SUBJECT

Update on the Development of the California State Plan for the Every Student Succeeds Act

SUMMARY OF THE ISSUE(S)

The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) was signed into law by President Barack Obama on December 10, 2015, and goes into effect in the 2017–18 school year. The ESSA reauthorizes the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), the nation’s federal education law, and replaces the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB).

As part of California’s transition to the ESSA, California must submit an ESSA Consolidated State Plan (State Plan) to the U.S. Department of Education (ED) in 2017. The State Plan will describe the State’s implementation of standards, assessments, accountability, and assistance programs. This agenda item provides an update to inform the State Board of Education (SBE) and the public regarding the development of the ESSA State Plan as well as a draft ESSA State Plan.

Since 2010, California has been engaged in an extensive redesign of its education system, including new standards and assessments, a new funding formula, and a new accountability and support system. Most of the content in the current draft of the State Plan, provided as Attachment 1, reflects policy decisions that have been made by the SBE during the course of this multi-year redesign.

The draft ESSA State Plan also contains staff recommendations on several topics for SBE consideration before the draft plan is made available for the 30-day public comment period, scheduled to begin in late May 2017. These topics have been brought to the SBE, California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG), and other stakeholders for deliberation previously, but no specific policy proposal has yet been presented or approved by the SBE. These topics include:

- Native language assessments,
- Establishment of long-term goals,
- Identification of schools, and
- Annual measurement of achievement (95 percent participation rate).

The initial draft of the State Plan contains preliminary policy proposals on these topics. The California Department of Education (CDE) recommends that the SBE deliberate and approve the inclusion of these policy proposals in the initial draft of the State Plan before the public comment period begins so that stakeholders have
ample opportunity to provide feedback on these plan elements based on specific policy proposals.

Additional content in the draft is less well-defined and will benefit from further research, stakeholder input, and SBE deliberation. For example, many features of the statewide system of support, including the design and implementation of strategies to support schools identified for additional assistance and the best, evidence-based investment of ESSA optional and required reservations for state-level activities, will be developed collaboratively in the coming months with a variety of local, regional, and state entities. California will also need to develop a definition for "ineffective" teacher and determine how best to support local educational agencies (LEAs) as they address any identified local educator equity issues.

The initial draft of the State Plan does not include specific policy proposals on these topics. Continued stakeholder input and SBE deliberations will inform further development in these areas, some of which may remain a "plan to plan" in the final State Plan submitted to ED in September 2017.

RECOMMENDATION

The CDE recommends that the SBE approve the draft ESSA State Plan for the statutorily required 30-day public comment period. The CDE will bring a final draft of the State Plan to the SBE for approval in September 2017.

BRIEF HISTORY OF KEY ISSUES

The ESSA maintains the original purpose of ESEA: equal opportunity for all students. Departing from the NCLB reauthorization, ESSA grants much more authority to states, provides new opportunities to enhance school leadership, provides more support for early education, and renews a focus on well-rounded educational opportunity and safe and healthy schools. The reauthorization of ESEA provides California with a number of opportunities to build upon the State’s new directions in accountability and continuous improvement.

California is committed to aligning state and federal education policies to the greatest extent possible to develop an integrated local, state, and federal accountability and continuous improvement system grounded in the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF). This will promote coherence across programs to better serve the needs of LEAs, schools, educators, and students; recognize the diverse and multidimensional characteristics of LEAs, schools, educators, and students, and provide support accordingly; and systematically and collaboratively identify and resource opportunities to build the capacity of local, regional, and state educators and leaders to better serve students and families.

At its January 2017 meeting, the SBE unanimously approved the following guiding principles as part of a framework to develop a working draft of the State Plan.

- Ensure that state priorities and direction lead the plan with opportunities in the ESSA leveraged to assist in accomplishing goals and objectives.
- Create a single, coherent system that avoids the complexities of having separate state and federal accountability structures.
• Refresh applications, plans, and commitments to ensure that LEAs are evidencing alignment of federal funds to state and local priorities.

• Use the ESSA State Plan to draw further focus to California’s commitment to the implementation of rigorous state standards, equity, local control, performance, and continuous improvement.

• Leverage state administrative funds to realign CDE operations to state priorities.

• Strategically approach state-allowed reservations from Title programs to further state priorities.

Consistent with these principles, California’s draft State Plan has been written to meet statutory requirements in a way that furthers California’s actions to implement an effective education system that reflects a commitment to performance, equity, and continuous improvement.

Although California has been working steadily to develop its State Plan since ESSA was signed in 2015, federal requirements regarding state plan development have been in flux for many months. In May 2016, ED made available proposed regulations for Accountability, Data Reporting, and Submission of State Plans for public review and comment. Shortly thereafter, a consolidated state plan template was released. California used this template as a starting point for organizing its State Plan. In November 2016, ED released final regulations for Accountability, Data Reporting, and Submission of State Plans, as well as a final consolidated state plan template incorporating regulatory requirements. The template was organized thematically and states were encouraged to utilize resources across programs to support state priorities.

In February 2017, as the repeal of the Accountability, Data Reporting, and Submission of State Plans regulations was being considered by Congress, ED signaled its intention to develop and make available a revised consolidated state plan template based solely on statutory requirements and designed to collect only “absolutely necessary” information. This new template, released on March 13, 2017, is more concise than previous versions and is organized by program, not by theme. Regulatory requirements are not included in the template, and several elements of the previous templates, including the sections on consultation and coordination, standards, and educator equity data, are no longer required.

Given the new federal approach to collect only what is “absolutely necessary,” and at the request of the SBE, California’s State Plan has been written to meet, not exceed, federal requirements. It describes how California plans to use, manage, and monitor federal funds to support implementation of rigorous state academic standards consistent with California’s existing LCFF approach, providing the State maximum flexibility to utilize federal resources to effectively support California’s accountability and continuous improvement system. Introductory material and additional italicized text has been inserted into the document to provide context for how federal requirements fit into the broader state system. This material will not be included in the document that will be submitted to ED.

Pending SBE approval, CDE staff will conduct the required 30-day public comment period for the draft State Plan. The public comment period is scheduled to begin on May 22, 2017, and continue through June 2017. Stakeholder feedback will be shared with the SBE at its July 2017 and September 2017 meetings, providing multiple opportunities for public input. California intends to submit its State Plan to ED on September 18, 2017.
ESSA State Plan Assurances

ESSA Section 8304 provides that each state that submits a consolidated State Plan must have on file with the ED a single set of assurances. At its March 2017 meeting, the SBE approved the CDE staff recommendation that the SBE review and approve any required ESSA assurances and authorize the SBE President to sign and submit the assurances to the ED by the due date established by the ED. The SBE unanimously approved and authorized these recommended actions. At that time, the State Plan Assurances Template included references to the ESSA accountability regulations, which have since been rescinded and have no effect. The ED informed states that it would release a revised assurances template that would remove references to the accountability regulations, and ED also moved the due date for assurances from April 3 to June 2, 2017, to accommodate submission of the revised template.

On April 27, 2017, the ED published for public comment the revised Assurances Template available at https://www.regulations.gov/document?D=ED-2017-ICCD-0054-0001. It is anticipated that the final template will be available on May 17, 2017. The authority granted to the SBE President by the SBE members at the March 2017 meeting to sign and submit the assurances to the ED remains in effect. This update is provided for information only and no further SBE action related to this matter is required.

Ongoing Communication and Engagement

States are required to consult with diverse stakeholders at multiple points during the design, development, and implementation of their ESSA state plans. The SBE and CDE are committed to ensuring a transparent transition to the new law and developing an ESSA State Plan that is informed by the voices of diverse Californians and have engaged in extensive stakeholder outreach throughout the development of the document. The engagement strategies and processes employed by the State are described in the introduction of the plan. A summary of outreach and consultation activities conducted by CDE staff in March and April 2017 is provided in Attachment 2.

The most current information regarding California’s transition to the ESSA is available on the CDE ESSA Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/essa. Interested stakeholders are encouraged to join the CDE ESSA listserv to receive notifications when new information becomes available by sending a blank e-mail message to join-essa@mlist.cde.ca.gov. Questions regarding ESSA in California may be sent to ESSA@cde.ca.gov.

SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION DISCUSSION AND ACTION

March 2017: CDE staff presented to the SBE an update on the development of the State Plan including a status update on issues that need to be addressed in the State Plan and stakeholder feedback regarding State Plan policy decisions. SBE members engaged in discussion regarding the policy decisions and provided feedback to staff to consider in the State Plan draft. Additionally, CDE staff recommended that the SBE review and approve any required ESSA assurances and authorize the SBE President to sign and submit the assurances to the ED by the due date established by the ED. The SBE unanimously approved and authorized these recommended actions.

January 2017: CDE staff presented to the SBE an update on the development of the ESSA State Plan including proposed guiding principles and recommended approach for ESSA State Plan development. The SBE unanimously approved the guiding principles.
November 2016: CDE staff presented to the SBE an update on the development of the ESSA State Plan including the ESSA Consolidated State Plan Development Draft Timeline; the first draft sections of the ESSA Consolidated State Plan; and the communication, outreach, and consultation CDE staff conducted in September and October 2016. The first draft sections of the ESSA Consolidated State Plan included the sections addressing Consultation and Coordination, Challenging State Academic Standards and Academic Assessments, and program specific requirements. SBE members approved CDE staff recommendations to authorize the SBE President to submit a joint letter with the State Superintendent of Public Instruction in response to ESSA regulations for supplement, not supplant under Title I, Part A.

September 2016: CDE staff presented to the SBE an update on the development of the ESSA State Plan including an overview of ESSA programs, an overview of ESSA Consolidated State Plan requirements and related decision points, a preliminary status of various decisions, and areas where final regulations will be needed to address plan requirements. The update included information regarding use of federal funds and a description of stakeholder outreach and communications activities. Further, CDE staff reviewed Phase I of stakeholder engagement around ESSA, which was provided to the SBE as an August Information Memorandum. In addition, CDE and SBE staff presented to the SBE an update regarding the development of a new accountability and continuous improvement system, which led to the SBE approval of key elements of the system that will be used to evaluate schools and districts in ten areas critical to student performance, including graduation rates, readiness for college and careers, academic achievement, and progress of English learners.

July 2016: CDE staff presented to the SBE an update on the development of the ESSA State Plan including opportunities in the ESSA to support California’s accountability and continuous improvement system, an update on proposed ESSA regulations, and a description of stakeholder outreach and communications activities. SBE members approved CDE staff recommendations to authorize the SBE President to submit joint letters with the State Superintendent of Public Instruction in response to ESSA regulations for accountability, data reporting, submission of state plans, and assessments. Additionally, CDE and SBE staff presented to the SBE an update regarding the development of a new accountability and continuous improvement system, which led to the SBE approval of a measure of college and career readiness, a methodology for establishing standards for state priorities, inclusion of a standard for use of local climate surveys, an Equity Report within the top-level summary data display, and the development of a timeline through the 2017 calendar year addressing upcoming developmental work.

May 2016: CDE staff presented to the SBE an update on the development of the ESSA State Plan including Title I State Plan requirements described in the ESSA, outreach and consultation with stakeholders, and a draft State Plan development timeline. CDE and SBE staff presented to the SBE an update regarding the development of a new accountability and continuous improvement system, which led to the SBE approval of specific design elements of the LCFF evaluation rubrics and direction to staff to prepare recommendations and updates concerning standards for the LCFF priority areas and feasibility of incorporating additional indicators. The SBE also approved the ESSA 2016–17 School Year Transition Plan and two federal ESSA waiver requests to address double testing in science and Speaking and Listening assessment requirements. The SBE also heard a presentation of the Final Report from the State Superintendent of Public Instruction’s Advisory Accountability and Continuous Improvement Task Force.

March 2016: CDE and SBE staff presented to the SBE an update regarding development of a new accountability system including information regarding the Local Control and Accountability Plan and annual update template, evaluation rubrics, the
ESSA State Plan, and the revised timeline for transitioning to a new accountability and continuous improvement system. The SBE approved appointments to the California Practitioners Advisory Group.

**January 2016:** CDE staff presented to the SBE an update on issues related to California’s implementation of the ESEA, including information regarding ESSA, and the implications for state accountability and state plans.

**FISCAL ANALYSIS (AS APPROPRIATE)**

California’s total K–12 funding as of the 2016–17 California Budget Act is $88.3 billion:
State  $52.9 billion
Local  27.4 billion
Federal  8.0 billion
Total  $88.3 billion

This includes K–12 revenues from all sources. ESSA funds are a portion of the total federal funding amount. The ESSA will be implemented in 2017–18. No fiscal changes are projected for the remainder of the 2016–17 school year. The ESSA will become effective for non-competitive formula grants in the 2017–18 school year, and for competitive grants as instructed by ED, but largely in the 2017–18 school year as well.

The following fiscal information relates specifically to the programs included in the ESSA Consolidated State Plan. State allocations for fiscal years 2016 and 2017 are preliminary estimates based on currently available data. Allocations based on new data may result in significant changes from these preliminary estimates. The 2016–17 amounts provided below are based on actual grant awards, but are also subject to change.

The 2017–18 amounts provided below are based on ED’s State Tables which are based on President Obama’s Proposed Budget for federal fiscal year (FFY) 2017, which runs through October 2017. Although the fiscal year is more than halfway over, funding for this fiscal year has not yet been finalized. A temporary budget measure known as a “continuing resolution” or “CR” kept the federal government operational through May 5, 2017. These numbers may be updated as the final numbers for the fiscal year become available, but we do not anticipate significant changes to funding levels at this time.

There are, however, a number of changes to various formulas that may impact funding as ESSA goes into effect this year.

For Title I, minor changes to the amount of Title I funds that flow through each of the four parts will be made, but the state grant formula overall is unchanged.

Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by State and Local Educational Agencies: California currently receives approximately $1.767 billion. The CDE anticipates that California will receive $1.803 billion in Title I, Part A funds in 2017–18.

Title I, Part B: State Assessment Grants: California currently receives approximately $28 million from ESEA Title VI, State Assessments program. The CDE anticipates that California will receive $26.4 million in ESSA, Title I, Part B funds in 2017–18.

Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children: California currently receives approximately $128.7 million. The CDE anticipates that California will receive $116.2 million in Title I, Part C funds in 2017–18.

Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk: California currently receives approximately $1.7 million. The CDE anticipates that California will receive $1.2 million in Title I, Part D funds in 2017–18.

Title II, Part A: Preparing, Training, and Recruiting High Quality Teachers, Principals, and Other School Leaders: The state grant formula will be adjusted, gradually eliminating the hold harmless provision by 2023 and increasing the poverty factor and decreasing the population factor from the current 65/35 ratio to 80/20 in 2020. According to a report by the Congressional Research Service, California’s Title II, Part A funding is projected to increase by more than $25 million by 2023 as a result of these changes.
California currently receives approximately $249.3 million. The CDE anticipates that California will receive $252 million in Title II, Part A funds in 2017–18.

Title III: Language Instruction for English Learners and Immigrant Students: The state grant formula for Title III remains unchanged. California currently receives approximately $150 million. The CDE anticipates that California will receive $167.6 million in Title III funds in 2017–18.

Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants: California does not currently receive Title IV, Part A funding. The CDE anticipates that California will receive $58 million in Title IV, Part A funds in 2017–18 based on President Obama’s Proposed Budget.

Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers: California currently receives approximately $132.7 million. The CDE anticipates that California will receive $113.7 million in Title IV, Part B funds in 2017–18.

Title V, Rural Education Initiative: California currently receives approximately $1.5 million from Title VI, Part B, Subpart 1 of ESEA. The CDE anticipates that California will receive $3.5 million in 2017–18.

Title IX, Part A: Education for Homeless Children and Youths: California currently receives approximately $8.2 million. The CDE anticipates that California will receive $10 million in 2017–18.

Funding for FFY 2018 (which CDE will receive for the 2018–19 school year) is still being debated in Congress. A budget blueprint sent to Congress by President Trump in March would make significant changes to federal education funding, including eliminating funding for Title II professional development and Title IV, Part B 21st Century Community Learning Centers. However, Congress has sole jurisdiction over federal appropriations. The conversation regarding funding for FFY 2018 is likely to continue throughout the year.

Additionally, CDE staff has also provided funding analyses and recommendations in the following documents:

- September 2016 SBE Meeting Agenda Item 02 (http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr16/documents/sep16item02.doc)
  - Attachment 1: Overview of Every Student Succeeds Act Programs
    This document provides an overview of programs included in the ESSA, including estimated funding amounts and reservations for state administration and state level activities.
  - Attachment 3: ESSA State Plan: Information to Support Decision-Making Regarding Use of Federal Funds
    This document provides the SBE with context to inform decision-making regarding uses of ESSA funds at the state and local levels, including an overview of how ESEA funds are currently used and considerations for using ESSA funds to supplement state investments.

  This memorandum provides an overview of the opportunities within the ESSA to
use federal funds to support state priorities along with several scenarios and opportunities to “braid” resources.

ATTACHMENT(S)

Attachment 1: DRAFT California ESSA Consolidated State Plan (81 Pages)
Attachment 2: ESSA State Plan Development: Communications, Outreach, and Consultation with Stakeholders: March–April 2017 (5 Pages)
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Introduction

The California Way

On December 10, 2015, President Obama signed the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) into law, setting a starting point for an approach to the management and use of federal education funding that encourages increased state and local control. The change in federal direction comes during California’s implementation of an extensive redesign of its education system, including new standards and assessments, a new funding formula, and a new accountability and support system.

Since 2010, California has moved boldly towards a continuous improvement system that values, supports, and necessitates local control and responsibility to ensure that all students are prepared to live, work, and thrive in a multicultural, multilingual, and highly connected world. When Governor Brown introduced the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) in 2013, he cited the concept of “subsidiarity” as a means of assigning responsibility to the level of government most capable of guiding actions to effectively address local needs and opportunities. As he noted in his 2014 State of the State address:

No better example of this can be found than in your enactment last year of the Local Control Funding Formula…Instead of prescriptive commands issued from headquarters here in Sacramento, more general goals have been established for each local school to attain, each in its own way. This puts the responsibility where it has to be: In the classroom and at the local district.¹

Superintendent Torlakson’s Blueprint 2.0 Planning Team provided a comprehensive description of the California Way:

The days of California’s reliance on a single standardized test for accountability purposes are over. While we had good intentions, we now recognize that we were using the wrong drivers for positive educational change. The implementation of the LCFF and the new California Standards drive an accountability system that differs from the previous one in almost every respect. Schools and local educational agencies (LEAs) throughout California now have a unique opportunity to reconfigure themselves as learning organizations committed to continuous improvement. The result of all of this work is emerging as The California Way, which builds on a collaborative team approach to positive education change and is now attracting national attention as an alternative to test-driven reform. The California Way rests on the belief that educators want to excel, trusts them to improve when given the proper supports, and provides local schools and districts with the leeway and flexibility to deploy resources so they can improve. The California Way engages students, parents, and communities as part of a collaborative decision-making process around how to fund and implement these improvement efforts, and provides supplemental resources to ensure that California’s English learners (ELs), foster youths, and students in poverty have the learning supports they need.²

California’s journey to the system described in A Blueprint for Great Schools Version 2.0 started with the adoption of academic standards in the content areas of mathematics, English language arts/literacy, English language development, and science. The state had previously adopted standards in the content areas of history-social science, physical education, health, world language, visual and performing arts, and career technical education and will soon adopt model standards for computer science. The state has renewed its focus on the whole child, including social and emotional needs and school climate. California also recognizes the importance of school readiness and will work to integrate early learning into a clearly articulated P–12 system. The new standards and assessment system, with its focus on critical thinking, authentic learning

experiences, and formative assessment, are a further example of California’s shift to local control; the state is steadily moving to a system of teaching and learning that encourages engagement and responsive instruction to support learning and improved outcomes across a broad spectrum of measures.

The LCFF emphasizes equity through the mechanism of funding and expectations for comparable outcomes and creates linkages between need, funding, and outcomes. The changes that California has made to state academic standards, assessments, funding, and accountability are moving the entire system away from one that is compliance-bound to one focused on performance, equity, and improvement.

Developing a single, coherent system

California is committed to aligning state and federal education policies to the greatest extent possible to develop an integrated local, state, and federal accountability and continuous improvement system grounded in the LCFF. The system will promote coherence across programs to better serve the needs of students, educators, schools, and LEAs; recognize the diverse and multidimensional characteristics of LEAs, schools, educators, and students, and provide support accordingly; and systematically and collaboratively identify and resource opportunities to build the capacity of local, regional, and state educators and leaders to better serve students and families.

At its January 2017 meeting, the State Board of Education (SBE) unanimously approved the following guiding principles for development of California’s ESSA State Plan:

- Create a single, coherent system that avoids the complexities of having separate state and federal accountability structures.
- Ensure that state priorities and direction lead the plan with opportunities in the ESSA leveraged to assist in accomplishing goals and objectives.
- Refresh applications, plans, and commitments to ensure that LEAs are evidencing alignment of federal funds to state and local priorities.
- Use the ESSA State Plan to draw further focus to California’s commitment to the implementation of rigorous state standards, equity, local control, performance, and continuous improvement.
- Leverage state administrative funds to realign CDE operations to state priorities.
- Strategically approach state-allowed reservations from Title programs to further state priorities.

Key elements of this aligned system include integration of the LEA Plan required under the ESSA with the Local Control and Accountability Plan required under LCFF, alignment of state and federal accountability metrics, and development of a multi-leveled statewide system of support for LEAs and schools. Each of these elements is described below.

Integrated Planning Processes: LCFF increases local control over spending decisions while requiring LEAs to adopt and annually update local control and accountability plans (LCAPs), developed with stakeholder input, that address state priority areas. The LCAP is the primary planning document for each LEA.

California is committed to updating required plans to ensure that federally funded goals and activities are aligned to state priorities. The state is also determined to streamline and align local planning processes to the greatest extent possible. To achieve these objectives, the CDE, in collaboration with LEA representatives, designed a new approach to meeting federal planning requirements within the context of the LCAP process. Upon review of the required federal LEA plan provisions, the working group agreed that a well-written LCAP encompasses many of the
federal provisions. The group mapped the LEA plan provisions to LCAP priorities and considered how best to address the provisions that were not addressed in the LCAP.

A prototype for a new LCAP Addendum was developed through this process. The addendum is intended to supplement the LCAP, just as ESSA funds are intended to supplement state funds. The new addendum will be piloted with several districts in 2017.

**Aligned Accountability Metrics:** Like the LCFF, the ESSA requires the use of multiple measures for school accountability. Since the ESSA’s enactment, the SBE has proceeded with the goal of developing an integrated local, state, and federal accountability system based on the LCFF. The LCFF requires evaluation rubrics that include performance standards for LEAs, schools, and the statutorily defined student groups, which include the groups required under the ESSA.

In developing and ultimately approving the evaluation rubrics, the SBE decided that the state indicators in the evaluation rubrics will be used as the required indicators under the ESSA to create a single accountability system for LEAs and schools.

- The Academic Indicator and College/Career Indicator include student test scores on English language arts and mathematics for grades 3–8, and once in high school;
- The English Learner Progress Indicator measures progress of English learners (ELs) toward language proficiency;
- Graduation rate is a state indicator;
- Chronic absence will serve as an additional academic indicator for grades K–8, given its strong correlation with future academic attainment; and
- Suspension rate will serve as an additional indicator that applies to grades K–12.

At its January 2017 meeting, the SBE finalized the details for a field test of the evaluation rubrics during 2016–17, before California’s new accountability system is fully operational for LEAs in 2017–18. Performance data from the evaluation rubrics will be reported to the public through the California School Dashboard, a new Web site available at [http://www.caschooldashboard.org/](http://www.caschooldashboard.org/), that parents/guardians, educators, and the public can use to see how LEAs and schools are meeting the needs of California’s diverse student population.

**Coherent Supports and Interventions:** Inspired by the conceptual framework behind a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS), California is developing a statewide system of support that will align state and regional resources to support improvement for all schools and districts. This approach will provide support to LEAs and schools within California’s integrated local, state, and federal accountability and continuous improvement system. It builds on three levels of supports: Support for All LEAs and Schools, Differentiated Assistance, and Intensive Intervention, as shown in Table A below.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Support</th>
<th>Description of Supports Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support for All LEAs and Schools (Level 1)</td>
<td>Various state and local agencies provide an array of support resources, tools, and voluntary technical assistance that all LEAs may use to improve student performance at the LEA and school level and narrow disparities among student groups across the LCFF priorities, including recognition for success and the ability to share promising practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Level of Support | Description of Supports Available
--- | ---
Differentiated Assistance (Level 2) | County superintendents (or the Superintendent of Public Instruction/California Department of Education [CDE], when provided to county offices of education [COEs]) and the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence (CCEE) provide differentiated assistance for LEAs and schools, in the form of individually designed technical assistance, to address identified performance issues, including significant disparities in performance among student groups.

Intensive Intervention (Level 3) | The Superintendent of Public Instruction may require more intensive interventions for LEAs and/or schools with persistent performance issues and a lack of improvement over a specified time period.

The foundation of the system is supporting all LEAs and schools to improve outcomes and opportunities for all students and to narrow disparities among student groups. The importance and value of local decision-making and flexibility are central to the success of the LCFF. Improving student success, increasing public trust, and supporting engagement in local decision-making require shared responsibility and accountability first and foremost at the local level.

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

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

**California’s ESSA Consolidated State Plan**

Although California has been working steadily to develop its State Plan since the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was reauthorized in 2015, federal requirements regarding state plan development have been in flux for many months. In May 2016, ED made available proposed regulations for Accountability, Data Reporting, and Submission of State Plans for public review and comment. Shortly thereafter, a draft consolidated state plan template was released. California used this template as a starting point for organizing its State Plan. In November 2016, ED released final regulations for Accountability, Data Reporting, and Submission of State Plans, as well as a final consolidated state plan template incorporating regulatory requirements. The template was organized thematically and states were encouraged to utilize resources across programs to support state priorities.

In February 2017, as the repeal of this set of regulations was being considered by Congress, ED signaled its intention to develop and make available a revised consolidated state plan template based solely on statutory requirements and designed to collect only “absolutely necessary” information. This new template, released on March 13, 2017, is more concise than previous versions and is organized by program, not by theme. Regulatory requirements are not included
in the template, and several elements of the previous templates are no longer required, including the sections on consultation and coordination, standards, and educator equity data.

Given the new federal approach to collect only what is “absolutely necessary,” and at the request of the SBE, California’s State Plan has been written to meet, not exceed, federal requirements. It describes how California plans to use, manage, and monitor federal funds to support implementation of rigorous state academic standards consistent with California’s existing LCFF approach, providing the state maximum flexibility to utilize federal resources to effectively support California’s accountability and continuous improvement system.

Although the new template does not require states to provide information regarding how they are conducting consultation with stakeholders, stakeholder engagement is key to the development and implementation of California education policy. Stakeholders have been, and continue to be, integrally involved in the development of the new accountability system, including reviewing data methodologies and simulations, reviewing indicator cut scores and distributions, providing input regarding the identification of schools and districts for technical assistance and support, and providing feedback regarding the system’s user-interface. The state regularly conducts consultation with the following groups:

- California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG): The CPAG is an advisory committee to the SBE and also serves as the state’s Title I committee of practitioners. The CPAG has provided, and will continue to provide, input regarding accountability to the SBE throughout the State Plan development process.

- LCFF Policy Input Group: This group includes representatives from statewide professional associations and community based organizations. It provides feedback to the CDE and SBE regarding LCFF implementation and accountability.

- User Acceptance Testing Group: This group consists of representatives from over 30 LEAs, including COEs, school districts, and charter schools. It provides feedback to the CDE and SBE regarding the LCFF evaluation rubrics and their relevance, usefulness, and applicability to support local planning and evaluation of performance relative to state priorities.

- Technical Design Group: This is a group of psychometric theory and education research experts and LEA practitioners that provides recommendations to the CDE on matters related to the state and federal accountability system.

- English Learner Progress Indicator Work Group: This group was comprised of individuals with EL program expertise and EL data expertise with representatives from the county and district levels as well as representatives from stakeholder groups. It was tasked with creating a composite measure for the English Learner Progress Indicator that includes English acquisition, reclassification rates, and at-risk and long-term EL rates.

- School Conditions and Climate Work Group: This group consists of members with expertise in education measurement and school conditions/climate. It is tasked with reviewing existing school climate measurement approaches, tools, resources, and surveys that measure aspects of school conditions and climate and presenting recommendations to the CDE regarding the school climate state priority indicator.

- College/Career Indicator Work Group: This group is designed to inform the CDE on further development work for the College/Career Indicator (CCI) to provide a balance of college and career measures. The CCI Work Group will also provide feedback on the existing methodology and potential data collection requirements to support inclusion of future measures.
• Alternative School Task Force: This group is tasked with developing a set of recommendations to the CDE and the SBE to inform a comprehensive accountability framework and indicators specific to alternative schools.

Since the ESSA became law, the state has engaged in public state board and advisory group meetings, webinars, regional stakeholder meetings, stakeholder surveys, and targeted consultation. Thousands of Californians have contributed to the document.

• In Phase I of the California ESSA Stakeholder Engagement Plan, the CDE and several COEs across the state partnered to host a series of regional stakeholder meetings to provide an overview of the ESSA and an update on the development of the State Plan and to consult with stakeholders regarding what should be included in the State Plan.

• Phase II of stakeholder outreach took place in November and December 2016 and focused on public review and comment on several draft sections of the ESSA State Plan. Stakeholders were encouraged to utilize resources in the ESSA Stakeholder Engagement Toolkit, available at http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/es/toolkit.asp, to learn more about the timeline for the development of the State Plan and important overview information about ESSA and State Plan requirements. Stakeholders were also directed to the Stakeholder Engagement - Phase II Toolkit, available at http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/es/toolkit2.asp. This set of tools included toolkit facilitator instructions, select draft sections of the State Plan, overview videos summarizing the context and contents of each section, and the public comment survey used to collect feedback on the draft sections.

• In February 2017, the CDE, in partnership with several COEs, conducted Phase III of stakeholder outreach, convening a second round of stakeholder meetings to inform the development of California’s State Plan. During these meetings, stakeholders were asked to provide feedback on a set of ESSA-related policy options to inform SBE decision-making. Meeting materials are available on the CDE Policy Input Meeting Materials Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/es/policyfactsheets.asp.

• Phase IV of stakeholder engagement will include the required 30-day public comment period on the complete draft of the State Plan. The CDE will conduct webinars and regional stakeholder meetings to explain the contents of the plan and encourage engagement in the public comment process. The public comment period is scheduled to begin on May 22, 2017, and continue through June 2017.

More information regarding these stakeholder engagement activities and links to the summaries of stakeholder feedback collected during each phase of outreach are available on the CDE ESSA State Plan Development Opportunities Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/es/essaopptopart.asp.

In addition to these formal opportunities for providing feedback, stakeholders are encouraged to submit comments, questions, recommendations, or letters concerning the State Plan at any time to the CDE by e-mail at ESSA@cde.ca.gov. Stakeholders are also encouraged to provide public comment during the following CPAG and SBE meetings in which the State Plan will be discussed:

• June 1, 2017: CPAG Meeting
• July 12–13, 2017: SBE Meeting
• August 25, 2017: CPAG Meeting
• September 13, 2017: SBE Meeting
The CDE anticipates presenting the ESSA State Plan for final SBE approval at the September 2017 SBE meeting before submitting it to the U.S. Department of Education on September 18, 2017.

**Additional Information**

Each section of the plan begins with a description of the purpose of the program and an estimate regarding how much funding California receives for the program and how many California students are served by the program. The 2017–18 amounts provided are based on the U.S. Department of Education’s State Tables which are based on the President Obama’s Proposed Budget for federal fiscal year (FFY) 2017, which runs through October 2017. Although the fiscal year is more than halfway over, funding for this fiscal year has not yet been finalized, and stated amounts are subject to change. A temporary budget measure known as a “continuing resolution” or “CR” kept the federal government operational through May 5, 2017. These numbers may be updated as the final numbers for the fiscal year become available, but we do not anticipate significant changes to funding levels at this time. Funding for FFY 2018 (which California will receive for the 2018–19 school year) is still being debated in Congress. A budget blueprint sent to Congress by President Trump in March would make significant changes to federal education funding, including eliminating funding for Title II professional development and Title IV, Part B 21st Century Community Learning Centers. However, Congress has sole jurisdiction over federal appropriations. The conversation regarding funding for FFY 2018 is likely to continue throughout the year.
California ESSA State Plan Glossary

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym/Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CalEDFacts</strong></td>
<td><em>CalEDFacts</em> is a compilation of statistics and information on a variety of issues concerning education in California. <a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/pn/fb/">http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/pn/fb/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>California School Dashboard</strong></td>
<td>The California School Dashboard (Dashboard) is a Web site released in March 2017 that parents/guardians, educators, and the public can use to see how districts and schools are meeting the needs of California's diverse student population based on the concise set of measures included in the new accountability system, including test scores, graduation rates, English learner progress, and suspension rates. Additionally, the Dashboard includes reporting and evaluation of local indicators. The Dashboard is part of California's new school accountability system based on the Local Control Funding Formula, enacted in 2013. As provisioned in California Education Code, the Dashboard will be used to support local educational agencies (LEAs) in identifying strengths, weaknesses, and areas for improvement; to assist in determining whether LEAs and schools are eligible for technical assistance; and to assist the state in determining whether LEAs and schools are eligible for more intensive support/intervention. <a href="http://www.caschooldashboard.org/">http://www.caschooldashboard.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAASPP</strong></td>
<td>The California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) System was established on January 1, 2014. The CAASPP System replaced the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program, which became inoperative on July 1, 2013. The CAASPP system includes the Smarter Balanced summative assessments for English language arts/literacy and mathematics, the California Science Tests, the reading/language arts standards-based Tests in Spanish, and the California Alternative Assessments. <a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta">http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta</a> tg/ca/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CCEE</strong></td>
<td>The California Collaborative for Educational Excellence (CCEE) was established pursuant to California Education Code Section 52074, which states that “[t]he purpose of the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence is to advise and assist school districts, county superintendents of schools, and charter schools in achieving the goals set forth in a local control and accountability plan.” The CCEE is a public agency that is governed by a five-member governing board composed of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction (or his or her designee), the president of the State Board of Education (or his or her designee), a county superintendent of schools appointed by the Senate Committee on Rules, a superintendent of a school district appointed by the Governor, and a teacher appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly. <a href="http://ccee-ca.org/">http://ccee-ca.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym/Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDE</td>
<td>The California Department of Education (CDE) oversees the state's diverse and dynamic public school system, which is responsible for the education of more than seven million children and young adults in more than 10,000 schools. The CDE and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction are responsible for enforcing education law and regulations and for continuing to reform and improve public elementary school programs, secondary school programs, adult education, expanded learning programs, and some preschool and child care programs. The CDE's mission is to provide a world-class education for all students, from early childhood to adulthood. The CDE serves the state by innovating and collaborating with educators, schools, parents, and community partners, preparing students to live, work, and thrive in a highly connected world. <a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/">http://www.cde.ca.gov/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COE</td>
<td>There are 58 county offices of education (COEs) in California that provide services to the state's school districts. COEs have elected governing boards and are administered by elected or appointed county superintendents. The county superintendent is responsible for examining and approving school district budgets and expenditures and for reviewing and approving Local Control and Accountability Plans. COEs support school districts by performing tasks that can be done more efficiently and economically at the county level. COEs provide or help formulate new curricula, staff development and training programs, and instructional procedures; design business and personnel systems; and perform many other services to meet changing needs and requirements. When economic or technical conditions make county or regional services most appropriate for students, COEs provide a wide range of services, including special and vocational education, programs for youths at risk of failure, and instruction in juvenile detention facilities. In addition, several statutes give COEs responsibility for monitoring districts for adequate textbooks, facilities, and teacher qualifications. <a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/sd/co/coes.asp">http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/sd/co/coes.asp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPAG</td>
<td>The California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG) provides input to the State Board of Education (SBE) on ongoing efforts to establish a single coherent local, state, and federal accountability system. This advisory committee also serves as the state's committee of practitioners under Title I requirements. The purpose of this advisory committee is to provide input to the SBE on practical implications of decisions before the SBE, which includes providing input on decisions related to implementing the state's Local Control Funding Formula. The committee also reviews any state rules and regulations relating to Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act, in order to advise the state in carrying out its Title I responsibilities. <a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/cc/cp/">http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/cc/cp/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym/Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSMP</td>
<td>The California Subject Matter Project (CSMP) is a network of nine discipline-based statewide projects that support on-going quality professional development. Activities and programs are designed by university faculty, teacher leaders, and teacher practitioners to improve instructional practices that lead to increased achievement for all students. The CSMP encompasses the course content represented in California’s K–12 standards and frameworks, and covers all of the academic disciplines required to meet college entrance (“a-g”) requirements. After completing a program, teachers are offered ongoing education resources and support through professional communities, and further, programs cultivate and emphasize teacher leadership. CSMP programs support teachers’ implementation of standards and literacy strategies in order to nurture the academic skills of English learners and students with low literacy and content area skills. The CSMP bolsters the state’s efforts to incorporate the new standards and assessments, while also addressing the needs of California’s diverse students to ensure they acquire the requisite content knowledge to succeed in college and beyond or in their chosen careers. <a href="https://csmp.ucop.edu/">https://csmp.ucop.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC</td>
<td>The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) is an agency in the Executive Branch of the California State Government that operates as an independent standards board and works in conjunction with the California Department of Education to serve California teachers. The CTC is statutorily responsible for the design, development, and implementation of standards that govern educator preparation for the public schools of California, for the licensing and credentialing of professional educators in California, for the enforcement of professional practices of educators, and for the review and discipline of applicants and credential holders in the State of California. <a href="http://www.ctc.ca.gov/">http://www.ctc.ca.gov/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Frameworks</td>
<td>The California State Board of Education (SBE) adopts curriculum frameworks for kindergarten through grade twelve (K–12) in accordance with California Education Code (EC) Section 51002, which calls for the development of “broad minimum standards and guidelines for educational programs.” Curriculum frameworks in the core curriculum areas of English language arts/English language development, mathematics, history–social science, and science are aligned to the SBE-adopted academic content standards. The Instructional Quality Commission (IQC) develops the curriculum frameworks under the authority of EC Section 33538, in a process defined in the California Code of Regulations, Title 5, sections 9510–9516. The process begins with the California Department of Education conducting four focus groups of educators to get input on improvements to an existing framework. The IQC recruits members for the Curriculum Framework and Evaluation Criteria Committee (CFCC). The CFCC is composed of a minimum of nine to a maximum of 20 members, at least half of whom are classroom teachers. The IQC makes recommendations to the SBE about the development of a curriculum framework and appointments to the CFCC. Curriculum frameworks are developed in a public manner. The CFCC develops a draft document, and the IQC prepares the draft framework for field review and holds public meetings on the document. The IQC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Acronym/Term | Definition
---|---
| is responsible for the draft framework that is recommended to the SBE. After a 60-day public comment period, the SBE also holds a public hearing prior to considering the framework for adoption. After adoption, the frameworks are available for purchase through the CDE and may be viewed on the CDE All Curriculum Frameworks Web page at [http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/allfwks.asp](http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/allfwks.asp).

Curriculum frameworks have drawn state and national recognition for focusing directly on the curriculum and for contributing substantively to the improvement of teaching and learning. Based on current research in education and the specific content area, the frameworks provide a firm foundation for curriculum and instruction by describing the scope and sequence of knowledge and the skills that all students are expected to master. The frameworks’ overarching dedication is to the balance of factual knowledge, fundamental skills, and the application of knowledge and skills.

In addition, the frameworks establish criteria to evaluate instructional materials. These criteria are used to select, through the state adoption process mandated in EC sections 60200–60206, instructional materials for K–8. Frameworks also guide district selection of instructional resources for grades nine through twelve. Although curriculum frameworks cover the K–12 educational program, their effect can be seen in preschool programs, child-care centers, adult education programs, higher education instruction, and university entrance requirements.

**EL**

The Every Student Succeeds Act defines the term English learner (EL) as an individual:
(A) who is aged 3 through 21;
(B) who is enrolled or preparing to enroll in an elementary school or secondary school;
(C) (i) who was not born in the United States or whose native language is a language other than English;
(ii)(I) who is a Native American or Alaska Native, or a native resident of the outlying areas; and
(II) who comes from an environment where a language other than English has had a significant impact on the individual’s level of English language proficiency; or
(iii) who is migratory, whose native language is a language other than English, and who comes from an environment where a language other than English is dominant; and
(D) whose difficulties in speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language may be sufficient to deny the individual—
(i) the ability to meet the challenging state academic standards;
(ii) the ability to successfully achieve in classrooms where the language of instruction is English; or
(iii) the opportunity to participate fully in society.

**Federal Program Monitoring**

School districts, direct-funded charter schools, and county offices that receive funding for certain federal programs may be chosen for a review by the state. The purpose of the review is to ensure that they are spending the funding as required by law. At the end of each review, the state will complete a report that details any findings of non-compliance and informs the school, district, or county office how to correct the findings.

[http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/cr/](http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/cr/)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym/Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Golden State Seal Merit Diploma</td>
<td>California Assembly Bill 3488, approved in July 1996, called for the development of the Golden State Seal Merit Diploma (GSSMD) to recognize public school graduates who have demonstrated their mastery of the high school curriculum in at least six subject matter areas, four of which are English-language arts, mathematics, science, and U.S. history, with the remaining two subject matter areas selected by the student. The GSSMD is awarded jointly by the State Board of Education and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. <a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ca/meritdiploma.asp">http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ca/meritdiploma.asp</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| LCAP                             | The Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) is an important component of California’s Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF). The LCAP is a tool for local educational agencies to set goals, plan actions, and leverage resources to meet those goals to improve student outcomes with specific activities to address state and local priorities. The eight state priorities include the following:  
  1. Basic  
     a. Teacher assignment  
     b. Access to standards-aligned instructional materials  
     c. Facilities  
  2. Implementation of State Standards  
  3. Parental Involvement  
  4. Pupil Achievement  
  5. Pupil Engagement  
  6. School Climate  
  7. Course Access  
  8. Other Pupil Outcomes  
  California Education Code requires that LCAPs be developed in a public process in consultation with teachers, principals, administrators, other school personnel, local bargaining units of the school district, parents, and pupils. http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/lc/ |
| LCAP Addendum                    | The Local Control and Accountability Plan Addendum (LCAP Addendum) is the mechanism by which local educational agencies will address local planning requirements of Every Student Succeeds Act programs within the LCAP development process. The addendum is intended to supplement the LCAP, just as ESSA funds are intended to supplement state funds. It addresses the local planning requirements for the following ESSA programs:  
  • Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by State and Local Educational Agencies  
  • Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk  
  • Title II, Part A: Supporting Effective Instruction  
  • Title III, Part A: Language Instruction for English Learners and Immigrant Students  
  • Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants  
  California’s 2013–14 Budget Act enacted landmark legislation that greatly simplifies the school finance system and provides additional resources to local educational agencies serving students with greater educational needs. The changes introduced by the Local Control |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym/Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding Formula (LCFF)</td>
<td>represent a major shift in how the state funds local educational agencies (LEAs), eliminating revenue limits and most state categorical programs. LEAs receive funding based on the demographic profile of the students they serve and gain greater flexibility to use these funds to improve student outcomes. More information regarding the LCFF is available on the California Department of Education (CDE) LCFF Overview Web page at <a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/lcffoverview.asp">http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/lcffoverview.asp</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAs</td>
<td>receive a base grant based upon average daily attendance with additional funds for students in certain grade spans. In addition, they receive a supplemental grant equal to 20 percent of the base grant based on the number of students eligible to receive free or reduced-price meals, English learners, and foster youth students, and a concentration grant equal to 50 percent of the adjusted base grant for these same students when exceeding 55 percent of an LEA’s enrollment. LEAs have broad discretion regarding use of the base grants but are required to develop, adopt, and annually update a three-year Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) which describes how they intend to meet annual goals for all pupils, with specific activities to address state and local priorities identified in LCFF statute. The law requires LEAs to increase or improve services for high-need students in proportion to the additional funding apportioned on the basis of the target student enrollment in the district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>In California, local educational agencies (LEAs) include county offices of education, school districts, and direct-funded charter schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBE</td>
<td>The California State Board of Education (SBE) is the state’s 11 member K–12 policy-making body for academic standards, curriculum, instructional materials, assessments, and accountability. California Education Code 12032 officially designates the SBE as the state educational agency (SEA) for federally funded education programs, including the Every Student Succeeds Act. The SEA has the primary responsibility for overseeing the state’s full compliance with provisions of federal law including school accountability. <a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/">http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>The state educational agency (SEA) is defined in ESSA as the agency primarily responsible for the state supervision of public elementary schools and secondary schools. California Education Code 12032 officially designates the State Board of Education as the SEA for federally funded education programs, including the ESSA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seal of Biliteracy</td>
<td>The State Seal of Biliteracy, codified in California Education Code sections 51460–51464, provides recognition to high school students who have demonstrated proficiency in speaking, reading, and writing in one or more languages in addition to English. <a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/sealofbiliteracy.asp">http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/sealofbiliteracy.asp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDG</td>
<td>The Technical Design Group (TDG) is a group of experts in psychometric theory and education research that provide recommendations to the California Department of Education on matters related to the state and federal accountability system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction
Section 8302 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), requires the Secretary to establish procedures and criteria under which, after consultation with the Governor, a State educational agency (SEA) may submit a consolidated State plan designed to simplify the application requirements and reduce burden for SEAs. ESEA section 8302 also requires the Secretary to establish the descriptions, information, assurances, and other material required to be included in a consolidated State plan. Even though an SEA submits only the required information in its consolidated State plan, an SEA must still meet all ESEA requirements for each included program. In its consolidated State plan, each SEA may, but is not required to, include supplemental information such as its overall vision for improving outcomes for all students and its efforts to consult with and engage stakeholders when developing its consolidated State plan.

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

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

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

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

Alternative Template
If an SEA does not use this template, it must:
1) Include the information on the Cover Sheet;
2) Include a table of contents or guide that clearly indicates where the SEA has addressed each requirement in its consolidated State plan;
3) Indicate that the SEA worked through CCSSO in developing its own template; and
4) Include the required information regarding equitable access to, and participation in, the programs included in its consolidated State plan as required by section 427 of the General Education Provisions Act. See Appendix B.

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

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

Assurances
In order to receive fiscal year (FY) 2017 ESEA funds on July 1, 2017, for the programs that may be

3 Unless otherwise indicated, citations to the ESEA refer to the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA.
included in a consolidated State plan, and consistent with ESEA section 8302, each SEA must also submit a comprehensive set of assurances to the Department at a date and time established by the Secretary. In the near future, the Department will publish an information collection request that details these assurances.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SEA Contact</strong> (Name and Position):</th>
<th>Telephone:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address:</td>
<td>Email Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Department of Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1430 N Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento, CA 95814</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By signing this document, I assure that:
To the best of my knowledge and belief, all information and data included in this plan are true and correct.
The SEA will submit a comprehensive set of assurances at a date and time established by the Secretary, including the assurances in ESEA section 8304.
Consistent with ESEA section 8302(b)(3), the SEA will meet the requirements of ESEA sections 1117 and 8501 regarding the participation of private school children and teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Authorized SEA Representative (Printed Name)</strong></th>
<th>Telephone:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Signature of Authorized SEA Representative</strong></th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Governor (Printed Name)</strong></th>
<th>Date SEA provided plan to the Governor under ESEA section 8540:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edmund G. Brown, Jr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Signature of Governor</strong></th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Programs Included in the Consolidated State Plan

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

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

or

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

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

☐ Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children

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

☐ Title II, Part A: Supporting Effective Instruction

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

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

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

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

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

**Instructions**

Each SEA must provide descriptions and other information that address each requirement listed below for the programs included in its consolidated State plan. Consistent with ESEA section 8302, the Secretary has determined that the following requirements are absolutely necessary for consideration of a consolidated State plan. An SEA may add descriptions or other information, but may not omit any of the required descriptions or information for each included program.
A. Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies

The purpose of this program is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps.

This program provides financial assistance through states to local educational agencies (LEAs) and public schools with high numbers or percentages of children from low-income families to help ensure that all students meet challenging state academic content standards. LEAs target the Title I funds they receive to public schools with the highest percentages of children from low-income families.

Title I schools with percentages of low-income students of at least 40 percent may use Title I funds, along with other federal, state, and local funds, to operate a "schoolwide program" to upgrade the instructional program for the whole school. Title I schools with less than 40 percent low-income students or that choose not to operate a schoolwide program offer a "targeted assistance program" in which the school identifies students who are failing, or most at risk of failing, to meet the state's challenging academic standards. Targeted assistance schools design, in consultation with parents, staff, and district staff, an instructional program to meet the needs of those students.

To support low-income students in meeting the state’s academic content standards, Title I, Part A includes provisions regarding the state’s standards and assessments, accountability system, school support and improvement activities, activities to ensure equitable access to effective educators, and efforts to improve school conditions and school transitions.

California estimates it will receive $1.8 billion in Title I, Part A funds in 2017–18. Under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), states must reserve 7 percent to support schools identified as needing additional support, not less than 95 percent of which must be subgranted to LEAs to serve identified schools or, with permission of the LEA, subgranted to an external entity to provide such support. The remaining 5 percent of the 7 percent may be used by the state for school improvement activities. In 2015–16, under the No Child Left Behind Act, over 3.9 million students in California participated in programs under Title I, Part A.

1. **Challenging State Academic Standards and Assessments** *(ESEA section 1111(b)(1) and (2) and 34 CFR §§ 200.1–200.8)*

2. **Eighth Grade Math Exception** *(ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(C) and 34 CFR § 200.5(b)(4)):
   i. Does the State administer an end-of-course mathematics assessment to meet the requirements under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) of the ESEA?
      - Yes
      - No

   ii. If a State responds “yes” to question 2(i), does the State wish to exempt an eighth-grade student who takes the high school mathematics course associated with the end-of-course assessment from the mathematics assessment typically administered in eighth grade under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(aa) of the ESEA and ensure that:
       a. The student instead takes the end-of-course mathematics assessment the State administers to high school students under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) of the ESEA;
       b. The student’s performance on the high school assessment is used in the year in which the student takes the assessment for purposes of measuring academic achievement under section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i) of the ESEA and participation in assessments under section 1111(c)(4)(E) of the ESEA;
       c. In high school:

4 The Secretary anticipates collecting relevant information consistent with the assessment peer review process in 34 CFR § 200.2(d). An SEA need not submit any information regarding challenging State academic standards and assessments at this time.
1. The student takes a State-administered end-of-course assessment or nationally recognized high school academic assessment as defined in 34 CFR § 200.3(d) in mathematics that is more advanced than the assessment the State administers under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) of the ESEA;
2. The State provides for appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR § 200.6(b) and (f); and
3. The student’s performance on the more advanced mathematics assessment is used for purposes of measuring academic achievement under section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i) of the ESEA and participation in assessments under section 1111(c)(4)(E) of the ESEA.

Yes  
No

iii. If a State responds “yes” to question 2(ii), consistent with 34 CFR § 200.5(b)(4), describe, with regard to this exception, its strategies to provide all students in the State the opportunity to be prepared for and to take advanced mathematics coursework in middle school.

3. Native Language Assessments (ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(F) and 34 CFR § 200.6(f)(2)(ii) ) and (f)(4):
   i. Provide its definition for “languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population,” and identify the specific languages that meet that definition.

California has identified Spanish as its most populous language other than English. This is based on 2015–16 Language Data for Districts and Schools by Language Group, which may be accessed on the CDE Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/pf/cm/transref.asp. These data indicate that Spanish is spoken by 33.5 percent of students in kindergarten through grade twelve. The next most populous language is spoken by only 1.31 percent of students. Within the English learner student group, Spanish is spoken by 83.4 percent of students, with the next language trailing far behind at 2.2 percent.

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

California is committed to providing reliable assessments in languages other than English based on the constructs being measured. For the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) Smarter Balanced mathematics assessment in grades three through eight and grade eleven, California provides stacked translations in Spanish and language glossaries in the 10 languages most commonly spoken in Smarter Balanced member state schools. In addition, for the CAASPP Smarter Balanced mathematics and English language arts (ELA) assessments, California provides translated test directions in 17 languages.

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

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

Currently, the California Science Test is under development and is scheduled to be operational in 2018–19; it will include stacked translations in Spanish and embedded glossaries for specific words.

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

Although the Spanish RLA assessment is aligned, to the extent feasible, with the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) en Español, the Spanish RLA assessment and the English language arts (ELA) assessment measure constructs that are fundamentally different, thus yielding data that are not comparable. A test construct refers to the concept or the characteristic that a test is designed to measure. For example, because contractions (i.e., don't) are a construct of the English language, but not a construct of the Spanish language, a Spanish language assessment would fail to include a construct that is important to the English language. Likewise, there are constructs in Spanish (i.e., accent marks) for which there are no English equivalents. The RLA assessment for Spanish as well as for ELA are accurate and reliable measures for their intended constructs. The ESSA requirement is to determine which of the measures is “most likely to yield accurate and reliable information;” given the constructs are different, this comparison is inappropriate. As a result, California will not be using the Spanish RLA assessment in lieu of the ELA assessment for federal accountability purposes, as the assessments are not interchangeable. This decision is supported by the following recent research by nationally renowned linguistic scholars:

• “Issues of equivalence across languages are considerably more serious in the case of English Language Arts--it is impossible to make valid inferences about EL students’ knowledge of this field based on their scores on English Language Arts administered in their native language. The reason is twofold. First, language arts are specific to the language in which they originate. Second, to a large extent, language arts involve more than meaning…there are subtle aspects that cannot be replicated and assessed across languages.” (Solano-Flores, G. & Hakuta, K. [2017] Assessing Students in their Home Language, pp. 14–15)

Moreover, the U.S. Department of Education states, “We further agree that it is important that any content assessment that states develop in languages other than English measure the same construct as the assessments administered in English…” per the Federal Register, Vol. 81, No 236, Page 88921 (2016). As explained in the bullet above, assessing a student’s ELA knowledge with an assessment in the student's native language is not valid because the two assessments measure different constructs (i.e., “language arts are specific to the language in which they originate”). California will not administer the CSA in lieu of the ELA assessment because the assessments measure different constructs and do not align with the federal government’s stance that the constructs that measure ELA and native language assessments must be the same.

Additionally, the College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards, which are part of the CCSS in ELA/Literacy, emphasize the importance of literacy and language arts in English in order to prepare students for entering college and/or the workforce. Allowing students to take the Spanish RLA assessment in lieu of the ELA assessment beyond their first year in the United States would provide no measure of the students’ progress toward meeting the ELA standards, thereby failing to measure their preparedness for college and the workforce.

Although the Spanish RLA assessment measures a separate construct, it is still an important construct to measure. It will provide LEAs with a reliable measure of Spanish RLA which will enable them to evaluate their Spanish language arts programs and can be used in their Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP), if appropriate. The CDE will ensure that LEAs are provided with access to data which can be considered in their LCAP development process. These purposes are
consistent with the SBE-approved purposes of the CSA.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of the California Science Tests</td>
<td>Pilot test: 2016–17</td>
<td>State and federal funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field test: 2017–18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operational: 2018–19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

In 2015, CAASPP stakeholder meetings were held to gather meaningful input on the development of the assessments as documented in the March 2016 report from the CDE to the Governor entitled Recommendations for Expanding California’s Comprehensive Assessment System (http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ca/documents/compassessexpand.pdf). The CDE also meets regularly with parent, educator, and family advocacy groups, the California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG), the Advisory Commission on Special Education, and LEA representatives to provide assessment updates and receive feedback.

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

California is currently developing stacked translations in Spanish simultaneously with the development of the California Science Test (CAST) and therefore, these stacked translations will be available once the CAST becomes operational in 2018–19.

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

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

- Black or African American
- Asian
- Filipino
- Hispanic or Latino
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
• Two or More Races
• White

California also includes the following student groups in its accountability system:

• Socioeconomically Disadvantaged
• English Learners
• Students with Disabilities
• Foster Youth
• Homeless

b. If applicable, describe any additional subgroups of students other than the statutorily required subgroups (i.e., economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, children with disabilities, and English learners) used in the Statewide accountability system.

California includes foster youth and homeless children and youth in its accountability system.

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

X Yes
No

d. If applicable, choose one of the following options for recently arrived English learners in the State:

X Applying the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(i); or
☐ Applying the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(ii); or
☐ Applying the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(i) or under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(ii). If this option is selected, describe how the State will choose which exception applies to a recently arrived English learner.

ii. Minimum N-Size (ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A)):

a. Provide the minimum number of students that the State determines are necessary to be included to carry out the requirements of any provisions under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that require disaggregation of information by each subgroup of students for accountability purposes.

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

Note: California will use a minimum student group size of 15 or more students for foster youth and homeless youth under LCFF for LEAs (i.e., LCAP goals and performance levels on the California School Dashboard).

b. Describe how the minimum number of students is statistically sound.

Given the confidence level and margin of error, a sample size of 30 is needed to appropriately estimate the population. A sample size of 30 produces a standardized normal distribution, where the distance between the variance is
normal/standard, resulting in statistically significant results (based on the central limit theorem).

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

Research overwhelmingly supports a minimum N size of 30 to produce a mean, range, standard deviation, and even distribution. Based on this research, the California Legislature established the N size for accountability purposes in California Education Code Section 52052. There was support from educational stakeholders and a general consensus regarding the established N size of 30 when the legislation was introduced.

d. Describe how the State ensures that the minimum number is sufficient to not reveal any personally identifiable information.\(^5\)

To preserve student anonymity, the CDE does not report data if a student group has less than 11 valid results.

e. If the State’s minimum number of students for purposes of reporting is lower than the minimum number of students for accountability purposes, provide the State’s minimum number of students for purposes of reporting.

The minimum size for reporting is 11.

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

Long-term goals, and the ability for LEAs or schools to determine interim progress goals, are built into the California Model. For a complete description of the model, please see the response to Section A.4.v: Annual Meaningful Differentiation. The new system is based on a five-by-five colored grid that produces 25 results. A school and student group’s placement on the grid determines the improvement that is required to maintain the current performance level (color) on the grid or to move to the next performance level.

Note: For a summary of all the decisions the SBE is required to make regarding the new federal accountability requirements, please review the April 2017 Information Memorandum on the “Relationship Between the State Board of Education’s Adopting the Local Control Funding Formula Evaluation Rubrics and the Title I School Accountability Requirements Under the Every Student Succeeds Act” on the CDE April 2017 Information Memoranda Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/infomemoapr2017.asp. An overview of the California accountability model (California Model) is provided on the CDE California Accountability Model & School Dashboard Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/cm/. Detailed information on the production of the new indicators in the new California Model is provided in the “Technical Guide for the New Accountability System” available on the CDE Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/cm/ under the Data Files and Guide tab.

\(^5\) Consistent with ESEA section 1111(i), information collected or disseminated under ESEA section 1111 shall be collected and disseminated in a manner that protects the privacy of individuals consistent with section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g, commonly known as the “Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974”). When selecting a minimum n-size for reporting, States should consult the Institute for Education Sciences report “Best Practices for Determining Subgroup Size in Accountability Systems While Protecting Personally Identifiable Student Information” to identify appropriate statistical disclosure limitation strategies for protecting student privacy.
a. **Academic Achievement.** *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(aa))*

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

For ELA baseline data, 6.3 percent of schools are in the Red performance level, 12.8 percent are in the Orange performance level, 46.4 percent are in the Yellow performance level, 19.8 percent are in the Green performance level, and 14.6 percent are in the Blue performance level. For the mathematics baseline data, 8.1 percent of schools are in the Red performance level, 14.2 percent are in the Orange performance level, 44.2 percent are in the Yellow performance level, 19.9 percent are in the Green performance level, and 13.5 percent are in the Blue performance level.

The SBE has not yet established goals for all schools and student groups. Based on where the cut points for Status and Change were drawn within the current statewide distribution of performance, the Green performance level represents a logical starting place for establishing goals.

As reflected in the baseline data, the Green performance level represents approximately the top third of performance statewide, making it ambitious to set a goal of moving all schools and student groups to that level of performance.

There are, however, five boxes that make up the Green performance level on the five-by-five grid, representing different combinations of Status and Change. The SBE will determine a specific “Green” box as the goal. In other words, the SBE will establish the minimum specific Status and Change requirements to meet the goal.

The CDE has produced a report that indicates where schools are on the five-by-five colored grid, allowing schools to determine how much improvement is needed to reach that goal.

The SBE has not yet established a timeline for reaching the goal. The SBE expects to revise the performance levels for state indicators every five to seven years and has established an annual review process to assess progress on all indicators statewide. The SBE also may update performance standards sooner if warranted (e.g., if the majority of LEAs, schools, and/or student groups have exceeded the goal). Accordingly, the goal will be to reach a specific cell in the Green performance level within five to seven years.

Note: Staff will review the five-by-five grids for each state indicator and present specific recommendations for the SBE’s consideration at the July 2017 SBE meeting. As a starting point for stakeholder input during the public comment period, staff have identified the cell for High (Status) and Maintained (Change) as a potential goal. All of the Blue cells would exceed the goal, and the SBE would determine whether any other Green cells also exceed the goal (e.g., Very High [Status] and Declined [Change]). Based on SBE direction, staff anticipate revising this section of the draft plan to describe a specific goal.

Staff anticipates that the SBE will adopt performance standards at its September 2017 meeting for the approved College/Career Indicator, which includes grade 11 assessment results for ELA and mathematics. This section
2. Provide the measurements of interim progress toward meeting the long-term goals for academic achievement in Appendix A.

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

Because all student groups have the same long-term goal, student groups with lower baseline performance will need to make greater improvement over time to reach the long-term goal. The ability for LEAs or schools to determine interim progress goals, including for lower performing student groups, is built into the California Model.

b. Graduation Rate. *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(bb))*

1. Describe the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and for each subgroup of students, including: (i) baseline data; (ii) the timeline for meeting the long-term goals, for which the term must be the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State; and (iii) how the long-term goals are ambitious.

California’s overall graduation rates have been steadily increasing since California started calculating the four-year cohort rate beginning with the 2009–10 graduating class. The graduation rate baseline data produced 11.0 percent of schools in the Red performance level, 6.9 percent in the Orange performance level, 15.8 percent in the Yellow performance level, 23.0% in the Green performance level, and 43.3 percent in the Blue performance level.

The SBE has not yet established goals for all schools and student groups or a timeline for reaching the goals. Based on where the cut points for Status and Change were drawn within the current statewide distribution of performance, the Green performance level represents a logical starting place for establishing goals.

There are, however, four boxes that make up the Green performance levels on the five-by-five grid, representing different combinations of Status and Change. The SBE will determine a specific "Green" box as the goal. In other words, the SBE will establish the minimum specific Status and Change requirements to meet the goal.

The CDE has produced a report that indicates where schools are on the five-by-five colored grid, allowing schools to determine how much improvement is needed to reach that goal.

The SBE has not yet established a timeline for reaching the goal. The SBE expects to revise the performance levels for state indicators every five to seven years and has established an annual review process to assess progress on all indicators statewide. The SBE also may update performance standards sooner if warranted (e.g., if the majority of LEAs, schools, and/or student groups have exceeded the goal). Accordingly, the goal will be to reach a specific cell in the Green performance level within five to seven years.

*Note: Staff will review the five-by-five grids for each state indicator and present specific recommendations for the SBE’s consideration at the July 2017 SBE meeting. As a starting point for stakeholder input during the public comment period, staff have identified the cell for High (Status) and*
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Maintained (Change) as a potential goal. All of the Blue cells would exceed the goal, and the SBE would determine whether any other Green cells also exceed the goal (e.g., Very High [Status] and Declined [Change]). Less than 40 percent of all schools are in the High (Status) and Maintained (Change) for graduation rate and only one student group (Asian) is in the High (Status) and Maintained (Change). If the SBE sets High (Status) and Maintained (Change) as the goal, it would be an ambitious goal to move all schools and student groups to reach or exceed that box in the Green performance level. Based on SBE direction, staff anticipate revising this section of the draft plan to describe a specific goal.

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

California is still in the process of incorporating the five-year cohort graduation rate into the accountability system and anticipates incorporating the five-year cohort data into the accountability system for the fall 2018 release.

3. Provide the measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate in Appendix A.

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

Given that all student groups have the same long-term goal, student groups with lower baseline performance will need to make greater improvement over time to reach the long-term goal. The ability for LEAs or schools to determine interim progress goals, including for lower performing student groups, is built into the California Model.

c. English Language Proficiency. (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii))

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

The California Model methodology provides credit to schools when students move up one performance level on the language proficiency test from the prior year to the current year. Using the current language assessment results (the California English Language Development Test [CELDT]) and current methodology, a student that starts with a beginning level on the CELDT is expected to achieve language proficiency within five years and maintain language proficiency based on the California Model.

Research indicates that it takes five to seven years for English learner (EL) students to become language proficient. Therefore, the California Model sets high expectations for schools.
However, California is currently transitioning to a new language proficiency test. The first operational administration of the new assessment, the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC), will occur in spring 2018. Once the ELPAC is operational and the CDE has the initial results, the SBE will revisit the English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) methodology, cut points, and timelines for language proficiency.

The ELPI baseline data using the CELDT produced 15.7 percent of schools in the Red performance level, 28.2 percent in the Orange performance level, 18.8 percent in the Yellow performance level, 27.0 percent in the Green performance level, and 10.3 percent in the Blue performance level.

The SBE has not yet established goals for all schools or a timeline for reaching the goals. Based on where the cut points for Status and Change were drawn within the current statewide distribution of performance, the Green performance level represents a logical starting place for establishing goals.

There are, however, five boxes that make up the Green performance level on the five-by-five grid, representing different combinations of Status and Change. The SBE will determine a specific “Green” box as the goal. In other words, the SBE will establish the minimum specific Status and Change requirements to meet the goal.

The CDE has produced a report that indicates where schools are on the five-by-five colored grid, allowing schools to determine how much improvement is needed to reach that goal.

The SBE has not yet established a timeline for reaching the goal. The SBE expects to revise the performance levels for state indicators every five to seven years and has established an annual review process to assess progress on all indicators statewide. The SBE also may update performance standards sooner if warranted (e.g., if the underlying construction of the measure changes due to use of a new assessment). Accordingly, the goal will be to reach a specific cell in the Green performance level within five to seven years.

Note: Staff will review the five-by-five grids for each state indicator and present specific recommendations for the SBE’s consideration at the July 2017 SBE meeting. As a starting point for stakeholder input, during the public comment, staff have identified the cell for High (Status) and Maintained (Change) as a potential goal. All of the Blue cells would exceed the goal, and the SBE would determine whether any other Green cells also exceed the goal (e.g., Very High [Status] and Declined [Change]). Based on SBE direction, staff anticipate revising this section of the draft plan to describe a specific goal.

2. Provide the measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goal for increases in the percentage of English learners making progress in achieving English language proficiency in Appendix A.

iv. Indicators (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B))
a. Academic Achievement Indicator. Describe the Academic Achievement indicator, including a description of how the indicator (i) is based on the long-term goals; (ii) is measured by proficiency on the annual Statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments; (iii) annually measures academic achievement for all students and separately for each subgroup of students; and (iv) at the State’s discretion, for each public high school in the State, includes a measure of student growth, as measured by the annual Statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments.
The Academic Indicator will include the CAASPP for ELA and mathematics in grades three through eight for elementary and middle schools. Currently, “Status” is determined using the average distance from the lowest scale score associated with Level 3 (Standard Met) on the most recent administration of the Smarter Balanced assessments, and “Change” is the difference between performance from the prior year and current year.

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

For high schools, the grade 11 assessment results are incorporated into the Career/College Indicator (CCI). To ensure transparency, grade eleven CAASPP results are also reported separately as the average distance from the lowest scale score associated with Level 3 (Standard Met) by schools and LEAs. The CCI is designed to include multiple measures in order to value the multiple pathways that students may take to prepare for postsecondary. The CCI currently has three levels (Prepared, Approaching Prepared, and Not Prepared) and is designed to allow new measures to be added when they become available. To determine how well schools have prepared students for postsecondary, the CCI evaluates all students in the four-year graduation cohort.

The following measures might be included (subject to SBE approval) in the fall 2017–18 release of the CCI:

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

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

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

In addition, California has convened a work group that will make recommendations regarding how to incorporate more career measures in the CCI. The group is scheduled to make short and long-term recommendations to the Superintendent of Public Instruction in fall 2017 to inform the CDE’s recommendations to the SBE.

For the CCI, “Status” is determined using the current CCI rate and “Change” is the difference between the current rate and the prior year’s rate.
measures the performance for all students and separately for each subgroup of students. If the Other Academic indicator is not a measure of student growth, the description must include a demonstration that the indicator is a valid and reliable statewide academic indicator that allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance.

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

In addition, this indicator will be especially important for schools that only serve students in grades K–2. A study in California found that only 17 percent of children chronically absent in both kindergarten and grade 1 were proficient readers by the end of grade 3, as compared to 64 percent of their peers who attended school regularly (Bruner, Discher, and Chang, 2011).

LEAs will report chronic absence data to the state for the first time in fall 2017. It is expected that the SBE will approve color-coded performance levels scores no earlier than the fall 2018, when at least two years of data will be available.

All student groups will have the same long-term goal. Student groups with lower baseline performance will need to make greater improvement over time to reach the long-term goal. The ability for LEAs or schools to determine interim progress goals, including for lower performing student groups, is built into the California Model.

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

The Graduation Rate Indicator will use the four-year cohort graduation rate. California is still in the process of incorporating the five-year cohort graduation rate into the accountability system. We anticipate incorporating the five-year cohort data into the accountability system for the fall 2018 release.

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

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

Currently, the ELPI combines performance on the English language test, currently the CELDT, with reclassified EL student data. For accountability purposes, the CELDT has six performance levels. “Status” is the percent of EL students who move up one performance category each year (e.g., move from level 1 to level 2) plus the percent of students who were reclassified in the prior year. “Change” is the difference between “Status” from the current year and
“Status” in the prior year. Students who have become English proficient must maintain their English proficiency.

California Education Code (EC) Section 313 requires LEAs to take the following criteria to into consideration for determining when students have achieved sufficient language proficiency to be reclassified:

- Assessment of English language proficiency, using an objective assessment instrument, including, but not limited to, the state test of English language development;
- Teacher evaluation, including, but not limited to, a review of the student's curriculum mastery;
- Parent opinion and consultation; and
- Comparison of student performance in basic skills against an empirically established range of performance in basic skills based on the performance of English proficient students of the same age.

California is currently transitioning to a new language proficiency test. The first administration of the new assessment, the ELPAC, will occur in spring 2018. Once the ELPAC is operational and the state has the initial results, the state may revisit the criteria listed above to determine how the reclassification criteria can be applied across all LEAs.

e. School Quality or Student Success Indicator(s). Describe each School Quality or Student Success Indicator, including, for each such indicator: (i) how it allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance; (ii) that it is valid, reliable, comparable, and statewide (for the grade span(s) to which it applies); and (iii) of how each such indicator annually measures performance for all students and separately for each subgroup of students. For any School Quality or Student Success indicator that does not apply to all grade spans, the description must include the grade spans to which it does apply.

The Suspension Rate Indicator will be used to measure school quality. For all state indicators, the California Model determines performance levels based on the distribution of LEA data. The distribution is used to set four cut scores for both Status and Change. However, for the Suspension Rate Indicator, the data were significantly different among elementary, middle, and high schools. Therefore, for the Suspension Rate Indicator only, three distributions were created, one for elementary, one for middle, and one for high schools. The three sets of distributions resulted in the establishment of three different sets of cut scores, which allows for a valid and reliable comparison among schools statewide by school type.

v. Annual Meaningful Differentiation (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(C))

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

California has developed a multiple measures accountability system that uses percentiles to create a five-by-five grid. This five by five grid provides 25 results that combine “Status” and “Change” to make an overall determination for each of the indicators. The accountability system provides equal weight to both “Status” and “Change.”
“Status” is determined using the current year performance (i.e., current year graduation rate), and “Change” is the difference between performance from the current year and the prior year, or between the current year and a multi-year weighted average.

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

- Very High
- High
- Medium
- Low
- Very Low

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

- Increased significantly
- Increased
- Maintained
- Declined
- Declined significantly

Each indicator will have its own unique set of cut points for “Status” and “Change.” The cut points will generally remain in place for five to seven years, although the SBE may adjust the cut scores earlier if statewide data demonstrate that the existing cut scores no longer support meaningful differentiation of schools. By combining the results of both “Status” and “Change,” a “Performance Level” can be assigned one of the following colors for each indicator:

- Blue
- Green
- Yellow
- Orange
- Red

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

**Figure 1. Sample Five-by-Five Grid**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Declined Significantly</th>
<th>Declined</th>
<th>Maintained</th>
<th>Increased</th>
<th>Increased Significantly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. Describe the weighting of each indicator in the State’s system of annual meaningful differentiation, including how the Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in ELP indicators each receive substantial weight individually and, in the aggregate, much greater weight than the School Quality or Student Success indicator(s), in the aggregate.

For each indicator, “Status” and “Change” have equal weight. In addition, each indicator is given equal weight when meaningfully differentiating schools, as explained in section vi.a below. Because five of the six indicators are academic, more weight is automatically attributed to academics without devaluing the importance of school quality (i.e., suspension rates).

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

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

Schools with less than 30 students will receive data on their Status and Change. However, they will not receive a performance level (i.e., a color). This will provide small schools with data that they can use to improve student performance. In addition, California’s new accountability system includes LEAs. The indicators used for school accountability will also be applied at the LEA level. As a result, the performance of students in schools with less than 30 students will be rolled up to the LEA level and to the state level. California is in the process of developing tools for all LEAs and schools to use for continuous improvement and implementing state law requirements for assistance and intervention for LEAs that are low-performing on the indicators described for the state and additional local indicators that apply only at the LEA level. Schools with less than 30 students will have access to these tools to assist them in their improvement plans. (Note: For privacy purposes results are never displayed for fewer than 11 students.)

California’s accountability system uses both “Status” and “Change” which requires two consecutive years of data. Therefore, newly opened schools will not receive performance levels on the state indicators until the second year of data is available.

State assessments are administered starting at grade 3. Elementary schools with kindergarten, grade 1, and/or grade 2 students will have their accountability reports based on grade 3 results of schools with which they are paired. Pairing is based on matriculation patterns. For start-up schools, where there is not a matriculation pattern, the grade 3 district average will be used.

For alternative schools, the SBE approved the development of comparable indicators that are more appropriate for these schools. Alternative schools are designed to meet the needs of at-risk student populations, and include schools that serve students who are in custody in the juvenile court system or enrolled in drop-out recovery programs and continuation schools. These schools help students who are credit deficient make up credits and work toward graduation. Such schools often serve students for limited durations. It is expected that the SBE will consider alternate measures for these schools over the coming year.
vi. Identification of Schools (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D))

a. Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. Describe the State’s methodology for identifying not less than the lowest-performing five percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds in the State for comprehensive support and improvement, including the year in which the State will first identify such schools.

The SBE has not yet established a methodology for identifying the lowest-performing 5 percent of schools. Using the methodology for meaningful differentiation based on performance on the state indicators described in section v.b above, California will identify the 5 percent of schools based on the combination of performance levels on the indicators that apply for each school. Under this approach, the initial pool would consist of schools that have the lowest performance level for all indicators (e.g., Red on all applicable indicators). The pool would successively expand based on established criteria (combinations of color-coded performance levels) until at least 5 percent of schools were identified. This gives much greater weight, in the aggregate, to the academic performance indicators because they represent a significant majority of the indicators used when expanding the pool.

Note: As explained in an April 2017 information memorandum (http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-exec-essa-apr17item02.doc), this approach is consistent with the approach for identifying LEAs for assistance under LCFF, in which no indicator receives extra weight relative to others. It also relies on the performance levels (with Status and Change) that the SBE approved as part of the evaluation rubrics and, like the LEA criteria, focuses identification on the Red performance level (although it may expand to include Orange or Yellow performance levels to reach 5 percent). There are numerous variations on this general approach that staff will review for technical reliability. Staff expect to present one or more specific scenarios under this general approach to the SBE at the July SBE meeting. The April 2017 information memorandum also identified several alternate approaches, including analysis of why those approaches are less consistent with the approach for identifying LEAs for technical assistance under LCFF.

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

California will use three years of graduation rate data to identify schools with a high school graduation rate less than 67 percent. Any school with a graduation rate less than 67 percent in all three years will be identified for comprehensive assistance. Alternative schools will be not be included; however, California will identify the lowest-achieving five percent of alternative schools based on the alternate measures the SBE is expected to approve.

Three years of data will be used to identify schools; therefore, newly opened schools will not be identified for comprehensive support and improvement until the third year of data is available.

California will identify high schools beginning in the 2018–19 school year.

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

California will apply the criteria used initially to identify these schools for additional targeted support and determine whether the school would still be eligible for additional targeted support based on their performance. Schools will meet the exit criteria if they no longer meet those criteria (i.e., have improved so a student group, on its own, would no longer be identified based on those criteria). California will identify these schools once every three years after the initial identification.

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

California will identify schools once every three years.

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

California will identify as consistently underperforming any schools in which any student group, on its own, meets the criteria for being identified for comprehensive support as the lowest-performing 5 percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds in the state.

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

California will use the same methodology that is used to identify schools for comprehensive support as the lowest-performing 5 percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds in the state. Schools will be identified beginning in the 2018–19 school year.

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

Not applicable.

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

The SBE has not yet established how the requirement for 95 percent student participation will factor into the statewide accountability system. California will report whether schools met the 95 percent participation requirement based on a unique symbol (for example, a color coded image or icon specific to participation rate).
Assistance specific to meeting the 95 percent participation rate will be offered to schools that do not meet that participation rate through the statewide system of support.

viii. **Continued Support for School and LEA Improvement (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A))**

a. **Exit Criteria for Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools.** Describe the statewide exit criteria, established by the State, for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement, including the number of years (not to exceed four) over which schools are expected to meet such criteria.

The statewide exit criteria would consider whether the school would still be eligible for comprehensive support, based on the criteria used initially to identify these schools for comprehensive support, when the next cohort of schools is identified for comprehensive support.

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

The statewide exit criteria would consider whether the school would still be eligible for targeted support, based on the criteria used initially to identify these schools for targeted support, when the next cohort of schools is identified for targeted support.

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

When a school fails to meet the state’s exit criteria for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) after a pre-determined number of years, more intensive support is then warranted. The goal for intensive support is to ensure rapid and sustained improvement for LEAs and their identified schools. Mandatory intensive support that builds LEA capacity to sustain continuous improvement over time may be implemented.

More rigorous interventions for schools that fail to meet exit criteria will be determined within a multi-tiered statewide system of support, where coordination of differentiated assistance and intensive intervention are provided by county superintendents, the CCEE, and the CDE/State Superintendent of Public Instruction. To inform these decisions, LEAs and their identified schools will use the California School Dashboard to identify strengths and areas for continued improvement. At minimum, the state may, through the statewide system of support, assist any LEA with schools that fail to exit from CSI to:

- Conduct a new school-level comprehensive needs assessment that focuses on systemic factors and identifies gaps between current conditions and desired conditions. The state may require that the LEA partner with an external entity, agency, or individual with demonstrated expertise and capacity to conduct a comprehensive, evidence-based review of the LEA and school.

- Place identified gaps and needs in priority order and target resources to address needs.
• Identify evidence-based interventions, strategies, activities, and/or practices or additional supports that contain greater rigor.

• Within the system of support, California may determine a limited set of evidence-based interventions, strategies, activities, and/or practices available for use and may offer additional intensive assistance such as customized planning support, coaching, participation in cohort networks, and COE mandatory planning and embedded coaching.

In making a determination about additional, more rigorous evidence-based interventions, strategies, activities, and/or practices, the state may consider outcomes of prior and existing school improvement supports and efforts and recommendations from partner agencies involved in the improvement work.

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

California will review resource allocation to those LEAs and schools identified for CSI and Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) through a multi-tiered statewide system of support and review process. Based on available data, elements of that process may include, but are not limited to, the following activities:

• Comprehensive Support and Improvement Review: Within a statewide system of support, California will review and approve initial CSI plans, including a review of how the LEA will address identified resource inequities.

• Targeted Support and Improvement Review: Within a LEA-level system of support, LEAs will review and approve initial TSI plans, which may be incorporated in the Single Plan for Student Achievement and will include a review of how the LEA will address identified resource inequities.

• Consolidated Application Reporting System (CARS): The CDE will revise and periodically review resource allocation pages in the CARS for LEAs with a significant number of schools identified for CSI and TSI.

• Federal Program Monitoring: The CDE will annually review selected LEAs, including LEAs with a significant number of schools identified for CSI and TSI, for resource allocation inequities, strategies designed to resolve resource allocation inequities, and progress in resolving resource allocation inequities. This process may include technical assistance and support for program strategies.

• Differentiated Assistance: The CDE will provide assistance to LEAs and schools identified for CSI and TSI with more intensive and differentiated assistance focused on LEAs with a significant number of schools identified for CSI and TSI with the intent to build LEA capacity to identify, correct, and monitor the resolution of resource inequities.

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

The California Way is rooted in collaboration and shared decision-making among
stakeholders in order to effect positive educational change. The SBE, CCEE, COEs, and CDE all have key roles in providing supports to help LEAs and schools improve and in providing more focused assistance for LEAs and schools that are struggling. Continuing collaboration and coordination among these agencies, as well as other state, regional, and local partners, will facilitate coherent technical assistance and support at the local level and ensure alignment of efforts with the California Way.

Based on feedback from stakeholders and in partnership with the CCEE, COEs and the CDE, the SBE will further define the emerging statewide system of support over the coming year, including roles and responsibilities, coordination among agencies, the nature and scope of assistance and support activities, and goals and progress monitoring to assess the statewide system of support’s effectiveness. This will include establishing parameters for the technical assistance the state will provide to each LEA in the state serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement.

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

Not applicable.

5. **Disproportionate Rates of Access to Educators (ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B)):** Describe how low-income and minority children enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are not served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers, and the measures the SEA will use to evaluate and publicly report the progress of the SEA with respect to such description.6

California has updated its State Plan to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators, approved by the U.S. Department of Education in August 2015, to include new data regarding the rates at which low-income and minority students are taught by unqualified, out-of-field, intern, or inexperienced teachers compared to non-low-income and non-minority students and to meet new requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by ESSA.

The 2016 State Plan to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators (which includes required definitions, rates, root causes of disproportionate rates, and strategies for addressing inequities) is posted on the CDE Educator Excellence Web page at [http://www.cde.ca.gov/pd/ee/](http://www.cde.ca.gov/pd/ee/). In this equity plan, the CDE has drawn upon data collected via the CALPADS, California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC), and CalEdFacts to create data profiles that provide information regarding the rates at which low-income and minority children are taught by unqualified, out-of-field, inexperienced, and intern teachers compared to the rates at which other children are taught by these teachers. At the request of stakeholders to provide a more precise depiction of statewide gaps, the plan includes equity gap data with California’s 10,453 schools organized by student demographics into deciles.

California does not currently collect data regarding teacher effectiveness, nor does the state have a definition for the term “ineffective teacher.” The CDE plans to consult with

---

6 Consistent with ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B), this description should not be construed as requiring a State to develop or implement a teacher, principal or other school leader evaluation system.
diverse stakeholders over the coming months regarding the most appropriate approach for addressing the statutory requirement to evaluate and publicly report data regarding “ineffective” teachers and the students they serve. In 2017–18, the state will collect data regarding out-of-field, inexperienced, underprepared, and intern teachers and publicly report this information in a report that will be provided to the SBE and posted on CDE Web pages.

Once the SBE has approved a definition of “ineffective teacher,” the CDE will develop an annual data profile that provides information regarding the rates at which low-income students and minority students are taught by “ineffective,” out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers compared to the rates at which other children are taught by these teachers. The state may continue to report additional data to the extent it is not incorporated into the definition of “ineffective.” Using this information, the CDE will prepare a report on the State’s progress toward eliminating equity gaps, will provide the report to the SBE on an annual basis, and will post the report on CDE Web pages.

LEAs with identified equity gaps will describe how they are addressing equitable access issues in their LCAP Addendum. LCAP Addenda will be reviewed by the CDE and approved by the SBE. Resources to assist LEAs in addressing equitable access are available on the CDE Educator Excellence Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/pd/ee/. Upon request, the CDE will provide technical assistance regarding resolving issues of disproportionate access. In addition, the CDE will monitor LEA strategies to address equity gaps through the federal program monitoring process.

**Table 2. California Educator Terms and Definitions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective teacher</td>
<td>This term is currently not defined. The CDE will work with stakeholders in the coming months to define “ineffective” and bring a recommendation to the SBE for approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-field teacher</td>
<td>A certificated employee in a teaching or services position for which the employee does not hold a legally recognized certificate, permit, or waiver with an appropriate authorization for the assignment or is not authorized for the assignment under another section of statute or regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inexperienced teacher</td>
<td>A teacher who has two or fewer years of teaching experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underprepared teacher</td>
<td>A teacher who is assigned based on the issuance of a Provisional Intern Permit, Short-term Staff Permit, or Variable or Short-term Waiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern teacher</td>
<td>A teacher who is assigned a District or University Intern Credential.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

California’s Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) sets eight priorities for school districts and charter schools (ten for county offices of education) and places significant emphasis on the improvement of school conditions for student learning. State Priority 6 specifically focuses on School Climate and requires LEAs to support the development of positive school climate through their LCAPs while considering suspension rates, pupil expulsion rates, and other local measures, including surveys of pupils, parents, and teachers on the sense of safety and school connectedness.
Progress for each of the LCFF priorities is tracked through state and local indicators and presented through evaluation rubrics adopted by the SBE. Suspension rates have been selected as a state indicator, and, as discussed in Section A.iv.e, are used as a measure of school quality. California’s strong commitment to the improvement of school conditions for student learning is further underscored by its selection of chronic absence as its additional K–8 academic measure under the ESSA. This is a reflection of the state’s understanding of the correlation of chronic absence with academic achievement and its utility as a key indicator of student risk.

Performance data from the evaluation rubrics is reported to the public through the California School Dashboard. With the implementation of this ESSA State Plan, LEAs will develop LCAP Addenda, which will draw from their LCAPs relevant data and goals that support development of positive school conditions for student learning.

An integrated state system of support including the CDE, CCEE, and COEs, as well as other state, regional, and local partners, will provide support for the development, implementation, and evaluation of LCAPs, LCAP Addenda, and school plans with a significant focus on the continuous improvement of conditions for student learning. This work will be supplemented by Title I, Part A, Title II, Part A, and Title IV, Part A resources.

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

California makes available a number of resources to assist LEAs in developing strategies to support students to make successful transitions. Curriculum frameworks include sections on content and pedagogy for each grade level, transitional kindergarten through grade 12, to help LEAs develop or improve coherent educational programs between feeder and receiving schools. The state sponsors regular statewide conferences, local institutes, and an online resource exchange to include presentations, workshops, and Q and A sessions by national, state, and local leaders to help disseminate best practices and guidance to schools served under Title I, Part A to improve or refine services and supports that ensure successful transitioning of students through their education continuum. California also has statutory requirements regarding pupil promotion and retention to support the use of appropriate promotion practices. The state is currently identifying articulation agreements that exist between our middle schools, high schools, and colleges.

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

Transitional kindergarten (TK) is the first year of a two-year kindergarten program that uses a modified kindergarten curriculum that is age and developmentally appropriate. A child is eligible for TK if they have their fifth birthday between September 2 and December 2. TK curriculum is aligned to the state-adopted academic content standards.
and frameworks, the California Preschool Learning Foundations, and California Preschool Curriculum Frameworks. Each elementary or unified school district must offer TK classes for all children eligible to attend. A child who completes one year in a TK program, may continue in a kindergarten program for one additional year.

Further, The California Mathematics Placement Act of 2015 requires the governing boards of LEAs that serve pupils entering grade nine to adopt “a fair, objective, and transparent mathematics placement policy” before the beginning of the 2016–17 school year. The mathematics placement policy must be adopted in a regularly scheduled public meeting. The law further supports successful transitions by authorizing the governing boards of LEAs serving pupils who are transitioning between elementary school and middle or junior high school to develop and implement a mathematics placement policy.

Each spring, all grade 11 students in California take the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for ELA and mathematics. These assessments, which are administered as part of the CAASPP System, also serve as an indicator of readiness for college-level coursework in English and mathematics and are used by the California State University (CSU) and participating California Community Colleges (CCCs) to determine Early Assessment Program (EAP) status. There are four possible EAP status levels: Ready, Conditionally Ready, Not Yet Ready, and Not Ready. “Ready” students are considered ready for English and/or mathematics college-level coursework and are exempt from having to take the CSU English Placement Test (EPT) and/or Entry Level Mathematics (ELM) exam. These students will be able to register in college degree-bearing courses upon enrolling in a CSU or a participating CCC. If a student’s results are at any level below “Ready,” they will have to meet requirements before registering for degree-bearing courses in participating colleges. Providing this information to students before they begin grade 12 has been shown to decrease the need for college remediation.

The state is also working to promote and expand student access to career pathways in the 15 Industry Sectors. For three years (2015–16, 2016–17, and 2017–18) the CDE is allocated $900 million to provide incentive funds to districts to expand and improve career technical educational (CTE) programs or in some cases to establish new programs.

As part of the emerging statewide system of support, California will incorporate ESSA and state resources to the greatest extent possible to ensure that LEAs and schools identified as needing additional assistance have the necessary support to develop or strengthen processes and procedures that lead to successful student transitions from pre-kindergarten to postsecondary.

B. Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children

The purpose of this program is to:

- Assist states in supporting high-quality and comprehensive educational programs and services during the school year and, as applicable, during summer or intersession periods that address the unique needs of migratory children.

- Ensure that migratory children who move among states are not penalized in any manner by disparities within the state in curriculum, graduation requirements, and challenging state academic standards.

- Ensure that migratory children receive full and appropriate opportunities to meet the same challenging state academic standards that all children are expected to meet.
• Help migratory children overcome educational disruption, cultural and language barriers, social isolation, various health-related problems, and other factors that inhibit the ability of such children to succeed.

• Help migratory children benefit from state and local systemic reforms.

It is estimated that California will receive $116.2 million in Title I, Part C funds to be used to administer the program and fund regional migrant education programs. In 2015–16, almost 97,000 migratory children in California were eligible to receive services under Title I, Part C.

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

   i. The full range of services that are available for migratory children from appropriate local, State, and Federal educational programs;

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

   Once a migrant family or youth is identified, a recruiter interviews the parent, guardian, or youth to determine eligibility for MEP services using a customizable interview script that is facilitated by the state’s data system, the Migrant Student Information System, or “MSIN 6.0.” An automated procedure in the MSIN 6.0 COEStar Performance Reporter produces a table that contains a list of all students who might be eligible to be counted or served by the program. To verify residence in years two and three of eligibility, the CDE requires that subgrantees make contact with all families and youth in their geographic areas at least once each year (typically on the anniversary of their qualifying arrival date). The subgrantee must document the nature of the contact (phone or in person), verify that children on the Certificate of Eligibility are still at the residence, verify if additional age-eligible children have joined the residence, and document if a worker has moved to seek or obtain employment. If a new qualifying move has been made, the recruiter must make a personal visit to the residence to complete a new Certificate of Eligibility. Children are not counted unless they have one or more of the following: valid qualifying move date, new residency date, or enrollment date (residency enrollment for non-attendees or a school enrollment for attendees) during the period in question.

   Students that are identified as migratory students receive the core instruction as provided through state funds. Students who are low-income and disadvantaged receive supplementary services from Title I, Part A. In California, about half of the migratory student population is identified as English learners and these students receive supplementary services through Title III. Additionally, migratory students
in California receive supplementary services in preschool through grade 12 and services for those identified as out-of-school youth. Collaboration between educational services and health agencies is coordinated by the 20 subgrantees.

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

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

California’s Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) reinforces joint planning among local, state, and federal programs serving migratory children. The LCFF emphasizes equity by focusing on student group performance and coordination of services and provides core and base services for all students, including migrant students. California’s new accountability system has an academic achievement indicator, a graduation rate indicator, and an English learner progress indicator amongst other state and federal indicators. Approximately half of all migrant students are English learners and having both the state and local indicators emphasize the accountability progress of English learners provides a mechanism to jointly plan applications for local, state, and federal funds and collaborate on services to be provided.

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

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

iv. Measurable program objectives and outcomes.

California assesses the unique educational needs of migratory children, including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school, through two different methods. First, the CDE requires that each subgrantee complete a local Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA). The CNA is conducted by an independent agency for each of the 20 MEP subgrantees and includes data collected from focus groups, including students and parents, staff surveys, and academic testing data for the region's migrant student population. The local CNA provides both the MEP subgrantees and the CDE with an independent assessment and evaluation of regional migrant student and program needs, and provides specific recommendations and solutions for improving outcomes for California’s migrant student population. Each local CNA
serves as the basis for program development and delivery in each respective service area. Additionally, each subgrantee completes an Individual Needs Assessment to identify individual student needs, including medical, social, and mental health needs, and develops a targeted intervention plan for each eligible student ages 3 to 21 on an annual basis.

The second method CDE uses to ensure that all educational needs of migratory children, including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school, are met and that the students participate effectively in school, consists of a three-part process: 1) identify needs via the CNA; 2) develop a State Services Delivery Plan (SSDP) based on the statewide CNA, which outlines the statewide needs, measurable program objectives and outcomes; and 3) revise the regional application based on the SSDP. Furthermore, the CDE requires that all Title I, Part C subgrantees provide an annual update using the regional application to monitor program and student achievement. Starting in 2017–18, the regional application will be on a three-year cycle, and subgrantees will have to provide an annual update on three sections: student needs, measurable program outcomes, and revision of programs based on outcomes. Subgrantees will revise the needs of migratory children in their regional application based on several data sources to ensure that all eligible student needs are reviewed annually. Additionally, subgrantees will revise their direct services and measurable program objectives and outcomes to implement a cycle of continuous improvement.

California is currently implementing a process to identify statewide needs of migratory children based on a meta-analysis of the 20 regional local CNAs and a review of statewide data. In February 2016, the CDE began a series of stakeholder meetings to discuss and prioritize the needs of migratory children that must be addressed in order for migratory children to participate effectively in school. The Statewide CNA report will be released in May 2017.

California is currently implementing a process to identify statewide measurable program objectives and outcomes for migratory children based on the development of the statewide CNA and input from stakeholders. California will have the updated SSDP, including the statewide measurable program objectives and outcomes, ready in June 2017.

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

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

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

California’s priorities for the use of Title I, Part C funds directly relate to the State’s evaluation of the unique educational needs of migratory children. The CNA identifies specific needs of migratory children. In turn, the SSDP guides the MEP in planning and service delivery at the state, regional, and local levels to address the needs of migratory children with a focus on students identified as Priority for Services (PFS).

The current process for identifying PFS children is conducted as an annual identification after the end of the Performance Period established by the U.S. Department of Education. This is done using the record of a move made during the regular school year within the Performance Period, in addition to assessment data for the Performance Period. After the child has been identified based on move and assessment scores (four months after the end of the period in which their move occurred), they are marked as PFS for that Performance Period, and are PFS in the following year if still present.

In 2016–17, the MSIN 6.0 system will function in real time for identifying children as PFS. All of the data required to make the PFS determination (based on moves and assessment scores) will be reported in a single system. If the move is within the regular school year and the child has a Statewide Student Identifier number, then his/her most current state assessment scores can be evaluated to immediately identify him/her as PFS. This immediate identification enables regions to target services sooner, allows for faster reporting to the MSIX, and allows for faster EDFacts file creation.

The CDE will have the responsibility for documenting the determination of PFS. The PFS determination will be made on a daily basis through the MSIN 6.0 system. Subgrantees (regional offices and LEAs that have MOUs or District Service Agreements [DSAs]) will be responsible for providing services appropriate to the child’s need.

The determination process will be immediate: children will be evaluated using the state’s criteria as soon as the county office of education documenting the move during the Performance Period is verified; subgrantees will be notified within 24 hours of the determination; and children identified as PFS will be monitored to ensure services are delivered.

Strategies to administer Title I, Part C funds may be updated to align with the emerging statewide system of support.

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

The purpose of this program is to:

- Improve educational services for children and youth in local, tribal, and state institutions for neglected or delinquent children and youth so that such children and youth have the opportunity to meet the same challenging state academic standards that all children in the state are expected to meet;

- Provide such children and youth with the services needed to make a successful transition from institutionalization to further schooling or employment; and

- Prevent at-risk youth from dropping out of school, and to provide dropouts and children and youth returning from correctional facilities, or institutions for neglected or
delinquent children and youth, with a support system to ensure their continued education and the involvement of their families and communities.

Local educational agencies (LEAs) and state agencies are eligible to receive funds for this program if they serve neglected or delinquent children as described in the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). In California, the state agency that receives Title I, Part D, subpart 1 funding is the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR). Generally, the CDCR’s share of the California’s Part D allocation is determined by the number of such students served in the CDCR multiplied by 40 percent of the average per-pupil expenditure in the state. It is estimated that California will receive $1.2 million in Title I, Part D, subpart 1 funds in 2017–18.

California also serves neglected, delinquent, and at-risk students under Title I, Part D, subpart 2, section 1421. Title I, Part D, subpart 2, funds are allocated to LEA, rather than the state, Part D programs. California allocates Part D, subpart 2 funds for supplemental education programs and services in detention center education programs. Part D, subpart 2, programs are administered through the county offices of education (COE). For administrative and funding allocation purposes under Part D, subpart 2, the COEs act as LEA. Part D, subpart 2 funds are generated through an annual survey of neglected or delinquent children in State and locally operated institutions. It is estimated that California will receive $21,057,740 in Title I, Part D, subpart 2 2017–18 funding. In school year 2015–16, Title I, Part D programs in California served nearly 52,000 students.

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

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

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

   California will increase annually its pre- and post-testing of youth in Title I, Part D programs in reading and mathematics, the number of students who earn a high school diploma or pass a high school equivalency exam, and the enrollment of students in career-related programs or in programs to continue their education. These goals and objectives are aligned and built upon the U.S. Department of Education’s leading indicators and will be used to assess the effectiveness of Title I, Part D programs in California. The CDE will develop and implement required regional training and technical assistance to funded agencies to support local and state level implementation of Title I, Part D requirements in alignment with the emerging statewide system of support.

D. Title II, Part A: Supporting Effective Instruction

The purpose of this program is to provide grants to states and subgrants to local educational agencies (LEAs) to:
• Increase student achievement consistent with the challenging state academic standards;

• Improve the quality and effectiveness of teachers, principals, and other school leaders;

• Increase the number of teachers, principals, and other school leaders who are effective in improving student academic achievement in schools; and

• Provide low-income and minority students greater access to effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders.

Under Title II, Part A, 95 percent of the state grant is subgranted to LEAs. The remaining 5 percent is used for administration and state-level activities. These funds are provided to States and LEAs based on a formula that considers the population and level of poverty. The California Department of Education (CDE) anticipates that California will receive $252 million in Title II, Part A funds in 2017–18. Of this amount, $239.4 million will be subgranted to LEAs, and the remaining $12.6 million will be dedicated to administrative and state-level activities. The ESSA provides California with an opportunity to reserve 3 percent of the Title II, Part A LEA subgrant allocation for activities for principals or other school leaders. Based on the estimate of $252 million, this represents $7,182,000. Allowable uses of Title II, Part A funds are described in sections 2101(c) and 2103 of the ESSA. In 2016–17 under the No Child Left Behind Act, 1,250 districts and direct-funded charter schools received Title II, Part A funds.

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

Note: Since 2010, California has been steadily supporting the transition to new standards for English language arts (ELA)/literacy, mathematics, English language development (ELD) and science. The State Board of Education (SBE) has updated the curriculum frameworks for each of these sets of standards and has also updated the curriculum framework for the history/social science standards.

Successful implementation of standards requires strong instructional leadership in every school and well-prepared teachers in every classroom. In order for any standards-based system to be successful, educators must possess a thorough understanding of what students are expected to know and be able to do, as well as an array of instructional strategies designed to support every student in meeting those expectations. California must continue to build the instructional capacity of its teachers and leaders to improve educational outcomes for its students.

In keeping with California’s deep commitment to educational equity, Title II, Part A resources will be used to build the capacity of California educators to successfully implement state academic content standards while emphasizing the importance of meeting the specific, and often multiple, learning needs of diverse students, including, but not limited to, English learners, students with disabilities, foster youth, and low-income students. Consistent with California’s theory of action and commitment to continuous improvement, state-level activities will be designed collaboratively by the CDE, SBE, California Collaborative for Educational Excellence (CCEE), county offices of Education (COEs), California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC), California Subject Matter Project (CSMP), and other entities as appropriate; informed by California School Dashboard data; and updated as necessary to flexibly address emerging statewide needs as they are identified. Key activities are described below.

Implementation of State Academic Content Standards: Currently, the CDE, SBE, and COEs are working in collaboration with other state, regional, and local partners to
support the implementation of state academic content standards. The Standards Implementation Steering Committee, Collaboration Committees, and Communities of Practice support standards implementation through collaborative and coordinated efforts at the state, regional, and local levels in the areas of curriculum, instruction, and professional learning.

California will build upon this work using Title II, Part A funds and funds available through related programs to support the dissemination and implementation of SBE adopted standards and frameworks, deploying a variety of strategies to provide professional learning opportunities for educators to support student achievement. Activities will be designed to address specific areas of need identified through the California School Dashboard, review of LEA Local Control and Accountability Plans (LCAPs) and LCAP Addenda, and surveys. These data points will be reviewed regularly and activities updated as necessary to support continuous improvement.

**Support for School Leaders:** To promote high-quality instruction and instructional leadership, California plans to leverage the optional 3 percent Title II, Part A LEA subgrant reservation to incorporate into the emerging statewide system of support resources and activities that will focus on developing and providing professional learning and other systems of support for principals and other school leaders. The initiative will emphasize the development of culturally competent leaders and leadership teams to guide and support teachers/staff in engaging students in differentiated teaching and learning so that all students graduate ready for success in college and careers.

Activities may include approaches and methods to collect and analyze data related to student achievement and well-being and educator workforce equitable distribution and labor-management collaboration; strategies to implement cycles of continuous improvement, based on data in making evidence-based decisions to solve problems of practice; engagement of K–12 principals and other school leaders, achieved through collegially selected topics of high interest (e.g., development of cultural competency and access to instructional resources) and professional learning opportunities; and strategies that establish and support distributed or shared leadership at the school site that include teacher leaders along with site administrators in communities of practice, supportive infrastructure, and adequate time for the work to unfold.

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

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

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

Title II, Part A funds will be used to collect and evaluate pertinent data, and then report on equitable access to teachers in schools that receive Title I, Part A funds. Consistent with California’s commitments to equity, continuous improvement, and local control, the state will incorporate resources and supports for LEA efforts to address issues regarding educator equity into the statewide system of support, and may use Title II, Part A funds for this purpose. Specific strategies will be developed within the context of the emerging
3. **System of Certification and Licensing (ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(B))**: Describe the State’s system of certification and licensing of teachers, principals, or other school leaders.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Figure 2. Chapter at a Glance of “Chapter 9: Access and Equity” of the English Language Arts/English Language Development Framework for California Public Schools Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve, p. 879

Access and Equity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Chapter at a Glance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>880</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>881</td>
<td>California’s Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>882</td>
<td>Standard English Learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>884</td>
<td>African American English Speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>886</td>
<td>Chicana/Chicano English Speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>888</td>
<td>English Learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>891</td>
<td>Reclassified English Proficient Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>891</td>
<td>Instructional Programs and Services for English Learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>893</td>
<td>Biliterate Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>893</td>
<td>Students Who are Deaf and Bilingual in ASL and Printed English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>894</td>
<td>Students Who are Deaf and Hard of Hearing Who Communicate with Spoken English or Simultaneous Communication, Including Sign Supported Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>895</td>
<td>Students Living in Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>897</td>
<td>Migrant Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>898</td>
<td>Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>899</td>
<td>Advanced Learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>902</td>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>905</td>
<td>Accommodations and Modifications for Students with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>907</td>
<td>Students with Autism Spectrum Disorders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>908</td>
<td>Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>910</td>
<td>Planning for and Supporting the Range of Learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>910</td>
<td>Universal Design for Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>913</td>
<td>Multi-Tiered System of Supports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>916</td>
<td>Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>920</td>
<td>Instructional Practices for Supporting Students Experiencing Difficulty Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>928</td>
<td>Linguistic and Cultural Congruence for ELs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>928</td>
<td>Literacy Learning and Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>929</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>930</td>
<td>Works Cited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

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

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

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

Data and consultation are at the heart of California’s school funding system. At the local level, LCAPs are updated annually, allowing for local evaluation of programs and activities and realignment of resources that is responsive to the evolving needs of educators, students, and the district community.
Supplementing the LCAP development process with its requirements for community engagement, LEAs must complete the LCAP Addendum, which is the mechanism by which LEAs address the local planning requirements of the ESSA. Specifically, LEAs must describe programs and activities they will engage in using their Title II, Part A funds. Therefore, the expenditure of these funds is planned for in consultation with the local school community.

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

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

California does not plan to utilize Title II, Part A funds to improve preparation programs. Investments to strengthen supports for educators will be made within California’s state system of support as described above.

E. Title III, Part A, Subpart 1: English Language Acquisition and Language Enhancement

The purposes of this program are to:

- Help ensure that English learners (ELs), including immigrant children and youth, attain English proficiency and develop high levels of academic achievement in English;

- Assist all ELs, including immigrant children and youth, to achieve at high levels in academic subjects so that all ELs can meet the same challenging state academic standards that all children are expected to meet;

- Assist teachers (including preschool teachers), principals and other school leaders, states, LEAs, and schools in establishing, implementing, and sustaining effective language instruction educational programs designed to assist in teaching ELs, including immigrant children and youth;

- Assist teachers (including preschool teachers), principals and other school leaders, states, and LEAs to develop and enhance their capacity to provide effective instructional programs designed to prepare ELs, including immigrant children and youth, to enter all-English instructional settings; and

- Promote parental, family, and community participation in language instruction educational programs for the parents, families, and communities of ELs.

It is anticipated that California will receive $167.6 million in Title III funds in 2017–18. Of the state’s Title III allotment, at least 95 percent must be allocated to local educational agencies (LEAs) and the remaining 5 percent may be used to carry out state activities described in ESSA Section 3111(b)(2); however, not more than 50 percent of this 5 percent may be used for state administration. LEAs that enrolled one or more EL and/or immigrant students during the previous fiscal year are eligible to receive Title III, Part A funding. In the case of immigrant education funds, the LEA must also meet the enrollment criteria for eligible
immigrant students. In 2015–16, around 1.3 million students in California were eligible to receive services under Title III, Part A.

As stated in the plan introduction, California is committed to aligning state and federal education policies to the greatest extent possible to develop an integrated local, state, and federal accountability and continuous improvement system grounded in the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF). The system promotes coherence across programs to better serve the needs of LEAs, schools, educators, and students; recognize the diverse and multidimensional characteristics of LEAs, schools, educators, and students, and support LEAs, schools, educators, and students in diverse and multidimensional ways; and systematically and collaboratively identify and resource opportunities to build the capacity of local, regional, and state educators and leaders to better serve students and families.

Key elements of this aligned coherent system include integration of LEA plan provisions with the Local Control and Accountability Plan required under LCFF, alignment of state and federal accountability metrics, and development of a coherent, multi-leveled state and federal support and intervention system.

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

The statewide California entrance procedures ensure that all students who may be ELs are assessed for such status using a valid and reliable instrument within 30 days after enrollment in a school in the state. California will replace the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) with the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) as the state’s English language proficiency (ELP) assessment in 2018. Validity of the ELPAC is assured through the processes used to develop the assessment instrument including content review, alignment studies, standard setting procedures, and comparison studies. Cronbach’s alpha, a measure of internal consistency, will be used to calculate reliability of the ELPAC. Inter-correlations and standard errors of measurement will also be reported.

California has established processes to include timely and meaningful consultation representing the geographic diversity of the state for all our current standardized, statewide entrance and exit procedures by engaging stakeholders in meetings throughout the state, hosting statewide conferences, trainings, soliciting participation in various committees, soliciting public comment during the regulations process and policy updates. Guidance documents and professional development are provided through various formats that provide access to stakeholders.

Pursuant to *Education Code* Section 313, the current standardized reclassification procedures for ELs are as follows, in accordance with the *California Code of Regulations*, Title 5, Section 11303:

1. Assessment of language proficiency using the state test of English language proficiency;
2. Teacher evaluation inclusive of a review of the student’s curriculum mastery;
3. Parent opinion and consultation, inclusive of a review of student data, and at which time the parent is provided opportunity to opine and question; and
4. Comparison of student performance in basic skills against an empirically established range of performance in basic skills based on the performance of English proficient students of the same age.

California ensures that the same standardized procedures are used for exiting students.
from the EL subgroup as are used for Title I reporting and accountability purposes. The ELPAC summative assessment will be administered as an operational assessment statewide in spring 2018. To ensure the exit from EL status is valid and reliable, a cut-score validation study will be conducted based on data received from the ELPAC summative assessment. Once the ELPAC is fully operational, California will examine the need to update the exit criteria.

2. **SEA Support for English Learner Progress (ESEA section 3113(b)(6))**: Describe how the SEA will assist eligible entities in meeting:

   i. The State-designed long-term goals established under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii), including measurements of interim progress towards meeting such goals, based on the State’s English language proficiency assessments under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(G); and

   ii. The challenging State academic standards.

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

   The California English Language Development Standards (CA ELD Standards) are designed to guide instruction so that ELs develop sufficient language to gain access to and engage in academic subjects, achieve in grade-level academic content, and meet state academic standards for college and career readiness. The CA ELD Standards were adopted in 2012 and are correlated to the English Language Arts (ELA) standards that were adopted in 2010. California is first in the nation to produce an integrated ELA/ELD framework and all subsequently adopted frameworks now include the integration of ELD. In 2015, a correspondence study was conducted to ensure the CA ELD Standards are aligned to both the science and mathematics standards. The study found a strong correlation between the language demands of the content and the CA ELD Standards. California ensures every content area framework incorporates the CA ELD Standards and the SBE adopts materials that are aligned to the content standards and the CA ELD Standards.

   ELs also participate in the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) system. ELs who have not attended a school in the U.S. within the last 12 months are exempted during that time from the assessments.

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

   The English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) measures the percent of EL students who are making progress toward language proficiency from one year to the next on the CELDT and the number of ELs who were reclassified from EL to fluent English proficient in the prior year. The CELDT has five performance levels, and the interim goal for every EL student is to progress at least one performance level each year. Therefore, the benchmark for all students is to advance one performance level a year. The newcomer long-term goal is to achieve proficiency within five years. The entry performance level determines the number of years expected to reach proficiency, but no less than one year progress is expected. It is important to note that California will transition to full implementation of the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) in the 2018–19 school year replacing the CELDT. The ELPI is reported on the California School Dashboard which can be found on the CDE California.
Accountability Model & School Dashboard Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/em/. Progress on the California School Dashboard as well as local metrics will be used to measure interim progress and achievement of the academic goals for ELs.

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

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

The state has established a system of monitoring LEAs receiving Title III funds through a CDE federal program monitoring (FPM) process. All LEAs in the state are divided into four cohorts. Two cohorts are subject to review each year. Thus, the CDE's FPM process includes a data review of 50 percent of the LEAs in the state to identify and conduct a total of 125 LEA on-site and online reviews during any given year. The remaining 50 percent of the LEAs in the state receive the data review the following year. A description of the FPM process, LEAs identified in each cohort, LEAs selected for online or on-site reviews, and program instruments can be found on the CDE Compliance Monitoring Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/cr/. Several items in the monitoring instrument for EL programs emphasize student achievement of English language proficiency.

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

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

Strategies to monitor and provide technical assistance regarding Title III, Part A funds will be updated to align with the emerging statewide system of support.

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

The purpose of this program is to improve students’ academic achievement by increasing the capacity of states, local educational agencies (LEAs), schools, and local communities to:
• Provide all students with access to a well-rounded education;
• Improve school conditions for student learning; and
• Improve the use of technology in order to improve the academic achievement and digital literacy of all students.

California anticipates receiving $58 million in Title IV, Part A funds. The state's allotment is based on its portion of the Title I appropriation, and similarly, LEAs receive funds under this part based on their portion of the state's Title I appropriation. Of the State's Title IV allotment, no less than 95 percent must be allocated to LEAs, not more than 1 percent may be used to administer the program, and the remaining 4 percent may be used by the state for activities described in the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Section 4104(b).

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

California plans to use Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 state-level activity funds to build the capacity of California educators to successfully implement state academic content standards while emphasizing the importance of meeting the specific, and often multiple, learning needs of diverse students, including, but not limited to, English learners, students with disabilities, foster youth, and low-income students. Specific activities and strategies are described in more detail in the Title II, Part A section of this plan.

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

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

1. Calculate the percentage of each LEA's Title I, Part A allocation from the total amount of Title I, Part A funding allocated to all LEAs by the state during the prior fiscal year.

2. Compute each LEA's share of the Title IV, Part A allocation by applying the above calculated percentage to the total amount of Title IV, Part A funds available for allocation.

3. If there are insufficient Title IV, Part A funds resulting in LEAs not receiving the minimum-allowed amount of $10,000, California will ratably reduce the LEA allocations of Title IV, Part A funding. This will involve a calculation by which a certain proportionate amount of each LEA allocation is reduced so that every applying LEA may receive at least the minimum allotment of $10,000 as pursuant to ESSA Section 4105(a)(2).

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

The purpose of this program is to provide opportunities for communities to establish or expand activities in community learning centers that:

• Provide opportunities for academic enrichment, including providing tutorial services to help students, particularly students who attend low-performing schools, to meet the challenging State academic standards;
• **Offer students a broad array of additional services, programs, and activities, such as youth development activities, service learning, nutrition and health education, drug and violence prevention programs, counseling programs, arts, music, physical fitness and wellness programs, technology education programs, financial literacy programs, environmental literacy programs, mathematics, science, career and technical programs, internship or apprenticeship programs, and other ties to an in-demand industry sector or occupation for high school students that are designed to reinforce and complement the regular academic program of participating students; and**

• **Offer families of students served by community learning centers opportunities for active and meaningful engagement in their children’s education, including opportunities for literacy and related educational development.**

*California estimates it will receive $113.7 million in Title IV, Part B funds in 2017–18, which funds a competitive grant program for eligible community learning centers. In 2016–17, under the No Child Left Behind Act, 687 programs were funded by the 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) program.*

1. **Use of Funds (ESEA section 4203(a)(2)):** Describe how the SEA will use funds received under the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program, including funds reserved for State-level activities.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. That propose to target services to students (and their families) who primarily attend schools that:
   a. Are implementing comprehensive support and improvement activities or targeted support and improvement activities under Section 1111(d) or other schools determined by the LEA to be in need of intervention and support to improve student academic achievement and other outcomes; and
   b. Enroll students who may be at risk for academic failure, dropping out of school, involvement in criminal or delinquent activities, or who lack strong positive role models;

2. Are submitted jointly by eligible entities consisting of at least one:
   a. LEA receiving funds under of Title I, Part A; and
   b. Another eligible entity\(^8\);

The applicant will be given this priority if it demonstrates that it is unable to

---

\(^8\) Eligible entities include LEAs, community based organizations, Indian tribes or tribal organizations, another public or private entity, or a consortium of two or more such agencies or organizations or entities.
partner with a community-based organization in reasonable geographic proximity and of sufficient quality.

3. Demonstrate that the activities proposed in the application:
   a. Are, as of the date of the submission of the application, not accessible to students who would be served; or
   b. Would expand accessibility to high-quality services that may be available in the community.

4. Replace an expiring grant. (This is a general state funding priority requirement.)

5. Will provide year-round expanded learning programming. (This is a state middle and elementary funding priority requirement.)

6. Have programs that have previously received funding, but are not currently expiring. (This is a state high school funding priority requirement.)

7. Propose expansion of existing grants up to the per site maximum. (This is a state high school funding priority requirement.)

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

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

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

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

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

The purpose of this program is to address the unique needs of rural school districts that frequently lack the personnel and resources needed to compete effectively for federal competitive grants and receive formula grant allocations in amounts too small to be effective in meeting their intended purposes. Under Title V, Part B, Subpart 2, the U.S. Department of Education makes allocations to states, which in turn make subgrants to eligible local educational agencies (LEAs). An LEA is eligible for an allocation under the Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) Program if three criteria are met:

- Rural criterion: All schools served by the LEA have a locale code of 6, 7, or 8 (assigned by the National Center for Education Statistics), or if a state government agency defines the location of the LEA as rural;
• Low-Income criterion: 20 percent or more of the children age 5 to 17 served by the LEA are from families with incomes below the poverty line (as determined by the U.S. Census Bureau), and;

• An LEA is not eligible to receive funds under the Title V, Part B, Subpart 1 program.

Grant funds awarded to LEAs under this subpart can be used for any of the following:

• Activities authorized under Title I, Part A
• Activities authorized under Title II, Part A
• Activities authorized under Title III
• Activities authorized under Title IV, Part A
• Parental involvement activities

California will work to ensure that these funds are used in concert with an integrated system of support. A state receiving a grant under this subpart may not use more than 5 percent of the amount of the grant for State administrative costs and to provide technical assistance to eligible LEAs. It is estimated that California will receive $3.5 million in 2017–18 Title V, Part B, Subpart 2 funds. In 2016–17, under the No Child Left Behind Act, 58 district and direct-funded charter schools received funds under the Rural and Low-Income School Program.

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

To support California students, the RLIS Program objectives will include, but will not be limited to, ensuring that all eligible LEAs are aware of, and have the ability to apply for and receive RLIS funding; ensuring that all eligible LEAs use the RLIS fund to effectively support other specified federal programs; and ensuring that RLIS LEAs report annually on allowable uses of funds through the Consolidated Application Reporting System.

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

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

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

The Education for Homeless Children and Youth (EHCY) program is authorized under Title VII, Subtitle B of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11431 et seq.) (McKinney-Vento Act). The McKinney-Vento Act is designed to address the challenges that homeless children and youths have faced in enrolling, attending, and succeeding in school. Under the McKinney-Vento Act, states must ensure that each homeless child and youth has equal access to the same free, appropriate public education, including a public preschool education, as other children and youths. Homeless children and youths must have access to the educational and related services that they need to enable them to meet the same challenging state academic standards that all students are expected to meet. States and local educational agencies (LEAs) are required to review and undertake steps to revise
laws, regulations, practices, or policies that may act as barriers to the identification, enrollment, attendance, or success in school of homeless children and youths.

The McKinney-Vento Act under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) includes, among other things, new or changed requirements focused on:

- **Identification of homeless children and youths;**

- **Preschool-aged homeless children, including clarification that local liaisons must ensure that these children and their families have access to and receive services, if eligible, under LEA-administered preschool programs, including Head Start, Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (Early Intervention Program for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities), and other preschool programs administered by the LEA;**

- **Collaboration and coordination with other service providers, including public and private child welfare and social services agencies; law enforcement agencies; juvenile and family courts; agencies providing mental health services; domestic violence agencies; child care providers; runaway and homeless youth centers; providers of services and programs funded under the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act; and providers of emergency, transitional, and permanent housing, including public housing agencies, shelter operators, and operators of transitional housing facilities;**

- **Professional development and technical assistance at both the state and local levels;**

- **Removing enrollment barriers, including barriers related to missed application or enrollment deadlines, fines, or fees; records required for enrollment, including immunization or other required health records, proof of residency, or other documentation; or academic records, including documentation for credit transfer;**

- **School stability, including the expansion of school of origin to include preschools and receiving schools and the provision of transportation until the end of the school year, even if a student becomes permanently housed;**

- **Privacy of student records, including information about a homeless child or youth’s living situation; and**

- **The dispute resolution process.**

California anticipates receiving $10 million in 2017–18 EHCY funds, the majority of which is subgranted to LEAs based on the number of homeless children and youth enrolled in schools served by the LEA. In 2016–17, 61 LEAs received EHCY funds.

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

LEAs identify and track homeless students using a variety of methods including but not limited to self-identification, questions on registration forms, data queries, and in-take questionnaires. Each LEA is required to identify and track the number of homeless students by grade level in the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS), which houses student-level data including student demographics, course data, discipline, assessment, staff assignments, and other data for state and federal reporting.

These categories are based on the requirements outlined in the Consolidated State Performance Report that is submitted to the U.S. Department of Education annually. The data provided through CALPADS serves as the California Department of Education’s
(CDE’s) means of identifying homeless children and youth in the State.

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

The CDE is currently in the process of developing an intake template that will be designed to collect information related to the individual needs of the homeless students that a school or district serves. Staff will provide the tool and relevant trainings on using the template to LEAs, measure the use of the template through CARS reporting mechanisms, and encourage its use to assess the needs of homeless youth across the state. Additionally, each LEA is required to identify at least one homeless education liaison who is charged with representing the interests of the homeless students that the LEA serves, assessing the needs of these students, ensuring that needs are addressed by the appropriate entity, and serving as a resource to parents, families, and school and LEA personnel.

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

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

California has revised its dispute resolution process to improve the process and better align with federal requirements and intends to conduct further revisions to the dispute resolution process in 2017 to include more specific language regarding timelines, roles of all stakeholders, student-centered factors, and eligibility to facilitate the prompt resolution of disputes.

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

The process is posted on the CDE’s Resources for Homeless Children and Youths Web page at [http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/hs/cv/disputeres.asp](http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/hs/cv/disputeres.asp). The CDE will continue to provide professional development and technical assistance to LEAs regarding the dispute resolution process to ensure effective implementation.

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

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

The CDE will develop, disseminate, and post training modules on various homeless education topics for principals, teachers, liaisons, health care providers, outside agencies, and registrars. These training modules will include all EHCY provisions under the ESSA, such as an overview of EHCY, definitions, identification, enrollment, transportation, collaboration, dispute resolution, unaccompanied youths, preschool-age students, and Title I, Part A reservation funds. The CDE also routinely offers professional development and trainings on homeless education to local school attendance review boards, which are comprised of school personnel and other relevant stakeholders.

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

4. Access to Services (722(g)(1)(F) of the McKinney-Vento Act): Describe procedures that ensure that:

i. Homeless children have access to public preschool programs, administered by the SEA or LEA, as provided to other children in the State;

The CDE will continue to coordinate and collaborate with Head Start, Early Head Start, and the Interagency Coordinated Council and offer professional development and technical assistance to LEAs as well as to preschool programs regarding homeless education and preschool collaboration. There will be an emphasis on identification, enrollment, and transportation with an encouragement for LEAs and preschool programs to establish a case management process to meet the needs of homeless preschoolers. Additionally, the CDE plans to add a question on the Homeless Education Implementation and Policy page in the CARS regarding the number of homeless preschoolers enrolled by an LEA- or state-run preschool program.

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

The CDE will undertake a variety of activities to support access to secondary education for homeless youth. The CDE will continue to implement state policies (AB 1806 and AB 1166) that enable homeless students to complete the school district’s high school graduation requirements within a fifth year or to complete state graduation requirements. The CDE will train LEAs to analyze their homeless students’ data available in the California School Dashboard and other sources, including dropout rates and graduation rates, to determine homeless students’ needs and ways to collaborate and coordinate with various agencies to meet these needs. The CDE has disseminated resources, sample templates, and presentations on credit recovery and partial credit acceptance. Currently, the
California Education Code requires LEAs to accept appropriate credit for full or partial coursework, and the CDE will update the 2007 Granting and Transferring of Partial Course Credit letter to reflect new requirements under state policies and the ESSA.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Within the training modules mentioned above, the CDE will provide an overview of the requirements and showcase successful implementation strategies. These modules will be for any stakeholder to learn about state and federal law with a focus on collaboration and coordination with higher education, new state laws, and the process of completing the Free Application for Federal Student Aid. The CDE will assist in various ways with the implementation of California’s AB 801 (2016), which states a postsecondary educational institution must designate a staff member to serve as the Homeless and Foster Student Liaison. This staff member can be employed within the financial aid office, or another appropriate office or department. The Homeless and Foster Student Liaison will be responsible for understanding the provisions of the federal Higher Education Act pertaining to financial aid eligibility of homeless youth, including unaccompanied homeless youth. The liaison shall assist these students in applying for and receiving federal and state financial aid and other available services. Creating connections between LEA homeless liaisons, school counselors, and the Homeless and Foster Student Liaisons is essential for homeless youth to prepare for college.

Appendix A: Measurements of interim progress

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

A. Academic Achievement
The ability for LEAs or schools to determine interim progress goals, including for lower performing student groups, is built into the California Model. The CDE has produced a report that indicates where schools and student groups are on the five-by-five colored grid, allowing schools to determine improvement needed to progress toward the long-term goals and the differential improvement needed to close achievement gaps that exist for particular student groups. For example, based on a current Status, how much improvement is needed to be High (Status) and Maintained (Change) or above? Dividing that by the number of years left to reach the goal provides the average annual Change needed to reach the goal within the period of time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELA Academic Indicator – Distance from Level 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Math Academic Indicator – Distance from Level 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 or more points above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Very High
45 or more points above

High
10 points above to less than 45 points above

Medium
5 points below to less than 10 points above

Low
More than 5 points below to 70 points below

Very Low
More than 70 points below
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 points below to less than 35</td>
<td>More than 5 points below to 25 points below</td>
<td>More than 25 points below to 95 points</td>
<td>More than 95 points below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>points above</td>
<td></td>
<td>below</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Staff expect that the State Board of Education will adopt performance standards at its September 2017 meeting for the approved College/Career Indicator, which includes Grade 11 assessment results for English/language arts and mathematics. This section will be updated to reflect those performance standards, once approved.
B. Graduation Rates
The ability for LEAs or schools to determine interim progress goals, including for lower performing student groups, is built into the California Model. The CDE has produced a report that indicates where schools and student groups are on the five-by-five colored grid, allowing schools to determine improvement needed to progress toward the long-term goals and the differential improvement needed to close achievement gaps that exist for particular student groups. For example, based on a current Status, how much improvement is needed to be High (Status) and Maintained (Change) or above? Dividing that by the number of years left to reach the goal provides the average annual Change needed to reach the goal within the period of time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduation Rate Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.0% or greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.0% to less than 95.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.0% to less than 90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.0% to less than 85.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 67.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency

The ability for LEAs or schools to determine interim progress goals, including for lower performing student groups, is built into the California Model. The CDE has produced a report that indicates where schools and student groups are on the five-by-five colored grid, allowing schools to determine improvement needed to progress toward the long-term goals and the differential improvement needed to close achievement gaps that exist for particular student groups. For example, based on a current Status, how much improvement is needed to be High (Status) and Maintained (Change) or above? Dividing that by the number of years left to reach the goal provides the average annual Change needed to reach the goal within the period of time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Learner Progress Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ESSA State Plan Development: Communications, Outreach, and Consultation with Stakeholders: March – April 2017

States are required to consult with diverse stakeholders at multiple points during the design, development, and implementation of their Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) state plans. The California Department of Education (CDE) is committed to ensuring a transparent transition to the new law and developing an ESSA Consolidated State Plan (State Plan) that is informed by the voices of diverse Californians. A summary of communications, outreach, and consultation activities conducted by CDE staff in March and April 2017 is provided below.

**Date:** March 13, 2017  
**Meeting:** California Conference on American Indian Education  
**Participants:** Educators, parents, families, students, tribal leaders, and CDE staff  
**Details:**

CDE staff presented an overview of the ESSA and provided an update on ESSA State Plan development. Staff highlighted opportunities to participate in the plan development process and presented on specific opportunities for American Indian Education under ESSA.

---

**Date:** March 15, 2017  
**Meeting:** UC Davis Resourcing Excellence in Education Meeting  
**Participants:** UC Davis Resourcing Excellence in Education staff and CDE staff  
**Details:**

CDE staff provided an update on ESSA State Plan development and discussed opportunities to improve instructional quality using federal funds provisioned under ESSA.

---

**Date:** March 17, 2017  
**Meeting:** State and Federal Programs Directors Meeting  
**Participants:** State and Federal Program Directors and CDE staff  
**Details:**

CDE staff provided an update on ESSA State Plan development, including an update regarding federal regulations, the new ESSA State Plan Template, local planning requirements for 2017–18, the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) Addendum, and school improvement reservations under ESSA Section 1003.

---

**Date:** March 17, 2017  
**Meeting:** Bilingual Coordinators Network  
**Participants:** Bilingual Coordinators from county offices of education (COEs) and local educational agencies (LEAs) and CDE staff  
**Details:**

CDE staff provided an update on ESSA State Plan development, including an update regarding federal regulations and local planning requirements for 2017–18. Staff provided an overview of the guiding principles and framework for the plan and
highlighted the upcoming opportunities to participate in plan development during Phase IV of stakeholder engagement.

**Date:** March 27, 2017  
**Meeting:** University Principal Preparation Initiative Meeting  
**Participants:** Teams from seven states, including California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) staff and CDE staff.  
**Details:**  
Meeting participants discussed opportunities in the ESSA to build the capacity of education leaders.

**Date:** March 29, 2017  
**Meeting:** Statewide System of Support Meeting  
**Participants:** California County Superintendents Educational Services Association staff, California Collaborative for Educational Excellence staff, COE staff, SBE staff, and CDE staff.  
**Details:**  
Participants discussed the emerging statewide system of support, roles and responsibilities of each agency, and next steps for continued collaboration.

**Date:** April 3, 2017  
**Meeting:** Child Nutrition Advisory Council Meeting  
**Participants:** Child Nutrition Advisory Council members and CDE staff  
**Details:**  
CDE staff provided an update on ESSA State Plan development, including an update regarding federal regulations. Staff provided an overview of the guiding principles and framework for the plan and highlighted the upcoming opportunities to participate in plan development during Phase IV of stakeholder engagement.

**Date:** April 12, 2017  
**Meeting:** Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) Equity Coalition  
**Participants:** Representatives from Public Advocates; The California Association for Bilingual Education; National Center for Youth Law; EdVoice; The Education Trust – West; Californians Together; Children Now, SBE staff, and CDE staff  
**Details:**  
CDE and SBE staff provided an update regarding ESSA State Plan development and discussed opportunities to collaborate during Phase IV of stakeholder engagement to promote participation.

**Date:** April 13, 2017  
**Meeting:** California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG) Meeting  
**Participants:** CPAG members, SBE members, CDE staff, SBE staff, and the public  
**Details:**
CDE staff provided an update on ESSA State Plan development, including an update on local planning requirements for 2017–18. Staff solicited feedback from CPAG members regarding the draft LCAP Addendum.

**Date:** April 14, 2017  
**Meeting:** Consortium for the Implementation of Common Core Stakeholder Meeting  
**Participants:** Consortium for the Implementation of Common Core members and CDE staff  
**Details:**

CDE staff presented an overview of the ESSA and provided an update on ESSA State Plan development, including the guiding principles, framework for the plan, and federal regulations. Staff highlighted opportunities to participate in the plan development process during Phase IV of stakeholder engagement. Staff also presented ways to build capacity for implementing state academic content standards utilizing ESSA resources.

**Date:** April 17, 2017  
**Meeting:** California Teachers Association Meeting  
**Participants:** California Teachers Association staff, SBE staff, and CDE staff  
**Details:**

CDE staff shared an update regarding ESSA State Plan development and solicited feedback from California Teachers Association staff about ESSA requirements regarding educator equity.

**Date:** April 21, 2017  
**Meeting:** State and Federal Programs Directors’ Meeting  
**Participants:** State and Federal Program Directors and CDE staff  
**Details:**

CDE staff provided an update on ESSA State Plan development and the draft LCAP Addendum. Staff also highlighted opportunities to participate in plan development during Phase IV of stakeholder engagement.

**Date:** April 24 – 25, 2017  
**Meeting:** National Governors Association Human Capital Learning Lab: Building Aligned Teacher and Principal Pipelines  
**Participants:** Teams from 15 states, including CTC staff, SBE staff, and CDE staff  
**Details:**

Meeting participants discussed opportunities in the ESSA to support the development of an aligned statewide system for recruiting, training, and supporting teachers and principals.

**Other Communication Channels**
Below is a table and graph displaying the total number of Web page views for the CDE ESSA Web pages since their inception in March 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Page Views</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>2,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>5,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>7,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>12,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>8,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>9,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>9,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>9,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>16,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>11,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>14,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>20,866</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below is a table and graph displaying the number of CDE ESSA listserv messages and the number of subscribers to the CDE ESSA listserv since its inception in April 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Subscribers</th>
<th>Messages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>1,144</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>1,253</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>1,542</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>1,587</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>1,744</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>1,774</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>