



CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

JANUARY 2017 AGENDA

SUBJECT	
Developing an Integrated Local, State, and Federal Accountability and Continuous Improvement System: Approval of the Performance Standards for the Academic Indicator; Review of Growth Model Selection Criteria; Approval of Self-Reflective Tools for Remaining Local Performance Indicators; Update on Continuing Developmental Work on the Evaluation Rubrics; and Update on the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence Activities.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Action <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information <input type="checkbox"/> Public Hearing

SUMMARY OF THE ISSUE(S)

California's new accountability and continuous improvement system is being built on the foundations of the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF). The new local, state, and federal accountability system will provide a more complete picture of what contributes to a positive educational experience for students by reporting performance on multiple measures across the LCFF priorities.

The State Board of Education (SBE) is required to develop an accountability tool, known as evaluation rubrics that assists LEAs in identifying strengths, weaknesses, and areas in need of improvement across all LCFF priorities. The SBE adopted the evaluation rubrics, including the performance standards for all the local performance indicators and state indicators, except the Academic Indicator, at the September 2016 SBE meeting.

The California Department of Education (CDE) withdrew a recommendation to the SBE for using performance levels in the Academic Indicator at the November 2016 SBE meeting to allow staff to develop a methodology that uses scale scores to measure school progress. This item includes a new recommended methodology for the Academic Indicator based on scale scores and a proposed definition for the English learner (EL) student group.

This item is the twelfth in a series of regular updates on California's progress towards transitioning to an integrated local, state, and federal accountability and continuous improvement system based on multiple measures, as defined by the LCFF. The purpose of this item is to present the SBE with update on the development of the evaluation rubrics and recommend action on the remaining unresolved issues from the November 2016 meeting.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommend that the SBE take the following action:

1. Adopt the performance standards for the Academic Indicator, based on student test scores on English Language Arts/Literacy (ELA) and Mathematics for grades 3–8, that includes results from the second year of Smarter Balanced tests, and the definition of the EL student group for the Academic Indicator, as reflected in a forthcoming addendum.
2. Approve proposed self-reflection tools for local educational agencies (LEAs) to determine progress on the local performance indicators for Implementation of State Academic Standards (Priority 2) and Parent Engagement (Priority 3), as reflected in a forthcoming addendum.

BRIEF HISTORY OF KEY ISSUES

Education Code (EC) Section 52064.5 identifies three statutory purposes for the LCFF evaluation rubrics: to support LEAs in identifying strengths, weaknesses and areas for improvement; to assist in determining whether LEAs are eligible for technical assistance; and to assist the State Superintendent of Public Instruction in determining whether LEAs are eligible for more intensive state support/intervention.

Given the central role of the evaluation rubrics and the Web-based rubrics system in the emerging local, state, and federal accountability and continuous improvement system, staff recommend that the SBE adopt the proposed cut scores for the Academic Indicator.

Attachment 1 provides a summary of the performance standards for the Academic Indicator based on the approved methodology to establish cut points and performance categories for state indicators. This attachment provides the recommended cut scores for the Academic Indicator based on the proposed scale score methodology, which includes grades three through eight Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment results. Also provided is a summary analysis of the inclusion and/or exclusion of reclassified fluent-English-proficient students from the EL student group in the Academic Indicator.

Attachment 2 includes recommended growth model selection criteria and provides a draft timeline for the development of a growth model.

Attachment 3 provides recommendations on the self-reflection tools and menu of local measures that LEAs can use to determine progress on the local performance indicators. The tools and measures are revised based on feedback from stakeholders, including the California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG).

Attachment 4 provides information on the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence Component I workshops.

Attachment 5 provides an updated draft timeline for the integrated, local, state, and federal accountability and continuous improvement system that includes a summary of outreach with stakeholders.

Attachment 6 contains *EC* sections referencing the LCFF.

SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION DISCUSSION AND ACTION

In December 2016, the SBE received the following information memoranda:

- Overview of Course Enrollment/Completion Data Collection
<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-dsib-amard-nov16item01.doc>
- Update on the Draft of the Local Performance Indicators: Implementation of State Academic Standards (Priority 2) and Parent Engagement (Priority 3)
<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-sbe-dec16item01.doc>
- Summary of State Board of Education Actions Related to Adopting the Local Control Funding Formula Evaluation Rubrics
<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-sbe-dec16item02.doc>

In November 2016, the SBE approved the proposed self-reflection tools for LEAs to determine progress on the local performance indicators for Basics (Priority 1), School Climate (Priority 6), Coordination of Services for Expelled Students (Priority 9), and Coordination of Services for Foster Youth (Priority 10). The SBE also clarified that LEAs must report the results of the local measurement of progress to their local governing boards at a regularly scheduled public meeting of the local governing board. The SBE added language to the criteria to determine LEA eligibility for technical assistance and intervention under the LCFF statutes approved at the September 2016 SBE meeting, to clarify the applicability of the criteria to charter schools.

Additionally, the CDE withdrew a recommendation to adopt the performance standards for the academic indicator based on the percent of students who met or exceeded standards for English language arts and mathematics Smarter Balanced test results for grades three through eighth. The CDE agreed to present a revised recommendation using scale scores to measure schools progress at the January SBE 2017 meeting.

In October 2016, the SBE received the following information memoranda:

- An update on the proposed revisions to the LCAP template and instructions (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-exec-lasso-sep16item01.doc>)
- Proposed approaches on the use of self-assessment tools and menu of local measures for LEAs to determine progress on the local performance indicators (September CPAG/SBE Study Session: <http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/cc/cp/documents/memo-cpag-sep16item02.doc> and October CPAG/SBE Study Session: <http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/cc/cp/documents/memo-cpag-oct16item04.doc>).
- An overview of the historical information on alternative school accountability and upcoming activities in the development of the new alternate accountability system (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-dsib-amard-oct16item03.doc>).
- An update on the progress of the English Learner Indicator Work Group (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-dsib-amard-oct16item02.doc>).

In September 2016, the SBE approved the performance standards for all local indicators and all but one state indicators, and the annual process for the SBE to review the rubrics to determine if updates or revisions are necessary. The SBE also directed CDE staff to: (1) develop recommended cut scores and performance categories for the ELA and mathematics assessments in grades three through eight, (2) further develop the statement of model practices, (3) continue the developmental work on the CCI (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr16/documents/sep16item01.doc>).

In August 2016, the SBE received the following information memoranda:

- An update on developing the new accountability and continuous improvement system draft timeline (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-sbe-aug16item01.doc>)
- A framework for supporting local educational agencies and schools (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-sbe-aug16item02.doc>)
- An overview of the college/career indicator structure and proposed measures (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-dsib-amard-aug16item01.doc>)
- Proposed percentile cut scores for state indicators (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-dsib-amard-aug16item02rev.doc>)

In July 2016, the SBE approved a design for the LCFF evaluation rubrics that includes: a measure of college/career readiness; a methodology for establishing standards for the LCFF priorities that are not addressed by the state indicators; the inclusion of standard

for the use of school climate surveys to support a broader assessment on school climate (Priority 6); the inclusion of an equity report; and directed staff to develop an updated timeline (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr16/documents/jul16item02.doc>).

In June 2016, the SBE received the following information memoranda:

- Update on possible student-growth models to communicate Smarter Balanced Results
(<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-dsib-amard-jun16item01.doc>)
- A summary of the decisions on accountability and continuous improvement that were approved at the May 2016 meeting
(<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-sbe-jun16item01.doc>)
- Draft statements of model practices
(<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-sbe-jun16item02.doc>)
- Process to identify options for school climate surveys and a composite measure of English learner proficiency (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-dsib-amard-jun16item02.doc>)

In May 2016, the SBE approved a design for the LCFF evaluation rubrics that includes: a set of state indicators; a methodology for calculating performance as a combination of status and change for the state indicators in order to differentiate performance at the LEA and school levels, and for student groups; a component that supports the use of local data; and concepts for a top-level display. The SBE also directed staff to prepare a recommendation for the July 2016 Board meeting for establishing standards for the LCFF priorities that are not addressed by the state indicators and options for incorporating college and career readiness, local climate surveys, and an English learner composite into the overall LCFF evaluation rubrics design (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr16/documents/may16item02revised.doc>).

In April 2016, the SBE received the following information memoranda:

- A summary of the decisions on accountability and continuous improvement that were approved at the March 2016 meeting
(<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-amard-apr16item01.doc>)
- Further analysis on potential key indicators
(<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-dsib-amard-apr16item02.doc>)
- Additional analysis on the graduation rate to inform the methodology to set standards for performance and expectations for improvement
(<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-dsib-amard-apr16item04.doc>)

- LCAP template revisions (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-exec-lasso-apr16item01.doc>)

In March 2016, the SBE reviewed the proposed architecture of the single, coherent accountability and continuous improvement system and options for developing a concise set of state indicators for accountability and continuous improvement purposes. The SBE took action to direct staff to proceed with further analysis and design work to develop a complete draft of the LCFF evaluation rubrics prototype (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr16/documents/mar16item23.doc>).

In February 2016, the SBE received a series of information memoranda on the following topics:

- Updated timeline that details the proposed transition to the new accountability and continuous improvement system (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-sbe-feb16item01.doc>).
- Common terminology and definition of terms used to describe the proposed architecture for the new accountability and continuous improvement system (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-sbe-feb16item02.doc>).
- Draft architecture that clarifies how the pieces of the emerging, integrated accountability system will fit together (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-sbe-feb16item03.doc>).
- Further analysis on the graduation rate indicator to illustrate potential standards (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-sbe-feb16item04.doc>).
- Options for key indicators that satisfy the requirements of the LCFF and ESSA (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-sbe-feb16item05.doc>).
- Overview of student-level growth models for Smarter Balanced summative assessment results (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-dsib-amard-feb16item01.doc>).
- Review of college and career indicator (CCI) options (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-dsib-amard-feb16item02.doc>).

FISCAL ANALYSIS (AS APPROPRIATE)

The 2016–17 state budget includes \$71.9 billion in the Proposition 98 Guarantee. This includes an increase of more than \$2.9 billion to support the continued implementation of LCFF and builds upon the investment of more than \$12.8 billion provided over the last three years. This increase will bring the formula to 96 percent of full implementation.

ATTACHMENT(S)

- Attachment 1: Proposed Performance Standards for the Academic Indicator Based on Student Test Scores in English Language Arts/Literacy and Mathematics for Grades Three through Eight, Definition of the English Learner Subgroup (1 Page)
- Attachment 2: Growth Model Selection Criteria (2 Pages)
- Attachment 3: Proposed Approach to Determine Progress on the Local Performance Indicators for Implementation of State Academic Standards (Priority 2) and Parent Engagement (Priority 3) (1 Page)
- Attachment 4: Overview of California Collaborative for Educational Excellence Component I Workshops (1 Page)
- Attachment 5: Draft Timeline for the Integrated, Local, State, and Federal Accountability and Continuous Improvement System, Including Outreach with Stakeholders (10 Pages)
- Attachment 6: California *Education Code* Sections 52064.5, 47607, 47607.3, 52071, 52071.5, 52072, 52072.5, 52060, 52066, 52064, and 52052 (18 Pages)

**Proposed Performance Standards for the Academic Indicator Based on
Student Test Scores in English Language Arts/Literacy and Mathematics for
Grades Three through Eight**

Note: Staff have collected feedback on the Academic Indicator from the California Practitioners Advisory Group and other stakeholder groups. The California Department of Education is presenting the recommendations for the Academic Indicator to the Technical Design Group on December 16, 2016; therefore, a summary of all feedback with the staff recommendation will be posted as an addendum to this item.

Growth Model for the School and District Accountability System: Selection Criteria

In September 2016, the State Board of Education (SBE) approved a state accountability system that measures both status and change across several indicators. Attachment 1 of this item proposes a methodology that uses scale scores to produce the Academic Indicator. In the initial release of the evaluation rubrics, the proposed methodology to determine both status and change for the Academic Indicator. However, for future releases of the evaluation rubrics, the SBE has indicated an interest in developing a student-level growth model as the change component for the Academic Indicator. This attachment is the first in a series on the change component (i.e., growth model) of the Academic Indicator.

The first step in the selection of a growth model is the clear understanding of the purpose and questions that the model will be asked to answer. In general, growth models can be categorized into three overarching categories: absolute, relative, and projections. Each type of growth model has several potential variations.

In order to guide the process for review of the various models, the California Department of Education (CDE) is recommending that the SBE engage in a conversation around characteristics desired for growth reporting. Based on feedback from the SBE on the suggested selection criteria, the criteria will establish the characteristics to be considered in the review. The following are a suggested set of criteria to be applied in evaluating the various types of growth models. In the event that no single model meets all of the criteria for selection, it is suggested that ease of communicating model results be central to the selection of models for further study and possible adoption.

Suggested Selection Criteria

1. Conform to rigorous technical standards.

The growth model should measure academic progress over time of schools, local educational agencies (LEAs), and the state. It should produce precise information that is valid for its purpose. The model should have the capacity to produce reliable results for student groups as small as 30.

2. Capable of being included in accountability systems.

The growth model should fit into a multiple measures approach of looking at state and district academic progress over time as envisioned in the SBE approved accountability system. Additionally, information should be consumable and usable by LEAs for the purpose of establishing local goals and evaluating local programs (e.g., local control accountability plans).

3. Provide a measure of academic growth across the continuum of performance.

The growth model should allow for progress to be measured across the continuum of academic achievement. The model should have the capacity to be used to evaluate academic achievement gaps between students groups in such a way as to make determinations about the narrowing of those gaps. The information on which the growth model is based should be consistent from year to year and reflect how students performed in terms of where they started in the previous year.

4. Provide for inclusion of all students.

The growth model should be applied to all students who earn a valid score on the English language arts/literacy and mathematics statewide assessments. The information to produce this information should be based only on student test scores and not on any other school or student characteristics.

5. Provide information on academic progress that is easily communicated to educators and the public.

The information from the growth model should be able to be displayed in a manner that stakeholder groups can understand when applied to schools, LEAs, and the state.

Selection Timeline

The following timeline outlines the proposed approach to the final selection of a growth model and is inclusive of the outreach activities that should occur prior to the final selection by the SBE. Note: this timeline is subject to change.

Date	Activity
January 2017	SBE engages in conversation and provides direction on the growth model selection criteria.
February 2017	The CDE, along with technical advisors, reviews potential growth models to the SBE suggested growth model selection criteria.
March 2017	The CDE presents to the SBE the results of the review of the growth models to the selection criteria. The CDE recommends, and the SBE takes action on, which growth models to conduct simulations.
Spring/Summer 2017	The CDE, along with technical experts, conduct data simulations on the models approved at the March SBE meeting. The CDE conducts outreach stakeholder outreach to gather input on the various options.
Summer/Fall 2017	The CDE will provide an SBE Information Memorandum that provides an update on the status of the review of models.
Fall 2017	The CDE presents to the SBE the results of the data simulations and outreach activities for information purposes.
March 2018	The CDE recommends, and the SBE approves, the selection of a growth model for inclusion in the 2018 accountability system (baseline).

Proposed Approach to Determine Progress on the Local Performance Indicators for Implementation of State Academic Standards (Priority 2) and Parent Engagement (Priority 3)

At its November 2016 meeting, the State Board of Education (SBE) approved tools for local educational agencies (LEAs) to determine progress on the local performance indicators for Basics (Priority 1), School Climate (Priority 6), Coordination of Services for Expelled Students (Priority 9), and Coordination of Services for Foster Youth (Priority 10). LEAs will use these self-reflection tools to evaluate and report their progress on the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) evaluation rubrics local performance indicators.

A December 2016 information memorandum provided updated draft self-reflection tools for the two local performance indicators that were not included in the SBE's November 2016 action: Implementation of State Academic Standards (Priority 2) and Parent Engagement (Priority 3) (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/BE/pn/im/documents/memo-sbe-dec16item01.doc>).

The California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG) provided feedback on the revised draft self-reflection tools at its December 7, 2016, meeting, and staff have received additional feedback from interested stakeholders. An Item Addendum will be posted prior to the SBE's January 2017 meeting with final proposed self-reflection tools for the local performance indicators for Implementation of State Academic Standards (Priority 2) and Parent Engagement (Priority 3) and a recommendation that the SBE approve the proposed tools for inclusion in the initial phase of the evaluation rubrics.

Overview of California Collaborative for Educational Excellence Component I Workshops

The California Collaborative for Educational Excellence (CCEE) was established as part of the LCFF Law 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.” To this end, the Legislature allocated \$20 million of one-time funding over three years (2016–17 through 2018–19) to the CCEE “to establish a statewide process to provide professional development training” to county offices of education, school districts, and charter schools regarding the use of the LCFF evaluation rubrics and the Local Control and Accountability Plan Template. The professional development training, *LCFF Professional Development Training Implementation Plan*, was approved by CCEE Governing Board on October 6, 2016. (Note: A link to the training is available on the CCEE Web site at <http://ccee-ca.org/mwg-internal/de5fs23hu73ds/progress?id=iQ3rMfTu72N-5DR4Ty9kaid8o1rTcX07iavwSlrpoMQ>).

This Plan contains four components. Component I consists of a fall and a spring set of workshops offered at multiple locations each year across the state with the intent of providing a common foundation for interpreting, understanding, and using the LCFF evaluation rubrics and the LCAP Template. Component II uses Regional Lead County Offices of Education and an aligned Content Library to ensure that aligned local trainings on LCFF are available to all county offices of education, school districts, and charter schools across the state. Component III consists of two tiers of support networks designed to support capacity building and deep learning regarding the use of the LCFF evaluation rubrics and the LCAP Template as tools for continuous improvement. Component IV is an LCFF Support Desk to provide responses to certain inquiries that may arise at the local level regarding the evaluation rubrics and the LCAP Template.

The CCEE successfully hosted the first set of Component I workshops in November 2016. Details of these workshops will be presented to the State Board of Education. The second set of Component I workshops is tentatively scheduled for March 2017. The CCEE is still in the initial phases of implementing Components II, III, and IV,

Draft Timeline for the Integrated, Local, State, and Federal Accountability and Continuous Improvement System, Including Outreach with Stakeholders

Since the State Board of Education (SBE) adopted the initial phase of the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) evaluation rubrics at its September 2016 meeting, staff have incorporated the feedback from the stakeholder input sessions and work groups to inform recommendations on the academic indicator, the remaining local performance indicators, and data displays for the web-based user interface being developed for the LCFF evaluation rubrics. The prototype for the initial phase of the LCFF rubrics is flexible and intended to evolve based on user experiences and stakeholder feedback. Staff will continue to analyze feedback to make recommendations for system improvements. Below is a summary of the stakeholder input opportunities provided since the November 2016 meeting and an updated timeline of future accountability and continuous improvement tasks to be completed.

- *California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG)*: The CPAG is an advisory committee to the SBE (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/cc/cp/>) that met on December 7, 2016. The CPAG provided feedback on the Academic Indicator and the local performance indicators. The CPAG also provided input on the framing of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plan and preliminary concepts on supporting excellent educators. The CPAG recommendations on the Academic Performance Indicator and the summary on the local performance indicators will be included as addenda to this item. The next CPAG meeting is scheduled for February 16, 2017.
- *Equity and Policy Stakeholder Input Working Group*: WestEd, on behalf of the California Department of Education (CDE) and SBE, will host a webinar in early January for representatives from statewide and community-based organizations to review draft tools for the implementation of state academic standards and parent engagement local performance indicators. A summary of the feedback will be posted on the WestEd LCFF Web page.
- *School Conditions and Climate Work Group*: The CDE convened a School Climate and Conditions Work Group (CCWG) to make recommendations to support the SBE's policy development in the area of school conditions and climate as outlined in the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF). The CCWG convened its first meeting via WebEx in September 2016 and has continued to meet monthly. On October 28, 2016, a stakeholder input session via webinar was held. The content for the webinar is available on the WestEd LCFF Website located at <https://lcff.wested.org/category/school-conditions-and-climate/>. On November 28, 2016, the CCWG held its first face-to-face meeting that included time for the CCWG to both meet in person in the morning and engage with stakeholders in the afternoon at the Sacramento County Office of Education. A summary of the meeting and stakeholder session will be described in a forthcoming information memorandum.

- *English Learner Indicator Work Group:*

The English Learner Work Group met on December 14, 2016. The meeting featured three guest presenters courtesy of the Council of Chief State School Officers: Pete Goldschmidt from the California State University, Northridge, Kenji Hakuta from Stanford University, and Delia Pompa with Migration Policy Institute. The guest speakers presented on the multiple issues that states must consider when incorporating English learner (EL) progress into the accountability systems. CDE staff presented information and data on three different definitions for the EL student group in the Academic Indicator: (1) ELs only, (2) ELs plus students who were reclassified fluent English proficient (RFEP) for two years or less, and (3) ELs plus RFEPs for four years or less.

The work group had a very thoughtful and in-depth discussion on which EL student group definition would be the most appropriate for the new Academic Indicator. However, the work group did not reach a consensus on a preferred definition for the EL student group in the Academic Indicator.

- *Statements of Model Practices:* The CDE will post an information memorandum that will provide an update on the development of the Statements of Model Practices (Model Practices). This memorandum will describe the progress that is underway to engage stakeholders in the development and use of the Model Practices and the creation of a support system that will further their use and integration with local LCAP activities statewide. The CDE will be hosting a public information session in late January that will describe the development of an LCFF Model Practices Resource Ecosystem and will provide stakeholders with an opportunity to contribute to the further development of the Model Practices and their linkages to external resources.

Timeframe	SBE Review and Decision Points	Ongoing Development and Tasks
August 2016	<p>SBE received a series of Information Memorandum on the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • draft timeline and proposed annual review of the LCFF indicators, • a framework for technical assistance, • an update on the college/career indicator and proposed cut-point and performance categories for the state indicators, and • an updated timeline to revise the LCAP template. 	<p><i>Early August-Continue receiving feedback on accountability and continuous improvement:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conference Calls • Standing Meetings • Policy Input Sessions <p><i>Work Groups:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDE convenes the school conditions and climate work group
September 2016	<p><i>LCFF Evaluation Rubrics:</i></p> <p>Initial Phase of the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) Evaluation Rubrics for SBE Adoption.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance categories for CAASPP, English Learner Proficiency, Graduation Rate, Suspension Rate, and College/Career Readiness. • Criteria to determine eligibility for technical assistance based on performance on all LCFF priorities. • Design dimensions for the evaluation rubrics web application that includes, but is not limited to, the top-level data display, equity report, and standard reports. • CDE provides an update on the working groups to explore school conditions and climate and English learner proficiency indicator. <p><i>ESSA State Plan:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of the law and plan requirements, review of stakeholder feedback 	<p><i>California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG) Meeting:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CPAG provides feedback on draft ESSA State Plan • CPAG reviews plan for future work on state and local indicators (e.g., college /career readiness) • CPAG reviews the plan to revise the LCAP template <p><i>Work Groups:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDE convenes the school conditions and climate work group <p>Proposed Information Memorandum on updated draft for revised LCAP template and instructions</p>

Timeframe	SBE Review and Decision Points	Ongoing Development and Tasks
October 2016		<p><i>California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG) Meeting:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CPAG provides feedback on draft ESSA State Plan • CPAG reviews draft standards for the LCFF local performance measures <p><i>Early October-Continue receiving feedback on accountability and continuous improvement:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conference Calls • Standing Meetings • Policy Input Sessions <p><i>Work Groups:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School conditions and climate work group will provide opportunities for stakeholder input • CDE convenes the English Learner Indicator work group <p>Proposed Information Memorandum on local indicators</p>
November 2016	<p><i>LCFF Evaluation Rubrics:</i></p> <p>Update on local indicators to measure state priorities not addressed by the state indicators (e.g., priorities 1,2,3,6,7,8,9,10) and implications for state performance standards based on stakeholder input gathered in October 2016</p>	<p><i>LCFF Evaluation Rubrics:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • California Collaborative for Educational Excellence (CCEE) workshop trainings

Timeframe	SBE Review and Decision Points	Ongoing Development and Tasks
<p>November 2016</p>	<p>CDE provides an update on the School Conditions and Climate work group and the English Learner Indicator work group. CDE also provides an update on the Statements of Model Practices.</p> <p><i>LCAP Template:</i></p> <p>Final changes to the LCAP template for SBE adoption.</p> <p><i>ESSA State Plan:</i></p> <p>CDE presents first draft of ESSA State Plan based on stakeholder input, including CPAG comments, for SBE review.</p>	<p><i>ESSA State Plan:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ESSA State Plan extended public comment period begins November 18 • ESSA State Plan Stakeholder Outreach Phase 2 begins • Webinars • Regional meetings • Survey • Stakeholder engagement toolkit
<p>December 2016</p>		<p><i>California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG) Meeting:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides feedback on ESSA State Plan Update • Provides feedback on the Academic Indicator • Update on the proposal to review the LCFF evaluation rubrics state and local indicators and statements of model practices <p><i>Work Groups:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDE convenes the school conditions and climate work group • School conditions and climate work group will provide opportunities for stakeholder input • CDE convenes the English Learner Indicator work group • CDE Convenes the Technical Design Group (TDG)

Timeframe	SBE Review and Decision Points	Ongoing Development and Tasks
<p>January 2017</p>	<p><i>LCFF Evaluation Rubrics:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDE presents recommendation for a new methodology that uses scale scores for the Academic Indicator and the definition of the English Learner (EL) student group in the Academic Indicator. • CDE presents preliminary recommendations to the SBE for transition plan to support the use of school conditions and climate measures in the accountability and continuous improvement system. <p><i>ESSA State Plan:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDE brings proposed guiding principles and a recommended approach to developing a State Plan based upon California's current trajectory and needs for discussion and approval. 	<p><i>ESSA State Plan:</i></p> <p>Stakeholder Outreach Phase 3, regarding proposed guiding principles and a recommended approach to developing a State Plan begins</p> <p><i>Work Groups:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDE convenes the English Learner Indicator work group • CDE convenes the School Conditions and Climate work group
<p>February 2017</p>		<p><i>Early February-Continue receiving feedback on accountability and continuous improvement:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conference Calls • Standing Meetings • Policy Input Sessions <p><i>California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG) Meeting</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviews proposed guiding principles and a recommended approach to developing a State Plan and makes recommendations • Reviews first set of policy options, including extensive input from stakeholders regarding advantages and

Timeframe	SBE Review and Decision Points	Ongoing Development and Tasks
		<p>disadvantages of each option, and recommendations for input</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advise SBE on annual review of evaluation rubrics state and local indicators
<p>March 2017</p>	<p><i>LCFF Evaluation Rubrics:</i></p> <p>Annual review of evaluation rubrics, which may include, but is not necessarily limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CAASPP performance categories • English Learner Indicator • Suspension Rate and School Climate • Academic Engagement • College/Career Indicator <p><i>ESSA State Plan:</i></p> <p>CDE brings stakeholder feedback re: guiding principles and approach to plan development to SBECDE brings first set of policy options, including extensive input from stakeholders regarding advantages and disadvantages of each option, and recommendations to the SBE for approval</p>	<p><i>Work Groups:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDE convenes the English Learner Indicator work group • CDE convenes the School Conditions and Climate Stakeholder Session
<p>April 2017</p>		<p><i>Early April-Continue receiving feedback on accountability and continuous improvement:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conference Calls • Standing Meetings • Policy Input Sessions <p><i>California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG) Meeting</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviews progress on pilot of state and local indicators,

Timeframe	SBE Review and Decision Points	Ongoing Development and Tasks
		<p>feedback from SBE on annual review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviews second set of policy options, including extensive input from stakeholders regarding advantages and disadvantages of each option, and recommendations for input • Reviews alignment of ESSA state plan to LCFF evaluation rubrics (e.g., plan alignment activities) <p>Proposed Information Memorandum on the English Learner Indicator</p>
<p>May 2017</p>	<p><i>LCFF Evaluation Rubrics:</i></p> <p>CDE presents recommendations to the SBE for transition plan to support the use of the English Learner Indicator in the accountability and continuous improvement system.</p> <p><i>ESSA State Plan:</i></p> <p>CDE brings second set of policy options, including extensive input from stakeholders regarding advantages and disadvantages of each option, and recommendations to the SBE for approval</p>	
<p>June 2017</p>		<p><i>Early June-Continue receiving feedback on accountability and continuous improvement:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conference Calls • Standing Meetings • Policy Input Sessions

Timeframe	SBE Review and Decision Points	Ongoing Development and Tasks
		<p><i>California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG) Meeting</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on state and local indicator pilots and implications for standards and technical assistance • Feedback on completed ESSA state plan <p><i>Work Groups:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDE convenes the School Conditions and Climate Stakeholder Session
<p>July 2017</p>	<p><i>ESSA State Plan:</i> CDE brings completed State Plan to SBE for review and revision before required 30 day public comment period I</p> <p>New Accountability System begins July 2017.</p>	<p><i>Work Groups:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDE convenes the School Conditions and Climate Stakeholder Session <p>30 day public comment period and stakeholder outreach phase 3 for ESSA State Plan begins</p>
<p>August 2017</p>		<p><i>Early August-Continue receiving feedback on accountability and continuous improvement:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conference Calls • Standing Meetings • Policy Input Sessions <p><i>California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG) Meeting</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review ESSA State Plan and

Timeframe	SBE Review and Decision Points	Ongoing Development and Tasks
		<p>provide input to SBE.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review proposal to revise evaluation rubrics based on the state and local indicator pilots and SBE annual review at the March SBE meeting <p><i>Work Groups:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CDE convenes the School Conditions and Climate Stakeholder Session
<p>September 2017</p>	<p><i>LCFF Evaluation Rubrics:</i> Possible action to revise the evaluation rubrics based on the annual review completed in March 2017, any updated data elements and indicators based on stakeholder input.</p> <p>CDE presents recommendations to the SBE on the use of school climate measures in the accountability and continuous improvement system.</p> <p>SBE approves ESSA State Plan</p> <p>California submits ESSA Consolidated State Plan to ED on September 18, 2017</p>	
<p>2018-19</p>	<p>The new technical assistance, support, and interventions under LCFF and ESSA are implemented.</p>	

Note: Dates and proposed development activities are subject to change. The table will be updated and presented at future SBE meetings.

California Education Code Sections 52064.5, 47607, 47607.3, 52071, 52071.5, 52072, 52072.5, 52060, 52066, 52064, and 52052

Please note: the California *Education Code* sections referenced below do not reflect the changes included in the 2016-2017 budget adoption and the enacted revisions to legislation through the recently passed budget bills.

Education Code Section 52064.5.

(a) On or before October 1, 2016, the state board shall adopt evaluation rubrics for all of the following purposes:

(1) To assist a school district, county office of education, or charter school in evaluating its strengths, weaknesses, and areas that require improvement.

(2) To assist a county superintendent of schools in identifying school districts and charter schools in need of technical assistance pursuant to Section 52071 or 47607.3, as applicable, and the specific priorities upon which the technical assistance should be focused.

(3) To assist the Superintendent in identifying school districts for which intervention pursuant to Section 52072 is warranted.

(b) The evaluation rubrics shall reflect a holistic, multidimensional assessment of school district and individual schoolsite performance and shall include all of the state priorities described in subdivision (d) of Section 52060.

(c) As part of the evaluation rubrics, the state board shall adopt standards for school district and individual schoolsite performance and expectations for improvement in regard to each of the state priorities described in subdivision (d) of Section 52060.

Education Code Section 47607.

(a) (1) A charter may be granted pursuant to Sections 47605, 47605.5, and 47606 for a period not to exceed five years. A charter granted by a school district governing board, a county board of education, or the state board may be granted one or more subsequent renewals by that entity. Each renewal shall be for a period of five years. A material revision of the provisions of a charter petition may be made only with the approval of the authority that granted the charter. The authority that granted the charter may inspect or observe any part of the charter school at any time.

(2) Renewals and material revisions of charters are governed by the standards and criteria in Section 47605, and shall include, but not be limited to, a reasonably comprehensive description of any new requirement of charter schools enacted into law after the charter was originally granted or last renewed.

(3) (A) The authority that granted the charter shall consider increases in pupil academic achievement for all groups of pupils served by the charter school as the most important factor in determining whether to grant a charter renewal.

(B) For purposes of this section, "all groups of pupils served by the charter school" means a numerically significant pupil subgroup, as defined by paragraph (3) of subdivision (a) of Section 52052, served by the charter school.

(b) Commencing on January 1, 2005, or after a charter school has been in operation for four years, whichever date occurs later, a charter school shall meet at least one of the

following criteria before receiving a charter renewal pursuant to paragraph (1) of subdivision (a):

(1) Attained its Academic Performance Index (API) growth target in the prior year or in two of the last three years both schoolwide and for all groups of pupils served by the charter school.

(2) Ranked in deciles 4 to 10, inclusive, on the API in the prior year or in two of the last three years.

(3) Ranked in deciles 4 to 10, inclusive, on the API for a demographically comparable school in the prior year or in two of the last three years.

(4) (A) The entity that granted the charter determines that the academic performance of the charter school is at least equal to the academic performance of the public schools that the charter school pupils would otherwise have been required to attend, as well as the academic performance of the schools in the school district in which the charter school is located, taking into account the composition of the pupil population that is served at the charter school.

(B) The determination made pursuant to this paragraph shall be based upon all of the following:

(i) Documented and clear and convincing data.

(ii) Pupil achievement data from assessments, including, but not limited to, the Standardized Testing and Reporting Program established by Article 4 (commencing with Section 60640) of Chapter 5 of Part 33 for demographically similar pupil populations in the comparison schools.

(iii) Information submitted by the charter school.

(C) A chartering authority shall submit to the Superintendent copies of supporting documentation and a written summary of the basis for any determination made pursuant to this paragraph. The Superintendent shall review the materials and make recommendations to the chartering authority based on that review. The review may be the basis for a recommendation made pursuant to Section 47604.5.

(D) A charter renewal may not be granted to a charter school prior to 30 days after that charter school submits materials pursuant to this paragraph.

(5) Qualified for an alternative accountability system pursuant to subdivision (h) of Section 52052.

(c) (1) A charter may be revoked by the authority that granted the charter under this chapter if the authority finds, through a showing of substantial evidence, that the charter school did any of the following:

(A) Committed a material violation of any of the conditions, standards, or procedures set forth in the charter.

(B) Failed to meet or pursue any of the pupil outcomes identified in the charter.

(C) Failed to meet generally accepted accounting principles, or engaged in fiscal mismanagement.

(D) Violated any provision of law.

(2) The authority that granted the charter shall consider increases in pupil academic achievement for all groups of pupils served by the charter school as the most important factor in determining whether to revoke a charter.

(d) Before revocation, the authority that granted the charter shall notify the charter school of any violation of this section and give the school a reasonable opportunity to

remedy the violation, unless the authority determines, in writing, that the violation constitutes a severe and imminent threat to the health or safety of the pupils.

(e) Before revoking a charter for failure to remedy a violation pursuant to subdivision (d), and after expiration of the school's reasonable opportunity to remedy without successfully remedying the violation, the chartering authority shall provide a written notice of intent to revoke and notice of facts in support of revocation to the charter school. No later than 30 days after providing the notice of intent to revoke a charter, the chartering authority shall hold a public hearing, in the normal course of business, on the issue of whether evidence exists to revoke the charter. No later than 30 days after the public hearing, the chartering authority shall issue a final decision to revoke or decline to revoke the charter, unless the chartering authority and the charter school agree to extend the issuance of the decision by an additional 30 days. The chartering authority shall not revoke a charter, unless it makes written factual findings supported by substantial evidence, specific to the charter school, that support its findings.

(f) (1) If a school district is the chartering authority and it revokes a charter pursuant to this section, the charter school may appeal the revocation to the county board of education within 30 days following the final decision of the chartering authority.

(2) The county board of education may reverse the revocation decision if the county board of education determines that the findings made by the chartering authority under subdivision (e) are not supported by substantial evidence. The school district may appeal the reversal to the state board.

(3) If the county board of education does not issue a decision on the appeal within 90 days of receipt, or the county board of education upholds the revocation, the charter school may appeal the revocation to the state board.

(4) The state board may reverse the revocation decision if the state board determines that the findings made by the chartering authority under subdivision (e) are not supported by substantial evidence. The state board may uphold the revocation decision of the school district if the state board determines that the findings made by the chartering authority under subdivision (e) are supported by substantial evidence.

(g) (1) If a county office of education is the chartering authority and the county board of education revokes a charter pursuant to this section, the charter school may appeal the revocation to the state board within 30 days following the decision of the chartering authority.

(2) The state board may reverse the revocation decision if the state board determines that the findings made by the chartering authority under subdivision (e) are not supported by substantial evidence.

(h) If the revocation decision of the chartering authority is reversed on appeal, the agency that granted the charter shall continue to be regarded as the chartering authority.

(i) During the pendency of an appeal filed under this section, a charter school, whose revocation proceedings are based on subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1) of subdivision (c), shall continue to qualify as a charter school for funding and for all other purposes of this part, and may continue to hold all existing grants, resources, and facilities, in order to ensure that the education of pupils enrolled in the school is not disrupted.

(j) Immediately following the decision of a county board of education to reverse a decision of a school district to revoke a charter, the following shall apply:

- (1) The charter school shall qualify as a charter school for funding and for all other purposes of this part.
- (2) The charter school may continue to hold all existing grants, resources, and facilities.
- (3) Any funding, grants, resources, and facilities that had been withheld from the charter school, or that the charter school had otherwise been deprived of use, as a result of the revocation of the charter shall be immediately reinstated or returned.
- (k) A final decision of a revocation or appeal of a revocation pursuant to subdivision (c) shall be reported to the chartering authority, the county board of education, and the department.

Education Code Section 47607.3.

(a) If a charter school fails to improve outcomes for three or more pupil subgroups identified pursuant to Section 52052, or, if the charter school has less than three pupil subgroups, all of the charter school's pupil subgroups, in regard to one or more state or school priority identified in the charter pursuant to subparagraph (A) of paragraph (5) of subdivision (b) of Section 47605 or subparagraph (A) of paragraph (5) of subdivision (b) of Section 47605.6, in three out of four consecutive school years, all of the following shall apply:

(1) Using an evaluation rubric adopted by the state board pursuant to Section 52064.5, the chartering authority shall provide technical assistance to the charter school.

(2) The Superintendent may assign, at the request of the chartering authority and with the approval of the state board, the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence to provide advice and assistance to the charter school pursuant to Section 52074.

(b) A chartering authority shall consider for revocation any charter school to which the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence has provided advice and assistance pursuant to subdivision (a) and about which it has made either of the following findings, which shall be submitted to the chartering authority:

(1) That the charter school has failed, or is unable, to implement the recommendations of the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence.

(2) That the inadequate performance of the charter school, based upon an evaluation rubric adopted pursuant to Section 52064.5, is either so persistent or so acute as to require revocation of the charter.

(c) The chartering authority shall consider increases in pupil academic achievement for all pupil subgroups served by the charter school as the most important factor in determining whether to revoke the charter.

(d) A chartering authority shall comply with the hearing process described in subdivision (e) of Section 47607 in revoking a charter. A charter school may not appeal a revocation of a charter made pursuant to this section.

Education Code Section 52071.

(a) If a county superintendent of schools does not approve a local control and accountability plan or annual update to the local control and accountability plan approved by a governing board of a school district, or if the governing board of a school

district requests technical assistance, the county superintendent of schools shall provide technical assistance, including, among other things, any of the following:

- (1) Identification of the school district's strengths and weaknesses in regard to the state priorities described in subdivision (d) of Section 52060, communicated in writing to the school district. This identification shall include a review of effective, evidence-based programs that apply to the school district's goals.
 - (2) Assignment of an academic expert or team of academic experts to assist the school district in identifying and implementing effective programs that are designed to improve the outcomes for all pupil subgroups identified pursuant to Section 52052. The county superintendent of schools may also solicit another school district within the county to act as a partner to the school district in need of technical assistance.
 - (3) Request that the Superintendent assign the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence to provide advice and assistance to the school district.
- (b) Using an evaluation rubric adopted by the state board pursuant to Section 52064.5, the county superintendent of schools shall provide the technical assistance described in subdivision (a) to any school district that fails to improve pupil achievement across more than one state priority described in subdivision (d) of Section 52060 for one or more pupil subgroup identified pursuant to Section 52052.
- (c) Technical assistance provided pursuant to this section at the request of a school district shall be paid for by the school district requesting the assistance.

Education Code Section 52071.5.

- (a) If the Superintendent does not approve a local control and accountability plan or annual update to the local control and accountability plan approved by a county board of education, or if the county board of education requests technical assistance, the Superintendent shall provide technical assistance, including, among other things, any of the following:
- (1) Identification of the county board of education's strengths and weaknesses in regard to the state priorities described in subdivision (d) of Section 52066, communicated in writing to the county board of education. This identification shall include a review of effective, evidence-based programs that apply to the board's goals.
 - (2) Assignment of an academic expert or team of academic experts, or the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence established pursuant to Section 52074, to assist the county board of education in identifying and implementing effective programs that are designed to improve the outcomes for all pupil subgroups identified pursuant to Section 52052. The Superintendent may also solicit another county office of education to act as a partner to the county office of education in need of technical assistance.
- (b) Using an evaluation rubric adopted by the state board pursuant to Section 52064.5, the Superintendent shall provide the technical assistance described in subdivision (a) to any county office of education that fails to improve pupil achievement in regard to more than one state priority described in subdivision (d) of Section 52066 for one or more pupil subgroups identified pursuant to Section 52052.

(c) Technical assistance provided pursuant to this section at the request of a county board of education shall be paid for by the county board of education receiving assistance.

Education Code Section 52072.

(a) The Superintendent may, with the approval of the state board, identify school districts in need of intervention.

(b) The Superintendent shall only intervene in a school district that meets both of the following criteria:

(1) The school district did not improve the outcomes for three or more pupil subgroups identified pursuant to Section 52052 or, if the school district has less than three pupil subgroups, all of the school district's pupil subgroups, in regard to more than one state or local priority in three out of four consecutive school years.

(2) The California Collaborative for Educational Excellence has provided advice and assistance to the school district pursuant to Section 52071 and submits either of the following findings to the Superintendent:

(A) That the school district has failed, or is unable, to implement the recommendations of the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence.

(B) That the inadequate performance of the school district, based upon an evaluation rubric adopted pursuant to Section 52064.5, is either so persistent or acute as to require intervention by the Superintendent.

(c) For school districts identified pursuant to subdivision (a), the Superintendent may, with the approval of the state board, do one or more of the following:

(1) Make changes to a local control and accountability plan adopted by the governing board of the school district.

(2) Develop and impose a budget revision, in conjunction with revisions to the local control and accountability plan, that the Superintendent determines would allow the school district to improve the outcomes for all pupil subgroups identified pursuant to Section 52052 in regard to state and local priorities.

(3) Stay or rescind an action, if that action is not required by a local collective bargaining agreement, that would prevent the school district from improving outcomes for all pupil subgroups identified pursuant to Section 52052 in regard to state or local priorities.

(4) Appoint an academic trustee to exercise the powers and authority specified in this section on his or her behalf.

(d) The Superintendent shall notify the county superintendent of schools, the county board of education, the superintendent of the school district, and the governing board of the school district of any action by the state board to direct him or her to exercise any of the powers and authorities specified in this section.

Education Code Section 52072.5.

(a) The Superintendent may, with the approval of the state board, identify county offices of education in need of intervention.

(b) The Superintendent shall only intervene in a county office of education that meets both of the following criteria:

(1) The county office of education did not improve the outcomes for three or more pupil subgroups identified pursuant to Section 52052 or, if the county office of education has less than three pupil subgroups, all of the county office of education's pupil subgroups, in regard to more than one state or local priority in three out of four consecutive school years.

(2) The California Collaborative for Educational Excellence has provided advice and assistance to the county office of education pursuant to Section 52071.5 and submits either of the following findings to the Superintendent:

(A) That the county office of education has failed, or is unable, to implement the recommendations of the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence.

(B) That the inadequate performance of the county office of education, based upon an evaluation rubric adopted pursuant to Section 52064.5, is either so persistent or acute as to require intervention by the Superintendent.

(c) For county offices of education identified pursuant to subdivision (a), the Superintendent may, with the approval of the state board, do one or more of the following:

(1) Make changes to a local control and accountability plan adopted by the county board of education.

(2) Develop and impose a budget revision, in conjunction with revisions to the local control and accountability plan, that the Superintendent determines would allow the county office of education to improve the outcomes for all pupil subgroups identified pursuant to Section 52052 in regard to state and local priorities.

(3) Stay or rescind an action, if that action is not required by a local collective bargaining agreement, that would prevent the county office of education from improving outcomes for all pupil subgroups identified pursuant to Section 52052 in regard to state or local priorities.

(4) Appoint an academic trustee to exercise the powers and authority specified in this section on his or her behalf.

(d) The Superintendent shall notify the county board of education and the county superintendent of schools, in writing, of any action by the state board to direct him or her to exercise any of the powers and authorities specified in this section.

Education Code Section 52060.

(a) On or before July 1, 2014, the governing board of each school district shall adopt a local control and accountability plan using a template adopted by the state board.

(b) A local control and accountability plan adopted by the governing board of a school district shall be effective for a period of three years, and shall be updated on or before July 1 of each year.

(c) A local control and accountability plan adopted by the governing board of a school district shall include, for the school district and each school within the school district, both of the following:

(1) A description of the annual goals, for all pupils and each subgroup of pupils identified pursuant to Section 52052, to be achieved for each of the state priorities identified in subdivision (d) and for any additional local priorities identified by the governing board of the school district. For purposes of this article, a subgroup of pupils identified pursuant to Section 52052 shall be a numerically significant pupil subgroup as specified in paragraphs (2) and (3) of subdivision (a) of Section 52052.

(2) A description of the specific actions the school district will take during each year of the local control and accountability plan to achieve the goals identified in paragraph (1), including the enumeration of any specific actions necessary for that year to correct any deficiencies in regard to the state priorities listed in paragraph (1) of subdivision (d). The specific actions shall not supersede the provisions of existing local collective bargaining agreements within the jurisdiction of the school district.

(d) All of the following are state priorities:

(1) The degree to which the teachers of the school district are appropriately assigned in accordance with Section 44258.9, and fully credentialed in the subject areas, and, for the pupils they are teaching, every pupil in the school district has sufficient access to the standards-aligned instructional materials as determined pursuant to Section 60119, and school facilities are maintained in good repair, as defined in subdivision (d) of Section 17002.

(2) Implementation of the academic content and performance standards adopted by the state board, including how the programs and services will enable English learners to access the common core academic content standards adopted pursuant to Section 60605.8 and the English language development standards adopted pursuant to former Section 60811.3, as that section read on June 30, 2013, or Section 60811.4, for purposes of gaining academic content knowledge and English language proficiency.

(3) Parental involvement, including efforts the school district makes to seek parent input in making decisions for the school district and each individual schoolsite, and including how the school district will promote parental participation in programs for unduplicated pupils and individuals with exceptional needs.

(4) Pupil achievement, as measured by all of the following, as applicable:

(A) Statewide assessments administered pursuant to Article 4 (commencing with Section 60640) of Chapter 5 of Part 33 or any subsequent assessment, as certified by the state board.

(B) The Academic Performance Index, as described in Section 52052.

(C) The percentage of pupils who have successfully completed courses that satisfy the requirements for entrance to the University of California and the California State University, or career technical education sequences or programs of study that align with state board-approved career technical education standards and frameworks, including,

but not limited to, those described in subdivision (a) of Section 52302, subdivision (a) of Section 52372.5, or paragraph (2) of subdivision (e) of Section 54692.

(D) The percentage of English learner pupils who make progress toward English proficiency as measured by the California English Language Development Test or any subsequent assessment of English proficiency, as certified by the state board.

(E) The English learner reclassification rate.

(F) The percentage of pupils who have passed an advanced placement examination with a score of 3 or higher.

(G) The percentage of pupils who participate in, and demonstrate college preparedness pursuant to, the Early Assessment Program, as described in Chapter 6 (commencing with Section 99300) of Part 65 of Division 14 of Title 3, or any subsequent assessment of college preparedness.

(5) Pupil engagement, as measured by all of the following, as applicable:

(A) School attendance rates.

(B) Chronic absenteeism rates.

(C) Middle school dropout rates, as described in paragraph (3) of subdivision (a) of Section 52052.1.

(D) High school dropout rates.

(E) High school graduation rates.

(6) School climate, as measured by all of the following, as applicable:

(A) Pupil suspension rates.

(B) Pupil expulsion rates.

(C) Other local measures, including surveys of pupils, parents, and teachers on the sense of safety and school connectedness.

(7) The extent to which pupils have access to, and are enrolled in, a broad course of study that includes all of the subject areas described in Section 51210 and subdivisions (a) to (i), inclusive, of Section 51220, as applicable, including the programs and services developed and provided to unduplicated pupils and individuals with exceptional needs, and the programs and services that are provided to benefit these pupils as a result of the funding received pursuant to Section 42238.02, as implemented by Section 42238.03.

(8) Pupil outcomes, if available, in the subject areas described in Section 51210 and subdivisions (a) to (i), inclusive, of Section 51220, as applicable.

(e) For purposes of the descriptions required by subdivision (c), the governing board of a school district may consider qualitative information, including, but not limited to, findings that result from school quality reviews conducted pursuant to subparagraph (J) of paragraph (4) of subdivision (a) of Section 52052 or any other reviews.

(f) To the extent practicable, data reported in a local control and accountability plan shall be reported in a manner consistent with how information is reported on a school accountability report card.

(g) The governing board of a school district shall consult with teachers, principals, administrators, other school personnel, local bargaining units of the school district, parents, and pupils in developing a local control and accountability plan.

(h) A school district may identify local priorities, goals in regard to the local priorities, and the method for measuring the school district's progress toward achieving those goals.

Education Code Section 52066.

(a) On or before July 1, 2014, each county superintendent of schools shall develop, and present to the county board of education for adoption, a local control and accountability plan using a template adopted by the state board.

(b) A local control and accountability plan adopted by a county board of education shall be effective for a period of three years, and shall be updated on or before July 1 of each year.

(c) A local control and accountability plan adopted by a county board of education shall include, for each school or program operated by the county superintendent of schools, both of the following:

(1) A description of the annual goals, for all pupils and each subgroup of pupils identified pursuant to Section 52052, to be achieved for each of the state priorities identified in subdivision (d), as applicable to the pupils served, and for any additional local priorities identified by the county board of education.

(2) A description of the specific actions the county superintendent of schools will take during each year of the local control and accountability plan to achieve the goals identified in paragraph (1), including the enumeration of any specific actions necessary for that year to correct any deficiencies in regard to the state priorities listed in paragraph (1) of subdivision (d). The specific actions shall not supersede the provisions of existing local collective bargaining agreements within the jurisdiction of the county superintendent of schools.

(d) All of the following are state priorities:

(1) The degree to which the teachers in the schools or programs operated by the county superintendent of schools are appropriately assigned in accordance with Section 44258.9 and fully credentialed in the subject areas, and, for the pupils they are teaching, every pupil in the schools or programs operated by the county superintendent of schools has sufficient access to the standards-aligned instructional materials as determined pursuant to Section 60119, and school facilities are maintained in good repair as specified in subdivision (d) of Section 17002.

(2) Implementation of the academic content and performance standards adopted by the state board, including how the programs and services will enable English learners to access the common core academic content standards adopted pursuant to Section 60605.8 and the English language development standards adopted pursuant to Section

60811.3 for purposes of gaining academic content knowledge and English language proficiency.

(3) Parental involvement, including efforts the county superintendent of schools makes to seek parent input in making decisions for each individual schoolsite and program operated by a county superintendent of schools, and including how the county superintendent of schools will promote parental participation in programs for unduplicated pupils and individuals with exceptional needs.

(4) Pupil achievement, as measured by all of the following, as applicable:

(A) Statewide assessments administered pursuant to Article 4 (commencing with Section 60640) of Chapter 5 of Part 33 or any subsequent assessment, as certified by the state board.

(B) The Academic Performance Index, as described in Section 52052.

(C) The percentage of pupils who have successfully completed courses that satisfy the requirements for entrance to the University of California and the California State University, or career technical education sequences or programs of study that align with state board-approved career technical education standards and frameworks, including, but not limited to, those described in subdivision (a) of Section 52302, subdivision (a) of Section 52372.5, or paragraph (2) of subdivision (e) of Section 54692.

(D) The percentage of English learner pupils who make progress toward English proficiency as measured by the California English Language Development Test or any subsequent assessment of English proficiency, as certified by the state board.

(E) The English learner reclassification rate.

(F) The percentage of pupils who have passed an advanced placement examination with a score of 3 or higher.

(G) The percentage of pupils who participate in, and demonstrate college preparedness pursuant to, the Early Assessment Program, as described in Chapter 6 (commencing with Section 99300) of Part 65 of Division 14 of Title 3, or any subsequent assessment of college preparedness.

(5) Pupil engagement, as measured by all of the following, as applicable:

(A) School attendance rates.

(B) Chronic absenteeism rates.

(C) Middle school dropout rates, as described in paragraph (3) of subdivision (a) of Section 52052.1.

(D) High school dropout rates.

(E) High school graduation rates.

(6) School climate, as measured by all of the following, as applicable:

(A) Pupil suspension rates.

(B) Pupil expulsion rates.

(C) Other local measures, including surveys of pupils, parents, and teachers on the sense of safety and school connectedness.

(7) The extent to which pupils have access to, and are enrolled in, a broad course of study that includes all of the subject areas described in Section 51210 and subdivisions (a) to (i), inclusive, of Section 51220, as applicable, including the programs and services developed and provided to unduplicated pupils and individuals with exceptional needs, and the program and services that are provided to benefit these pupils as a result of the funding received pursuant to Section 42238.02, as implemented by Section 42238.03.

(8) Pupil outcomes, if available, in the subject areas described in Section 51210 and subdivisions (a) to (i), inclusive, of Section 51220, as applicable.

(9) How the county superintendent of schools will coordinate instruction of expelled pupils pursuant to Section 48926.

(10) How the county superintendent of schools will coordinate services for foster children, including, but not limited to, all of the following:

(A) Working with the county child welfare agency to minimize changes in school placement.

(B) Providing education-related information to the county child welfare agency to assist the county child welfare agency in the delivery of services to foster children, including, but not limited to, educational status and progress information that is required to be included in court reports.

(C) Responding to requests from the juvenile court for information and working with the juvenile court to ensure the delivery and coordination of necessary educational services.

(D) Establishing a mechanism for the efficient expeditious transfer of health and education records and the health and education passport.

(e) For purposes of the descriptions required by subdivision (c), a county board of education may consider qualitative information, including, but not limited to, findings that result from school quality reviews conducted pursuant to subparagraph (J) of paragraph (4) of subdivision (a) of Section 52052 or any other reviews.

(f) To the extent practicable, data reported in a local control and accountability plan shall be reported in a manner consistent with how information is reported on a school accountability report card.

(g) The county superintendent of schools shall consult with teachers, principals, administrators, other school personnel, local bargaining units of the county office of education, parents, and pupils in developing a local control and accountability plan.

(h) A county board of education may identify local priorities, goals in regard to the local priorities, and the method for measuring the county office of education's progress toward achieving those goals.

Education Code Section 52064.

(a) On or before March 31, 2014, the state board shall adopt templates for the following purposes:

(1) For use by school districts to meet the requirements of Sections 52060 to 52063, inclusive.

(2) For use by county superintendents of schools to meet the requirements of Sections 52066 to 52069, inclusive.

(3) For use by charter schools to meet the requirements of Section 47606.5.

(b) The templates developed by the state board shall allow a school district, county superintendent of schools, or charter school to complete a single local control and accountability plan to meet the requirements of this article and the requirements of the federal No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 related to local educational agency plans pursuant to Section 1112 of Subpart 1 of Part A of Title I of Public Law 107-110. The state board shall also take steps to minimize duplication of effort at the local level to the greatest extent possible. The template shall include guidance for school districts, county superintendents of schools, and charter schools to report both of the following:

(1) A listing and description of expenditures for the 2014–15 fiscal year, and each fiscal year thereafter, implementing the specific actions included in the local control and accountability plan.

(2) A listing and description of expenditures for the 2014–15 fiscal year, and each fiscal year thereafter, that will serve the pupils to whom one or more of the definitions in Section 42238.01 apply and pupils redesignated as fluent English proficient.

(c) If possible, the templates identified in paragraph (2) of subdivision (a) for use by county superintendents of schools shall allow a county superintendent of schools to develop a single local control and accountability plan that would also satisfy the requirements of Section 48926.

(d) The state board shall adopt the template pursuant to the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act (Chapter 3.5 (commencing with Section 11340) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code). The state board may adopt emergency regulations for purposes of implementing this section. The adoption of emergency regulations shall be deemed an emergency and necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, safety, or general welfare.

(e) Notwithstanding subdivision (d), the state board may adopt the template in accordance with the requirements of the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act (Article 9 (commencing with Section 11120) of Chapter 1 of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code). When adopting the template pursuant to the requirements of the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act, the state board shall present the template at a regular meeting and may only take action to adopt the template at a subsequent regular meeting. This subdivision shall become inoperative on January 31, 2018.

(f) Revisions to a template or evaluation rubric shall be approved by the state board by January 31 before the fiscal year during which the template or evaluation rubric is to be used by a school district, county superintendent of schools, or charter school.

(g) The adoption of a template or evaluation rubric by the state board shall not create a requirement for a governing board of a school district, a county board of education, or a governing body of a charter school to submit a local control and accountability plan to

the state board, unless otherwise required by federal law. The Superintendent shall not require a local control and accountability plan to be submitted by a governing board of a school district or the governing body of a charter school to the state board. The state board may adopt a template or evaluation rubric that would authorize a school district or a charter school to submit to the state board only the sections of the local control and accountability plan required by federal law.

Education Code Section 52052.

(a) (1) The Superintendent, with the approval of the state board, shall develop an Academic Performance Index (API), to measure the performance of schools and school districts, especially the academic performance of pupils.

(2) A school or school district shall demonstrate comparable improvement in academic achievement as measured by the API by all numerically significant pupil subgroups at the school or school district, including:

- (A) Ethnic subgroups.
- (B) Socioeconomically disadvantaged pupils.
- (C) English learners.
- (D) Pupils with disabilities.
- (E) Foster youth.
- (F) Homeless youth.

(3) (A) For purposes of this section, a numerically significant pupil subgroup is one that consists of at least 30 pupils, each of whom has a valid test score.

(B) Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), for a subgroup of pupils who are foster youth or homeless youth, a numerically significant pupil subgroup is one that consists of at least 15 pupils.

(C) For a school or school district with an API score that is based on no fewer than 11 and no more than 99 pupils with valid test scores, numerically significant pupil subgroups shall be defined by the Superintendent, with approval by the state board.

(4) (A) The API shall consist of a variety of indicators currently reported to the department, including, but not limited to, the results of the achievement test administered pursuant to Section 60640, attendance rates for pupils in elementary schools, middle schools, and secondary schools, and the graduation rates for pupils in secondary schools.

(B) The Superintendent, with the approval of the state board, may also incorporate into the API the rates at which pupils successfully promote from one grade to the next in middle school and high school, and successfully matriculate from middle school to high school.

(C) Graduation rates for pupils in secondary schools shall be calculated for the API as follows:

(i) Four-year graduation rates shall be calculated by taking the number of pupils who graduated on time for the current school year, which is considered to be three school

years after the pupils entered grade 9 for the first time, and dividing that number by the total calculated in clause (ii).

(ii) The number of pupils entering grade 9 for the first time in the school year three school years before the current school year, plus the number of pupils who transferred into the class graduating at the end of the current school year between the school year that was three school years before the current school year and the date of graduation, less the number of pupils who transferred out of the school between the school year that was three school years before the current school year and the date of graduation who were members of the class that is graduating at the end of the current school year.

(iii) Five-year graduation rates shall be calculated by taking the number of pupils who graduated on time for the current school year, which is considered to be four school years after the pupils entered grade 9 for the first time, and dividing that number by the total calculated in clause (iv).

(iv) The number of pupils entering grade 9 for the first time in the school year four years before the current school year, plus the number of pupils who transferred into the class graduating at the end of the current school year between the school year that was four school years before the current school year and the date of graduation, less the number of pupils who transferred out of the school between the school year that was four years before the current school year and the date of graduation who were members of the class that is graduating at the end of the current school year.

(v) Six-year graduation rates shall be calculated by taking the number of pupils who graduated on time for the current school year, which is considered to be five school years after the pupils entered grade 9 for the first time, and dividing that number by the total calculated in clause (vi).

(vi) The number of pupils entering grade 9 for the first time in the school year five years before the current school year, plus the number of pupils who transferred into the class graduating at the end of the current school year between the school year that was five school years before the current school year and the date of graduation, less the number of pupils who transferred out of the school between the school year that was five years before the current school year and the date of graduation who were members of the class that is graduating at the end of the current school year.

(D) The inclusion of five- and six-year graduation rates for pupils in secondary schools shall meet the following requirements:

(i) Schools and school districts shall be granted one-half the credit in their API scores for graduating pupils in five years that they are granted for graduating pupils in four years.

(ii) Schools and school districts shall be granted one-quarter the credit in their API scores for graduating pupils in six years that they are granted for graduating pupils in four years.

(iii) Notwithstanding clauses (i) and (ii), schools and school districts shall be granted full credit in their API scores for graduating in five or six years a pupil with disabilities who graduates in accordance with his or her individualized education program.

(E) The pupil data collected for the API that comes from the achievement test administered pursuant to Section 60640 and the high school exit examination administered pursuant to Section 60851, when fully implemented, shall be disaggregated by special education status, English learners, socioeconomic status, gender, and ethnic group. Only the test scores of pupils who were counted as part of the enrollment in the annual data collection of the California Basic Educational Data System for the current fiscal year and who were continuously enrolled during that year may be included in the test result reports in the API score of the school.

(F) (i) Commencing with the baseline API calculation in 2016, and for each year thereafter, results of the achievement test and other tests specified in subdivision (b) shall constitute no more than 60 percent of the value of the index for secondary schools.

(ii) In addition to the elements required by this paragraph, the Superintendent, with the approval of the state board, may incorporate into the index for secondary schools valid, reliable, and stable measures of pupil preparedness for postsecondary education and career.

(G) Results of the achievement test and other tests specified in subdivision (b) shall constitute at least 60 percent of the value of the index for primary schools and middle schools.

(H) It is the intent of the Legislature that the state's system of public school accountability be more closely aligned with both the public's expectations for public education and the workforce needs of the state's economy. It is therefore necessary that the accountability system evolve beyond its narrow focus on pupil test scores to encompass other valuable information about school performance, including, but not limited to, pupil preparedness for college and career, as well as the high school graduation rates already required by law.

(I) The Superintendent shall annually determine the accuracy of the graduation rate data. Notwithstanding any other law, graduation rates for pupils in dropout recovery high schools shall not be included in the API. For purposes of this subparagraph, "dropout recovery high school" means a high school in which 50 percent or more of its pupils have been designated as dropouts pursuant to the exit/withdrawal codes developed by the department or left a school and were not otherwise enrolled in a school for a period of at least 180 days.

(J) To complement the API, the Superintendent, with the approval of the state board, may develop and implement a program of school quality review that features locally convened panels to visit schools, observe teachers, interview pupils, and examine pupil work, if an appropriation for this purpose is made in the annual Budget Act.

(K) The Superintendent shall annually provide to local educational agencies and the public a transparent and understandable explanation of the individual components of the API and their relative values within the API.

(L) An additional element chosen by the Superintendent and the state board for inclusion in the API pursuant to this paragraph shall not be incorporated into the API until at least one full school year after the state board's decision to include the element into the API.

(b) Pupil scores from the following tests, when available and when found to be valid and reliable for this purpose, shall be incorporated into the API:

- (1) The standards-based achievement tests provided for in Section 60642.5.
- (2) The high school exit examination.

(c) Based on the API, the Superintendent shall develop, and the state board shall adopt, expected annual percentage growth targets for all schools based on their API baseline score from the previous year. Schools are expected to meet these growth targets through effective allocation of available resources. For schools below the statewide API performance target adopted by the state board pursuant to subdivision (d), the minimum annual percentage growth target shall be 5 percent of the difference between the actual API score of a school and the statewide API performance target, or one API point, whichever is greater. Schools at or above the statewide API performance target shall have, as their growth target, maintenance of their API score above the statewide API performance target. However, the state board may set differential growth targets based on grade level of instruction and may set higher growth targets for the lowest performing schools because they have the greatest room for improvement. To meet its growth target, a school shall demonstrate that the annual growth in its API is equal to or more than its schoolwide annual percentage growth target and that all numerically significant pupil subgroups, as defined in subdivision (a), are making comparable improvement.

(d) Upon adoption of state performance standards by the state board, the Superintendent shall recommend, and the state board shall adopt, a statewide API performance target that includes consideration of performance standards and represents the proficiency level required to meet the state performance target.

(e) (1) A school or school district with 11 to 99 pupils with valid test scores shall receive an API score with an asterisk that indicates less statistical certainty than API scores based on 100 or more test scores.

(2) A school or school district annually shall receive an API score, unless the Superintendent determines that an API score would be an invalid measure of the performance of the school or school district for one or more of the following reasons:

(A) Irregularities in testing procedures occurred.

(B) The data used to calculate the API score of the school or school district are not representative of the pupil population at the school or school district.

(C) Significant demographic changes in the pupil population render year-to-year comparisons of pupil performance invalid.

(D) The department discovers or receives information indicating that the integrity of the API score has been compromised.

(E) Insufficient pupil participation in the assessments included in the API.

(F) A transition to new standards-based assessments compromises comparability of results across schools or school districts. The Superintendent may use the authority in this subparagraph in the 2013–14, 2014–15, and 2015-16 school years only, with the approval of the state board.

(3) If a school or school district has fewer than 100 pupils with valid test scores, the calculation of the API or adequate yearly progress pursuant to the federal No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (20 U.S.C. Sec. 6301 et seq.) and federal regulations may be calculated over more than one annual administration of the tests administered pursuant to Section 60640 and the high school exit examination administered pursuant to Section 60851, consistent with regulations adopted by the state board.

(4) Any school or school district that does not receive an API calculated pursuant to subparagraph (F) of paragraph (2) shall not receive an API growth target pursuant to subdivision (c). Schools and school districts that do not have an API calculated pursuant to subparagraph (F) of paragraph (2) shall use one of the following:

(A) The most recent API calculation.

(B) An average of the three most recent annual API calculations.

(C) Alternative measures that show increases in pupil academic achievement for all groups of pupils schoolwide and among significant subgroups.

(f) Only schools with 100 or more test scores contributing to the API may be included in the API rankings.

(g) The Superintendent, with the approval of the state board, shall develop an alternative accountability system for schools under the jurisdiction of a county board of education or a county superintendent of schools, community day schools, nonpublic, nonsectarian schools pursuant to Section 56366, and alternative schools serving high-risk pupils, including continuation high schools and opportunity schools. Schools in the alternative accountability system may receive an API score, but shall not be included in the API rankings.

(h) For purposes of this section, county offices of education shall be considered school districts.

(i) For purposes of this section, "homeless youth" has the same meaning as in Section 11434a(2) of Title 42 of the United States Code.