative descriptions that were categorized into the themes in Table 3, please refer to Appendix F, Details of Narrative Analysis Results.

#### Observations of Ratings and Narratives Together

The team noticed several interesting themes when looking at the ratings and narratives together:

For the rating results, which was based on the full population, two practices in Section 1 explicitly address building educator capacity; Practice 1, developing the capacity of staff to build trusting and respectful relationships with families, and Practice 3, supporting staff to learn about each family’s strengths, cultures, languages, and goals for their children respectively.

* For Practice 1, the majority of LEAs (72%) rated themselves at Full Implementation or Full Implementation and Sustainability and in the narratives, two-thirds of LEAs (66%) mentioned building trusting relationships with families as a strength.
* In contrast, for Practice 3, slightly more than half (53%) rated themselves at those top levels.

Interestingly, when examining the narrative data, which was based on 198 LEAs, only 17 percent of LEAs mentioned capacity building of educators as a focus area for improvement.

### Findings for Section 2 (Building Partnerships for Student Outcomes)

Section 2 of the self-reflection tool focuses on **building partnerships for student outcomes**. Within this section, LEAs rated their progress, using a scale of 1 to 5, for the following four practices:

* **Practice 5:** Providing professional learning and support to teachers and principals to improve a school’s capacity to partner with families.
* **Practice 6:** Providing families with information and resources to support student learning and development in the home.
* **Practice 7:** Implementing policies or programs for teachers to meet with families and students to discuss student progress and ways to work together to support improved student outcomes.
* **Practice 8:** Supporting families to understand and exercise their legal rights and advocate for their own students and all students.

In addition, LEAs responded to the following narrative prompt: Briefly describe the LEA’s current strengths and progress in this area, and identify a focus area for improvement, including how the LEA will improve the engagement of underrepresented families.

#### Ratings

Chart 2 provides a summary of the ratings reported by LEAs on each of the four practices within Section 2.

Chart 2: Percentage of LEAs on each rating of the four practices within Section 2
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For practices in Section 2, the data indicates that:

* The majority of LEAs rated themselves at 4 (Full Implementation) or 5 (Full Implementation and Sustainability).
	+ Practice 7 reflected the highest percentage of LEAs being at 5 (Full Implementation and Sustainability) stage.
	+ Practice 5 reflected a lower percentage of LEAs reporting being at 4 (Full Implementation) or 5 (Full Implementation and Sustainability) stage.
* There were two practices in this section in which 9 percent or above of LEAs rated themselves at 1 (Exploration and Research) or 2 (Beginning Development)
	+ For Practice 5, 2 percent of LEAs rated themselves at 1 (Exploration and Research); and 8 percent of LEAs rated themselves at 2 (Beginning Development).
	+ For Practice 8, 3 percent of LEAs rated themselves at 1 (Exploration and Research); and 6 percent of LEAs rated themselves at 2 (Beginning Development).

#### Narratives

In addition to self-rating the four practices within Section 2, LEAs responded to the following narrative prompt: Briefly describe the LEA’s current strengths and progress in this area, and identify a focus area for improvement, including how the LEA will improve the engagement of underrepresented families.

Further, LEA responses to the narrative prompt describe practices being implemented at the local level, as related to student outcomes.

Table 4 provides an overall description of the percentage of LEAs that addressed the prompt for Narrative 2:

Table 4: Number and percentage of LEAs that addressed prompts for Narrative 2

| **How LEAs addressed the prompt** | **Total Number and Percent of LEAs****(n=198)** |
| --- | --- |
| Described a strength and/or progress | 176 (89%) |
| Identified a focus area for improvement | 111 (56%) |
| Addressed engagement of underrepresented families | 91 (46%) |
| Referred to evidence that informs the narratives/ratings | 89 (45%) |
| Described how the LEA engaged stakeholders  | 58 (29%) |

The analysis of data reported for Narrative 2 shows that of the 198 LEAs in the stratified sample:

* Almost 90 percent of LEAs described a strength or progress area.
* Slightly more than half of LEAs identified a focus area for improvement.
* Only 46 percent addressed the engagement of underrepresented families, although all LEAs were required to address this area.
* Less than half of the LEAs referred to evidence.
* 29 percent of LEAs described how they engaged stakeholders.

##### Narrative Themes

In addition to seeking to gain a sense of whether LEAs address the prompts in the narrative section, the study looked at the responses provided to identify themes in the stratified sample.

* The analysis of narratives from the 89 percent of LEAs that described a strength or progress with respect to building relationships, resulted in five themes which are presented in the table below.
* The analysis of narratives from the 56 percent of LEAs that described a focus area with respect to building relationships, resulted in the emergence of four themes.

Table 5 shows the number of LEAs that reported having each of the specific strengths or focus areas followed by a bulleted list of practices that were included in the theme. Note the following:

* Themes are listed in the table in the order of their frequencies.
* An LEA was counted for the theme if they reported at least one of the practices listed under the theme. On the other hand, an LEA that reported more than one practice under a theme was only counted once for each theme. In other words, the sum of the frequencies of the sub-themes is usually bigger than the frequency of the theme in Table 4. The reason is that the LEAs may report practicing several sub-themes within one theme.

Table 5: Number and percentage of LEAs that reported having specific strengths, focus areas, referring to evidence to inform their ratings, and using various methods to engage stakeholders, with regards to building partnership with families (Narrative 2)

|  **Strengths, Focus Areas, and how LEAs Use Evidence and Engage Stakeholders** | **Total LEAs****(n=198)** |
| --- | --- |
| **Strength 1:** **Providing families with information/resources to support student learning at home*** Providing digital and non-digital communication tools
* Individual communication with families, e.g., parent-teacher meetings
* Providing information/resources related to student learning
* Providing social emotional support
 | 124 (63%) |
| **Strength 2:** **Implementing policies, programs, and/or practices for teachers/staff to work with families*** Joint events/meetings/programs, e.g., District's Coordination of Services Team meetings, School Attendance Review Board, etc.
* Developing or implementing a family engagement system/policy, e.g., school site plans and LCAP
 | 101 (51%) |
| **Strength 3: Improving schools’ capacity to partner with families*** Creating a position/team specifically to work on partnering with families
* Professional learning for teachers and staff focusing on how to better connect and partner with families
* Professional learning for teachers and staff focusing on professional learning communities (PLCs) and/or specific subjects
 | 69 (35%) |
| **Strength 4: Engaging underrepresented families*** Supporting underrepresented families via individual meetings or joint efforts (e.g., task force, community meetings, racial justice task force, community liaisons, etc.)
* Removing barriers, such as providing transportation or translation services
 | 50 (25%) |
| **Strength 5:** **Providing parents with classes/workshops or parent education** * Parent classes/workshops on academic-related topics
* Training on school or district information systems (e.g., Aeries, PowerSchool, ParentSquare, etc.), attendance, or other non-academic issues
 | 49 (25%) |
| **Strength 6: Supporting families to exercise their legal rights*** Creating multiple committees or programs to connect parents in advocating for students
* Providing families with information about their legal rights/responsibilities
 | 39 (20%) |
| **Focus area 1:** **To engage underrepresented families*** To be in direct contact with underrepresented family groups
* To provide PD training on how best to improve a school’s capacity to collaborate and engage with underrepresented families
* To remove as many barriers as possible
 | 47 (24%) |
| **Focus area 2:** **To provide families with information/resources to support student learning*** To create methods to share information and resources to support student learning and development in the home
* To provide families with information/resources (content) to support student learning
 | 34 (17%) |
| **Focus area 3:** **To provide more parent education workshops/training*** To provide more events/programs related to building family capacities
* To help parents to understand the requirements for grade level mastery; to help parents learn how to support their student’s growth in various domains
 | 31 (16%) |
| **Focus area 4: To implement policies, programs, and/or practices for teachers/staff to work with families*** To develop partnerships with the focus on student outcomes, e.g., expanding Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) parent nights, Project 2Inspire, etc.
* To make system-level improvement
 | 31 (16%) |
| **Focus area 5:** **To improve schools’ capacity to partner with families*** To provide more professional learning opportunities for teachers and staff to support effective partnerships
* To provide more opportunities to build networks and/or professional learning communities
 | 28 (14%) |
| **Focus area 6: To support families to understand and exercise their legal rights*** Continue to support families to understand and exercise their legal rights and advocate for their own child(ren)
 | 8 (4%) |
| **How LEAs refer to evidence** to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings* Survey data to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings
* Other forms of evidence to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings
 | 89 (45%) |
| **How LEAs use various methods to engage stakeholders*** Feedback loops, focus groups, interviews, surveys, etc.
 | 58 (29%) |

For the details of the narrative results by LEA types (i.e., COE, charter, and district), as well as specific examples of narrative descriptions that were categorized into the themes in Table 5, please refer to Appendix F, Details of Narrative Analysis Results.

### Findings for Section 3 (Seeking Input for Decision-making)

Section 3 of the self-reflection tool focuses on a foundational element of **seeking input for decision-making**. Within this section, LEAs rated their progress, using a scale of 1 to 5, in the following four practices:

* **Practice 9:** Progress in building the capacity of and supporting principals and staff to effectively engage families in advisory groups and with decision-making.
* **Practice 10:** Progress in building the capacity of and supporting family members to effectively engage in advisory groups and decision-making.
* **Practice 11:** Progress in providing all families with opportunities to provide input on policies and programs, and implementing strategies to reach and seek input from any underrepresented groups in the school community.
* **Practice 12:** Progress in providing opportunities to have families, teachers, principals, and district administrators work together to plan, design, implement, and evaluate family engagement activities at school and district levels.

In addition, LEAs responded to the following narrative prompt: Briefly describe the LEA’s current strengths and progress in this area, and identify a focus area for improvement, including how the LEA will improve the engagement of underrepresented families.

#### Ratings

The chart below provides a summary of the ratings reported by LEAs on each of the four practices within Section 3.

Chart 3: Percentage of LEAs on each rating of the four practices within Section 3
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For practices in Section 3, the data indicates that:

* The most frequent rating was 4 (Full Implementation).
* The majority of LEAs rated themselves at 4 (Full Implementation) or 5 (Full Implementation and Sustainability).
	+ Practice 9 reflects that 60 percent of LEAs rated themselves at either 4 (Full Implementation) or 5 (Full Implementation and Sustainability) stage.
	+ For Practices 10, 11, and 12, slightly lower than 60 percent, but more than 50 percent, of LEAs rated themselves at either the 4 (Full Implementation) or 5 (Full Implementation and Sustainability) stage.
* Conversely, very few LEAs rated themselves at 1 (Exploration and Research) stage.
	+ Less than one percent of LEAs rated themselves at 1 (Exploration and Research) for Practices 9, 10, and 11.
	+ Noticeably, 3 percent of LEAs rated themselves at 1 (Exploration and Research) for Practice 12. Practice 12 had the highest percentage of LEAs, among all four practices in Section 3, that rated themselves at 2 (Beginning Development) or 3 (Initial Development).
* Roughly a quarter of the LEAs rated themselves at 3 (Initial Implementation).

#### Narratives

In addition to self-rating the four practices within Section 3, LEAs responded to the following narrative prompt: Briefly describe the LEA’s current strengths and progress in this area, and identify a focus area for improvement, including how the LEA will improve the engagement of underrepresented families.

Further, LEA responses to the narrative prompt describe practices being implemented at the local level, as related to student outcomes.

Table 6 provides an overall description of the percentage of LEAs that addressed the prompt for the Narrative 3:

Table 6: Number and percentage of LEAs that addressed prompts for Narrative 3

| **How LEAs Addressed the Prompt** | **Total Number and Percent of LEAs****(n=198)** |
| --- | --- |
| Described a strength and/or progress | 179 (90%) |
| Identified a focus area for improvement | 114 (58%) |
| Addressed engagement of underrepresented families | 95 (48%) |
| Referred to evidence that informs the narratives/ratings | 62 (31%) |
| Described how the LEA engaged stakeholders  | 151 (76%) |

##### Narrative Themes

In addition to seeking to gain a sense of whether LEAs address the prompts in the narrative section, the study looked at the responses provided to identify themes in the stratified sample.

* The analysis of narratives from the 90 percent of LEAs that described a strength or progress with respect to building relationships, resulted in five themes which are presented in the table below.
* The analysis of narratives from the 58 percent of LEAs that described a focus area with respect to building relationships, resulted in the emergence of four themes.

Table 7 shows the number of LEAs that reported having each of the specific strengths or focus areas followed by a bulleted list of practices that were included in the theme. Note the following:

* Themes are listed in the table in the order of their frequencies.
* An LEA was counted for the theme if they reported at least one of the practices listed under the theme. On the other hand, an LEA that reported more than one practice under a theme was only counted once for each theme. In other words, the sum of the frequencies of the sub-themes is usually bigger than the frequency of the theme in Table 6. The reason is that the LEAs may report practicing several sub-themes within one theme.

Table 7: Number of LEAs that reported having specific strengths, focus areas, and referring to evidence to inform their ratings, with regards to seeking families’ input in decision-making (Narrative 3)

| **Strengths, Focus Areas, and how LEAs Use Evidence** | **Total LEAs****(n=198)** |
| --- | --- |
| **Strength 1: Engaging families and encouraging them to provide input*** Recruiting parents/families to participate in decision-making
* Using surveys via multiple platforms (e.g., text and email) to solicit feedback from families and engage them in decision-making
* Providing various events/meetings to engage families and have them participate in decision-making
 | 151 (76%) |
| **Strength 2: System-level support and practices*** Creating supportive systems (e.g., structures, policies, articulated positions, funding, and environment) in which stakeholders are encouraged to provide input
* Using various communication methods to communicate with families
* Making information accessible and understandable to all families
* Providing training and technical support to administrators (e.g., principals and staff) to support the engagement of stakeholders
 | 126 (64%) |
| **Strength 3: Supporting underrepresented families*** Mentioning/emphasizing the inclusion of underrepresented families in their efforts of engaging families in decision-making
* Providing translation services and interpreters
* Removing barriers (e.g., providing special accommodations; being flexible with location, date, time, and format of the meeting/event)
 | 60 (30%) |
| **Strength 4:** **Family capacity building*** Providing workshops/training to families on decision-making and on supporting students learning at home
 | 23 (12%) |
| **Focus area 1: To provide families with opportunities to provide input*** To recruit more families; to increase the participation of families in decision-making
* To create/provide various events/meetings/programs to have families provide input and have stakeholders work together
 | 72 (36%) |
| **Focus area 2: To support underrepresented families*** To support underrepresented families, for example, by removing barriers that may keep them from participating in decision-making opportunities
 | 47 (24%) |
| **Focus area 3: To provide system-level support** * To create a supportive/collaborative system, structure, and environment for both educators and families
* To use various communication methods to communicate with families; and/or to make information accessible and understandable to all families
* To provide training and support to administrators (e.g., principals and staff) to better engage families
 | 44 (22%) |
| **Focus area 4: To build family capacity*** To provide workshops/trainings to families and build their capacities in decision-making
 | 11 (6%) |
| **How LEAs refer to evidence to inform their responses to the narratives and/or rating** * Survey data to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings
* Other forms of evidence to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings
 | 62 (31%) |
| **How LEAs use various methods to engage stakeholders*** Feedback loops, focus groups, interviews, surveys, etc.
 | 58 (29%) |

##### How LEAs use various methods to engage stakeholders

For the details of the narrative results by LEA types (i.e., COE, charter, and district), as well as specific examples of narrative descriptions that were categorized into the themes in Table 9, please refer to Appendix F, Details of Narrative Analysis Results.

### Findings Related to All Twelve Practices

The chart below displays rating data for each of the 12 practices grouped according to the following categories/groups;

* Ratings 1 and 2
* Rating 3
* Ratings 4 and 5

Chart 4: Overview of the 12 Practices
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Data shows that across all 12 practices:

* **LEAs were more likely to rate themselves at 4 (Full Implementation) or 5 (Full Implementation and Sustainability) in Section 1, in comparison to Section 2 and Section 3.**
	+ In Section 1, 70 percent or more of LEAs rated themselves at 4 (Full Implementation) or 5 (Full Implementation and Sustainability) for Practices 1, 2, and 4.

**Practice 1**: Developing the capacity of staff (i.e. administrators, teachers, and classified staff) to build trusting and respectful relationships with families.

**Practice 2**: Creating welcoming environments for all families in the community.

**Practice 4**: Developing multiple opportunities for the LEA and school sites to engage in two-way communication between families and educators using language that is understandable and accessible to families.

* + In Section 2 and 3, only one practice (Practice 7) had 75 percent of LEAs that rated themselves at 4 (Full Implementation) or 5 (Full Implementation and Sustainability).
* **There were five practices (Practices 3, 5, 8, 11, and 12) in which 9 percent or more LEAs rated themselves at the 1 (Exploration and Research) stage or 2 (Beginning Development) stage.**

**Practice 3**: Supporting staff to learn about each family’s strengths, cultures, languages, and goals for their children.

**Practice 5**: Providing professional learning and support to teachers and principals to improve a school’s capacity to partner with families.

**Practice 8**: Supporting families to understand and exercise their legal rights and advocate for their own students and all students.

**Practice 11**: Progress in providing all families with opportunities to provide input on policies and programs, and implementing strategies to reach and seek input from any underrepresented groups in the school community.

**Practice 12**: Progress in providing opportunities to have families, teachers, principals, and district administrators work together to plan, design, implement, and evaluate family engagement activities at school and district levels.

### Comparison of Narrative Findings Across 3 Sections

Table 8: Comparison of Narrative Findings Across 3 Sections

| **Item** | **Narrative 1** | **Narrative 2** | **Narrative 3** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Described a strength and/or progress | 93% | 89% | 90% |
| Identified a focus area for improvement | 53% | 56% | 58% |
| Addressed engagement of underrepresented families | 46% | 46% | 48% |
| Referred to evidence that informs the narratives/ratings | 49% | 45% | 31% |
| Described how the LEA engaged stakeholders | 33% | 29% | 76% |

* A great majority of LEAs (89 percent or more) in the stratified sample described a strength for narrative 1, 2 and 3.
* More than half of LEAs in the stratified sample identified a focus area for improvement.
* While the prompt required LEAs to address underrepresented families, data analysis shows that less than half of LEAs did this.
* Interestingly, 76 percent of LEAs described how they engaged stakeholders in their response to narrative 3; this was a much higher percentage than in narrative 1 (33%) and narrative 2 (29%).

Table 9 provides a deeper analysis of how LEAsaddressed the engagement of underrepresented families within their narrative response as shown in Table 8. In accordance with the SBE-adopted self-reflection tool, LEAs were asked to address the engagement of underrepresented families in their narrative responses within each section of the tool.

Table 9:Underrepresented Families: Comparison of Strengths and Focus Areas Across Narratives

| **Item** | **Narrative 1** |  **Narrative 2** | **Narrative 3** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reporting underrepresented families as a strength | 58 (29%) | 50 (25%) | 60 (30%) |
| Reporting underrepresented families as a focus area  | 51 (26%) | 47 (24%) | 47 (24%) |
| Reporting underrepresented families for both strength and focus area | 18 (9%) | 6 (3%) | 12 (6%) |

The analysis of data submitted by LEAs in the sample indicated that across all three narratives:

* Slightly more than one-quarter of LEAs (25 to 30 percent) indicated the engagement of underrepresented families as a strength.
* About one-quarter of LEAs (24 to 26 percent) indicated the engagement of underrepresented families as a focus area.
* Across the three narratives, the percentages of LEAs that reported underrepresented families as both a strength and a focus area range between 3 percent and 9 percent.

## Recommendations and Next Steps

Data from the first year of the self-reflection tool’s implementation offers valuable information to state and local educational agencies that can be used to drive systemic improvements. Although the findings in this analysis are not considered to be evaluative in nature, they are indicative of what LEAs reported at a given point in time (2019 Dashboard submission). As such, the ratings reported and the narrative descriptions provided give a snapshot of where LEAs believe they were with respect to the implementation of twelve research-based family engagement practices at that time. This information can be helpful as a foundation for learning more about family engagement practices in California as well as serve as a catalyst for strengthening the implementation of research-based practices. Ultimately, the goal is to strengthen family engagement practices across the state for the benefit of students and to advance California’s vision of family engagement to one that encompasses a more systemic and integrated approach to building partnerships between schools, families and communities.

Based on the learnings from the analysis of local indicator data for Priority 3 (Parental Involvement and Family Engagement) in the 2019 Dashboard, the CDE intends to propose the following changes to the local indicator tool and process to address identified issues in the review of year one data.

* Revise the instructions for the self-reflection tool to clarify that the ratings and narrative responses provided an LEA must be based on an analysis of stakeholder input and local data.
* Revise the narrative prompt. The narrative prompt for each of the three sections currently requires an LEA to describe: (1) its current strengths and progress, (2) its focus area(s) for improvement, and (3) how it will improve engagement of underrepresented families. Based on lessons learned from the report the CDE recommends that the current narrative prompt be broken out into three narrative prompts, with each prompt addressing a component of the current narrative prompt.

* Require LEAs to provide an appropriate response within each field of the Dashboard.
* Update Dashboard functionality related to the Priority 3 local indicator to:
	+ Establish business rules to avoid nulls and zeros in the ratings section and no responses (i.e. blank narrative boxes) in the narrative section; and
	+ Update the self-reflection tool in the Dashboard to incorporate revisions adopted by the SBE.

## Final Thoughts

This study has been a valuable endeavor. The insights into how LEAs in California report their strengths and challenges across the 12 research-based practices provide a foundation for further discussion and investigation. This information can also support continued development of technical assistance and professional learning for LEAs.

The closing of schools in March 2020 highlighted the crucial need to strengthen school and family partnerships. Across California, it became readily apparent that LEAs who had built strong partnerships with families were able to more smoothly transition into distance learning. The COVID-19 Pandemic has magnified the necessity of strong family school partnerships, not only to accelerate student learning, but also to provide a safe and supportive environment that promotes the development of the whole child/student, including social emotional well-being and mental health. Families can no longer be seen as occasional partners, rather they need to be seen as equal partners in a system that works to promote improved student outcomes. Furthermore, given the disproportionate impact of COVID on traditionally underrepresented families, the importance of partnering with all families and especially families of underrepresented students is greater than it ever has been.

The Department looks forward to future Dashboard data for Priority 3 (Parental Involvement and Family Engagement) and opportunities to analyze Dashboard data in order to support LEAs in strengthening family engagement practices. The Department also looks forward to working with the SBE to strengthen implementation of research-based family engagement practices through professional development, technical assistance, and continued study of current implementation efforts. A strong commitment to family engagement, combined with a collective, collaborative, and systemic partnership will support improvement of family engagement practices for the benefit of all California students.
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### Subject

Update on the Implementation of the Integrated Local, State, and Federal Accountability and Continuous Improvement System: Update and Recommended Action Regarding Local Indicators; and Update on the Continuing Development Work; and Revisions under Consideration for the 2019 California School Dashboard.

### Type of Action

Action, Information

### Summary of the Issue(s)

With the approval of a new accountability system in May 2016, the State Board of Education (SBE) established an annual review process of the California School Dashboard (Dashboard). This process includes the review of state and local indicators and performance standards to consider necessary changes or improvements based on newly available data, recent research, and/or stakeholder feedback.

Under this process, the California Department of Education (CDE) includes state and local indicators that need revisions or updates in the work plan presented at each March SBE meeting. This process allows for a gradual and deliberate approach to improving the state and local indicators and incorporating changes prior to the annual release of the Dashboard each fall.

This item will present recommended revisions to the self-reflection tool for Parental Involvement and Family Engagement (Local Control Funding Formula [LCFF] Priority 3). In addition, the item provides an extensive update on activities and recommendations for the 2019 Dashboard release and an update on the outreach activities completed to date on the Dashboard.

### Recommendation

The CDE recommends that the SBE approve: (1) the proposed revision to the self-reflection tool for Priority 3: Parental Involvement and Family Engagement.

In addition, the CDE recommends that the SBE provide guidance on the proposed work plan and take additional action as deemed necessary and appropriate.

### Brief History of Key Issues

To meet the requirements of California *Education Code* (*EC*) Section 52064.5, the SBE has approved standards for local indicators, i.e. indicators for which the state does not collect data, which support local educational agencies (LEAs) in measuring and reporting their progress within the appropriate priority area. The local indicators are as follows:

* Basic Services and Conditions (Appropriately Assigned Teachers, Access to Curriculum-Aligned Instructional Materials, and Safe, Clean and Functional School Facilities) (Priority 1)
* Implementation of State Academic Standards (Priority 2)
* Parent Engagement (Priority 3)
* School Climate (Priority 6)
* Access to a Broad Course of Study (Priority 7)
* Coordination of Services for Expelled Students (Priority 9, for county offices of education [COEs] only)
* Coordination of Services for Foster Youth (Priority 10, for COEs only)

For each local indicator, the SBE approved the following standard:

LEAs measure their progress on the local indicator based on locally available information and reports the results to the LEA's local governing board at a regularly scheduled meeting of the local governing board and to stakeholders and the public through the Dashboard. LEAs use self-reflection tools to measure and report their progress through the Dashboard and to reflect on their progress as part of local planning and improvement efforts. LEAs that meet the SBE approved standard for a local indicator identify the standard as “Met” in the Dashboard. LEAs that fail to meet the SBE approved standard will be identified as “Not Met” or “Not Met for Two or More Years” in the Dashboard.

In September 2018, Assembly Bill 2878 amended *EC* sections 52060(d)(3) and 52066(d)(3), to expand the description of LCFF Priority 3 (Parent Involvement) to include family engagement. AB 2878 retained the existing requirements for LEAs to seek parent input in making decisions for the school district and each individual school site and to promote parental participation in programs for unduplicated pupils and individuals with exceptional needs and added identified family engagement activities for LEAs to consider for implementation.

#### Self-Reflection Tool

In 2017, the CDE established the Ad Hoc Family Engagement Workgroup (Workgroup) at the recommendation of the School Conditions and Climate Workgroup, to serve as a think tank of experts who could advise the CDE on policy related to family engagement. The Workgroup is composed of individuals with a wide range of expertise in family engagement.

For the past 18 months, the CDE in partnership with the Workgroup, has:

* Created a working definition of family engagement to inform its work
* Reviewed current research on family engagement
* Conducted research on the family engagement policies and tools in other states
* Identified potential challenges and barriers to engaging families
* Identified promising practices currently implemented in local educational agencies (LEAs) throughout California
* Analyzed the responses to the current self-reflection tool in the Dashboard
* Identified recommendations for improving the current self-reflection tool

The proposed self-reflection tool is based on current research, current state and federal guidance documents (e.g. Dual Capacity Building Framework, CDE Family Engagement Toolkit, etc.), and the recommendations of the Workgroup.

The Workgroup has made the following recommendations for the tool:

* Ensure that a diverse group of stakeholders is involved in the self-reflection process.
* Emphasize the importance of:
	+ Building relationships as the foundation for effective and equitable family engagement
	+ Connecting family engagement to student outcomes and making it an integral part of the process to develop and annually update Local Control and Accountability Plans (LCAPs)
	+ Seeking input to inform decision making
	+ Using accessible language and not educational jargon, to make the tool easily understandable for families and other stakeholders
	+ Using the tool as part of a continuous improvement process that informs the planning and development of the LCAP
* Include descriptions of effective family engagement practices taking place within the LEA
* Provide the opportunity for LEAs to provide a brief narrative about their ratings

The self-reflection tool is organized into three research supported areas:

* Building Relationships
* Building partnerships for improved student outcomes
* Seeking input for decision-making

On February 9, 2019, the draft self-reflection tool was shared with the California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG). Members expressed support for the tool and noted their appreciation for:

* Developing a tool that was user friendly, inclusive, and that incorporated promising practices supported by research.
* Engaging stakeholders in the self-reflection process, including the determination of the information/data that will help LEAs to reflect on any given practice
* The integration of practices to support engagement of underrepresented families.

Much of the feedback from the CPAG focused on how the tool would be implemented, such as how stakeholders would be identified, how stakeholders would be engaged, how data would be gathered, and how LEAs with multiple schools would gather evidence from school sites. The CDE intends to address these and other aspects of implementation through guidance and trainings.

On February 19, 2019, the CDE shared the tool with the LCFF stakeholder group and received positive feedback.

Attachment 1 contains the current self-reflection tool for LCFF Priority 3. Attachment 2 contains the Workgroup’s proposed Self-Reflection Tool for LCFF Priority 3. The CDE recommends that the SBE approve the revised self-reflection tool for use in the 2019 Dashboard.

#### The California School Dashboard

Since the SBE adopted the initial phase of the Dashboard at its September 2016 meeting, extensive feedback from numerous stakeholder input sessions and work groups continues to inform the state and local indicators and Dashboard displays and reports. The Spring 2017 Dashboard release was designed as a field test of the system. Accordingly, the system was intended to be flexible and further evolve based on user experiences and stakeholder feedback in anticipation of the first operational release of the Dashboard in fall 2017.

The 2018–19 state budget appropriated $300,000 to upgrade the look and feel of the Dashboard and make it more user-friendly. The new design is friendlier, simpler to use, easier to understand, and more intuitive. The Dashboard has been fully translated into Spanish to provide complete access to Spanish-speaking families. Web traffic statistics show that the newly redesigned Dashboard is much more widely used than the previous version. In the month of January 2019 alone, the Dashboard had over 136,000-page views and 69,000 unique users.

The CDE also developed several new resources to support the release of the 2018 Dashboard, which are posted on the CDE California School Dashboard and System of Support web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/cm/>. In addition, the School Dashboard Additional Reports and Data web page, at <https://www6.cde.ca.gov/californiamodel/>, provides several detailed reports, including the Five-by-Five Placement Reports, the College/Career Reports, the Participation Reports, and the Student Groups Report. These reports are highly popular with the public and LEA staff. In the month of January 2019, over 150,000 viewers, and over 14,223 unique users, visited the site.

The CDE will conduct a live demonstration of the Dashboard and the additional reports which support the Dashboard at the SBE March meeting.

### Summary of Previous State Board of Education Discussion and Action

In November 2014, the SBE adopted the LCAP template. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr14/documents/nov14item14.doc> )

In September 2016, the SBE approved the performance standards for all local indicators and the state indicators (except for the Academic Indicator), and the annual process for the SBE to review the rubrics to determine if updates or revisions are necessary. (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr16/documents/sep16item01.doc>)

In November 2016 meeting, the SBE approved tools for LEAs to determine progress on the local performance indicators for specific priorities within the LCFF statute. The self-reflection tools are for: Priority 1—Basic Services and Conditions at schools; Priority 6—School Climate; Priority 9—Coordination of Services for Expelled Students; and Priority 10—Coordination of Services for Foster Youth. (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr16/documents/nov16item03.doc>)

In January 2017, the SBE approved the Academic Indicator, based on student test scores on English language arts/literacy (ELA) and mathematics for grades three through eight that includes results from the second year of Smarter Balanced tests, as well as the definition of the English Learner (EL) student group for the Academic Indicator. Additionally, the SBE approved the self-reflection tools for LEAs to determine progress on the local performance indicators for Implementation of State Academic Standards (Priority 2) and Parent Engagement (Priority 3). (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/jan17item02.doc>)

Additionally, the SBE received the following Information Memorandum:

* Update on School Conditions and Climate Workgroup (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-exe-jan17item01.doc>)

In February 2017, the SBE received the following Information Memoranda:

* Updated Summary of SBE Actions Related to Adopting the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics ([http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-sbe-feb17item01v2.doc](https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-feb18item02.docx))
* Update on the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics Components: Statements of Model Practices (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-exe-jan17item02.doc>)

In March 2017, the SBE heard an update on the development of the new accountability system; an overview of alternative schools in preparation for the development of applicable indicators; a work plan for state indicator development; and an update on the local indicators—specifically, the work by the School Conditions and Climate Work Group. ([http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/mar17item02.doc](http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-exec-ocd-jun17item01.doc))

In May 2017, the SBE heard an update on the Dashboard, and received an overview of the recommendations of the English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) Workgroup. The SBE took action to approve the development of an application process to require alternative schools of choice and charter schools to re-certify—every three years—that at least 70 percent of their enrollment is comprised of high-risk students (as defined in the SBE-approved eligibility criteria) in order to continue participating as an alternative school in the accountability system. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/may17item01.doc>)

In November 2017, the SBE adopted new Status cut scores for the Academic Indicator (for both ELA and mathematics) and the Change cut scores for mathematics only. In addition, the SBE adopted new five-by-five colored grids for the Academic Indicator. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/nov17item03.doc>)

Also, in November 2017, the SBE received a summary report of the work of the School Conditions and Climate Work Group (CCWG). The report included a synopsis of the framework recommendations including state- and LEA-level recommendations. The CCWG’s recommendations comprise both those that can be acted on with existing resources and authority and those for which additional resources and authority will be necessary to implement. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/nov17item03rev.doc>)

In February 2018, the SBE received the following Information Memoranda:

* Update on the Development of a Revised Self-Reflection Tool for the Local Performance Indicator for Local Control Funding Formula Priority 6, School Climate (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-exec-ocd-feb18item01.docx>)

In January 2018, the SBE received an update on the outreach activities related to the Fall 2017 Dashboard release and two presentations from LEAs on their work with the Dashboard. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/jan18item01.docx>)

In February 2018, the SBE received the following Information Memoranda:

* Developing a New State Accountability System: Update on the Implementation of the College/Career Indicator; Including the Expansion of Career Measures and Performance Comparisons for Academic Measures (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-feb18item02.docx>)
* Developing a New State Accountability System: Update on the Development of a Student-Level Growth Model (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-feb18item01.docx>)

In March 2018, the SBE heard an update on the continuing development work of the Dashboard, including revisions under consideration for the 2018 Dashboard, and an update on the local indicators—specifically, the proposed revision to the self-reflection tool for Priority 6: School Climate; in addition, the SBE approved the tool for LEAs to determine progress on the local performance indicators for LCFF Priority 7: Access to a Broad Course of Study. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/mar18item01.docx>)

In April 2018, the SBE approved revisions to California’s Every School Succeeds Act (ESSA) Plan for resubmission to the U.S. Department of Education (ED) (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/apr18item01.docx>)

Also, in April 2018, the SBE received the following Information Memoranda:

* Request to the U.S. Department of Education to Waive the Every Student Succeeds Act Statute for the English Learner Proficiency Indicator. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-apr18item01.docx>)
* Update on the Development of the College/Career Indicator, Including an Overview of the Research Supporting the Current Model. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-apr18item02.docx>)
* Ongoing Development of California’s New Accountability System: Timeline of State Board of Education Agenda Items and Information Memoranda Regarding the California School Dashboard. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-mar18item01.docx>)

In May 2018, the SBE adopted methodology for calculating the one-year graduation rate for schools with Dashboard Alternative School Status (DASS). (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/may18item02.docx>)

In June 2018, the SBE received the following Information Memoranda:

* Update on the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California. <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-adad-jun18item02.docx>
* Ongoing Development of California’s New Accountability System: Update on Revisions to Calculating the Graduation Rate and Impact on the California School Dashboard. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-jun18item02.docx>)

In July 2018, the SBE approved the application of the safety net methodology at the student group level and the three-year plan for the ELPI. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/jul18item01.docx>)

In August 2018, the SBE received a revised draft of California’s ESSA Plan. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-exec-essa-aug17item01-rev.doc>)

In September 2018, the SBE approved two new measures—the State Seal of Biliteracy and Leadership/Military Science—for inclusion in the College/Career Indicator; the methodology for the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator; cut scores for the DASS graduation rate; and the reporting of the five-year graduation rate in the Dashboard. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/sep18item01.docx>)

In October 2018, the SBE received an Information Memorandum on the ongoing implementation of California’s accountability system, including a timeline of activities and SBE agenda items and Information Memoranda regarding the Dashboard. <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-oct18item02.docx>)

In November 2018, the SBE approved further amendments to California’s ESSA State Plan (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/nov18item05.docx>)

Also in November 2018, the SBE approved summative English Learner Proficiency Assessments for California threshold scores (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/nov18item09.docx>)

### Fiscal Analysis (as appropriate)

The 2018–19 state budget funds the Proposition 98 Minimum Guarantee at $78.4 billion. This reflects state funding of $54.9 billion and local funding of $23.5 billion, accounting for $11,631 in transitional kindergarten through grade twelve per-pupil funding. The budget package fully funds the LCFF two years ahead of the estimated time frame for implementation.

### Attachment(s)

* Attachment 1: Current Self-Reflection Tool for Local Control Funding Formula Priority 3: Parental Involvement and Family Engagement (3 Pages)
* Attachment 2: Proposed Self-Reflection Tool for Local Control Funding Formula Priority 3: Parental Involvement and Family Engagement (9 Pages)
* Attachment 3: Revisions Under Consideration for the 2019 California School Dashboard (6 Pages)
* Attachment 4: California School Dashboard Educational Outreach Activities
(8 Pages)

### Attachment 1

### Current Self-Reflection Tool for Local Control Funding Formula Priority 3: Parental Involvement and Family Engagement

#### Parent Engagement

**Standard:** The local educational agency (LEA) annually measures its progress in: (1) seeking input from parents in decision making; and (2) promoting parental participation in programs, and reports the results to its local governing board at a regularly scheduled meeting and to stakeholders and the public through the California School Dashboard (Dashboard).

**Criteria:** The LEA will assess its performance on a (Met, Not Met, or Not Met for Two or More Years) scale.

**Evidence:** The LEA measures its progress using the self-reflection tool included in the Dashboard, and reports these results to its local governing board at a regularly scheduled meeting and through the local data selection option in the Dashboard.

#### Approach for Self-Reflection Tool to Use as Evidence

LEAs will provide a narrative summary of their progress toward: (1) seeking input from parents/guardians in school and district decision making; and (2) promoting parental participation in programs.

The summary of progress must be based either on information collected through surveys of parents/guardians or other local measures. Under either option, the LEA briefly describes why it chose the selected measures, including whether the LEA expects that progress on the selected measure is related to goals it has established for other LCFF priorities in its local control and accountability plan (LCAP).

#### OPTION 1: Survey

If the LEA administers a local survey to parents/guardians in at least one grade within each grade span that the LEA serves (e.g., K–5, 6–8, and 9–12), the LEA will summarize the following in the text box provided in the Dashboard:

1. The key findings from the survey related to seeking input from parents/guardians in school and district decision making;
2. The key findings from the survey related to promoting parental participation in programs; and
3. Why the LEA chose the selected survey and whether the findings relate to the goals established for other LCFF priorities in the LCAP.

[Insert text here]

#### OPTION 2: Local Measures Summarize the following in the text box provided in the Dashboard:

The LEA’s progress on at least one measure related to seeking input from parents/guardians in school and district decision making;

1. The LEA’s progress on at least one measure related to promoting parental participation in programs; and
2. Why the LEA chose the selected measures and whether the findings relate to the goals established for other LCFF priorities in the LCAP.

Examples of measures that LEAs might select are listed below.

1. Seeking Input in School/District Decision Making
	1. Measure of teacher and administrator participation in professional development opportunities related to engaging parents/guardians in decision making.
	2. Measure of participation by parents/guardians in trainings that also involve school/district staff to build capacity in working collaboratively.
	3. Measure of parent/guardian participation in meetings of the local governing board and/or advisory committees.
2. Promoting Participation in Programs
3. Measure of whether school sites have access to interpretation and translation services to allow parents/guardians to participate fully in educational programs and individual meetings with school staff related to their child’s education.
4. Measure of whether school sites provide trainings or workshops for parents/guardians that are linked to student learning and/or social-emotional development and growth.
5. Measure of whether school and district staff (teachers, administrators, support staff) have completed professional development on effective parent/guardian engagement in the last two school years.

[Insert text here]

### Attachment 2

### Proposed Self-Reflection Tool for Local Control Funding Formula Priority 3: Parental Involvement and Family Engagement

#### Self-Reflection Tool for Priority 3: Parent Engagement

**Standard:** The local educational agency (LEA) annually measures its progress in: (1) seeking input from parents in decision making; and (2) promoting parental participation in programs, and reports the results to its local governing board at a regularly scheduled meeting and to stakeholders and the public through the California School Dashboard (Dashboard).

**Criteria:** The LEA will assess its performance on a (Met, Not Met, or Not Met for Two or More Years) scale.

**Evidence:** The LEA measures its progress using the self-reflection tool included in the Dashboard, and reports these results to its local governing board at a regularly scheduled meeting and through the local data selection option in the Dashboard.

#### Introduction

Family engagement is an essential strategy for building pathways to college and career readiness for all students and is an essential component of a systems approach to improving outcomes for all students. More than thirty years of research has shown that family engagement can lead to improved student outcomes (e.g. attendance, engagement, academic outcomes, social emotional learning, etc.). Consistent with the California Department of Education’s (CDE’s) Family Engagement Toolkit:[[3]](#footnote-3)

* Effective and authentic family engagement has been described as an intentional partnership of educators, families and community members who share responsibility for a child from the time they are born to becoming an adult.
* To build an effective partnership, educators, families, and community members need to develop the knowledge and skills to work together, and schools must purposefully integrate family and community engagement with goals for students' learning and thriving.

The Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) legislation recognized the importance of family engagement by requiring LEAs to address Priority 3 within their local control and accountability plan (LCAP). The self-reflection tool described below enables LEAs to reflect upon their implementation of family engagement as part of their continuous improvement process and prior to updating their LCAP.

For LEAs to engage all families equitably, it is necessary to understand the cultures, languages, needs and interests of families in the local area. Furthermore, developing family engagement policies, programs, and practices needs to be done in partnership with local families, using the tools of continuous improvement.

#### Instructions

This self-reflection tool is organized into three sections. Each section includes promising practices in family engagement:

1. Building Relationships between School Staff and Families
2. Building Partnerships for Student Outcomes
3. Seeking Input for Decision-making

LEAs use this self-reflection tool to reflect on its progress, successes, needs and areas of growth in family engagement policies, programs, and practices. This tool will enable an LEA to engage in continuous improvement and determine next steps to make improvements in the areas identified.

The results of the process should be used to inform the LCAP and the development process, to assess prior year goals, actions and services as well as to plan or modify future goals, actions, and services in the LCAP.

For each statement in the table below:

1. Identify the diverse stakeholders that need to participate in the self-reflection process in order to ensure input from all groups of families, staff and students in the LEA, including families of unduplicated students and families of individuals with exceptional needs as well as families of underrepresented students.
2. Engage stakeholders in determining what data and information will be considered to complete the self-reflection tool. LEAs should consider how the practices apply to families of all student groups, including families of unduplicated students and families of individuals with exceptional needs as well as families of underrepresented students.
3. Based on the analysis of data, identify the number which best indicates the LEA’s current stage of implementation for each practice using the following rating scale (lowest to highest):

1 – Exploration and Research Phase

2 – Beginning Development

3 – Initial Implementation

4 – Full Implementation

5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability

1. Write a brief response to the prompts following each of the three sections.
2. Use the information from the self-reflection process to inform the LCAP and the LCAP development process, as well as the development of other school and district plans.

#### Building Relationships

1. **Rate the LEA’s progress in developing the capacity of staff (i.e. administrators, teachers, and classified staff) to build trusting and respectful relationships with families.**

*Rating Scale (lowest to highest): 1 – Exploration and Research Phase; 2 – Beginning Development; 3 – Initial Implementation; 4 – Full Implementation; 5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability*

[Insert rating]

1. **Rate the LEA’s progress in creating welcoming environments for all families in the community.**

*Rating Scale (lowest to highest): 1 – Exploration and Research Phase; 2 – Beginning Development; 3 – Initial Implementation; 4 – Full Implementation; 5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability*

[Insert rating]

1. **Rate the LEA’s progress in supporting staff to learn about each family’s strengths, cultures, languages, and goals for their children.**

*Rating Scale (lowest to highest): 1 – Exploration and Research Phase; 2 – Beginning Development; 3 – Initial Implementation; 4 – Full Implementation; 5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability*

[Insert rating]

1. **Rate the LEA’s progress in developing multiple opportunities for the LEA and school sites to engage in two-way communication between families and educators using language that is understandable and accessible to families.**

*Rating Scale (lowest to highest): 1 – Exploration and Research Phase; 2 – Beginning Development; 3 – Initial Implementation; 4 – Full Implementation; 5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability*

[Insert rating]

**Dashboard Narrative Box**

Briefly describe the LEA’s current strengths and progress in this area, and identify a focus area for improvement, including how the LEA will improve the engagement of underrepresented families.

 [Insert description]

#### Building Partnerships for Student Outcomes

1. **Rate the LEA’s progress in providing professional learning and support to teachers and principals to improve a school’s capacity to partner with families.**

*Rating Scale (lowest to highest): 1 – Exploration and Research Phase; 2 – Beginning Development; 3 – Initial Implementation; 4 – Full Implementation; 5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability*

[Insert rating]

1. **Rate the LEA’s progress in providing families with information and resources to support student learning and development in the home.**

*Rating Scale (lowest to highest): 1 – Exploration and Research Phase; 2 – Beginning Development; 3 – Initial Implementation; 4 – Full Implementation; 5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability*

[Insert rating]

1. **Rate the LEA’s progress in implementing policies or programs for teachers to meet with families and students to discuss student progress and ways to work together to support improved student outcomes.**

*Rating Scale (lowest to highest): 1 – Exploration and Research Phase; 2 – Beginning Development; 3 – Initial Implementation; 4 – Full Implementation; 5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability*

[Insert rating]

1. **Rate the LEA’s progress in supporting families to understand and exercise their legal rights and advocate for their own students and all students.**

*Rating Scale (lowest to highest): 1 – Exploration and Research Phase; 2 – Beginning Development; 3 – Initial Implementation; 4 – Full Implementation; 5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability*

[Insert rating]

**Dashboard Narrative Box**

Briefly describe the LEA’s current strengths and progress in this area and identify a focus area for improvement, including how the LEA will improve the engagement of underrepresented families.

[Insert description]

#### Seeking Input for Decision Making

1. **Rate the LEA’s progress in building the capacity of and supporting principals and staff to effectively engage families in advisory groups and with decision-making.**

*Rating Scale (lowest to highest): 1 – Exploration and Research Phase; 2 – Beginning Development; 3 – Initial Implementation; 4 – Full Implementation; 5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability*

[Insert rating]

1. **Rate the LEA’s progress in building the capacity of and supporting family members to effectively engage in advisory groups and decision-making.**

*Rating Scale (lowest to highest): 1 – Exploration and Research Phase; 2 – Beginning Development; 3 – Initial Implementation; 4 – Full Implementation; 5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability*

[Insert rating]

1. **Rate the LEA’s progress in providing all families with opportunities to provide input on policies and programs, and implementing strategies to reach and seek input from any underrepresented groups in the school community.**

*Rating Scale (lowest to highest): 1 – Exploration and Research Phase; 2 – Beginning Development; 3 – Initial Implementation; 4 – Full Implementation; 5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability*

[Insert rating]

1. **Rate the LEA’s progress in providing opportunities to have families, teachers, principals, and district administrators work together to plan, design, implement and evaluate family engagement activities at school and district levels.**

*Rating Scale (lowest to highest): 1 – Exploration and Research Phase; 2 – Beginning Development; 3 – Initial Implementation; 4 – Full Implementation; 5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability*

[Insert rating]

**Dashboard Narrative Box**

Briefly describe the LEA’s current strengths and progress in this area and identify a focus area for improvement, including how the LEA will improve the engagement of underrepresented families.

[Insert description]

#### Resources

1. Southwest Educational Development Laboratory in Collaboration with the United States Department of Education. (2013) Partners in Education: A Dual Capacity Building Framework for Family School Partnerships. Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/documents/family-community/partners-education.pdf>
2. California Department of Education. (2017). Family Engagement Toolkit: Continuous Improvement through an Equity Lens. Sacramento, CA. Author. Retrieved from <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/documents/family-engagement.pdf>
3. California Department of Education. (2017). Editable Templates for Family Engagement Toolkit. Sacramento, CA. Author. Retrieved from <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/documents/toolkittemplates.doc>
4. United States Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Head Start, National Center on Parent, Family, and Community Engagement. (2018). [Head Start Parent, Family, and Community Engagement Framework](https://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/pdf/pfce-framework.pdf). Retrieved from <https://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/pdf/pfce-framework.pdf>
5. (2018). Head Start Parent, Family, and Community Engagement Framework. Retrieved from <https://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/pdf/pfce-framework.pdf>

### Attachment 3

### Revisions Under Consideration for the 2019 California School Dashboard

The State Board of Education (SBE) annually reviews the California School Dashboard (Dashboard) indicators and performance standards to consider whether changes or improvements are needed based on newly available data, recent research, and feedback from stakeholders. The annual review process requires that the California Department of Education (CDE) update the SBE at their March meeting on which indicators are under consideration for review and/or revisions for action by the SBE. The CDE is considering the following revisions to the 2019 Dashboard:

* Incorporation of the California Alternate Assessments (CAAs) in the Academic Indicator
* Incorporation of the Five-Year Graduation Rate into the Dashboard
* Application of the Three-by-Five Color Grid for the College/Career Indicator (CCI)
* Inclusion of Status for the English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) into the Dashboard
* Inclusion of Additional Measures in the CCI for Students with Disabilities

#### Incorporation of the California Alternate Assessments in the Academic Indicator

Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are administered the CAAs for English language arts/literacy (ELA) and mathematics. Approximately one percent of all students statewide take the CAAs. In accordance with the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), states must incorporate the assessment results of all students—including those the most significant cognitive disabilities–into their state accountability systems. Beginning with the 2019 Dashboard, the CAA results will be incorporated in the calculations of the Academic Indicator.

Unlike students who take the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments, who are evaluated against meeting the California Common Core State Standards, students who take the CAAs are evaluated against their level of “understanding” of Common Core Alternate Standards:

* Level 1 is “limited understanding”
* Level 2 is “foundational understanding”’
* Level 3 is “understanding” of alternate standards

The first operational CAA was administered in spring of 2016, with the achievement standards (levels) approved by the SBE at its September 2016 meeting. In September 2017, the SBE determined that the incorporation of the CAAs into the Academic Indicator should be delayed until additional years of operational data were available and the multi-year rollout of the CAA test was complete.

In the 2018 Dashboard, CAA data (the percent of students who achieved Levels 1, 2, and 3) were displayed for informational purposes only. The CDE will be working with various stakeholder groups, as well as the Technical Design Group (TDG), to develop a methodology for incorporating the CAA results into the calculations of the Academic Indicator for the 2019 Dashboard.

#### Incorporation of the Five-Year Graduation Rate into the Dashboard

Currently, the Graduation Rate Indicator only includes the four-year cohort graduation rate. It does not capture the progress of students who take five years to graduate from high school. The SBE previously expressed an interest in using the five-year cohort graduation rate as part of the Dashboard, as it could provide an opportunity for schools to demonstrate success with students who may need additional time to earn a regular high school diploma (e.g., students with disabilities and English learners).

The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) provides states the option to include a five-year graduation rate in the accountability system: however, states are required to set a more rigorous long-term goal for an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate (or five-year rate), as compared to the long-term goal set for the four-year cohort graduation rate. Based on a CDE review of the approved states plans for all 49 states and Puerto Rico, the U.S. Department of Education (ED) approved plans that create a combined four- and five-year graduation rate (e.g., simple or weighted average) and use the same long-term goal. Using a combined rate would allow California to take the five-year graduation rate into account without having to create a separate long-term goal.

Because schools with Dashboard Alterative Schools Status (DASS) have their graduation rate indicator calculated using the one-year graduation rate, the five-year graduation rate will only be applied to non-alternative schools. The options currently under consideration for incorporating the five-year graduation rate into the 2019 Dashboard include the following:

1. Provide a performance level (color) for the four-year cohort graduation rate only and continue to report the five-year graduation rate for informative data only.
2. Calculate a simple average for the four- and five-year cohort graduation rates. A simple average provides the same weight to all four- and five-year graduates.
3. Calculate a weighted average for the four- and five-year cohort graduation rates. This method provides more weight to students who graduate in four years (e.g., 2/3) rather than five years (e.g., 1/3).
4. Report both the four- and five-year cohort graduation rates on the Dashboard and assign the performance level (color) to the higher of the two rates.
5. Add the number of students who graduated in five years to the numerator and denominator of the four-year cohort rate.

#### Application of the Three-by-Five Color Grid for the College/Career Indicator

In September 2017, the SBE approved an alternative methodology—known as the “Three-by-Five” color grid—for assigning performance levels to LEAs or schools that serve small student populations (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/sep17item02.doc>).

Application of the three-by-five color grid results in a refiguring of the performance level tables by removing two Change levels—Increased Significantly and Decreased Significantly—and thus limiting extreme changes in small student populations. This methodology, which limits large swings in the Change data that can be triggered by just a few students, was originally approved for two state indicators:

* Graduation Rate Indicator: Applied if 149 or fewer students are in the graduating cohort
* Suspension Rate Indicator: Applied if 149 of fewer are cumulatively enrolled

In July 2018, the SBE approved that the methodology also be applied at the student group level for these two indicators (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/jul18item01.docx>). At its November 2018 meeting, the SBE approved applying this methodology to the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator (reported for the first time in the 2018 Dashboard), when 149 or fewer students are enrolled (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/nov18item04.docx>).

The CDE proposes that, beginning with the 2019 Dashboard, the three-by-five methodology be applied to the CCI, which is based on the same cohort of students used in the calculations for the Graduation Rate Indicator. The CDE will bring this request to the SBE for approval in May 2019.

#### Inclusion of Status for the English Learner Progress Indicator

In September 2016, the SBE adopted the methodology for the English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) using the results of the California English Language Development Test (CELDT). In 2017–18, California transitioned from the CELDT to the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC). This new assessment is substantially different from the CELDT because it is aligned to the more recently adopted 2012 California English language development standards, and it is inappropriate to compare ELPAC and CELDT results. Therefore, results from the spring 2018 and 2019 administrations of the ELPAC will serve as a baseline from which future EL progress will be measured.

As detailed in the July 2018 SBE item, the ELPI is the only indicator that measures **progress** **towards proficiency** rather than the end goal of proficiency itself (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/jul18item01.docx>). To measure progress toward proficiency (Status), two years of ELPAC Summative results are required. Accordingly, three years of ELPAC Summative results are required to calculate Status and Change for the ELPI (and therefore to report a color-coded performance level on the Dashboard).

At the November 2018 SBE meeting, the Board approved an updated timeline to the ESSA State plan to identify an additional cohort of schools under ESSA based on the 2019 Dashboard, including the ELPI based on Status only (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/nov18item05a1rev.docx>). Therefore, Status for this indicator will be reported in the 2019 Dashboard, when two years of ELPAC Summative results are available. CDE staff will bring a methodology for how to use the ELPI status in the identification of schools under ESSA to the SBE in the fall of 2019 for consideration.

The summative ELPAC was field tested in spring 2017 to determine test reliability and validity. The first operational ELPAC summative assessment was administered in spring 2018. The ELPAC cut scores were approved by the SBE in November 2018 (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/nov18item09.docx>). The ELPI Status cut scores are anticipated to be approved by the SBE in November 2019. A proposed three-year transition plan was included in the July 2018 SBE item.

#### Inclusion of Additional Measures in the CCI for Students with Disabilities

Schools with Dashboard Alternative School Status (DASS) are schools that serve high-risk student populations, including students with disabilities. Although DASS schools are measured on the same set of indicators as non-alternative schools, modified methods are being developed in order to fairly evaluate their success and progress. The CDE has worked with the Alternative Schools Task Force—a joint project with the John W. Gardner Center at Stanford University supported with a grant from the Stuart Foundation—to identify modified measures for DASS schools and students with disabilities. Beginning in fall 2018, all DASS schools, which includes special education schools, received a Dashboard for the first time. They are held accountable for the same state indicators, although modified measures may be used to fairly evaluate the success of alternative schools and students with disabilities. These modified measures include a Grade 12 (one-year) graduation rate for DASS schools, which was approved by the SBE at its May 2018 meeting (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/may18item02.docx>).

Students who take the CAA are included in the calculation of the CCI. However, the CCI does not currently include measures that fairly evaluate the success of these students. Based on the recommendation of the Alternative Schools Task Force, the CDE will collect information on the completion of the Workability program, transitional services offered through the Department of Rehabilitation, and work-based learning for the first time this spring through the California Special Education Management Information System (CASEMIS). These data will be evaluated for possible inclusion in the 2019 Dashboard as a modified measure for students who have an Individualized Education Program (IEP).

The Alternative Task Force is also exploring additional career measures for the CCI. Some of these measures will be collected in the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) for the first time at the end of school year, for possible inclusion in the CCI for the 2020 Dashboard:

* Completion of a state or federal job program (limited to DASS schools)
* Completion of pre-apprenticeship (both DASS and non-DASS schools)
* Work Force Readiness Certificate (limited to DASS schools)

#### Feedback from Stakeholder Groups

CDE staff received feedback from various stakeholder groups in regards to the proposed changes to the 2019 Dashboard. Members of the Regional Assessment Network (RAN) and the Capitol Regional Assessment Network (CRAN) indicated a desire not to implement any unnecessary changes to the 2019 Dashboard to allow for stability from one year to the next.

There was a consensus among the Local Control Funding Formula Stakeholder Group that at a minimum the five-year graduation rate should be included in the Dashboard for informational purposes. Several members also expressed support for including the five-year graduation rate in the determination of color performance. In addition, the Small Schools District Association supported applying the three-by-five color grid to the CCI.

The California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG) was supportive of adding a five-year graduation rate to the Dashboard. However, some members stated their preference to include it for informational purposes only. The remaining members, wanted to review the proposed methodology before determining how the five-year graduation rate should be included in the 2019 Dashboard. There was also support for including the use of the three-by-five color grid for the CCI.

Most CPAG members supported exploring other modified methods for DASS schools, especially Chronic Absenteeism and Suspension. However, some members expressed concerns regarding the addition of transitional services to the CCI.

At the February 2019 TDG meeting, members expressed support for adding a five-year graduation rate to the Dashboard, but emphasized that the methodology needs to ensure that the inclusion of fifth-year graduates only generated a positive impact on the Graduation Rate Indicator. They also stated their support for the recommended revisions to the CCI: (1) applying the three-by-five color grid, and (2) adding measures for students with disabilities. In addition, the TDG began exploring possible methodologies for incorporating the California Alternate Assessment into the Academic Indicator.

### Attachment 4

### California School Dashboard Educational Outreach Activities

**Table 1. In-person Meetings/Conferences**

| **Date** | **Title** | **Estimated Number of Attendees** | **Topics** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| October 25, 2018 | San Bernardino County Office of Education Counselor Network Meeting | 150 | * Overview of the California School Dashboard (Dashboard) and Accountability System
* Deep Dive into the College/Career Indicator (CCI)
* Rollout of the 2018 Dashboard
 |
| October 31, 2018  | California Practitioners Advisory Group | 25 | * Proposed Status and Change Cut Scores for Chronic Absenteeism Indicator
* Proposed Status Cut Scores for Graduation Rate Indicator
* Dashboard Alternative School Status (DASS) Graduation Rate and Updated on Use of Special Education Certificate of Completion
* Proposed Change Cut Scores for CCI
* Revised Proposed Status and Change Cut Scores for English Language Arts and Mathematics for Grade 11 Academic Indicator
 |
| November 2, 2018 | Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Stakeholder Session | 300 | * New Look and Feel of the 2018 Dashboard
* Inclusion of the Participation Rate into the Academic Indicator
* DASS
* Rollout of the 2018 Dashboard
* Identification of Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) for Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) Support
* Identification of Schools for Comprehensive, Targeted, and Additional Targeted Support and Improvement
 |
| November 5, 2018 | North Central Counties Professional Development Network  | 50 | * State Indicators Reported in the 2018 Dashboard
* Overview of the *N-*Size and DASS
* Changes to the Indicators in the 2018 Dashboard
* Inclusion of the Participation Rate into the Academic Indicator
* Application of the Three-by-Five Colored Tables in the 2018 Dashboard
* Rollout of the 2018 Dashboard
 |
| November 13–14, 2018 | California Educational Research Association Annual Conference | 165 | * New Look and Feel of the 2018 Dashboard
* Change to Indicators for the 2018 Dashboard
* Growing Up: Different Ways to Look at Student Growth on Assessments
* Unpacking the New CCI in the Dashboard
 |
| November 14, 2018 | Independent Study Conference | 75 | * DASS and the DASS Graduation Rate
 |
| November 15, 2018  | Alternative Accountability Policy Forum | 100 | * DASS and the DASS Graduation Rate
 |
| November 15, 2018  | Alternative Accountability Policy Forum: Closing Session | 125 | * Overview of CDE’s role in the education policy process under ESSA
* Status of the adoption of alternative accountability measures
 |
| November 28, 2018 | Regional Assessment Network | 45 | * Identification of Schools for Comprehensive and Targeted Support and Improvement
* Dashboard Updates
* Tying School Identification to the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) and Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA)
 |
| December 3, 2018 | Accountability Leadership Institute | 150 | * Overview of the Dashboard and Accountability System
* Incorporation of Participation Rate into Academic Indicator
* New Look and Feel of the Dashboard
* Resources Specific to English Learners
 |
| December 7, 2018 | System of Support Planning Group Meeting  | 75 | * Overview of 2018 Dashboard Data
* New Look and Feel of the Dashboard
 |
| December 7, 2018 | State and Federal Program Directors Meeting  | 100 | * 2018 Dashboard: Changes to Indicators
* LEAs and Schools Eligible for Support
* Perusing through the Dashboard
* Dashboard Resources
 |
| December 10, 2018 | Legislative Staff Briefing | 30 | * Overview of the New Dashboard
* Review of the System of Support
* ESSA Update
 |
| December 12, 2018  | LCFF Stakeholders: In-Person Study Session  | 12 | * 2018 Dashboard: Changes to Indicators
* LEAs Eligible for Support Under LCFF
* Perusing through the Dashboard and Resources
 |
| January 11, 2019  | Student Programs and Services Steering Committee | 40 | * Identification of LEAs for Support Under the LCFF
* Identification of Schools for Support and Improvement
* CCI: Potential New Measures in 2019
* Information Relating to Students with Disabilities
* Modified Methods Feedback
 |
| January 15, 2019  | CAASFEP Professional Development Institute  | 60 | * New Features and Changes to the Dashboard
* Identification of LEAs for Support Under the LCFF
* Identification of Schools for Support and Improvement
 |
| January 16, 2019  | Regional Assessment Network | 45 | * Revisions Under Consideration for the 2019 Dashboard
* Additional Reports
* Information Relating to Students with Disabilities
* Identification of LEAs for Support Under the LCFF
* Identification of Schools for Support and Improvement
* New Resources
 |
| January 18, 2019 | Juvenile Court, Community and Alternative School Administrators of California  | 40 | * New Features and Changes to the Dashboard
* DASS Graduation Rate
* Potential New College/Career Measures in 2019 Dashboard for DASS Schools
* Identification of Schools for Support and Improvement
 |
| January 25, 2019  | Capitol Regional Assessment Network  | 50  | * Revisions Under Consideration for the 2019 Dashboard
* Additional Reports
* Information Relating to Students with Disabilities
* New Resources
 |
| February 6, 2019 | California Practitioners Advisory Group | 25 | * Accountability 101: How We Got Here
* Developing the Dashboard Indicators
* Application of the Dashboard and Redesign
* Dashboard Live Demonstration
* Additional Reports and Resources
* Building a System of Support
* Proposed Changes for the 2019 Dashboard
* DASS: Developing Modified Methods for Other State Indicators
* Students with Disabilities: District of Residence Rule
 |
| February 20, 2019 | Advisory Commission on Special Education  | 28 | * Chronic Absenteeism Indicator
* Update on LEAs eligible for differentiated assistance in 2018-19
* Update on schools eligible for assistance under the Every Student Succeeds Act
 |
| February 22, 2019 | CISC Symposium | 50 | * Demonstrate new user interface for the Dashboard
* Explore Equity Report and Student Group Report to understand gaps between student groups
* Using the Dashboard, provide examples of districts eligible for differentiated assistance under LCFF and schools eligible for support under ESSA
 |

**Table 2. Webinars**

| **Date** | **Title** | **Estimated Number of Attendees** | **Topics** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| October 26, 2018 | DASS Module Presentation at the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence (CCEE) | 286 | * Overview of the DASS Module
* Accountability and Continuous Improvement
* DASS Program
* 2018 Dashboard
 |
| November 9, 2018  | CCI and Graduation Rate Webinar  | 445 | * Overview of the Dashboard and Accountability System
* New Look and Feel of the Dashboard
* Graduation Rate Indicator
* CCI
 |
| November 16, 2018  | Suspension and Chronic Absenteeism Webinar  | 393 | * Overview of the Dashboard and Accountability System
* Chronic Absenteeism Indicator
* Suspension Rate Indicator
* Methodology for Small Student Populations
 |
| November 26, 2018 | Academic and English Learner Progress Webinar  | 522 | * Overview of the Dashboard and Accountability System
* New Look and Feel of the Dashboard
* Academic Indicator
* Incorporation of Participation Rate into Academic Indicator
* Pair and Share
* English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI)
 |
| November 28, 2018 | Curriculum Instruction and Steering Committee: Science Sub-committee | 100 | * Update on the inclusion of the California Science Test (CAST)
* Overview of new look and feel of the Dashboard
 |
| December 10, 2018  | ESSA Stakeholder Session | 203 | * Identification of Schools for Support and Improvement
 |
| December 11, 2018  | System of Support Webinar  | 332 | * Overview of California’s System of Support
* Technical Assistance Opportunities and Support Provided by Divisions within the CDE
 |
| January 29, 2019  | Dashboard 101 Training Module with the CCEE | 208 | * Overview of the Dashboard
* Connecting the Dashboard to California’s Accountability and Continuous Improvement System
* Dashboard Methodology and Indicators
* Dashboard Analysis
* Connecting Dashboard Outcomes to School and Classroom Practice
* Dashboard Resources
 |
| January 30, 2019  | California Teachers Association  | 85 | * Overview of State and Local Indicators
* Dashboard demonstration
* Purpose of the Dashboard
* How we use this data (LCAP, LEA Identification, School Identification)
* System of Support
 |
| January 31, 2019  | ACSA Middle Grades and Secondary Council Dashboard Presentation  | 85 | * 2018 Dashboard: Changes to Indicators
* Dashboard Live Demonstration
* Revisions Under Consideration for the 2019 Dashboard
 |
| February 15, 2019 | ESSA Implementation Stakeholder Sessions | 202 | * ESSA Updates
* Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) and Additional Targeted Support and Improvement
* CSI Funding Support
* Changes to the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP)
* School Plan for Student Achievement
 |
| February 19, 2019 | LCFF Stakeholder Group | 15 | * CSI Funding Support
* Changes to the self-reflection tool for Priority 3: Parental Involvement and Family Engagement.
* Proposed changes to the 2019 Dashboard
 |
| February 26, 2019  | California Teachers Association  | 61 | * Overview of State and Local Indicators
* Dashboard demonstration
* Purpose of the Dashboard
* How we use this data (LCAP, LEA Identification, School Identification)
* System of Support
 |

## Appendix B: Self-Reflection Tool for Priority 3: Parent Engagement

**Standard:** The local educational agency (LEA) annually measures its progress in: (1) seeking input from parents in decision making; and (2) promoting parental participation in programs, and reports the results to its local governing board at a regularly scheduled meeting and to stakeholders and the public through the California School Dashboard (Dashboard).

**Criteria:** The LEA will assess its performance on a (Met, Not Met, or Not Met for Two or More Years) scale.

**Evidence:** The LEA measures its progress using the self-reflection tool included in the Dashboard, and reports these results to its local governing board at a regularly scheduled meeting and through the local data selection option in the Dashboard.

### Introduction

Family engagement is an essential strategy for building pathways to college and career readiness for all students and is an essential component of a systems approach to improving outcomes for all students. More than thirty years of research has shown that family engagement can lead to improved student outcomes (e.g. attendance, engagement, academic outcomes, social emotional learning, etc.). Consistent with the California Department of Education’s (CDE’s) Family Engagement Toolkit:[[4]](#footnote-4)

* Effective and authentic family engagement has been described as an intentional partnership of educators, families and community members who share responsibility for a child from the time they are born to becoming an adult.
* To build an effective partnership, educators, families, and community members need to develop the knowledge and skills to work together, and schools must purposefully integrate family and community engagement with goals for students' learning and thriving.

The Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) legislation recognized the importance of family engagement by requiring LEAs to address Priority 3 within their local control and accountability plan (LCAP). The self-reflection tool described below enables LEAs to reflect upon their implementation of family engagement as part of their continuous improvement process and prior to updating their LCAP.

For LEAs to engage all families equitably, it is necessary to understand the cultures, languages, needs and interests of families in the local area. Furthermore, developing family engagement policies, programs, and practices needs to be done in partnership with local families, using the tools of continuous improvement.

### Instructions

This self-reflection tool is organized into three sections. Each section includes promising practices in family engagement:

1. Building Relationships between School Staff and Families
2. Building Partnerships for Student Outcomes
3. Seeking Input for Decision-making

LEAs use this self-reflection tool to reflect on its progress, successes, needs and areas of growth in family engagement policies, programs, and practices. This tool will enable an LEA to engage in continuous improvement and determine next steps to make improvements in the areas identified.

The results of the process should be used to inform the LCAP and the development process, to assess prior year goals, actions and services as well as to plan or modify future goals, actions, and services in the LCAP.

For each statement in the table below:

1. Identify the diverse stakeholders that need to participate in the self-reflection process in order to ensure input from all groups of families, staff and students in the LEA, including families of unduplicated students and families of individuals with exceptional needs as well as families of underrepresented students.
2. Engage stakeholders in determining what data and information will be considered to complete the self-reflection tool. LEAs should consider how the practices apply to families of all student groups, including families of unduplicated students and families of individuals with exceptional needs as well as families of underrepresented students.
3. Based on the analysis of data, identify the number which best indicates the LEA’s current stage of implementation for each practice using the following rating scale (lowest to highest):1 – Exploration and Research Phase 2 – Beginning Development 3 – Initial Implementation 4 – Full Implementation 5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability
4. Write a brief response to the prompts following each of the three sections.
5. Use the information from the self-reflection process to inform the LCAP and the LCAP development process, as well as the development of other school and district plans.

#### Building Relationships

*Rating Scale (lowest to highest): 1 – Exploration and Research Phase; 2 – Beginning Development; 3 – Initial Implementation; 4 – Full Implementation; 5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability*

| **Building Relationships** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Rate the LEA’s progress in developing the capacity of staff (i.e. administrators, teachers, and classified staff) to build trusting and respectful relationships with families.
 | [Enter 1, if applicable] | [Enter 2, if applicable] | [Enter 3, if applicable] | [Enter 4, if applicable] | [Enter 5, if applicable] |
| 1. Rate the LEA’s progress in creating welcoming environments for all families in the community.
 | [Enter 1, if applicable] | [Enter 2, if applicable] | [Enter 3, if applicable] | [Enter 4, if applicable] | [Enter 5, if applicable] |
| 1. Rate the LEA’s progress in supporting staff to learn about each family’s strengths, cultures, languages, and goals for their children.
 | [Enter 1, if applicable] | [Enter 2, if applicable] | [Enter 3, if applicable] | [Enter 4, if applicable] | [Enter 5, if applicable] |
| 1. Rate the LEA’s progress in developing multiple opportunities for the LEA and school sites to engage in two-way communication between families and educators using language that is understandable and accessible to families.
 | [Enter 1, if applicable] | [Enter 2, if applicable] | [Enter 3, if applicable] | [Enter 4, if applicable] | [Enter 5, if applicable] |

**Dashboard Narrative Box (Limited to 3,000 characters)**

Briefly describe the LEA’s current strengths and progress in this area, and identify a focus area for improvement, including how the LEA will improve the engagement of underrepresented families.

#### Building Partnerships for Student Outcomes

*Rating Scale (lowest to highest): 1 – Exploration and Research Phase; 2 – Beginning Development; 3 – Initial Implementation; 4 – Full Implementation; 5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability*

| Building Partnerships | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Rate the LEA’s progress in providing professional learning and support to teachers and principals to improve a school’s capacity to partner with families.
 | [Enter 1, if applicable] | [Enter 2, if applicable] | [Enter 3, if applicable] | [Enter 4, if applicable] | [Enter 5, if applicable] |
| 1. Rate the LEA’s progress in providing families with information and resources to support student learning and development in the home.
 | [Enter 1, if applicable] | [Enter 2, if applicable] | [Enter 3, if applicable] | [Enter 4, if applicable] | [Enter 5, if applicable] |
| 1. Rate the LEA’s progress in implementing policies or programs for teachers to meet with families and students to discuss student progress and ways to work together to support improved student outcomes.
 | [Enter 1, if applicable] | [Enter 2, if applicable] | [Enter 3, if applicable] | [Enter 4, if applicable] | [Enter 5, if applicable] |
| 1. Rate the LEA’s progress in supporting families to understand and exercise their legal rights and advocate for their own students and all students.
 | [Enter 1, if applicable] | [Enter 2, if applicable] | [Enter 3, if applicable] | [Enter 4, if applicable] | [Enter 5, if applicable] |

**Dashboard Narrative Box (Limited to 3,000 characters)**

Briefly describe the LEA’s current strengths and progress in this area, and identify a focus area for improvement, including how the LEA will improve the engagement of underrepresented families.

#### Seeking Input for Decision Making

*Rating Scale (lowest to highest): 1 – Exploration and Research Phase; 2 – Beginning Development; 3 – Initial Implementation; 4 – Full Implementation; 5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability*

| Seeking Input | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Rate the LEA’s progress in building the capacity of and supporting principals and staff to effectively engage families in advisory groups and with decision-making.
 | [Enter 1, if applicable] | [Enter 2, if applicable] | [Enter 3, if applicable] | [Enter 4, if applicable] | [Enter 5, if applicable] |
| 1. Rate the LEA’s progress in building the capacity of and supporting family members to effectively engage in advisory groups and decision-making.
 | [Enter 1, if applicable] | [Enter 2, if applicable] | [Enter 3, if applicable] | [Enter 4, if applicable] | [Enter 5, if applicable] |
| 1. Rate the LEA’s progress in providing all families with opportunities to provide input on policies and programs, and implementing strategies to reach and seek input from any underrepresented groups in the school community.
 | [Enter 1, if applicable] | [Enter 2, if applicable] | [Enter 3, if applicable] | [Enter 4, if applicable] | [Enter 5, if applicable] |
| 1. Rate the LEA’s progress in providing opportunities to have families, teachers, principals, and district administrators work together to plan, design, implement and evaluate family engagement activities at school and district levels.
 | [Enter 1, if applicable] | [Enter 2, if applicable] | [Enter 3, if applicable] | [Enter 4, if applicable] | [Enter 5, if applicable] |

**Dashboard Narrative Box (Limited to 3,000 characters)**

Briefly describe the LEA’s current strengths and progress in this area, and identify a focus area for improvement, including how the LEA will improve the engagement of underrepresented families.

### Appendix A: Resources

1. Southwest Educational Development Laboratory in Collaboration with the United States Department of Education. (2013) Partners in Education: A Dual Capacity Building Framework for Family School Partnerships. Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/documents/family-community/partners-education.pdf>
2. California Department of Education. (2017). Family Engagement Toolkit: Continuous Improvement Through an Equity Lens. Sacramento, CA. Author. Retrieved from <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/documents/family-engagement.pdf>
3. California Department of Education. (2017). Editable Templates for Family Engagement Toolkit. Sacramento, CA. Author. Retrieved from <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/documents/toolkittemplates.doc>
4. United States Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Head Start, National Center on Parent, Family, and Community Engagement. (2018). Head Start Parent, Family, and Community Engagement Framework. Retrieved from <https://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/pdf/pfce-framework.pdf>

## Appendix C: 2019 Dashboard Data Files and Record Layouts

* This study was based on an analysis of data reported for Priority 3 (Parental Involvement and Family Engagement) in the 2019 California School Dashboard (Dashboard).
* The Priority 3 Record Layout and Priority 3 Performance 2019 Data File may be accessed from the California Department of Education’s 2019 Dashboard Data Files and Record Layouts web page at [invalid link removed].

## Appendix D: Data and Methodology

### Overview

This study used a mixed-method approach to explore how local educational agencies (LEAs) in California rated themselves on the implementation of research-based practices in family engagement. First, for the ratings of the 12 practices on a five-point Likert scale, a descriptive analysis was conducted to identify the frequencies of the five ratings on each of the 12 practices. This analysis included the full population of such LEAs. Second, for the narrative responses aligned to the three areas (i.e., Relationship, Partnership, and Decision), a qualitative analysis was conducted on a representative sample of LEAs to identify the strengths and focus areas for improvement reported by LEAs. The sample of 198 LEAs was selected through a stratified random sampling method, drawing on California’s 11 service regions, defined by the California County Superintendents Education Services Association (CCSESA).

This appendix describes the details of the study’s data and methodology.

### Data Sources

#### Description of the Full Population of LEAs

A total of 2361 LEAs responded to the Dashboard in 2019, among which there are:

* County offices of education (COEs) (3%), which also includes State Board of Education (SBE) Schools and Regional Occupation Centers/Programs (ROC/P)
* Charter schools (56%), which also includes County Communities, District Community Day Schools, and Juvenile Court Schools.
* Districts (40%), including:
	+ Unified school districts (15%)
	+ Elementary school districts (22%)
	+ High school districts (3%)

#### Data selection for qualitative analysis of the narratives

198 LEAs (or 8 percent of the 2361 LEAs) were selected for inclusion in the narrative analysis. They were selected based on the following steps:

1. To ensure geographic representativeness, the sample was drawn from the state’s 11 service regions, defined by CCSESA. These 11 regions cover all of the 58 counties in California.
2. Within each region, 18 LEAs were selected, using a stratified sampling method with the following five LEA strata (subgroups): (1) COE, (2) charter school, (3) unified school district, (4) elementary school district, and (5) high school district. To ensure inclusiveness, the research team first randomly selected one LEA of each of the five subgroups within each region.
3. And then, for the rest of the 13 LEAs of one region, the research team randomly selected LEAs from each of the five LEA subgroups based on their proportions within that region.

Note that the second step of the sample selection process helped ensure each subgroup of the LEAs has at least one representative within each region. Otherwise, some LEA subgroups (i.e., COEs, and high school districts) would not even have one representative due to their small proportions. Because of this step, the percentages of COEs and Districts among the 198 LEAs are higher than their percentages among the overall population. Meanwhile, the percentage of Charter schools in the 198 LEAs is smaller than that of the overall population.

The table below shows the distribution of the types of LEAs of the sample:

| **Region** | **COEs** | **Charter Schools** | **Districts\*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 1 | 6 | 11 |
| 2 | 2 | 2 | 14 |
| 3 | 2 | 7 | 9 |
| 4 | 2 | 7 | 9 |
| 5 | 1 | 7 | 10 |
| 6 | 2 | 6 | 10 |
| 7 | 2 | 6 | 10 |
| 8 | 1 | 5 | 12 |
| 9 | 1 | 11 | 6 |
| 10 | 1 | 9 | 8 |
| 11 | 1 | 14 | 3 |
| Total | 16 (8%) | 81 (41%) | 101 (51%) |

\*We combined “unified school districts,” “elementary school districts,” and “high school districts” into “Districts”.

The list of the 198 LEAs is available upon request.

### Missing Data

A small number of LEAs did not report or misreported to the Performance Standards, Ratings, or Narratives, as explained below:

#### Performance Standards

The SBE-approved standards for the local indicators that support LEAs in measuring and reporting their progress within the appropriate priority area. For each local indicator, the performance standards are as follows:

* Measuring LEA progress on the local indicator based on locally available information; and
* Reporting the results to the LEA's local governing board at a regularly scheduled meeting of the local governing board; and
* Reporting to stakeholders and the public through the Dashboard.

Provided an LEA satisfies the performance standards for each local indicator, the Dashboard will automatically assign a performance level of Met. If an LEA does not meet the performance standards, the Dashboard will automatically assign a performance level of Not Met or Not Met for Two or More Years, as applicable.

* Two LEAs had a blank in the Met/Not Met/Not Met for Two or More Years

#### Ratings

The Self-Reflection Tool requires LEAs to provide a rating between 1 and 5 for each of the 12 practices. When analyzing rating data, we noted that some LEAs had no rating reported, and some reflected a zero rating.

* Zeros: 160 LEAs reported a rating of zero across the 12 practices however the tool did not have a zero rating. It is not clear why or how LEAs entered a zero.
* Null: For Practices 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, and 12, there were two LEAs that had nulls did not have a rating; for practices 2, 6, 8, and 10, there were three LEAs that had nulls.

#### Narratives

The SBE requires LEAs to respond to three narratives (one within each section of the tool). Data analysis identified a total of 164 out of 2361 LEAs that failed to provide a narrative for Sections 1, 2, and 3. Within the sample of 198, there were eight LEAs that did not provide a narrative response.

The list of these LEAs is available upon request.

### Data Analysis

A mixed-method approach was used to explore how LEAs in California rated themselves on the implementation of the research-based practices in family engagement.

#### Quantitative Analysis

For the ratings of the 12 practices on a five-point Likert scale, descriptive analysis was conducted to identify the frequencies of the five ratings on each of the 12 practices, among the full population of such LEAs. Stacked bar charts were presented in the report to show the distribution of the ratings for each of the 12 practices. Details of the analysis results were also included in the tables in Appendix E.

#### Qualitative analysis

A smaller sample of 44 LEAs (four LEAs from each of the 11 regions) was selected to develop a codebook for the three areas of the narrative data (i.e., Relationship, Partnership, and Decision). These four LEAs included one COE, one charter school, and two districts. The research team developed an initial set of codes based on theory and knowledge of the field. One researcher from REL West conducted an initial analysis of the subset of the sample using these codes to identify major themes/subthemes aligned with the research questions. Focused coding techniques was used to elaborate and connect themes, and to delineate potential sub-themes within the broader topics.

Note that most of the themes/sub-themes were created in a deductive fashion, that is, based on theoretic and field knowledge of LEAs’ implementation in family engagement. Given that some codes were more nuanced and descriptive, they were identified and added to the codebook inductively from the actual data. The frequency of these codes and second-level codes (representing themes/sub-themes) among the 44 LEAs were examined. When some codes/second-level codes had very small frequencies (less than 10 percent of the sample), which means only a few LEAs reported such themes/sub-themes, they were collapsed into newer categories to better represent the themes/sub-themes with relatively higher frequencies.

The draft codebook was then refined through an iterative process within the research team. A researcher from REL West, a researcher from Region 15 as a content expert, and two researchers from the California Department of Education worked collaboratively to compare narrative entries to examine themes and inconsistencies. Discrepancies in coding were discussed and resolved, and the coding categories were revised (including the creation of additional coding categories). After this discussion, the research team revisited and finalized the codebook.

The researcher from REL West then re-coded entries from the same 44 LEAs based on the revised set of codes, and then code the data from the remaining 154 LEAs in the sample using the software ATLAS.ti. The final version of the codebook is included below.

### Limitations of the Study

Self-reported measures are subjective to many biases, such as bias due to social desirability, or bias due to interpretation of questions. This tool is no exception for such a limitation. Some ways in which the instructions intended to minimize bias are by requiring LEAs to engage stakeholders:

* In the self-reflection process in order to ensure input from all groups of families, staff and students in the LEA is collected; and
* To determine the data/information to consider in completing the self-reflection process.

However, as this was the first year of implementation of this tool, we recognized that there were variances in the way LEAs interpreted these instructions, how they rated themselves, as well as how they answered the prompts. As we continue improving the instructions of the tool to ensure its accuracy and clarity, further investigation (e.g., focus group, interviews, etc.) would be helpful to understand how LEAs approach the tool, interpret the instructions, and rate themselves.

Table 1: Examples Reported by LEAs for Narrative 1

| Strengths, Focus Areas for Improvement, and How LEAs refer to Evidence and Engage Stakeholders | Examples Reported by LEAs |
| --- | --- |
| Strength: Two-way communication with families | * Individual communication by various formats; phone calls, text messages, parent portal, ParentSquare, in person meeting, etc.
* Joint meetings, e.g., town hall meetings, advisory group meetings, meetings with stakeholders, etc.
* Social/informal events, e.g., community dinner, coffee with principal, etc.
* Making system-level information accessible and comprehensible/digestible to all families
 |
| Strength: Building trusting relationships with and building capacity of families | * Creating staff positions specifically for family and community engagement, e.g., parent liaison, coordinator, parent education consultant, family ambassador, family community liaisons, etc.
* Connecting with individual families, e.g., parent teacher home visits, home visits, individual intake meetings, individual learning plans, etc.
* Not limited to school site; occurs in a place that is comfortable for families, e.g., field trip, parent resource center, etc.
* Open door policies
* Parent project courses; parent training/workshops
 |
| Strength: Welcoming environment | * Environment is safe, respectful, nurturing, inclusive and supportive
* Environment is linguistically and culturally sensitive
 |
| Strength: Engaging underrepresented families | * Cultural recognition and cultural celebrations
* Providing interpretation services/materials in multiple languages
* Removing barriers, such as providing transportation, providing childcare during meeting
* Supporting homeless youth, foster youth, students with disabilities and other underrepresented students
 |
| Strength: Educator capacity building | * Staff/teachers are trained to provide individual connections with families/students
* Providing professional development (PD) on cultural sensitivities
* Other capacity building practices, e.g., including family engagement in job duties or responsibilities of staff
 |
| Focus Area: To support underrepresented students and families | * To provide language and cultural support, e.g., translation services
* To minimize barriers through individual outreach to underrepresented families
* To support homeless youth, foster youth, students with disabilities, and other underrepresented students
 |
| Focus Area: To improve two-way communication with families  | * To increase and improve methods of communication with families
* To provide more events/opportunities to communicate with families and to increase the parent participation/involvement
 |
| Focus Area: To build capacities of educators and staff to partner with families | * To provide cultural proficiency PD; to provide PD for best practices for working effectively with underrepresented families
* To help teachers/staff learn about the individual strengths of each family as well as their culture, language, and goals for their children
 |
| Focus Area: To create positive school climate/environment | * To provide safe, inclusive and welcoming school and office environments
 |
| How LEAs refer to evidence to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings  | * Survey data to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings
* Other forms of evidence to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings
 |
| How LEAs use various methods to engage stakeholders | * Feedback loops, focus groups, interviews, survey, etc.
 |

Table 2: Examples Reported by LEAs for Narrative 2

| Strengths, Focus Areas for Improvement, and How LEAs refer to Evidence and Engage Stakeholders | Examples Reported by LEAs |
| --- | --- |
| Strength: Providing families with information/resources to support student learning at home | * Providing digital and non-digital communication tools
* Individual communication with families, e.g., parent-teacher meetings
* Providing information/resources related to student learning
* Providing social emotional support
 |
| Strength: Implementing policies, programs, and/or practices for teachers/staff to work with families | * Joint events/meetings/programs, e.g., District's Coordination of Services Team meetings, School Attendance Review Board, etc.
* Developing or implementing a family engagement system/policy e.g., school site plans and LCAP
 |
| Strength: Improving schools’ capacity to partner with families | * Creating a position/team specifically to work on partnering with families
* Professional learning for teachers and staff focusing on how to better connect and partner with families
* Professional learning for teachers and staff focusing on professional learning communities (PLCs) and/or specific subjects
 |
| Strength: Engaging underrepresented families | * Supporting underrepresented families via individual meetings or joint efforts (e.g., task force, community meetings, racial justice task force, community liaisons, etc.)
* Removing barriers, such as providing transportation or translation services
 |
| Strength: Providing parents with classes/workshops or parent education  | * Parent classes/workshops on academic-related topics
* Training on school or district information systems (e.g., Aeries, PowerSchool, ParentSquare, etc.), attendance, or other non-academic issues
 |
| Strength: Supporting families to exercise their legal rights | * Creating multiple committees or programs to connect parents in advocating for students
* Providing families with information about their legal rights/responsibilities
 |
| Focus area: To engage underrepresented families | * To be in direct contact with some of our underrepresented family groups
* To provide PD training on how best to improve a school’s capacity to collaborate and engage with underrepresented families
* To remove as many barriers as possible
 |
| Focus area: To provide families with information/resources to support student learning | * To create methods to share information and resources to support student learning and development in the home
* To provide families with information/resources (content) to support student learning
 |
| Focus area: To provide more parent education workshops/training | * To provide more events/programs related to building family capacities
* To help parents to understand the requirements for grade level mastery; to help parents learn how to support their student’s growth in various domains
 |
| Focus area: To implement policies, programs, and/or practices to work with families | * To develop partnerships with the focus on student outcomes, e.g., expanding Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) parent nights, Project 2Inspire, etc.
* To make system-level improvement
 |
| Focus area: To improve schools’ capacity to partner with families | * To provide more professional learning opportunities for teachers and staff to support effective partnerships
* To provide more opportunities to build network and/or professional learning communities
 |
| Focus area: To support families to understand and exercise their legal rights | * Continue to support families to understand and exercise their legal rights and advocate for their own child(ren)
 |
| How LEAs refer to evidence to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings | * Survey data to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings
* Other forms of evidence to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings
 |
| How LEAs use various methods to engage stakeholders | * Feedback loops, focus groups, interviews, survey, etc.
 |

Table 3: Examples Reported by LEAs for Narrative 3

| Strengths, Focus Areas for Improvement, and How LEAs refer to Evidence and Engage Stakeholders | Examples Reported by LEAs |
| --- | --- |
| Strength: Engaging families and encouraging them to provide input | * Recruiting parents/families to participate in decision-making
* Using surveys via multiple platforms (e.g., text and email) to solicit feedback from families and engage them in decision-making
* Providing various events/meetings to engage families and have them participate in decision-making
 |
| Strength: System-level support and practices | * Creating supportive systems (e.g., structures, policies, articulated positions, funding, and environment) in which stakeholders are encouraged to provide input
* Using various communication methods to communicate with families
* Making information accessible and understandable to all families
* Providing training and technical support to administrators (e.g., principals, staff) to support the engagement of stakeholders
 |
| Strength: Supporting underrepresented families | * Mentioning/emphasizing the inclusion of underrepresented families in their efforts of engaging families in decision-making
* Providing translation services and interpreters
* Removing barriers (e.g., providing special accommodations; being flexible with location, date, time, and format of the meeting/event)
 |
| Strength: Family capacity building | * Providing workshops/training to families on decision-making and on supporting students learning at home
 |
| Focus area: To provide families with opportunities to provide input | * To recruit more families; to increase the participation of families in decision-making
* To create/provide various events/meetings/programs to have families provide input and have stakeholders work together
 |
| Focus area: To support underrepresented families  | * To support underrepresented families, for example, by removing barriers that may keep them from participating in decision-making opportunities
 |
| Focus area: To provide system-level support  | * To create a supportive/collaborative system, structure, and environment for both educators and families
* To use various communication methods to communicate with families; and/or to make information accessible and understandable to all families
* To provide training and support to administrators (e.g., principals and staff) to better engage families
 |
| Focus area: To build family capacity | * To provide workshops/trainings to families and build their capacities in decision-making
 |
| How LEAs refer to evidence to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings | * Survey data to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings
* Other forms of evidence to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings
 |
| How LEAs use various methods to engage stakeholders | * Feedback loops, focus groups, interviews, surveys, etc.
 |

## Appendix E: Details of Rating Analysis

This appendix presents the details of the analysis results of the rating data.

### Section 1

Table 1 displays the number and percentage of LEAs that selected each of the five ratings for each of the four practices in Section 1 of the tool.

Table 1: Number and percentage of LEAs on each of the ratings for the four practices within Section 1

|  **Practice** | **1. Exploration and Research Phase** | **2. Beginning Development** | **3. Initial Implementation** | **4. Full Implementation** | **5. Full Implementation and Sustainability** | **No Rating Reported** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Practice 1** | 12 (<1%) | 67 (3%) | 427 (18%) | 1,020 (43%) | 673 (29%) | 162 (7%) |
| **Practice 2** | 4 (<1%) | 42 (2%) | 334 (14%) | 1,021 (43%) | 797 (34%) | 163 (7%) |
| **Practice 3** | 46 (2%) | 177 (8%) | 742 (31%) | 816 (35%) | 418 (18%) | 162 (7%) |
| **Practice 4** | 14 (1%) | 82 (3%) | 441 (19%) | 997 (42%) | 665 (28%) | 162 (7%) |

### Section 2

Table 2 displays the number and percentage of LEAs that selected each of the five ratings for each of the four practices in Section 1 of the tool.

Table 2: Number and percentage of LEAs on each of the ratings for the four practices within Section 2

| **Practices** | **1. Exploration and Research Phase** | **2. Beginning Development** | **3. Initial Implementation** | **4. Full Implementation** | **5. Full Implementation and Sustainability** | **No Rating Reported** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Practice 5** | 52 (2%) | 192 (8%) | 676 (29%) | 859 (36%) | 420 (18%) | 162 (7%) |
| **Practice 6** | 34 (1%) | 117 (5%) | 583 (25%) | 955 (40%) | 509 (22%) | 163 (7%) |
| **Practice 7** | 23 (1%) | 86 (4%) | 331 (14%) | 985 (42%) | 774 (33%) | 162 (7%) |
| **Practice 8** | 66 (3%) | 148 (6%) | 575 (24%) | 931 (39%) | 478 (20%) | 163 (7%) |

### Section 3

Table 3 displays the number and percentage of LEAs that selected each of the five ratings for each of the four practices in Section 3 of the tool.

Table 3: Number and percentage of LEAs on each of the ratings for the four practices within Section 3

| **Practices** | **1. Exploration and Research Phase** | **2. Beginning Development** | **3. Initial Implementation** | **4. Full Implementation** | **5. Full Implementation and Sustainability** | **No Rating Reported** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Practice 9** | 24 (1%) | 125 (5%) | 625 (26%) | 932 (39%) | 493 (21%) | 162 (7%) |
| **Practice 10** | 37 (2%) | 146 (6%) | 680 (29%) | 891 (38%) | 444 (19%) | 163 (7%) |
| **Practice 11** | 31 (1%) | 180 (8%) | 660 (28%) | 938 (40%) | 390 (17%) | 162 (7%) |
| **Practice 12** | 67 (3%) | 209 (9%) | 698 (30%) | 810 (34%) | 415 (18%) | 162 (7%) |

## Appendix F: Details of Narrative Analysis Results

This appendix presents the details of the analysis results of the narrative data, including the frequencies of each theme and sub-theme by local educational agency (LEA) types, i.e., county office of education (COE), Charter, and District. Also included are the example quotations for each specific sub-theme.

Below is an overall description of the percentage of LEAs that addressed the prompt for the Narrative 1:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Aspect of the Prompt | Number and percent of COE(n=16) | Number and percent of Charter(n=81) | Number and percent of District(n=101) | Total number and percent of LEAs(n=198) |
| Described a strength and/or progress | 16 (100%) | 74 (91.4%) | 94 (93.1%) | 184 (92.9%) |
| Identified a focus area for improvement  | 12 (75%) | 38 (46.9%) | 55 (54.5%) | 105 (53%) |
| Addressed engagement of underrepresented families | 8 (50%) | 36 (44.4%) | 47 (46.5%) | 91 (46%) |
| Referred to evidence that informs the narratives and/or ratings | 8 (50%) | 38 (46.9%) | 51 (50.5%) | 97 (49%) |
| Described how the LEA engaged stakeholders  | 6 (37.6%) | 31 (38.3%) | 28 (27.7%) | 65 (32.8%) |

Overall, the 198 LEAs reported five strengths and progress in their practices in building relationships between school staff and families. They also reported four focus areas to improve, as well as how they refer to evidence to inform their responses to the narratives/ratings. The table below shows the number of LEAs that reported having each of the specific strengths or focus areas.

| Strengths, Focus Areas, and How LEAs Refer to Evidence and Engage Stakeholders | Themes | COE(n=16) | Charter(n=81) | Districts(n=101) | Total LEAs(n=198) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strength and/or progress | Two-way communication with families | 10 | 58 | 62 | 130 (65.7%) |
| Strength and/or progress | Building trusting relationships with and building capacity of families | 11 | 60 | 44 | 115 (58.1%) |
| Strength and/or progress | Welcoming environment  | 5 | 25 | 46 | 76 (38.4%) |
| Strength and/or progress | Engaging underrepresented families | 5 | 22 | 31 | 58 (29.3%) |
| Strength and/or progress | Educator capacity building | 5 | 16 | 17 | 38 (19.2%) |
| Focus area for improvement | To support underrepresented students and families | 4 | 21 | 26 | 51 (25.8%) |
| Focus area for improvement | To improve two-way communication with families | 6 | 19 | 21 | 46 (23.2%) |
| Focus area for improvement | To build capacities of educators and staff to partner with families | 4 | 7 | 23 | 34 (17.2%) |
| Focus area for improvement | To create positive school climate/environment  | 1 | 4 | 5 | 10 (5.1%) |
| How LEAs refer to evidence and engage stakeholders | Survey data or other forms of evidence to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings | 8 | 38 | 51 | 97 (49.0%) |
| How LEAs refer to evidence and engage stakeholders | Various methods to engage stakeholders  | 6 | 31 | 28 | 65 (32.8%) |

Within each of the themes identified above, we also explored further how LEAs did those practices with specific sub-themes as shown in the table below. Note that the sum of the frequencies of the sub-themes is usually bigger than the frequency of the theme in the previous table. The reason is that the LEAs may report practicing several sub-themes within one theme.

| Strengths, Focus Areas, and How LEAs Refer to Evidence and Engage Stakeholders | Themes | Sub-themes | COE(n=16) | Charter(n=81) | District(n=101) | Total LEAs(n=198) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strength, and/or progress  | Two-way communication | Individual communication by various formats: phone calls, text messages, parent portal, ParentSquare, in person meeting, etc.  | 11 | 25 | 41 | 77 |
| Strength, and/or progress  | Two-way communication | Joint meetings, e.g., town hall meetings, advisory group meetings, meetings with stakeholders, etc. | 4 | 36 | 32 | 72 |
| Strength, and/or progress  | Two-way communication | Social/informal events, e.g., community dinner, coffee with principal, etc.  | 8 | 31 | 32 | 71 |
| Strength, and/or progress  | Two-way communication | Making system-level information accessible and comprehensible/digestible to all families | 3 | 18 | 9 | 30 |
| Strength, and/or progress  | Building trusting relationships with and building capacity of families  | Creating staff positions specifically for family and community engagement, e.g., parent liaison, coordinator, parent education consultant, family ambassador, family community liaisons, etc.  | 6 | 9 | 10 | 25 |
| Strength, and/or progress  | Building trusting relationships with and building capacity of families  | Connecting with individual families, e.g., parent teacher home visits, home visits, individual intake meetings, individual learning plans, etc.  | 5 | 34 | 23 | 62 |
| Strength, and/or progress  | Building trusting relationships with and building capacity of families  | Not limited to school site; occurs in a place that is comfortable for families, e.g., field trip, parent resource center, etc. | 5 | 3 | 3 | 11 |
| Strength, and/or progress  | Building trusting relationships with and building capacity of families  | Open door policies | 2 | 8 | 3 | 13 |
| Strength, and/or progress  | Building trusting relationships with and building capacity of families  | Parent project courses; parent training/workshops | 6 | 22 | 6 | 34 |
| Strength, and/or progress  | Welcoming environment | Environment is safe, respectful, nurturing, inclusive and supportive | 5 | 25 | 31 | 61 |
| Strength, and/or progress  | Welcoming environment | Environment is linguistically and culturally sensitive | 2 | 9 | 20 | 31 |
| Strength, and/or progress  | Engaging underrepresented families | Cultural recognition and cultural celebrations | 2 | 3 | 5 | 10 |
| Strength, and/or progress  | Engaging underrepresented families | Providing interpretation services/materials in multiple languages | 9 | 13 | 13 | 35 |
| Strength, and/or progress  | Engaging underrepresented families | Removing barriers, such as providing transportation, providing childcare during meeting | 2 | 5 | 7 | 14 |
| Strength, and/or progress  | Engaging underrepresented families | Supporting homeless youth, foster youth, students with disabilities and other underrepresented students | 1 | 5 | 5 | 11 |
| Strength, and/or progress  | Educator capacity building | Staff/teachers are trained to provide individual connections with families/students  | 6 | 14 | 15 | 35 |
| Strength, and/or progress  | Educator capacity building | Providing professional development (PD) on cultural sensitivities  | 3 | 2 | 3 | 8 |
| Strength, and/or progress  | Educator capacity building | Other capacity building practices, e.g., including family engagement in job duties or responsibilities of staff | 2 | 6 | 1 | 9 |
| Focus area for improvement | To support underrepresented students and families | To provide language and cultural support, e.g., translation services | 5 | 13 | 11 | 29 |
| Focus area for improvement | To support underrepresented students and families | To minimize barriers through individual outreach to underrepresented families | 2 | 9 | 3 | 14 |
| Focus area for improvement | To support underrepresented students and families | To support homeless youth, foster youth, students with disabilities, and other underrepresented students | 1 | 3 | 11 | 15 |
| Focus area for improvement | To improve two-way communication with families  | To increase and improve methods of communication with families  | 8 | 11 | 8 | 27 |
| Focus area for improvement | To improve two-way communication with families  | To provide more events/opportunities to communicate with families, and to increase the parent participation/involvement | 2 | 10 | 16 | 28 |
| Focus area for improvement | To build capacities of educators and staff to partner with families | To provide cultural proficiency PD; to provide PD for best practices for working effectively with underrepresented families | 4 | 5 | 11 | 20 |
| Focus area for improvement | To build capacities of educators and staff to partner with families | To help teachers/staff learn about the individual strengths of each family as well as their culture, language, and goals for their children | 5 | 7 | 15 | 27 |
| Focus area for improvement | To create positive school climate/environment | To provide safe, inclusive and welcoming school and office environments  | 1 | 4 | 5 | 11 |
| How LEAs refer to evidence and engage stakeholders | How LEAs refer to evidence to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings  | Survey data to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings | 8 | 15 | 28 | 51 |
| How LEAs refer to evidence and engage stakeholders | How LEAs refer to evidence to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings  | Other forms of evidence to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings | 5 | 29 | 20 | 54 |
| How LEAs refer to evidence and engage stakeholders | How LEAs use various methods to engage stakeholders | Feedback loops, focus groups, interviews, survey, etc. | 6 | 31 | 28 | 65 |

### Example Quotations for Narrative 1

#### Strength and/or progress

1. Two-way communication with families
2. Individual communication by various formats: phone calls, text messages, parent portal, ParentSquare, in person meeting, etc.

*Phone calls are made home by the teacher, administrator, and support staff to communicate student progress and attendance. (COE)*

*The LEA utilizes technology, such as Remind, Aeries Parent Portal, Class Dojo, and conferences to keep parents informed. Additionally, all communication such as newsletters, student handbooks and all letters sent home in English and Spanish. When necessary, interpreters are utilized in all meetings, and conferences. (Charter)*

*To facilitate communication from schools to families, information is provided through online postings on the website and through social media to not only parents, but the community as well. Families receive text messages if they opt in, and phone calls providing them with critical school information (Aeries Communicator). In addition, parents have access to an online Parent Portal through which they can learn and keep current with their students’ daily attendance, grades, test scores, Individualized Education Plan, English Learner status, graduation requirements, discipline records, transportation schedule, health records and contact information (Aeries SIS). (District)*

1. Joint meetings, e.g., town hall meetings, advisory group meetings, meetings with stakeholders, etc.

*The Community and Court Schools School Site Council meetings during the school year provided an opportunity for parents and families to be involved in decision making for our LEA by encouraging community participation and input. (COE)*

*IVA’s collaboratively created Parent Academy agendas guide IVA’s educators and parents into asking questions and contributing together with faculty and staff results in deeply ingrained staff participation and practice where all participants seek to practice a Culture of Thinking. Parent Academies include Back to School Night, four beginning of the year new parent, and a Parent Academy on encouraging Healthy Relationships among others. (Charter)*

*In addition, the District’s LCAP Leadership Committee, consisting of over 30 stakeholders from the community, met three times between January and June of 2019, the District hosted a LCAP Community Forum, and various parent involvement groups from across the District participated in the LCAP development process including DELAC, DAC, School Site Councils, and the Superintendent’s Parent Council. (District)*

1. Social/informal events, e.g., community dinner, coffee with principal, etc.

*As a county operated program, our parents and families do not have access to traditional school site parent activities such as parent-teacher organization, booster clubs, and other traditional groups. In order to reach parents, we have tried a variety of approaches tailored to each program’s specific need. The Independent Living Skills Soulsbyville program help several events throughout the year designed to provide parents some training on a specific concept or skill and then engaged them in a fun activity – tea party, family fun night. The TLC program provides one-to-one parent/family meetings and are usually centered on working with families to create positive family dynamics. (COE)*

*Throughout the year the school offers many opportunities for families to come in and engage with the school, including but not limited to: day time events such as the annual Harvest Festival, twice yearly family/teacher conferences, evening events such as family night at the A’s, Bingo Night for parents/guardians, and Family Game Nights. (Charter)*

*District-wide there were over thirty (30) family engagement events/programs offered for our families. Some of the events and programs include but are not limited to: Back to School Night, Open House, Family Literacy/Math events, Kindergarten Orientation, Middle School Orientation, Volunteer Tea, Parent/Principal meetings, Parent Classroom volunteer programs, drama productions, World Fair, Watch D.O.G.S., College Fairs, Grandparents Day, Sami’s Circuit Family Night, Parent Academy sessions and Reclassification Ceremonies. Parent participation in our many school and District committees and teams, including School Site Council (SSC), English Language Advisory Committee (ELAC), Health Committee, Student Success Teams (SST), Individualized Education Plan (IEP) teams, Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (PBIS) team, Parent/Teacher conferences, informal Principal/Parent meetings, and At-Risk conferences encourage cultivation of relationships between staff and parents. (District)*

1. Making system-level information accessible and comprehensible/digestible to all families

*The Alameda County Office of Education Schools’ parent and family engagement policy is available at sites in the student enrollment packet. There are also a number of site engagements such as literacy events, Back to School, parent conferences, SSC, DELAC, and LCAP reviews; for parents to participate, share information, as well as for our LEA to gather stakeholder feedback. All information related to school and parent programs, meetings, and other activities are available to parents in multiple languages, as well as on our website. (COE)*

*The 2018-19 surveys conducted at SCS for parent engagement indicated that the school is very good at communicating all information and that they listen to any concerns or opinions/suggestions; parents feel a part of the learning process and are encouraged to be involved; and the survey was designed to provide information for WASC, Title I and LCAP. (Charter)*

*Communication from the school to parents is accomplished through a current, frequently updated website, robocalls, a monthly newsletter and classroom weekly “Red Folder,” through which parents can ask questions and respond to teachers. (District)*

1. Building trusting relationships with and building capacity of families
2. Creating staff positions specifically for family and community engagement, e.g., parent liaison, coordinator, parent education consultant, family ambassador, family community liaisons, etc.

*The Youth Advocate position is coordinating family activities beginning in the 2019-20 school year and will administer a needs assessment to determine how to improve family/parent engagement. (COE)*

*Our parent-community liaison regularly contacts parents of students in need of extra help, attention, or in times of concern. Our school has started a food bank to help struggling families. We also have a Halloween costume exchange and a clothing exchange to help families who need clothes or fun costumes. (Charter)*

*Twin Ridges ESD has a certificated and classified staff where everyone has three or fewer years working in the district. This is a unique configuration that has allowed the entire staff to come together with fresh eyes and identify what we see as working to move the district towards building relationships with families. (District)*

1. Connecting with individual families, e.g., parent teacher home visits; home visits, individual intake meetings, individual learning plans, etc.

*TCOE Court and Community schools’ current strength in the area of building trusting relationships between the school and parents is that we incorporate multiple opportunities throughout the school year to meet with parents, both individually and as a group. Currently we have a fall and spring parent teacher conferences and school site council. In addition, our counselor, transition specialist and truancy officers, make weekly contact with families of our students. (COE)*

*Teachers hold regular meetings with parents about their child’s school performance. Teachers send progress reports home before the semester end to inform parents if students are not meeting state standards. (Charter)*

*Each year, in August, all classroom teachers conduct home visits for all of the students in their class. If the family does not want the visit to take place in their home, they can choose an alternate location such as a park or café. The purpose of the visit is to build a relationship, prior to the start of school, and to give families an opportunity to share any information about their child that they think the teacher should know. The teachers do not bring any academic materials and the sole focus of the visit is on building relationships. (Charter)*

*Staff are encouraged to make positive connections with each family. Some of the ways that administrators support staff is including ideas on how to get to know families in weekly bulletins and staff meetings. At parent-teacher conferences, staff are encouraged to discuss goals for the students with their families. Parent conferences are held twice a year for grades TK-5, and once a year for 6th-8th. (District)*

1. Not limited to school site; occurs in a place that is comfortable for families, e.g., field trip, parent resource center, etc.

*Our school provides wrap around services to our students and families that many traditional schools are unable to provide. Through our partnerships with local non-profit organizations such as local Conservation Corps and other Community Based Organizations we connect our families to resources and support services. (Charter)*

*In support of building welcoming environments for families in the community, all LUSD staff and families were invited to participate in a 5K run sponsored by the Livingston community in partnership with the Livingston Union School District. (District)*

*Community School Model and increase services: Resources and services are brought to every school site elevating the importance of schools as “community hubs.” Services include school-based dental, immunization clinics, counseling services, family physical activity through 100 Mile Club, and parenting classes at the school site. (District)*

1. Open door policies

*Our staff has an open-door policy which allows parents or stakeholders to address concerns at any time. (COE)*

*Strengths and progress in the area of building relationships include an open door policy for students and parents with faculty and administration, frequent written and verbal communication regarding participation, observing student learning and classroom environments, Parent Events such as Parent Orientation, Bridge for Parents, International Family Festival, Student Heritage research and presentations, promotion and support of equity and diversity in our school, as well as in the local and greater community. (Charter)*

*Solvang's primary strength is its staff that strongly values communication with all stakeholders. Through face-to-face interactions to the use of online communication tools, staff effectively keep parents engaged. “An "open door" policy cultivates ongoing formal and informal communication among staff and families that builds trust. (District)*

1. Parent project courses; parent training/workshops

*The school also conducts two six-week parent development classes each semester to improve engagement and connect with underrepresented families. (COE)*

*There are also monthly parent institutes that are focused on various issues such as college readiness, social emotional support, student data, and various instructional programs. Weekly, there are one-hour parent institutes to help families support their children through the teenage years, focusing on social and emotional growth. (Charter)*

*Additionally, we offer parent education programs, in both English and Spanish, that share information and invite feedback so that parents can be advocates for their children and be full participants in school decision-making. Our work continues to evolve, with an emphasis on deepening the relationships of our underrepresented families. (District)*

1. Welcoming environment
2. Environment is safe, respectful, nurturing, inclusive, and supportive

*Interviews with a variety of stakeholders demonstrated that the SBCOE has been successful in creating welcoming environments for all families in the community and in developing multiple opportunities for two-way communication between families and educators in a language that is understandable and accessible to families. (COE)*

*Additionally, all five sites strive to create a welcoming environment where families feel safe and comfortable, while being on campus. VOCS staff works closely with families to learn about educational goals that are set for each student, along with discovering new information about the family’s strengths, culture, and reasons for homeschooling. (Charter)*

*Survey results based on the four questions asked regarding Building Relationships showed that the district’s strongest area is creating welcoming environments for all families in the community. (District)*

1. Environment is linguistically and culturally sensitive

*Bilingual staff are available to provide valuable communication to all parents. (COE)*

*The LEA also offers informational flyers to parents in different languages. These flyers help bridge the language barrier gap and allow more families to engage in school events. (Charter)*

*The school provides interpretation and translation services to allow parents/guardians to participate fully in educational programs and individual meetings with school staff related to their child’s education. (District)*

1. Engaging underrepresented families
2. Cultural recognition and cultural celebrations

*Our administrators and staff have developed competency in working with low-income African American and Latino families, which make up the large majority of our constituents. (COE)*

*Additionally. to ensure and improve the engagement of underrepresented families, Hispanic Family Gatherings were held at a schedule set by the families to learn more about and address the unique needs of the community and increase participation and partnership. An Equity Focus group has been established to seek better understanding and to improve the school experience for all students and families as well as for the greater good. A feedback loop is in place for Special Education processes in order to ensure understanding and improvements where necessary. (Charter)*

*In addition, the LEA hosts Quarterly meeting each year for our two major subgroups. We have our Native American Family meeting and our DELAC meeting every quarter with meetings held in Spanish through translators. (District)*

1. Providing interpretation services/materials in multiple languages

*The parents and family members who participated in the self-evaluation process included parents and families of English learners, foster youth and students with disabilities. English-Spanish interpreting was available at all meetings. (COE)*

*Non-English-speaking families are supported through Ingenuity Charter School bilingual staff and programs. The school tries to provide venues for quick and reliable communication to take place regarding, not only the learning process for students, but also for comments and concerns over the overall experience at Ingenuity. (Charter)*

*Translation is provided at parent meetings and parent-teacher conferences as needed for Hmong and Spanish speakers. Families are welcomed into our school sites for a variety of family events including festivals, open houses, student performances and parent input meetings (School Site Council, English Learner Advisory Committees). (District)*

1. Removing barriers, such as providing transportation, providing childcare during meeting

*Administrators and key staff have participated in a year-long equity institute to develop strategies for addressing race issues and barriers in working with students and families. This work was continued with ongoing consultation to support administrators and staff in developing positive communication with students and families and addressing barriers relative to income differential and race. (COE)*

*We reach out to underrepresented families in a variety of ways. We have multiple bilingual staff members to assist in communication with our Spanish speaking families. We have a school to home communication folder each week with educational and community information in English and Spanish. In addition, we share community resources with low-socioeconomic families. (Charter)*

*In addition to the activities listed above, parental participation for unduplicated pupils is promoted by offering meetings at a variety of times and all notifications/invitations/meetings were available in English and Spanish through oral translators and written translations. (District)*

1. Supporting homeless youth, foster youth, students with disabilities and other underrepresented students

*Our family liaison reaches out to and meets with our Foster Youth and Homeless students and families, students and families in trauma, and those students and families who need support. (District)*

*As mentioned above, one of many important resources is the addition of Inyo County Juvenile Probation Rehab Specialists and also weekly counseling from North Star to assist and support students. (COE)*

1. Educator capacity building
2. Staff/teachers are trained to provide individual connections with families/students

*SCOE has provided professional development and coaching for staff and administrators to build skills and a welcoming mindset to foster trust and project respect in working with our families. (COE)*

*All school staff receive two weeks of in-service training prior to the start of each school year. As part of that training time, the staff spends time assessing the school's needs and offerings, which includes assessing the ways in which staff can partner with our parents to provide students needed academic support as well as enrichment activities such as field trips. All staff are provided administrative support with parent/family communications. (Charter)*

*Teachers and administration participate in PTO, PMC, and STEER Pioneer meetings to gain better understanding of family needs and to promote shared responsibility for student success. In addition, teachers and staff participate in annual professional development to better support home school collaboration including “Love & Logic”, Ruby Payne “Bridges Out of Poverty”, “Trauma Informed Practices” delivered by EDCOE and additional self-selected professional development. (District)*

1. Providing professional development (PD) on cultural sensitivities

*Training has been provided to teachers and administrator to increase their ability to understand families’ cultures and languages and to respectfully understand their expectations of the school and hopes for their children. Our administrators are participating in the county wide Solano Equity Alliance and have been active participants in the Solano County Racial and Ethnic Disparity (RED) workgroup convened by the Solano County District Attorney to address race factors affecting life outcomes for students of color. Our administrators are also participating in a year-long professional development with Jamie Almanzan on practices to promote equity and close the opportunity gap in education. (COE)*

*There has been ongoing professional development for educators to support them in meeting the needs of our diverse student population. We can improve on how we communicate with families that are non-English speaking. (District)*

1. Other capacity building practices, e.g., including family engagement in job duties or responsibilities of staff

*Counselors, probation officers, Special Ed staff are all included in the progress and concerns of all students. Monthly Ed. Services staff meetings allows staff to be informed about school events and student supports needed. All staff are given “PRIDE” tickets to issue to students displaying character traits defined in our Positive Behavior support system. (COE)*

*Facility staff focus professional development on building relationships with incarcerated youth, as well as, academic improvement. (COE)*

*The school leader meets regularly with the KFA team to assist with any projects and to ensure alignment between the school and the community. (Charter)*

*Additionally, the LEA meets with the leadership team (Assistant Principals, Coaches, and Lead Special Education Specialists) twice a month to ensure the team is aware of all changes in curriculum, operations, and community events. (Charter)*

*Trauma-Informed training has been provided to all staff members. (District)*

#### Focus Area for Improvement

1. To support underrepresented students and families
2. To provide language and cultural support, e.g., translation services

*To improve the engagement of underrepresented families and strengthen the understanding of the needs of a high turnover student population, schools will continue to align family engagement activities with culturally proficient practices and increase outreach efforts to underserved populations. (COE)*

*One area of focus is expanding our school communications whereby information reaches more parents in a format that is easily understandable and in the family's home language. In doing so, Redwood Academy aims to improve the engagement of underrepresented families. (Charter)*

*We have an annual meeting to address our underrepresented families but we have not had any parents participate. We offer food and have it on a night of another well-attended event but no participants attend. We will improve our communication strategies by ensuring we translate the notifications in Spanish. We have made a concerted effort to communicate in a variety of ways to our most at-risk student population. (District)*

1. To minimize barriers through individual outreach to underrepresented families

*Improve the engagement of underrepresented families: Increase the effort to include underrepresented families by removing as many barriers as possible. Some of these efforts include providing childcare and translators at family events, as well as transportation, as needed. (COE)*

*The district will improve the engagement of underrepresented families by reaching out and communicating individually with a greater level of frequency. This can include making personal phone calls, sending individual invitations to events, and following up with families if they were not able to attend a family-school activity to ensure there were no barriers to their attendance. (Charter)*

*Based on this data, a focus area for improvement will be to expand and coordinate the work of community service assistants at school sites to engage with underrepresented families, work with sites to plan parent education nights focused on topics they have identified, and working to bring in community organizations to the school sites to minimize barriers and build stronger relationships between home and school. (District)*

1. To support homeless youth, foster youth, students with disabilities, and other underrepresented students

*The District’s LCAP contains the following planned actions and services for parent engagement: a. Outreach communications to families of English Learners, families of Foster and Homeless Youth, and families of socio-economically disadvantaged students which highlight opportunities to participate in school events and decision-making forums (District)*

*We have a strong turn out with our Hispanic group but have room to grow with reaching out to our Student with Disabilities. (District)*

1. To improve two-way communication with families
2. To increase and improve methods of communication with families

*We plan on improving methods to garner feedback on connecting families to local partner agency resources. (COE)*

*We could work on better communication avenues for families without (or with poor) access to the internet, in part conducting more phone calls/texts instead of emails. (Charter)*

*The District will continue to focus on ensuring families who may not have access to technology are invited to events and included on committees (e.g., SSC, ELAC, LCAP). Parents now have 24-hour access to student grades and CAASPP and ELPAC test results. (District)*

1. To provide more events/opportunities to communicate with families and to increase the parent participation/involvement

*More work needs to be completed in this area including: Parent/Guardian learning opportunities in positive discipline, substance abuse prevention, and connecting them to opportunities to connect with each other. (COE)*

*We will continue to provide numerous opportunities at the school site and district level to facilitate and support the engagement of our parents, staff and community. (Charter)*

*We also need to continue to enhance two-way communication between school and home and offer families more opportunities to provide feedback and input. (District)*

1. To build capacities of educators and staff to partner with families
2. To provide cultural proficiency PD; to provide PD for best practices for working effectively with underrepresented families

*An area for improvement would be to provide training for our teachers in cultural proficiency in order to expand their understanding of our students’ cultural norms. By providing cultural proficiency training to our teachers, they will gain knowledge on how to engage with our underrepresented families. (COE)*

*The charter will continue its effort to provide targeted PD in working with underrepresented families. (Charter)*

*A focus on culturally responsive teaching is ongoing by our teachers. All elementary schools invite families to share cultural traditions as part of teaching schoolwide cultural and diversity awareness and respect. Our survey indicated that 75% of parents see diversity respected and reflected by District policies and programs. (District)*

1. To help teachers/staff learn about the individual strengths of each family as well as their culture, language, and goals for their children

*An area of growth for our organization is supporting staff to learn about each family's strengths, culture, language and goals for their children. Because our alternative education programs are very small, we are able to support our staff in this area during weekly staff meetings, weekly work in Restorative Justice and PBIS with a focus on building community and quarterly parent conferences. (COE)*

*TIA recognizes our need to develop and recognize resources that will support the staff in recognizing each family's strengths, cultures, languages, and goals for their children. Several teachers have established great communication with parents via Class Tag and Google Classroom; however, the school needs to follow-up regarding how our teachers have inquired about parents goals for their child/children. (Charter)*

*A focus area for improvement in the Building Relationships section that addresses supporting staff to learn about each family’s strengths, cultures, languages, and goals for their children by offering district wide professional development opportunities in this area. (District)*

1. To create positive climate/environment
2. To provide safe, inclusive, and welcoming school and office environments

*As our population grows we look towards ensuring all families who join us throughout the school year are welcomed with the same access to orientation information as those families who have started at the beginning of the school year. (Charter)*

*Sites and district office will continue to work on and provide training on creating welcoming and safe environments for families by showing respect and avoiding stereotyping or judging families, and everyone is trained on anti-bullying policies. (District)*

#### How LEAs refer to evidence and engage stakeholders

##### How LEAs use evidence to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings

1. Survey data to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings

*Surveys were also distributed to all the students and families, including the California Healthy Kids Survey and locally developed questions. Parents supported the process and expressed experiencing positive connections with school staff. They also emphasized their interest in addressing students’ options after completing high school and an interest in being included in planning and monitoring student’s progress. (COE)*

*To rate our progress, we examined the feedback we have received from families through our twice-a-year parent and student survey results. We have received really important feedback but have room for improvement in participation rates. (Charter)*

*The Scotia Union School District provides a welcoming environment for families and community members. On the annual stakeholder survey, 97 percent of responses agreed with the statement "I feel welcome at Scotia School." (District)*

1. Other forms of evidence to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings

*One key strategy to improvement is to consistently utilize this tool to reflect upon current practice and potential barriers for families. Through the aforementioned process/tool we have identified that language barriers for our Spanish speaking parents is an impediment to relationship building and consistent clear communication that needs to be remedied. (COE)*

*Members act as a committed group of advisors to the staff and administration, regarding issues that affect the scholars and school of CCS. They provide feedback and insight from the parent’s perspective on school process, policies and initiatives to ensure that the needs of parents and their families are included as decisions are made. They also serve as an advisory that makes recommendations, encourages brainstorming and provides opportunities for parent involvement on committees. The feedback from our families shows an appreciation for the numerous ways we have used to engage them, from social media, to surveys, to a quarterly Town Hall with the Superintendent. (Charter)*

*The LEA supports with stakeholder review of state and local data during site council meetings. Stakeholder feedback is elicited. (District)*

##### How LEAs use various methods to engage stakeholders

1. Feedback loops, focus groups, interviews, surveys, etc.

*A broad range of stakeholders were included in the self-evaluation process during the 2018-19 school year to generate data for our local indicators. The process included meetings with parents and students, staff, and School Site Councils. The great majority of our parents are African American or Latino and come from families in the low-income range. (COE)*

*Parent and community input is sought multiple times each month through attendance at open school board meetings, PTC (Parent-Teacher-Club) meetings, planning committee meetings and school site council. We actively seek parent and student feedback through surveys sent out at least twice each year. Those results are used to improve many facets of the school experience for all stakeholders. (Charter)*

*To effectively evaluate progress with parent engagement for this local priority, the Fontana Unified School District convened an LCAP Parent Engagement Committee. The committee utilized the required self-evaluation tool in the fall of 2019 to establish baseline data in the evaluation of Fontana Unified School District’s 2018-2019 progress in building relationships and partnerships with families and in seeking input from parents in decision-making processes. (District)*

Below is an overall description of the percentage of LEAs that addressed the prompt for the Narrative 2:

| Aspect of the Prompt | Number and percent of COE(n=16) | Number and percent of Charter(n=81) | Number and percent of District(n=101) | Total number and percent of LEAs(n=198) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Described a strength and/or progress | 15 (94%) | 72 (89%) | 89 (88%) | 176 (89%) |
| Identified a focus area for improvement  | 11 (69%) | 40 (49%) | 60 (59%) | 111 (56%) |
| Addressed engagement of underrepresented families | 10 (63%) | 27 (33%) | 54 (54%) | 91 (46%) |
| Referred to evidence that informs the narratives and/or ratings | 7 (44%) | 29 (36%) | 53 (53%) | 89 (45%) |
| Described how the LEA engaged stakeholders  | 4 (25%) | 24 (30%) | 30 (30%) | 58 (29%) |

Overall, the 198 LEAs reported 6 strengths and progress in their practices in building partnerships for student outcomes. They also reported 6 focus areas to improve, as well as how they refer to evidence to inform their responses to the narratives/ratings. The table below shows the number of LEAs that reported having each of the specific strengths or focus areas.

| Strengths, Focus Areas, and How LEAs Refer to Evidence and Engage Stakeholders | Themes | COE(n=16) | Charter(n=81) | Districts(n=101) | Total LEAs(n=198) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strength and/or progress | Providing families with information/resources to support student learning at home | 9 | 56 | 59 | 124 (63%) |
| Strength and/or progress | Implementing policies, programs, and/or practices for teachers/staff to work with families | 8 | 38 | 55 | 101 (51%) |
| Strength and/or progress | Improving schools’ capacity to partner with families | 5 | 25 | 39 | 69 (35%) |
| Strength and/or progress | Engaging underrepresented families | 5 | 13 | 32 | 50 (25%) |
| Strength and/or progress | Providing parents with classes/workshops or parent education  | 5 | 18 | 26 | 49 (25%) |
| Strength and/or progress | Supporting families to exercise their legal rights | 3 | 15 | 21 | 39 (20%) |
| Focus area for improvement  | To engage underrepresented families | 7 | 15 | 25 | 47 (24%) |
| Focus area for improvement  | To provide families with information/resources to support student learning | 2 | 9 | 23 | 34 (17%) |
| Focus area for improvement  | To provide more parent education workshops/training | 2 | 15 | 14 | 31 (16%) |
| Focus area for improvement  | To implement policies, programs, and/or practices for teachers/staff to work with families | 3 | 12 | 16 | 31 (16%) |
| Focus area for improvement  | To improve schools’ capacity to partner with families | 3 | 8 | 17 | 28 (14%) |
| Focus area for improvement  | To support families to understand and exercise their legal rights | 2 | 2 | 4 | 8 (4%) |
| How LEAs refer to evidence and engage stakeholders  | Survey data or other forms of evidence to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings | 7 | 29 | 53 | 89 (45%) |
| How LEAs refer to evidence and engage stakeholders  | Various methods to engage stakeholders  | 4 | 24 | 30 | 58 (29%) |

Within each of the themes identified above, we also explored further how LEAs did those practices with specific sub-themes as shown in the table below. Note that the sum of the frequencies of the sub-themes is usually bigger than the frequency of the theme in the previous table. The reason is that the LEAs may report practicing several sub-themes within one theme.

| Strengths, Focus Areas, and How LEAs Refer to Evidence and Engage Stakeholders | Themes | Sub-themes | COE(n=16) | Charter(n=81) | Districts(n=101) | Total LEAs(n=198) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strength and/or progress | Providing families with information/resources to support student learning at home | Providing digital and non-digital communication tools  | 0 | 29 | 30 | 59 |
| Strength and/or progress | Providing families with information/resources to support student learning at home | Individual communication with families, e.g., parent-teacher meetings  | 8 | 40 | 38 | 86 |
| Strength and/or progress | Providing families with information/resources to support student learning at home | Providing information/resources related to student learning | 5 | 27 | 33 | 65 |
| Strength and/or progress | Providing families with information/resources to support student learning at home | Providing social emotional support | 4 | 12 | 8 | 24 |
| Strength and/or progress | Implementing policies, programs, and/or practices for teachers/staff to work with families | Joint events/meetings/programs, e.g., District's Coordination of Services Team meetings, School Attendance Review Board, etc.  | 5 | 32 | 49 | 86 |
| Strength and/or progress | Implementing policies, programs, and/or practices for teachers/staff to work with families | Developing or implementing a family engagement system/policy, e.g., school site plans and LCAP | 3 | 14 | 23 | 40 |
| Strength and/or progress | Improving schools’ capacity to partner with families | Creating position/team specifically to work on partnering with families | 3 | 7 | 20 | 30 |
| Strength and/or progress | Improving schools’ capacity to partner with families | Professional learning for teachers and staff focusing on how to better connect and partner with families | 2 | 22 | 19 | 43 |
| Strength and/or progress | Improving schools’ capacity to partner with families | Professional learning for teachers and staff focusing on professional learning communities (PLCs) and/or specific subjects | 1 | 7 | 5 | 13 |
| Strength and/or progress | Engaging underrepresented families | Supporting underrepresented families via individual meetings or joint efforts (e.g., task force, community meetings, racial justice task force, and community liaisons, etc.) | 4 | 9 | 16 | 29 |
| Strength and/or progress | Engaging underrepresented families | Removing barriers, such as providing transportation or translation services | 3 | 5 | 23 | 31 |
| Strength and/or progress | Providing parents with classes/workshops or parent education  | Parent classes/workshops on academic-related topics  | 2 | 13 | 16 | 31 |
| Strength and/or progress | Providing parents with classes/workshops or parent education  | Training on school or district information systems (e.g., Aeries, PowerSchool, ParentSquare, etc.), attendance, or other non-academic issues | 3 | 11 | 21 | 35 |
| Strength and/or progress | Supporting families to exercise their legal rights | Creating multiple committees or programs to connect parents in advocating for students  | 1 | 8 | 15 | 24 |
| Strength and/or progress | Supporting families to exercise their legal rights | Providing families with information about their legal rights/responsibilities  | 3 | 10 | 11 | 24 |
| Focus area for improvement  | To engage underrepresented families | To be in direct contact with underrepresented family groups | 1 | 5 | 15 | 21 |
| Focus area for improvement  | To engage underrepresented families | To provide PD training on how best to improve a school’s capacity to collaborate and engage with underrepresented families | 2 | 4 | 4 | 10 |
| Focus area for improvement  | To engage underrepresented families | To remove as many barriers as possible  | 4 | 6 | 12 | 22 |
| Focus area for improvement  | To provide families with information/resources to support student learning | To create methods to share information and resources to support student learning and development in the home | 0 | 4 | 16 | 20 |
| Focus area for improvement  | To provide families with information/resources to support student learning | To provide families with information/resources (content) to support student learning  | 2 | 5 | 14 | 21 |
| Focus area for improvement  | To provide more parent education workshops/training | To provide more events/programs related to building family capacities | 1 | 13 | 12 | 26 |
| Focus area for improvement  | To provide more parent education workshops/training | To help parents to understand the requirements for grade level mastery; to help parents learn how to support their student’s growth in various domains | 1 | 6 | 3 | 10 |
| Focus area for improvement  | To implement policies, programs, and/or practices for teachers/staff to work with families | To develop partnerships with the focus on student outcomes, e.g., expanding Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) parent nights, Project 2Inspire, etc. | 2 | 8 | 7 | 17 |
| Focus area for improvement  | To implement policies, programs, and/or practices for teachers/staff to work with families | To make system-level improvement | 1 | 5 | 10 | 16 |
| Focus area for improvement  | To improve schools’ capacity to partner with families | To provide more professional learning opportunities for teachers and staff to support effective partnerships  | 3 | 7 | 16 | 26 |
| Focus area for improvement  | To improve schools’ capacity to partner with families | To provide more opportunities to build network and/or professional learning communities | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Focus area for improvement  | To support families to understand and exercise their legal rights | Continue to support families to understand and exercise their legal rights and advocate for their own child(ren) | 2 | 2 | 4 | 8 |
| How LEAs refer to evidence and engage stakeholders  | How LEAs refer to evidence to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings | Survey data to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings | 1 | 12 | 24 | 37 |
| How LEAs refer to evidence and engage stakeholders  | How LEAs refer to evidence to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings | Other forms of evidence to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings | 6 | 20 | 32 | 58 |
| How LEAs refer to evidence and engage stakeholders  | How LEAs use various methods to engage stakeholders | Feedback loops, focus groups, interviews, surveys, etc. | 4 | 24 | 30 | 58 |

### Example Quotations for Narrative 2

#### Strength and/or progress

1. Providing families with information/resources to support student learning at home
2. Providing digital and non-digital communication tools

*Currently there are multiple ways for parents to communicate with staff such as; email, phone calls, and personal meetings. One of our most popular methods of communication is through Parent Square. Once parents sign up for Parent Square they can select their preferred method of communication. They can select email, text or app and each method has the option to have the information translated if needed. (District)*

*Summit Rainier utilizes a variety of tools and modes of communication to ensure that parents with disabilities are accommodated and informed. Including: individual conferencing and meetings, sign-language, written communication in multiple languages as a resource to anchor meetings, and the use of spaces that are ADA compliant so that all parents have access to participate. (Charter)*

1. Individual communication with families, e.g., parent-teacher meetings

*Oak View Union Elementary School District works closely with families to ensure the overall success of students through Student Success Team Meetings, IEP's, parent teacher conferences, 504 meetings and phone and email communication. (District)*

*Building capacity while building trust with families is also essential work. Staff works to support student outcomes by conducting ILP meetings and parent-teacher conferences at the end of each grading period. (COE)*

*Our school hosts Parent-teacher and Student-led conferences at least 3 times per year, which serves as a platform for teachers to collaborate with families and discuss student progress and method to support positive student outcomes. (Charter)*

1. Providing information/resources related to student learning

*Parents are informed annually of their Parental Rights which are always available on the District website in both English and Spanish. (District)*

*The teacher provides weekly updates of credits earned and progress toward graduation. Open communication between staff and parents is ongoing to keep parents informed of student progress. (COE)*

*We also have Back to School Night in August to let parents know what the standards and expectations are for the current grade level. Progress reports go home to parents every six weeks to make sure they are aware how their child is performing. We hold student led conferences twice a year to allow our student leaders to show accountability for their academic performance, behavior, community service, and goals. (Charter)*

1. Providing social emotional support

*Counselors and Guidance Specialists work with students to provide early mental health support and regularly meet with parents regarding student needs and progress. (District)*

*In addition, transition specialist, truancy officers and teachers discuss student progress with parents multiple times throughout the school year, both in formal and informal meetings. (COE)*

*Da Vinci Science has incorporated regular opportunities for parents to interact with teachers in summer and winter professional development days, seeking feedback and input on school programs and practices and building empathy between parents and teachers. These workshops focus on both academic and socio-emotional student outcomes. (Charter)*

1. Implementing policies, programs, and/or practices for teachers/staff to work with families
2. Joint events/meetings/programs, e.g., District's Coordination of Services Team meetings, School Attendance Review Board, etc.

*The District's SARB (School Attendance Review Board) also is working to strengthen relationships with families to try to improve student attendance. These groups are working on improving relationships with families. Reaching out to families through invitations to join the groups that have formed, the PAC, the Racial Justice Task Force, ELAC, or DELAC are important ways to increase and improve relationships between families and the District. (District)
The Alameda Office of Education schools works to provide a positive opportunity for the schools' educational stakeholders to work together under the leadership of the local superintendent and the local board of education to improve student achievement and outcomes; with an explicit and detailed understanding between all partners. (COE)*

*Various programs and events have been established to initiate outreach and make connections with parents, including the Parent GUIDES, parent conferences, various on campus and off campus volunteer opportunities, school open house and back to school events, Family Engagement Nights, and Parent Workshops. Establishing these connections and developing relationships leads to greater parent involvement. (Charter)*

1. Developing or implementing a family engagement system/policy, e.g., school site plans and LCAP

*The District is strong in implementing policies and programs for teachers to meet with families and students to discuss student progress and work towards improved student outcomes as evidenced by parent conferences, parent meetings, college and career guidance resources, and digital communication tools. (District)*

*Each Community School site has an open-door policy related to meeting with parents/guardians to discuss student progress and determine ways to work together to support student achievement, both behaviorally and academically. (COE)*

*KIPP SoCal understands the importance of family partnership to increase student outcomes. As such, schools have developed regular systems of communication with families through family/teacher conferences to regularly share the progress for students. In these conversations, teachers and families not only discuss student work but also discuss ways in which both teachers and families can work together to help students improve. (Charter)*

1. Improving schools’ capacity to partner with families
2. Creating a position/team specifically to work on partnering with families

*Soquel Union Elementary School District employs a community liaison to work directly with under-represented families. In this capacity, she provides translations, oral and written, connects families to community resources, and acts as a family advocate. (District)*

*SCOE employs an attendance/community liaison who educates and support staff in communicating with families, conducts home visits to address any concerns, and supports families as a referral hub for a variety of needs. Our student support specialists are trained in cross-cultural communication as part of their counseling/social work coursework, and work with families to help them with strategies to support their children’s success and to prepare them to support their children’s transition back to their school of residence when leaving our programs. (COE)*

*The Family and Community Engagement Coordinator will provide professional development to teachers, administrators and staff on how to best engage with families, including conducting home visits; working with parents as partners and communicating with families. (Charter)*

1. Professional learning for teachers and staff focusing on how to better connect and partner with families

*The PSUSD Family Center supports school efforts building capacity in partnering with families through systems such as parent nights, PTA/PTG/PTO training, and parent workshop sessions featuring topics such as technology skill development, SHAPE, and “7 Habits of Successful Families.” (District)*

*The school provides specialized staff training for key staff-parent interactions. (Charter)*

*Professional learning is provided to staff and administration which includes Trauma Informed Practices, Eliminating Barriers to Learning, and Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports. These trainings support staff in understanding the family dynamics that have negative impact on the student’s ability to come to school ready to engage in learning. (COE)*

1. Professional learning for teachers and staff focusing on professional learning communities (PLCs) and/or specific subjects

*Teachers and principals have been provided support to increase capacity by participating in the Professional Learning Network (PLN) for the tri-county region. The PLN offers staff an opportunity to collaborate with others in similar capacities to discuss student outcomes, family engagement, and other important topics. (COE)*

*The LEA is committed to ongoing relevant professional development in the areas of curriculum and instruction. As an AVID Elementary school, teachers are provided professional development in best practices in communicating the AVID program and its instructional and organizational tenets to stakeholders. Professional development occurs at AVID’s Summer Institute, currently attended by all teaching staff. Additionally, teachers participate in bi-weekly professional development in AVID best instructional practices. (Charter)*

*Laguna Parent Club meets regularly with the faculty to discuss and plan school activities, events, and plan for the future. They are an integral part of developing this LCAP. (District)*

1. Engaging underrepresented families
2. Supporting underrepresented families via individual meetings or joint efforts (e.g., task force, community meetings, racial justice task force, and community liaisons, etc.)

*In order to improve the engagement of underrepresented families, Chatom will continue to survey the parents and community on the preferred method of communication and provide professional learning to staff on best practices to promote parent partnerships. (District)*

*As mentioned above, one of many important resources is the addition of Inyo County Juvenile Probation Rehab Specialists and also weekly counseling from North Star to assist and support students. The partnership with North Star provides another layer of support to insure positive progress and outcomes particularly for those underrepresented families who often struggle to navigate some of the barriers to additional support and resources. (COE)*

*LEA strategies include: Invitation of underrepresented families to participate in Parenting Partners modules (some sites) LEA Policy Distribution to Parents and Family Members of Participating Children Materials and Training to Help Parents to Work with Their Children to Improve Achievement. (Charter)*

1. Removing barriers, such as providing transportation or translation services

*To ensure inclusion of all parents, each site provides translation in English, Spanish, and Triqui. This practice has increased our parent participation by site. (District)*

*Translation services are provided at school events to increase family participation. (COE)*

*Additionally, the school ensures that parents/caregivers of migratory children are engaged. This includes meeting with families prior to a departure and then again when they return. The school will also support a plan for the students to complete work as appropriate while they are away so the disruption is minimized. (Charter)*

1. Providing parent with classes/workshops or parent education
2. Parent classes/workshops on academic-related topics

*Site-based workshops have been developed by professional consultants and districtwide staff, and have engaged our parent community in understanding how to best prepare their child for college and career readiness. (District)*

*Families are provided opportunities to attend parent workshops on various topics including literacy, attendance, suicide prevention, bullying prevention, language development and technology literacy. (District)*

*We provide parent workshops on various topics of interest and need to our families. (Charter)*

1. Training on school or district information systems (e.g., Aeries, PowerSchool, ParentSquare, etc.), attendance, or other non-academic issues

*The District has annual training for parents in how to access the student information system, Aeries, which can be used daily to track student progress. (District)*

*Strength: Providing events to educate parents concerning trafficking and substance abuse. (COE)*

*Each year the Family Ambassadors host an annual convening that explores topics that are important to families. The convening hosts workshops that provides tools and resources for families to support their children. Additionally, this convening is developed by parents through the lens of being beneficial for parents. (Charter)*

1. Supporting families to exercise their legal rights
2. Creating multiple committees or programs to connect parents in advocating for students

*The District is beginning to support families through the Parent Advisory Council, DELAC, and the Racial Justice Task force, in supporting families in understanding their legal rights and in learning how to advocate for their children. (District)*

*Parents and families advocating for their students is encouraged and appreciated at SWACS. Staff provides families information regarding legal rights and resources available to them and their child. (COE)*

*Additionally, KIPP SoCal supports families from across all schools through a Family Ambassador program. In this program, family members learn about legal rights, develop leadership through self-agency, and are ultimately empowered and equipped to advocate for all students. (Charter)*

1. Providing families with information about their legal rights/responsibilities

*Families are encouraged to advocate for their children through the Individualized Education Plan (IEP) process, ELAC/DELAC and SSC meetings. Information regarding parent and student legal rights is disseminated to families at the beginning of each school year. (District)*

*In the area of building partnerships to foster positive student outcomes, the SBCOE has done well in supporting families to understand and exercise their legal rights and to advocate for their own students as well as all students. Because we are an alternative education site, many of our students come to us after incarceration, placement on probation or expulsion from their district of residence. The SBCOE treats the families of our students with dignity and respect, regardless of the student's issues, and seeks to work with these parents as equal partners in their child's education. (COE)*

*Parents are informed of their legal rights and ways to advocate for their student by way of the Student-Family Handbook and other school informational mailings, such as the Title I Parent Policy. (Charter)*

#### Focus Area for Improvement

1. To engage underrepresented families
2. To be in direct contact with underrepresented family groups

*An area for focus here would be in direct contact with some of our underrepresented family groups. All meetings are scheduled and provided for all parents, however we find that our underrepresented families, rarely attend such meetings. We continue to seek out ways in which to reach our underrepresented populations. (District)*

*The parents of underrepresented families will be encouraged to participate in the parent survey in the future. (Charter)*

1. To provide PD training on how best to improve a school’s capacity to collaborate and engage with underrepresented families

*Focus areas and activities to improve partnerships for student outcomes include the continued support of counselor and community service assistant positions at all levels, the expansion of AVID parent nights, and the continuation of Project 2inspire, the Parent Institute for Quality Education (PIQE), and the Speaker Series, which provide information and resources for parents on high interest community topics. Utilizing staff from the Mt. Diablo Equity and English Learner Departments, principals and teachers will receive training on how best to improve a school’s capacity to collaborate and engage with underrepresented families. (District)*

*As a focus for improvement, the LEA will provide staff development to train staff in best practices for working effectively with underrepresented families. (COE)*

*An ongoing area of improvement is in providing professional learning and support to teachers in order to improve their capacity to partner with families, particularly with the school's underrepresented families. In order to address this challenge, the school plans to continue to its equity professional development in which teachers and staff are given time and space to reflect on their own identities and how those identities show up for the families with whom they interact. (Charter)*

1. To remove as many barriers as possible

*Ensuring that improvements in communication take into account the need for translation and delivery in multiple modes will be a key to improving the engagement of underrepresented families. Monitoring successful outreach to these families will be critical to overall improvement within this area of the indicator. (District)*

*MCOS staff will focus on providing informational support meetings for parents and provide accommodations to facilitate greater levels of participation for families with transportation, language barriers, or mobility issues for these support meetings. (COE)*

*There needs to be a focus in engaging our historically underrepresented families, such as those from poverty and second language learner families. Efforts will continue by providing translated services, day care and varied times to meet. (Charter)*

1. To provide families with information/resources to support student learning
2. To create methods to share information and resources to support student learning and development in the home

*Focusing on LCAP goals and actions, Orick School will create methods to share information and resources to support student learning and development in the home. (District)*

*They also identified a need to improve communication to parents and the community about resources, training, workshops, and events for families and students that are taking place at the site and district level. Teachers need to communicate regularly with parents of all students regarding student achievement, growth opportunities, and available resources. Strategies to address these identified needs will be addressed through the LCAP process. (District)*

*Da Vinci Connect will re-examine the format and content of Parent Educator Conference days, curriculum workshops and the assessment feedback teachers share with parents regarding their children’s progress. This will ensure meaningful dialogue between parents and teachers as well as an understanding of next steps for student growth in a variety of skills (academic and non-academic). (Charter)*

1. To provide families with information/resources (content) to support student learning

*PSUSD will continue to improve supports for families in advocating for students and providing additional and effective resources to support student learning in the home. (District)*

*Areas of growth include providing families with information and resources to support student learning and development in the home and providing professional learning and support to teachers and principals to improve a school's capacity to partner with families. (COE)*

*Programs that provide resources and support to parents are mainly completed through the classroom, but true programs need to be established and built upon for all grades. (Charter)*

1. To provide more parent education workshops/training
2. To provide more events/programs related to building family capacities

*During our August staff meeting, all employees brainstormed ideas to increase family engagement and as a result GUESD and the Parents' Club will be hosting 3 family nights during the year. (District)*

*A focus area for improvement in building partnerships is to create more opportunities for parent education. While we do have an “open-door” policy to assist parents requesting help, we have other families that are unable to participate in meetings due to a variety of reasons. Offering engaging parent education activities in the future may be a way to involve all families in improving student outcomes. (COE)*

*Parents have expressed a desire for more educational opportunities. IBCS is focusing on increased parent education and strategies to teach parents how to support the academic success of students. (Charter)*

1. To help parents to understand the requirements for grade level mastery; to help parents learn how to support their student’s growth in various domains

*Data collection and analysis is beginning this school year along with resource development for outcome-based partnerships with parents. (District)*

*A focus area for improvement is developing opportunities to help parents learn how to support their student’s growth in the affective, academic and social/emotional domains at home. (COE)*

*Many parents of our English Learner students have also requested an adult ESL class. This would make it easier for them to communicate with their school community. To address these needs, the district will provide opportunities for parents to learn more about the state's mathematical practices and strategies to help their child with math homework. This will take place during the fall parent workshops. In addition, adult ESL will be offered during the spring of 2020. (Charter)*

1. To implement policies, programs, and/or practices for teachers/staff to work with families
2. To develop partnerships with the focus on student outcomes, e.g., expanding Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) parent nights, Project 2Inspire, etc.

*Though current efforts to build and engage in partnership with parents/guardians for student outcomes have yielded successes, there is significant room for improvement. A key focus area for improvement is communication about the available partnership, engagement, and support opportunities. Messaging from the district and school site levels needs to be more accessible to all. This includes data collections such as engagement/involvement surveys to assess needs for the district moving forward. (District)*

*MCOS staff will focus on providing informational support meetings for parents and provide accommodations to facilitate greater levels of participation for families with transportation, language barriers, or mobility issues for these support meetings. (COE)*

*Clovis Online has partnered with Gateway High School, Clovis Community Day School, and Enterprise Independent Study and chosen to focus on - providing families with information and resources to support student learning and development in the home. We will accomplish this by increasing our Parent Academies to better support families in the home. (Charter)*

1. To make system-level improvement

*We wish to strengthen are community partnerships to educate our community of the importance of our partnership to encourage student achievement. (District)*

*The ultimate goal is to regenerate our struggling schools and to create sustainable systems to help students and teachers achieve at higher levels and determine how the funding will be spent in our court and community schools. (COE)*

*To continue to strengthen this area, we are exploring and developing systems that will connect the Family Ambassador program to school site family engagement so that education is diffused to larger numbers of families. (Charter)*

1. To improve schools’ capacity to partner with families
2. To provide more professional learning opportunities for teachers and staff to support effective partnerships

*The focus for Woodlake Unified School District staff for the 2019-20 school year is marketing and customer service. Staff at various levels are receiving professional development in ensuring we provide quality customer service and open lines of communication for all stakeholders, including underrepresented groups. (District)*

*Areas of growth include providing families with information and resources to support student learning and development in the home and providing professional learning and support to teachers and principals to improve a school's capacity to partner with families. (COE)*

*The LEA will work on providing practical professional development trainings for teachers and families that will support student development in the home. An example of this would be providing parenting courses to families with the help of our school psychologist. Another example of this is implementing home-visits for all students as needed. (Charter)*

*One area of focus would be to provide more professional training on how to effectively and efficiently partner with families to ensure students' academic success, which would include improving the engagement of underrepresented families. (Charter)*

*Teacher-parent partnerships for improved student outcomes can be found throughout the district. However, a systemic approach needs to be formalized so that administrators, teachers, and staff have the capacity to support all families. All staff need to be provided information and professional development on family engagement. (District)*

1. Provide more opportunities to build networks and/or professional learning communities

*A focus area for improvement is the professional learning for teachers and principals to support effective partnerships. We have a set of structures that support this work, and are working to align across classrooms and grade-levels to ensure that all teachers and leaders are able to do this work in an impactful way. (Charter)*

*Similar to our efforts to build relationships with families, our focus area within building partnerships for student outcomes lies in our need for additional professional development with administrators and teachers. AUSD is exploring effective resources and programs to support administrators and staff in this area. (District)*

1. To support families to understand and exercise their legal rights
2. Continue to support families to understand and exercise their legal rights and advocate for their own child(ren)

*PVUSD finds that its weakness is in supporting families in understanding and exercising their legal rights and advocating for their own children and all children. PVUSD is offering parent informational nights to address this area. (District)*

*Area of Improvement: Need to include parental rights in the handbook/enrollment packet and offer incentives to encourage parents to attend meetings. (COE)*

*A focus area for improvement is to continue to support families to understand and exercise their legal rights and advocate for their own child(ren). (Charter)*

#### How LEAs refer to evidence and engage stakeholders

##### How LEAs refer evidence to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings

1. Survey data to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings

*Two areas of immediate concern are the district’s efforts to help staff understand how to improve school partnerships with parents and providing families with information to help them support their student’s learning at home. Both of these areas scored less than 60 percent on the parent survey. (District)*

*Additionally, with regard to building partnerships, the annual LCAP Survey was completed by 154 parents. The results for parents are the following: "I am a partner with this school in decisions made about my child's education" 33 percent strongly agreed and 29 percent agreed with this statement. "I feel welcomed to attend parent activities at this school" 48 percent strongly agreed and 25 percent agreed with this statement. (COE)*

*According to the 2018-19 parent survey, 100 percent of parents feel they can talk to school staff about their needs and concerns, 100 percent feel that the school is a safe place, 100 percent are satisfied with how the school is managed, and 91 percent feel their child is successful and adequately preparing for college. Anecdotal data suggests that parents appreciate the close relationships with staff and opportunities such as the College Program. (Charter)*

1. Other forms of evidence to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings

*LUSD has a parent conference attendance rate of 99 percent, allowing teachers to meet with the majority of families to discuss student progress and work together to support improved student outcomes. Families are encouraged to advocate for their children through the Individualized Education Plan (IEP) process, ELAC/DELAC and SSC meetings. (District)*

*By reviewing a number of explicit data points, the school has been able to evaluate progress on this indicator. We examined: Professional Development structure and survey Parent newsletters (+language access) (analytics) Personalized Learning Plan meetings (parents/caregiver/student/mentor) Policy accessibility on website Through 1:1conferences, parents are shown how to monitor their child's progress and how to access resources that will support them in this effort. (Charter)*

##### How LEAs use various methods to engage stakeholders

1. Feedback loops, focus groups, interviews, surveys, etc.

*The created surveys allow for parents to inquire about topics related to our school climate, academics, parent engagement, curricula, frameworks, arts integration, college and career readiness, all common core standards (Next Generation Science Standards, English/Language Arts and math standards, and the History/Social Science Framework), STEM education, Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, English Learner programs, supports and resources, and social emotional learning. (District)*

*There is also a Foster Youth Advisory Committee. These committees are an opportunity for families to provide feedback and participate in strengthening outcomes for the programs. (COE)*

*CCS utilized the support of the Parent Advisory Council (PAC) as a method to strategize and engage all stakeholders of the organization. The Parent Advisory Council serves to provide parent feedback on school policies and procedures at Compass Charter Schools to ensure that they are consistent with its Mission, Vision, and Values. Members act as a committed group of advisors to the staff and administration, regarding issues that affect the scholars and school of CCS. They provide feedback and insight from the parent’s perspective on school process, policies and initiatives to ensure that the needs of parents and their families are included as decisions are made. They also serve as an advisory that makes recommendations, encourages brainstorming and provides opportunities for parent involvement on committees. (Charter)*

*Parent and family engagement policy is reviewed, and stakeholder feedback received, at school site council meetings to identify roadblocks and develop strategies/solutions for implementation in non-traditional school programs. (Charter)*

Below is an overall description of the percentage of LEAs that addressed the prompt for the Narrative 3:

| **Aspect of the Prompt** | **Number and percent of COE****(n=16)** | **Number and percent of Charter****(n=81)** | **Number and percent of District****(n=101)** | **Total number and percent of LEAs****(n=198)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Described a strength and/or progress | 14 (88%) | 70 (86%) | 95 (94%) | 179 (90%) |
| Identified a focus area for improvement  | 11 (69%) | 45 (56%) | 58 (57%) | 114 (58%) |
| Addressed engagement of underrepresented families | 8 (50%) | 40 (49%) | 47 (47%) | 95 (48%) |
| Referred to evidence that informs the narratives and/or ratings | 4 (25%) | 18 (22%) | 40 (40%) | 62 (31%) |
| Described how the LEA engaged stakeholders  | 12 (75%) | 63 (78%) | 76 (75%) | 151 (76%) |

Overall, the 198 LEAs reported 4 strengths and progress in their practices in seeking input for decision-making. They also reported 4 focus areas to improve, and 2 approaches in which LEAs use evidence to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings. The table below shows the number of LEAs that reported having each of the specific strengths or focus areas.

| **Strengths, Focus Areas, and How LEAs Refer to Evidence and Engage Stakeholders** | **Themes** | **COE****(n=16)** | **Charter****(n=81)** | **Districts****(n=101)** | **Total LEAs****(n=198)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strength and/or progress | Engaging families and encouraging them to provide input | 12 | 63 | 76 | 151 (76%) |
| Strength and/or progress | System-level support and practices | 11 | 49 | 66 | 126 (64%) |
| Strength and/or progress | Supporting underrepresented families | 5 | 22 | 33 | 60 (30%) |
| Strength and/or progress | Family capacity building | 1 | 10 | 12 | 23 (12%) |
| Focus area for improvement | To provide families with opportunities to provide input | 6 | 32 | 34 | 72 (36%) |
| Focus area for improvement | To support underrepresented families | 3 | 23 | 21 | 47 (24%) |
| Focus area for improvement | To provide system-level support  | 5 | 15 | 24 | 44 (22%) |
| Focus area for improvement | To build family capacity | 1 | 2 | 8 | 11 (6%) |
| How LEAs refer to evidence and engage stakeholders  | Survey data or other forms of evidence to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings  | 4 | 18 | 40 | 62 (31%) |
| How LEAs refer to evidence and engage stakeholders  | Various methods to engage stakeholders | 12 | 63 | 76 | 151 (76%) |

Within each of the themes identified above, we also explored further how LEAs did those practices with specific sub-themes as shown in the table below. Note that the sum of the frequencies of the sub-themes is usually bigger than the frequency of the theme in the previous table. The reason is that the LEAs may report practicing several sub-themes within one theme.

| **Strengths, Focus Areas, and How LEAs Refer to Evidence and Engage Stakeholders** | **Themes** | **Sub-themes** | **COE****(n=16)** | **Charter****(n=81)** | **Districts****(n=101)** | **Total LEAs****(n=198)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strength and/or progress | Engaging families and encouraging them to provide input | Recruiting parents/families to participate in decision-making | 2 | 6 | 12 | 20 |
| Strength and/or progress | Engaging families and encouraging them to provide input | Using surveys via multiple platforms (e.g., text and email) to solicit feedback from families and engage them in decision-making | 5 | 42 | 41 | 88 |
| Strength and/or progress | Engaging families and encouraging them to provide input | Providing various events/meetings to engage families and have them participate in decision-making | 12 | 55 | 69 | 136 |
| Strength and/or progress | System-level support and practices | Creating supportive systems (e.g., structures, policies, articulated positions, funding, and environment) in which stakeholders are encouraged to provide input | 7 | 22 | 35 | 64 |
| Strength and/or progress | System-level support and practices | Using various communication methods to communicate with families | 4 | 31 | 26 | 61 |
| Strength and/or progress | System-level support and practices | Making information accessible and understandable to all families | 3 | 20 | 12 | 35 |
| Strength and/or progress | System-level support and practices | Providing training and technical support to administrators (e.g., principals and staff) to support the engagement of stakeholders  | 3 | 13 | 15 | 31 |
| Strength and/or progress | Supporting underrepresented families | Mentioning/emphasizing the inclusion of underrepresented families in their efforts of engaging families in decision-making | 4 | 13 | 22 | 39 |
| Strength and/or progress | Supporting underrepresented families | Providing translation services and interpreters  | 2 | 10 | 12 | 24 |
| Strength and/or progress | Supporting underrepresented families | Removing barriers (e.g., providing special accommodations; being flexible with location, date, time, and format of the meeting/event) | 1 | 5 | 8 | 14 |
| Strength and/or progress | Family capacity building | Providing workshops/training to families on decision-making and on supporting students learning at home  | 1 | 10 | 12 | 23 |
| Focus area for improvement  | To provide families with opportunities to provide input | To recruit more families; to increase the participation of families in decision-making | 1 | 24 | 18 | 43 |
| Focus area for improvement  | To provide families with opportunities to provide input | To create/provide various events/meetings/programs to have families provide input and have stakeholders work together | 5 | 18 | 23 | 46 |
| Focus area for improvement  | To support underrepresented families  | To support underrepresented families, for example, by removing barriers that may keep them from participating in decision-making opportunities | 3 | 23 | 21 | 47 |
| Focus area for improvement  | To provide system-level support  | To create a supportive/collaborative system, structure, and environment for both educators and families  | 2 | 7 | 8 | 17 |
| Focus area for improvement  | To provide system-level support  | To use various communication methods to communicate with families; and/or to make information accessible and understandable to all families | 2 | 7 | 13 | 22 |
| Focus area for improvement  | To provide system-level support  | To provide training and support to administrators (e.g., principals and staff) to better engage families) | 1 | 4 | 8 | 13 |
| Focus area for improvement  | To build family capacity | To provide workshops/trainings to families and build their capacities in decision-making  | 1 | 2 | 8 | 11 |
| How LEAs use evidence and engage stakeholders | How LEAs refer to evidence to inform narratives and/or ratings | Survey data to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings | 2 | 14 | 29 | 45 |
| How LEAs use evidence and engage stakeholders | How LEAs refer to evidence to inform narratives and/or ratings | Other forms of evidence to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings  | 3 | 6 | 21 | 30 |
| How LEAs use evidence and engage stakeholders | How LEAs use various methods to engage stakeholders | Feedback loops, focus groups, interviews, surveys, etc. | 12 | 63 | 76 | 151  |

### Example Quotations for Narrative 3

#### Strength and/or progress

1. Engaging families and encouraging them to provide input
2. Recruiting parents/families to participate in decision-making

*We will seek to identify parents, guardians, foster family members or group home staff to include in our stakeholder groups to increase engagement. (District)*

*Administrators, Teachers, and Classified staff recruit parents on an individual basis and advertise routinely through social media apps, newsletters, personal phone calls, and regularly scheduled school events. (District)*

*Strength: We have invited parents to become members of School Site Council, and had a parent join while her daughter was attending the school. (COE)*

*BCOE schools are small learning communities. Administrators, teachers and support staff at each site reach out to parents to invite them to be a part of training and the decision-making process, including SSC and LCAP. (Charter)*

1. Using surveys via multiple platforms (e.g., text and email) to solicit feedback from families and engage them in decision-making

*Chatom Union School District offers several opportunities to seek input from parents for decision making. Surveys are sent out to all parents in English and Spanish twice a year for input on school safety, conditions of learning, parent/student engagement, use of technology and ways to increase academic achievement through improved student services. (District)*

*For the last three years, FBUSD has collected parent feedback through a family engagement survey. Survey results were shared with the Board of Trustees at the September 12, 2019 school board meeting. This data is used to evaluate our family services and used to help improve how we engage with our families. (District)*

*CCS is also implementing Stakeholder surveys on the new text app to ensure families have input on the LCAP goals and actions and services to support the goals. (COE)*

*In addition, our school administers an annual parent survey to obtain input/feedback on our educational program, resources, and measure school climate and student connectedness. (Charter)*

1. Providing various events/meetings to engage families and have them participate in decision-making

*There are also monthly Board Meetings where public comment is encouraged and the Board of Trustees welcome discussions on any topic which will assist in helping the District improve services for student success. (District)*

*We also have had various family engagement opportunities towards providing feedback through district family nights, and through our Family Roundtable Discussions, the focus of many of these conversations were focused around English Learners, Foster and Homeless Students, as well as through families of students who were socio-economically disadvantaged. (District)*

*The Alameda County Office of Education schools have worked to ensure there are multiple opportunities for parent engagement including a combination of district-wide, school, and small group meetings and sessions complemented by tools and materials to facilitate participation, share information, and gather feedback in an effort to implement and coordinate parent programs, and cultivate relationships between the school and parents. (COE)*

*SVA provides opportunities for parents to engage in rich collaboration through multiple family workshops and forums. Parents make up most of our school board members in which they are directly responsible for the development and revision of policies the impact the organization as a whole. (Charter)*

1. System-level support and practices
2. Creating supportive systems (e.g., structures, policies, articulated positions, funding, and environment) in which stakeholders are encouraged to provide input

*PSUSD offers many opportunities for input on programs and policies. Committee structures such as AAPAC, DELAC, SEPAC, and the Superintendent’s Parent Meetings have provided forums through which discussions are held across various perspectives to drive district decision making. Additional groups are developed in order to address specific topics, such as the district’s Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS) stakeholder group which discusses suspension data and related equity issues. (District)*

*In recent years the district has begun to better align district wide efforts to engage by coordinating different groups such as district personnel, PTA and administrators, Building Bridges Collaborative, LIKE screening, SBFC partnership with PTA at THS, ELD conference combined with Wellness Fair 2018, etc. (District)*

*Another strength is the positive working environment and collaborative culture that exists between administration and instructional staff who work together to develop strategies that build positive relationships and partnerships with families and other student stakeholders. (COE)*

*We have a set of structures that support this work, and are working to align across classrooms and grade-levels to ensure that all teachers and leaders are able to do this work in an impactful way. (Charter)*

1. Using various communication methods to communicate with families

*All regularly scheduled school board meetings are live streamed on the district YouTube channel and all meetings notices are sent to families via text message, email, and by phone call. (District)*

*Students and families maintaining consistent communication which allows for multiple opportunities to facilitate and receive input. (COE)*

*Additionally, VOCS advertises and communicates different collaboration opportunities, such as Parent Workshops, Homeschool Chats, Town Hall meetings, Governing Board meetings, PEP meetings, and VOPTAC meetings by sending weekly emails and/or Parent Square/Newsflash announcements, posting flyers, and/or sharing the information at a scheduled table meeting. (Charter)*

1. Making information accessible and understandable to all families

*Areas of strength include: A strong setting for soliciting and engaging in input cycles with families is ELAC. At the first ELAC meeting of each school year, time is spent explaining various schools’ access to, and provisions available under Title I. Individual sites regularly flex their meeting locations and times (from student pick-up to evenings) to maximize parent participation. At each of the ELAC and DELAC meeting, information about what curriculum is being used and/or piloted is shared in addition to state and local assessment results, explaining how these are aligned to student learning goals and standards. (District)*

*The Alameda County Office of Education Schools' parent and family engagement policy is available at sites in the student enrollment packet. There are also a number of site engagements such as literacy events, Back to School, parent conferences, SSC, DELAC, and LCAP reviews; for parents to participate, share information, as well as for our LEA to gather stakeholder feedback. (COE)*

*LEA administration reviews policy requirements and drafts the required language of these documents for site administrators. Site administrators work with stakeholder groups to add site specific language and the Site Council provides feedback and approves the documents for distribution. Policy is distributed as an Appendix to the Site Handbook each fall. The LEA ensures information related to school and parent programs, meetings, and other activities is sent to the parents of participating students in a format, and to the extent practicable, in a language the parents can understand, by utilizing bilingual staff to translate documents and/or meetings. The LEA also supports sites with identifying two-way communication systems to ensure parents have access to school communications and can reply, as needed. (Charter)*

1. Providing training and technical support to administrators (e.g., principals and staff) to support the engagement of stakeholders

*Lancaster School District continues to make progress in building the capacity of and supporting principals and staff in their efforts to effectively engage families in advisory groups and with decision making. (District)*

*On-going professional development for teachers, academic counselors, and administrators to ensure teachers employ best practices as determined through student achievement data and input from parent/staff surveys. Treatment team meetings with behavioral health, medical staff, corrections, teachers, counselors, and administrators take place monthly to assist with students struggling with incarceration, social/emotional needs, and learning. (COE)*

*RMCS supports administrators, staff, and faculty to receive professional development to support the effective engagement of families in their child's learning and growth including but not limited to: written and verbal communication skills, equity understanding, and Spanish. (Charter)*

1. Supporting underrepresented families
2. Mentioning/emphasizing the inclusion of underrepresented families in their efforts of engaging families in decision-making

*Oak View Union Elementary School District provides multiple opportunities and events monthly for stakeholders, families, staff and underrepresented groups to engage in decision making. (District)*

*The district holds a large number of focus groups to continue work on the district LCAP and makes great effort to solicit and incorporate input from all stakeholders, including families from underrepresented groups. (District)*

*This will be a positive step in improving engagement with all stakeholders, but particularly with underrepresented groups. We will seek to solicit input from these underrepresented families and students so that we can develop new and improve existing strategies to garner more input and decision-making from our constituents. (COE)*

*Because BCOE schools serve high-risk youth, staff also reach out to community partners to seek their participation. Underrepresented families are personally invited to participate in the local decision-making process, either by survey, or by serving on a school site council. (Charter)*

1. Providing translation services and interpreters

*To ensure inclusion of all parents, each site provides translation in English, Spanish, and Triqui. This practice has increased our parent participation by site. On average, 50-75 parents attend each of our parent workshops per site throughout the school year. (District)*

*To facilitate engagement of underrepresented families, advisory group meetings are held at times and locations preferred by families, interpretation is provided, transportation is available, and activities are offered to families with young children. (COE)*

*The River Montessori Foundation serves as a parent-teacher-student leadership group, providing a feedback loop through regular meetings and frequent events. School communications are translated and interpreters are offered and provided for interactions and meetings when necessary and supportive for families. (Charter)*

1. Removing barriers (e.g., providing special accommodations; being flexible with location, date, time, and format of the meeting/event)

*To facilitate engagement of underrepresented families, advisory group meetings are held at times and locations preferred by families, interpretation is provided, transportation is available, and activities are offered to families with young children. (District)*

*Specific strategies are implemented to support successful school and family connections with a focus on reducing barriers to greater participation by parents, with significant attention given to parents who are economically disadvantaged, are disabled, have limited English proficiency, are migratory, have limited literacy, or are of any racial or ethnic minority background). SRVUSD provides translation services to parents with limited English Proficiency when providing information online, newsletters or meetings at school and district locations. (District)*

*All buildings are ADA compliant and the LEA is working on 508 compliance for websites. The LEA provides opportunities for the informed participation of parents and family members with disabilities by providing reasonable accommodations (such as sign-language interpreters, etc.) to parents and family members. As requested, special accommodations are made for communicating with families that have accessibility needs or other special needs which make corresponding with the school difficult. (Charter)*

*KIPP SoCal is committed to engaging underrepresented families however possible, including being flexible with meeting times and dates to accommodate schedules, providing School Site Council and English Learner Advisory Committee meeting materials in multiple languages as needed, and advertising meetings and other family engagement activities in multiple formats and/or venues (e.g., electronic bulletin and posted flyer in the office). (Charter)*

1. Family capacity building
2. Providing workshops/training to families on decision-making and on supporting students learning at home

*Site-based workshops have been developed by professional consultants and districtwide staff, and have engaged our parent community in understanding how to best prepare their child for college and career readiness. (District)*

*To continually increase the capacity of parents to participate more fully in decision-making groups, the LEA provides opportunities for parent leaders to attend local and regional conferences and trainings. (COE)*

*The LEA supports with site council training, including making training accessible to parents serving on the council. (Charter)*

*In addition to significant informal opportunities for parents and teachers to connect, the school is building out formal structures to support family engagement through advisory groups and enhance parent engagement in the formal governance process. We have formalized our SSC and ELAC nomination and election process to increase parent participation and enhanced our training to help parents better understand how to hold effective meetings and engage the formal process. (Charter)*

#### Focus Area for Improvement

1. To provide families with opportunities to provide input
2. To recruit more families; to increase the participation of families in decision-making

*Parents, guardians and community leaders will be actively recruited to participate in site and district level decision-making advisory groups to improve the District’s capacity to partner and engage with underrepresented families and communities. (District)*

*While we do engage with parents at LCAP stakeholder meetings to gather feedback regarding programs and policies, the participation rate at these meetings has been minuscule. An effort to encourage parents and families to attend activities has become a major priority. With flyers, phone calls home, and consistent communication, we hope to improve in this area. Regardless of numbers in attendance, we will not stop pursuing parental engagement until all families of our students are represented. (COE)*

*The LEA will improve the engagement of underrepresented families through the recruitment of potential board members (parents) of our English Language Learner population. (Charter)*

1. To create/provide various events/meetings/programs to have families provide input and have stakeholders work together

*Regarding having staff and families plan together to plan, design, implement and evaluate family engagement activities, we have provided for Family Roundtable discussions, as well as PTO/PTA. There is room for growth here in that we are looking to require sites to further offer opportunities towards engagement opportunities. (District)*

*Moving forward a focus area for improvement would be to plan in the spring with these groups and administrators upcoming parent engagement efforts for the school year in order to have coordinated messaging and opportunities for parent input and decision making. (District)*

*HCOE CCS schedules four Stakeholder meetings annually to engage families in the process of LCAP development. Typically, families do not attend these meetings. CCS is planning to host a stakeholder meeting at the winter family night which usually has a large family representation. This will provide more opportunities in LCAP development and the decision-making process. (COE)*

*The school is focused on new methods of getting parents and staff to work more collaboratively to review and discuss substantive issues, learning from other schools and getting feedback on school practices and approaches. (Charter)*

1. To support underrepresented families, for example, by removing barriers that may keep underrepresented families from participating decision-making opportunities
2. To support underrepresented families, for example, by removing barriers that may keep underrepresented families from participating decision-making opportunities

*In order to improve the engagement of underrepresented families, Chatom Union School District will continue to recruit Parent/Guardian participation. The District will also strive to schedule committee meetings and programs at times which results in the greatest attendance and offer surveys online for optimal input. (District)*

*Focus area for improvement: Increase attendance at decision-making meetings by removing barriers to participation. Continue to make the information easily accessible to all stakeholders. (COE)*

*Improve the engagement of underrepresented families: Increase the effort to include underrepresented families by removing as many barriers as possible. Some of these efforts include providing childcare and translators at family events, as well as transportation, as needed. (COE)*

*Specific to the engagement of underrepresented families in the decision-making process, we are seeking to provide a variety of times of day and time commitments to be involved, as well as utilizing the SLC process, where we have a high level of participation, to also gather family input. (Charter)*

1. To provide system-level support
2. To create a supportive/collaborative system, structure, and environment for both educators and families

*Mt. Diablo will also solicit families and staff from diverse backgrounds to take on positions of leadership at the school or in the community. (District)*

*The high turnover rate in both Court and Community School sites makes it challenging to have continuous parent/guardian involvement. The program will explore ways to increase parent/guardian involvement, including communicating with other county offices of education to determine their parental engagement practices. (COE)*

*We have a set of structures that support this work, and are working to align across classrooms and grade-levels to ensure that all teachers and leaders are able to do this work in an impactful way. (Charter)*

1. To use various communication methods to communicate with families; and/or to make information accessible and understandable to all families

*The LCAP Parent Engagement Committee recommended that at the beginning of the school year, during parent/student orientation, school sites should encourage parents to get involved at both the school site and district levels. Information regarding clubs, boosters, committees, and advisory groups should be readily available. Parents and students should take advantage of the beginning of the year to join one club or organization. Site administrators, teachers, and support staff should also be encouraged to join a site/district club or organization to promote student/parent engagement. (District)*

*We need to develop strategies to more fully engage parents, using multiple modes of communication to gather input. (COE)*

*However, what we experience is consistent participation by the same group of families. As a way to provide other means for communicating and soliciting input, we are considering leveraging social media and other online tools to achieve diversity in our parent/guardian/family groups that participate. (Charter)*

*KIPP will continue to assess the language needs of families to ensure that materials and presentations are being made available in an accessible way. (Charter)*

1. To provide training and support to administrators (e.g., principals and staff) to better engage families

*Focusing trainings to groups that represent school sites with high numbers of underrepresented groups will increase the capacity of such groups to engage in critical decision-making that impacts their students. (District)*

*The LEA will focus on building the capacity of school leaders to work collaboratively with families by establishing a Family Engagement Team for the 2019-20 school year, which will focus on implementing the strategies outlined in the CDE's Family Engagement Toolkit. (COE)*

*A focus area for improvement is the professional learning for teachers and principals to support effective partnerships. (Charter)*

1. To build family capacity
2. To provide workshops/trainings to families and build their capacities in decision-making

*Though many opportunities exist for building capacity and directly engaging in decision-making, there is much room for improvement. The district focal areas for improvement are (1) to provide additional parent trainings specific to the work of SCUSD advisory committees at both the site and district level (District)*

*For the 2019-20 school year, Woodlake Unified School District will continue to focus on educating families about the opportunities to positively impact their students’ education and their advocacy rights. The district has partnered with PIQE to provide an academy to help parents in this endeavor. (District)*

*Families indicated a need in supporting their child in meeting the high school graduation requirements, diversion, and support at the local high schools. (COE)*

*Da Vinci Connect's principal will host workshops about the short and long-term vision of the school, progress towards LCAP goals, and ways for parents to get and stay involved. The school will actively seek to engage the voices of historically under-represented families as the school is seeking to increase diversity and access to this home-school hybrid model. (Charter)*

#### How LEAs refer to evidence and engage stakeholders

##### How LEAs refer to evidence to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings

1. Survey data to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings

*Mt. Diablo Unified used the recommended* ***survey t****ool from the California Department of Education to survey parents and advisory members on how to best seek input for decision-making. Key findings from this survey indicated that high percentages of parents believe that the District is in the “exploration and research” phase in building the capacity of and supporting principals and staff to effectively engage families in advisory groups, in providing families with opportunities to provide input on policies and programs, implementing strategies to seek input from any underrepresented groups in the school community, and in providing opportunities to have families, teachers, principals, and district administrators work together to plan, implement and evaluate family engagement activities at school and district levels. (District)*

*Based on stakeholder* ***surveys*** *done in Spring 2019 and LCAP goals and actions Orick Elementary School District families and community this area is a strength. (District)*

*On our annual Hanover* ***survey*** *for parents, 88 percent of the parent respondents said they participate in activities or decision-making committees (up by 5 percent from the year before). (District)*

*The consistent small percentage of parents that participate in* ***surveys*** *– whether online or in person – indicate that our Goal 4 in the LCAP is an area of continued growth for TCSOS. The LCAP goal was written as: Goal 4: Strengthen communication between Community/Court School programs, parents, and community members. (COE)*

*We have very little turn out for general parent meetings relating to receiving feedback but we did get over 45 percent participation rate from parents on CALSCHLS, Stakeholder* ***Survey****, and Leader in Me MRA. 98 percent of our parents agree SOAR promotes active parental involvement in all programs. 91 percent state we keep them well-informed about school activities and 84 percent feel they are well-informed of their child's progress. We received an overall grade of a 91 percent on our Stakeholder Survey. (Charter)*

1. Other forms of evidence to inform their responses to the narratives and/or ratings

*The District is strong building the capacity of and supporting family members to effectively engage in advisory groups and decision-making as evidenced by advisory groups and task forces (GATE, CAC, CUCPTSA, DELAC, ELAC, LCAP PAC, Preschool PAC, School Site Council, Language Immersion Parent Committee, Title I Parent Committee, School Counseling Advisory Council). Progress was made in better understanding the needs of foster youth through a needs assessment. (District)*

*The findings relate to the goal of engagement as parents have many opportunities to become involved in their child’s education, while participating in decision-making and providing input on the LCAP: Number of consultation meetings hosted and attendance - 2016-17: 5 Parent Advisory Committee meetings held;
50 attendees - 2017-18: 5 Parent Advisory Committee meetings held;
79 attendees - 2018-19: 5 Parent Advisory Committee meetings held; 61 attendees. Parent attendance to workshops and learning opportunities is reported as follows: - 2016-17: 1,605 attendees; 140 workshops - 2017-18: 2,200 attendees; 205 workshops - 2018-19: 2,105 attendees; 180 workshops. (COE)*

*The feedback from our families shows an appreciation for the numerous ways we have used to engage them, from social media, to surveys, to a quarterly Town Hall with the Superintendent. (Charter)*

##### How LEAs use various methods to engage stakeholders

1. Feedback loops, focus groups, interviews, surveys, etc.

*Each school has two parents at the district-wide LCAP stakeholder meeting along with teachers, a classified staff member, the principal and students at the secondary level. This year, mixed groups of stakeholders rotated through six different data stations to review metrics outlined in our LCAP and the district's performance on each. Individuals wrote their own notes for the questions: What do you notice, what do you wonder, what actions might you suggest. After individuals made their own notes, the group discussed their reflections and the ideas were recorded for each group. The recorded notes were used to inform the actions outlined in the LCAP for 2019-20. (District)*

*The findings relate to the goal of engagement as parents have many opportunities to become involved in their child’s education, while participating in decision-making and providing input on the LCAP: Number of consultation meetings hosted and attendance - 2016-17: 5 Parent Advisory Committee meetings held; 50 attendees - 2017-18: 5 Parent Advisory Committee meetings held; 79 attendees - 2018-19: 5 Parent Advisory Committee meetings held; 61 attendees Parent attendance to workshops and learning opportunities is reported as follows: - 2016-17: 1,605 attendees; 140 workshops - 2017-18: 2,200 attendees; 205 workshops - 2018-19: 2,105 attendees; 180 workshops (COE)*

*In a review of this section, we looked to our community attendance and participation in engagement events including the Town Hall and board meetings. Since 2018-19 school year was the first year of the Town Hall, we will use the attendance as a baseline for future activities. (Charter)*

*We are constantly working to improve things for our families as evidence of our communication committee, attendance committee, community involvement committees and other community events. Our Parent Club is very active and provide the "extras" for areas of need that the general budget does not support. The Parent Club and School Site Council work to improve the school climate and academics for students and staff. (Charter)*

## Appendix G: Descriptive Text for Charts

### [Chart 1](#Chart1)

Title of the chart: Building Relationships Between School Staff and Families

Overall description of the chart: This chart reflects ratings reported by LEAs for each of the four practices within Section 1 of the tool. Within the chart, there is one stacked bar graph for each practice. Within each bar graph, there are five colors to represent each rating:

* Rating 1 (Exploration and Research phase) data is shown in yellow.
* Rating 2 (Beginning Development) data is shown in orange.
* Rating 3 (Initial Implementation) data is shown in grey.
* Rating 4 (Full Implementation) data is shown in green.
* Rating 5 (Full Implementation and Sustainability) data is shown in blue.

Descriptions of each bar graph:

* Practice 1: No LEAs reported a rating of 1 (Exploration and Research Phase); 3% of LEAs reported a rating of 2 (Beginning Development); 18% of LEAs reported a rating of 3 (Initial Implementation); 43% of LEAs reported a rating of 4 (Full Implementation); and 29% of LEAs reported a rating of 5 (Full implementation and Sustainability).
* Practice 2: No LEAs reported a rating of 1 (Exploration and Research Phase); 2% of LEAs reported a rating of 2 (Beginning Development); 14% of LEAs reported a rating of 3 (Initial Implementation; 43% of LEAs reported a rating of 4 (Full Implementation); and 34% of LEAs reported a rating of 5 (Full implementation and Sustainability).
* Practice 3: 2% of LEAs reported a rating of 1 (Exploration and Research Phase); 8% of LEAs reported a rating of 2 (Beginning Development); 31% reported a rating of 3 (Initial Implementation); 35% of LEAs reported a rating of 4 (Full Implementation); and 18% of LEAs reported a rating of 5 (Full Implementation and Sustainability).
* Practice 4: No LEAs reported a rating of 1 (Exploration and Research phase); 3% of LEAs reported a rating of 2 (Beginning Development); 19% of LEAs reported a rating of 3 (Initial Implementation); 42% of LEAs reported a rating of 4 (Full implementation); and 28% of LEAs reported a rating of 5 (Full Implementation and Sustainability).

### [C](#Chart2)[hart 2](#Chart2)

Title of the chart: Building Partnerships for Student Outcomes

Overall description of the chart: This chart reflects ratings reported by LEAs for each of the four practices within Section 2 of the tool. Within the chart, there is one stacked bar graph for each practice. Within each bar graph, there are five colors to represent each rating:

* Rating 1 (Exploration and Research Phase) data is shown in yellow.
* Rating 2 (Beginning Development) data is shown in orange.
* Rating 3 (Initial Implementation) data is shown in grey.
* Rating 4 (Full Implementation) data is shown in green.
* Rating 5 (Full Implementation and Sustainability) data is shown in blue.

Descriptions of each bar graph:

* Practice 5: 2% of LEAs reported a rating of 1 (Exploration and Research Phase); 8% of LEAs reported a rating of 2 (Beginning Development); 29% of LEAs reported a rating of 3 (Initial Implementation); 36% of LEAs reported a rating of 4 (Full Implementation); and 18% of LEAs reported a rating of 5 (Full implementation and Sustainability).
* Practice 6: 1% of LEAs reported a rating of 1 (Exploration and Research Phase); 5% of LEAs reported a rating of 2 (Beginning Development); 25% of LEAs reported a rating of 3 (Initial Implementation); 40% of LEAs reported a rating of 4 (Full Implementation); and 22% of LEAs reported a rating of 5 (Full Implementation and Sustainability).
* Practice 7: 1% of LEAs reported a rating of 1(Exploration and Research Phase); 4% of LEAs reported a rating of 2 (Beginning Development); 14% of LEAs reported a rating of 3 (Initial Implementation); 42% of LEAs reported a rating of 4 (Full Implementation); and 33% of LEAs reported a rating of 5 (Full Implementation and Sustainability).
* Practice 8: 3% of LEAs reported a rating of 1 (Exploration and Research Phase); 6% of LEAs reported a rating of 2 (Beginning Development); 24% of LEAs reported a rating of 3 (Initial Implementation); 39% of LEAs reported a rating of 4 (Full Implementation); and 20% of LEAs reported a rating of 5 (Full Implementation and Sustainability).

### [Chart 3](#Chart3)

Title of the chart: Seeking Input for Decision-Making

Overall description of the chart: This chart reflects ratings reported by LEAs for each of the four practices within Section 3 of the tool. Within the chart, there is one stacked bar graph for each practice. Within each bar graph, there are five colors to represent each rating:

* Rating 1 (Exploration and Research phase) data is shown in yellow.
* Rating 2 (Beginning Development) data is shown in orange.
* Rating 3 (Initial Implementation) data is shown in grey.
* Rating 4 (Full Implementation) data is shown in green.
* Rating 5 (Full Implementation and Sustainability) data is shown in blue.

Descriptions of each bar graph:

* Practice 9: 1% of LEAs reported a rating of 1 (Exploration and Research phase); 5% of LEAs reported a rating of 2 (Beginning Development); 26% of LEAs reported a rating of 3 (Initial Implementation); 39% of LEAs reported a rating of 4 (Full Implementation); and 21% of LEAs reported a rating of 5 (Full Implementation and Sustainability).
* Practice 10: 2% of LEAs reported a rating of 1 (Exploration and Research Phase); 6% of LEAs reported a rating of 2 (Beginning Development); 29% of LEAs reported a rating of 3 (Initial Implementation); 38% of LEAs reported a rating of 4 (Full Implementation); and 19% of LEAs reported a rating of 5 (Full Implementation and Sustainability).
* Practice 11: 1% of LEAs reported a rating of 1 (Exploration and Research Phase); 8% of LEAs reported a rating of 2 (Beginning Development); 28% of LEAs reported a rating of 3 (Initial Implementation); 40% of LEAs reported a rating of 4 (Full Implementation); and 17% of LEAs reported a rating of 5 (Full Implementation and Sustainability).
* Practice 12: 3% of LEAs reported a rating of 1 (Exploration and Research phase); 9% of LEAs reported a rating of 2 (Beginning Development); 30% of LEAs reported a rating of 3 (Initial Implementation); 34% of LEAs reported a rating of 4 (Full Implementation); and 18% of LEAs reported a rating of 5 (Full Implementation and Sustainability).

### [Chart 4](#Chart4)

Title of the chart: Overview of the 12 Practices

Overall description of the chart: This chart provides rating data for each of the 12 practices within the tool. There are 12 stacked bar graphs (one for each practice in the tool). Within each bar graph, there are three colors:

* Orange reflects the percent of LEAs that reported either a rating of 1 (Exploration and Research Phase) or a rating of 2 (Beginning Development).
* Green reflects the percent of LEAs that reported a rating of 3 (Initial Implementation).
* Blue reflects the percent of LEAs that reported a rating of 4 (Full Implementation) or a rating of 5 (Full Implementation and Sustainability).

#### Overview of the 12 Practices

Descriptions of Section 1

* Practice 1: 3% of LEAs reported either a rating of 1 (Exploration and Research Phase) or a rating of 2 (Beginning Development); 18% of LEAs reported a rating of 3 (Initial Implementation); 72% of LEAs reported a rating of 4 (Full Implementation) or a rating of 5 (Full Implementation and Sustainability).
* Practice 2: 2 % of LEAs reported either a rating of 1 (Exploration and Research Phase) or a rating of 2 (Beginning Development); 14% of LEAs reported a rating of 3 (Initial Implementation); 77% of LEAs reported a rating of 4 (Full Implementation) or a rating of 5 (Full Implementation and Sustainability).
* Practice 3: 9% of LEAs reported either a rating of 1 (Exploration and Research Phase) or a rating of 2 (Beginning Development); 31% of LEAs reported a rating of 3 (Initial Implementation); 52% of LEAs reported a rating of 4 (Full Implementation) or a rating of 5 (Full Implementation and Sustainability).
* Practice 4: 4% of LEAs reported either a rating of 1 (Exploration and Research Phase) or a rating of 2 (Beginning Development); 19% of LEAs reported a rating of 3 (Initial Implementation); 70% of LEAs reported a rating of 4 (Full Implementation) or a rating of 5 (Full Implementation and Sustainability).

Descriptions of Section 2

* Practice 5: 10% of LEAs reported either a rating of 1 (Exploration and Research Phase) or a rating of 2 (Beginning Development); 29% of LEAs reported a rating of 3 (Initial Implementation); 54% of LEAs reported a rating of 4 (Full Implementation) or a rating of 5 (Full Implementation and Sustainability).
* Practice 6: 6% of LEAs reported either a rating of 1 (Exploration and Research Phase) or a rating of 2 (Beginning Development; 25% of LEAs reported a rating of 3 (Initial Implementation); 62% of LEAs reported a rating of 4 (Full Implementation) or a rating of 5 (Full Implementation and Sustainability).
* Practice 7: 5% of LEAs reported either a rating of 1 (Exploration and Research Phase) or a rating of 2 (Beginning Development); 14% of LEAs reported a rating of 3 (Initial Implementation); 75% of LEAs reported a rating of 4 (Full Implementation) or a rating of 5 (Full Implementation and Sustainability).
* Practice 8: 9% of LEAs reported either a rating of 1 (Exploration and Research Phase) or a rating of 2 (Beginning Development); 24% of LEAs reported a rating of 3 (Initial Implementation); 60% of LEAs reported a rating of 4 (Full Implementation) or a rating of 5 (Full Implementation and Sustainability).

Descriptions of Section 3

* Practice 9: 6% of LEAs reported either a rating of 1 (Exploration and Research Phase) or a rating of 2 (Beginning Development); 26% of LEAs reported a rating of 3 (Initial Implementation); 60% of LEAs reported a rating of 4 (Full Implementation) or a rating of 5 (Full Implementation and Sustainability).
* Practice 10: 8% of LEAs reported either a rating of 1 (Exploration and Research Phase) or a rating of 2 (Beginning Development); 29% of LEAs reported a rating of 3 (Initial Implementation); 57% of LEAs reported a rating of 4 (Full Implementation) or a rating of 5 (Full Implementation and Sustainability).
* Practice 11: 9% of LEAs reported either a rating of 1 (Exploration and Research Phase) or a rating of 2 (Beginning Development); 28% of LEAs reported a rating of 3 (Initial Implementation); 56% of LEAs reported a rating of 4 (Full Implementation) or a rating of 5 (Full Implementation and Sustainability).
* Practice 12: 12% of LEAs reported either a rating of 1 (Exploration and Research Phase) or a rating of 2 (Beginning Development); 30% of LEAs reported a rating of 3 (Initial Implementation); 52% of LEAs reported a rating of 4 (Full Implementation) or a rating of 5 (Full Implementation and Sustainability).

## Appendix H: Resources

This appendix provides a list of resources used in developing the self-reflection tool. Also included are additional resources to support implementation of evidence-based and equitable family engagement. This list of resources is not comprehensive; we encourage readers to explore the extensive resources available to support implementation of evidence-based family engagement.

### Priority 3 (Parental Involvement and Family Engagement) Self-Reflection Tool

California Department of Education. (2019). Self-Reflection Tool for Priority 3 (Parental Involvement and Family Engagement). Retrieved from <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/documents/priority3tool.pdf>

### Source Data Files from 2019 California Dashboard

California Department of Education. (2019) Priority 3 Performance 2019, Data File. Retrieved from [invalid link removed]

### Resources

(References are listed in alphabetical order, not necessarily in order of relevance)

Bauman, E. and Wood, L. (2017). *How Family, School, and Community Engagement Can Improve Student Achievement and Influence School Reform.* Quincy, MA: Nellie Mae Education Foundation. Retrieved 1.10.21 [invalid link removed]

Brooks, M.P., Rollins, S.K., Collins, J., and Mayanja, N. (2019) *Taking It to the Next Level: Strengthening and Sustaining Family Engagement through Integrated, Systemic Practice.* Institute for Educational Leadership. Retrieved 1.11.21 <https://iel.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/Taking-It-To-the-Next-Level.pdf>

Building a Common Understanding of Family Engagement (Short video from Wisconsin Department of Education). <https://dpi.wi.gov/engaging-families/communication-tools>

Bryk, A. S., Sebring, P. B., Allensworth, E., Luppescu, S., and Easton, J. Q. (2010). *Organizing schools for improvement: Lessons from Chicago*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

California Department of Education. (2017). *Family Engagement Toolkit: Continuous Improvement through an Equity Lens.* Sacramento, CA: Author. Retrieved from <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/documents/family-engagement.pdf>

California Department of Education. (2017). *Editable Templates for Family Engagement Toolkit.* Sacramento, CA: Author. Retrieved from <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/documents/toolkittemplates.doc>

Caspe, M., Lopez, M.E. and Hanebutt, R. (2019). *The Family Engagement Playbook.* Global Family Research Project. Retrieved from [invalid link removed] on November 24, 2020.

Boudreau, E. (2020). *Research Stories: A Family Engagement Framework for All: How to Prioritize Effective Relationships to Drive Learning, at Every Level.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Graduate School of Education. Retrieved from <https://www.gse.harvard.edu/news/uk/20/06/family-engagement-framework-all> .
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