



CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

JANUARY 2016 AGENDA

SUBJECT	
Developing a New Accountability System: Update on the Local Control Funding Formula Evaluation Rubrics, including, but not limited to, a discussion on standards and expectations for improvement as specified in California <i>Education Code</i> Section 52064.5 and Implications for State and Federal Accountability.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Action <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information <input type="checkbox"/> Public Hearing

SUMMARY OF THE ISSUE(S)

California's new accountability system will build on the foundations of the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) consisting of the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP), Annual Update, evaluation rubrics, and the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence (CCEE) support structure. On June 24, 2015, Governor Brown signed Assembly Bill (AB) 104 (Chapter 13, Statutes of 2015), extending the deadline for adoption of the evaluation rubrics to October 1, 2016.

The recent enactment of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), gives states greater discretion to implement academic content standards, administer statewide and local assessments, and set ambitious performance goals to direct evidence-based improvement strategies and interventions to improve student performance.

This item is the sixth in a series of regular updates on California's progress on transitioning to a new accountability system that coherently supports the goals of multiple measures and continuous improvement as defined by the LCFF. To ensure that the new accountability system and the components of the state and federal accountability requirements are cohesive and well aligned, the State Board of Education (SBE) will need to phase in policy changes as the federal requirements are finalized.

The focus of this item is to review the accountability components of ESSA in relation to California's emerging work supporting accountability system coherence. The item includes an update on the LCFF evaluation rubrics using graduation rate as an example of standards, and a discussion of this approach in the context of aligning the ESSA with the LCFF.

RECOMMENDATION

The staff recommends that the SBE take action as deemed necessary and appropriate but recommends no specific action at this time.

BRIEF HISTORY OF KEY ISSUES

California's path to developing a new statewide accountability system originates from the statutory enactment by the Legislature to establish the LCFF signed by the Governor in 2013. The state priorities embedded throughout LCFF provide the foundation for accountability by defining what the state seeks to accomplish for its students and measures the progress of local educational agencies (LEAs) relative to these priorities (Attachment 1). Consisting of the LCAP, Annual Update, evaluation rubrics, and CCEE support systems, the LCFF enhances the allocation of resources by integrating LEA budgets with locally approved goals, services, and actions for LEAs to improve student outcomes.

Recent efforts to align the existing state academic and fiscal accountability components with the LCFF culminated in a draft framework and implementation plan for the new accountability system. The draft framework and implementation plan was presented to the SBE (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr15/documents/nov15item11.doc>). As California continues on its path to developing the new accountability system, the enactment of the ESSA introduces an opportunity to integrate federal and state accountability components, including the LCFF, to develop one coherent and unified accountability system. The new accountability system will be designed to strengthen teaching and learning, improve the individual capacity of teachers and school leaders, and increase institutional capacity for continuous improvement for schools, districts, and state agencies.

The SBE envisions a new integrated and comprehensive accountability system that supports continuous improvement. As California transitions to this new system, the following questions should be considered:

- What are the primary goals and purposes of the new accountability system?
- How can California best create one integrated state and federal accountability system?
- What specific technical issues will need to be addressed in aligning the federal accountability requirements with the state accountability system?
- How will data from multiple measures and indicators reflecting the state priorities be used to differentiate the needs of schools and districts needing technical assistance? Will the accountability system use differentiation to acknowledge continuous improvement and systems of local and state support?

- How will the accountability system provide both status and growth information for all indicators, in addition to growth on summative assessments (e.g., Smarter Balanced assessments)? How will information on how well schools and districts are performing and making satisfactory progress be determined?
- What is the necessary timeframe to create a single accountability system? How will the development of the ESSA requirements (e.g., State Plan) fit together with the implementation of the LCFF (e.g., completion of the evaluation rubrics)?

Attachment 1 presents a comparison of the ESSA and LCFF on select accountability components. As the components of the ESSA evolve through the regulatory and public comment process, the California Department of Education (CDE) and SBE staff will continue to report out to the SBE on the implications of these federal requirements on developing one coherent accountability system.

The ESSA and LCFF comparison provides the context for the update on the LCFF evaluation rubrics. Attachment 2 introduces the development of quality standards and expectations for improvement using graduation rate as an example. The four-year cohort graduation rate is included in both the ESSA and LCFF requirements and serves as a relevant example to clarify the technical issues and additional analyses that are necessary to align ESSA with the state's accountability system to support continuous improvement.

Attachment 3 provides an updated timeline to reflect the additional time that will be necessary to align the federal system with the state's accountability system. Prior to the enactment of the ESSA, the SBE was on track to adopt the evaluation rubrics in July 2016. The timeline now reflects a revised plan to utilize the entire amount of time authorized in statute (California Education Code (*EC*) Section 52064.5) to adopt the rubrics by October 1, 2016. In addition, the timeline reflects the process to revise the draft framework and implementation plan for the new accountability system that includes the development of the ESSA State Plan. This attachment also provides updated information on communication and outreach strategies to support the new accountability system, in addition to specific resources to support the LCAP.

Finally, Attachment 4 contains *EC* sections referencing the LCFF.

SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION DISCUSSION AND ACTION

In November 2015, the SBE received a draft framework and implementation plan for the new accountability system and an update on the LCFF evaluation rubrics that included an overview of the User Acceptance Testing (UAT) pilot (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr15/documents/nov15item11.doc>). The UAT is designed for select LEAs to provide input on local data management practices, design options for data displays, and analyses.

In September 2015, the SBE received an update on the LCFF evaluation rubrics that included a conceptual approach for organizing the indicators and metrics identified in statute for each of the state priorities for inclusion in the development of the rubrics (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr15/documents/sep15item14.doc>). Using graduation content as the example, the SBE reviewed a process for defining standards and expectations for improvement using an approach similar to the evidence-based approach used in Alberta, Canada.

In August 2015, the SBE received an Information Memorandum on the review of existing state academic and fiscal accountability components relative to the LCFF state priorities (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-sbe-aug15item01.doc>).

In July 2015, the SBE received an update on the LCFF evaluation rubrics that included a discussion on the policy framework to develop the evaluation rubrics based on the following: (1) align with state priorities and values related to certain learning conditions (i.e., *Williams* settlement legislation), graduation, and college and career readiness; (2) incorporate into the evaluation rubrics descriptions of practices for each of the state priorities grounded in research and best practices; and (3) conduct further research to identify relationships and correlations among metrics that will be included in the evaluation rubrics. (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr15/documents/jul15item01.doc>).

In June 2015, the SBE received the following Information Memoranda: (1) research to inform the development of the LCFF evaluation rubrics (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-sbe-jun15item01.doc>); and (2) review of measures being used by other states for college and career readiness (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-dsib-amard-jun15item01.doc>).

FISCAL ANALYSIS (AS APPROPRIATE)

LCFF: When the LCFF was adopted in the 2013–14 budget year, the budget projections for 2015–16 were approximately \$47 billion. With rising state revenues, the 2015–16 state budget signed by the Governor allocates \$53 billion this year. This provides an increase of \$6 billion to support the continued implementation of LCFF and build upon the investment of over \$6 billion provided over the last two years. As a result of this increase, the 2015–16 Budget Act provides an opportunity to correct historical inequities and implement the formula well ahead of schedule. Specifically, this investment translates to approximately \$3,000 more per student in 2015–16 over the 2011–12 levels and closes more than 51 percent of the remaining LCFF funding target. Additionally, \$40 million will be provided to county offices of education (COEs) to support their new responsibilities required under the evolving accountability structure of the LCFF and develop greater capacity and consistency within and between COEs.

ESSA: While it is still too early in the process to determine how all of the funding mechanisms will work for California, some of the significant changes include the following:

Title I Formula

- To date, it is projected that overall authorizations for Title I, Part A will increase by 12.3 percent over the next four years. The fiscal year 2015 appropriation is approximately \$15 billion to support school improvement and direct student services activities.
- The 1 percent cap to support state administrative support remains, while the School Improvement Grant has been eliminated and the current law of 4 percent set-aside of Title I, Part A for states to support school improvement activities is increased to 7 percent.
- States may also reserve 3 percent of Title I, Part A to support direct services.
- States can set aside 20 percent of budget for state and local assessments from Title I, Part B.
- Over time, more funding will be allocated to states with a higher proportion of migrant student population from Title I, Part C.

Weighted Student Funding Pilot

- This is a pilot program that will include up to 50 districts nationally to consolidate some of their federal funds with state and local dollars to establish a weighted student funding formula. The federal funds for this pilot include Title I, II, and III, in addition to portions of Title IV (Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants) and Part B of Title V (Rural Education Initiative).

ATTACHMENT(S)

Attachment 1: Comparison of Select Accountability Components from the Every Student Succeeds Act and the Local Control Funding Formula (8 Pages)

Attachment 2: Introduction to the Quality Standards for Graduation Rate and Preliminary Summary of the User Acceptance Testing Pilot (6 Pages)

Attachment 3: Timeline for the Proposed Transition to a New Accountability System, Including Communication, Resources, and Outreach (4 Pages)

Attachment 4: California *Education Code* Sections 52064.5, 47607.3, 52071, 52071.5, 52072, 52072.5, 52060, 52066, 52064, and 52052 (15 Pages)

Comparison of Select Accountability Components from the Every Student Succeeds Act and the Local Control Funding Formula

The recent enactment of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) introduces significant changes in federal accountability by allowing States to develop and implement accountability systems that meet minimum federal requirements and augment a State approach to technical assistance and intervention that will support continuous improvement. California is currently developing a statewide accountability system using a conceptual framework that is similar in many respects to the requirements proposed by ESSA. Many of the components of the developing state accountability system, such as the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) and the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) evaluation rubrics, will be the central drivers in California’s development of one coherent and comprehensive system that incorporates the federal accountability requirements. The table below describes select ESSA components on accountability in relation to the LCFF requirements. Given the enhanced discretion in ESSA for states to define accountability systems that meet minimum federal requirements, this comparison provides a preliminary review of ESSA to frame the discussion on aligning the federal requirements with California’s developing accountability system.

Timeline		
ESSA	LCFF	Comments
<p>The ESSA accountability system and related interventions will take effect in 2017–18.</p>	<p>The State Board of Education (SBE) must adopt the LCFF evaluation rubrics by October 1, 2016.</p>	<p>The ESSA State Plan will go into effect August 2017. Attachment 3 presents the timeline to support the planning and engagement strategies that will be used to develop the ESSA State Plan. Based on this timeline, the California Department of Education (CDE) will present the draft ESSA State Plan to the SBE no later than November 2016.</p>

Number of Indicators		
ESSA	LCFF	Comments
<p>Elementary and Middle Schools</p> <p><i>Academic Achievement</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> English language arts and mathematics in grades 3 through 8, inclusive Science assessed once in each grade span of 3–5 and 6–9 <p><i>English Proficiency</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress of English learners (ELs) in achieving English proficiency <p><i>Another Academic Indicator</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other academic factor that can be broken out by subgroup (this could include growth on assessments) <p><i>At Least One Other Indicator</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional indicator (e.g., student engagement and school climate/safety) 	<p>LCFF State Priorities for School Districts, Charter Schools, and County Offices of Education¹</p> <p><i>Basic:</i> degree to which teachers are appropriately assigned pursuant to <i>Education Code (EC)</i> Section 44258.9, and fully credentialed in the subject areas and for the pupils they are teaching; pupils have access to standards-aligned instructional materials pursuant to <i>EC</i> Section 60119; and school facilities are maintained in good repair pursuant to <i>EC</i> Section 17002(d). (Priority 1)</p> <p><i>Implementation of State Standards:</i> implementation of academic content and performance standards and English language development standards adopted by the state board for all pupils, including English learners ELs. (Priority 2)</p> <p><i>Parental involvement:</i> efforts to seek parent input in decision making at the district and each school site, promotion of parent participation in programs for unduplicated pupils and special need subgroups. (Priority 3)</p> <p><i>Pupil achievement:</i> performance on standardized tests, score on the Academic Performance Index (API), share of pupils that are college and career ready, share of ELs that become English proficient, EL reclassification rate, share of pupils that pass Advanced Placement exams with 3 or higher, share of pupils determined prepared for college by the Early Assessment Program. (Priority 4)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistent with California’s accountability system, ESSA proposes multiple measures to assess more than just performance on standardized tests. Measures of growth to reflect continuous improvement are also consistent between ESSA and LCFF. What has yet to be determined is the methodology for weighting certain indicators more than others, and whether these weights must aggregate into one index or composite score. The State must determine the selection of the additional academic achievement indicator for elementary and middle schools. Growth scores on assessments is one example.

¹ The description of the LCFF state priorities and associated indicators and metrics is specified in *California Code of Regulations (CCR)*, Title 5 Section 15497.5 and *EC* sections 52060 and 52066. The state priorities are required for all LEAs where applicable and listed in the table in the order of priorities one through ten for discussion purposes.

Number of Indicators		
ESSA	LCFF	Comments
<p>High Schools</p> <p><i>Academic Achievement</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> English language arts and mathematics assessed one time in grades 9 through 12 Science assessed once in grade span of 10–12 <p><i>English Proficiency</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress in achieving English proficiency <p><i>Another Academic Indicator</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate (states can add extended rate) <p><i>At Least One Other Indicator</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional indicator (e.g., opportunity to learn and readiness for post-secondary) <p>Participation rate of 95% on state tests is a standalone measure</p>	<p>LCFF State Priorities for School Districts, Charter Schools, and County Offices of Education</p> <p><i>Pupil engagement:</i> school attendance rates, chronic absenteeism rates, middle school dropout rates, high school dropout rates, high school graduation rates. (Priority 5)</p> <p><i>School climate:</i> pupil suspension rates, pupil expulsion rates, other local measures including surveys of pupils, parents and teachers on the sense of safety and school connectedness. (Priority 6)</p> <p><i>Course access:</i> pupil enrollment in a broad course of study that includes all of the subject areas described in <i>EC</i> Section 51210 and subdivisions (a) to (i), inclusive, of Section 51220, as applicable. (Priority 7)²</p> <p><i>Other pupil outcomes:</i> pupil outcomes in the subject areas described in <i>EC</i> Section 51210 and subdivisions (a) to (i), inclusive, of <i>EC</i> Section 51220, as applicable. (Priority 8)</p> <p><i>Expelled pupils (for county offices of education only):</i> coordination of instruction of expelled pupils pursuant to <i>EC</i> Section 48926. (Priority 9)</p> <p><i>Foster youth (for county offices of education only):</i> coordination of services, including working with the county child welfare agency to share information, responding to the needs of the juvenile court system, and ensuring transfer of health and education records. (Priority 10)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under ESSA, the State must also determine at least one other indicator for elementary, middle, and high school. Under LCFF, LEAs may select local indicators in addition to the State priority indicators/metrics. What criteria should be used to make the final selection of metrics for the purpose of identifying highest need schools? For example, among the LCFF metrics, using state defined and state collected metrics is preferred when using these data for comparative purposes.

² *EC* section 51210 applies to the adopted course of study for grades 1 to 6, inclusive, in the following areas of study: English, Mathematics, Social Science, Science, Visual and Performing Arts, Health, Physical Education and other studies prescribed by the SBE. *EC* section 51220 applies to the adopted course of study for grades 7 to 12, inclusive, in the following areas of study: English, Social Sciences, Foreign language or languages, Physical Education, Science, Mathematics, Visual and Performing Arts, Applied Arts, Career Technical Education, Automobile Driver Education, and other studies prescribed by the SBE.

Identification for Technical Assistance and Intervention		
ESSA	LCFF	Comments
<p>Identification of Lowest Performing LEAs for Intervention</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must “meaningfully differentiate” all schools and subgroups in state; more “substantial” weight on academic indicators • Must establish methodology for identifying schools for comprehensive support and improvement that are at least- the lowest-performing 5 percent (of Title I schools) and all high schools graduating less than 2/3 of students • Identification of students must start in 2017–18 and occur at least once every three years 	<p>Identification for Technical Assistance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For school districts, <i>EC</i> Section 52071 specifies that if an LCAP or Annual Update is not approved by the county superintendent of schools or if a local governing body requests assistance, then the county superintendent of schools shall provide technical assistance. Using the evaluation rubrics, the county superintendent shall provide technical assistance to any district that “fails to improve pupil achievement across more than one state priority...for one or more pupil subgroup identified pursuant to Section 52052.” • For county offices of education, <i>EC</i> Section 52071.5 specifies that if an LCAP or Annual Update is not approved by the SPI, or the county board of education requests assistance, the SPI shall provide technical assistance. Using the evaluation rubrics, the SPI shall provide technical assistance to any county office that “fails to improve pupil achievement across more than one state priority...for one or more pupil subgroup identified pursuant to Section 52052.” • For charter schools, <i>EC</i> Section 47607.3 specifies that the chartering authority shall provide technical assistance, using the evaluation rubrics, to the charter school if the 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.” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Once the indicators have been determined, the state must define the methodology to assign more weight to the academic factors when using performance on the indicators to differentiate LEAs. • How will the state assign weights within a multiple measures system for identification without creating a composite or single index score?

Identification for Technical Assistance and Intervention		
ESSA	LCFF	Comments
	<p>Identification for Intervention</p> <p><i>EC</i> Section 52072 specifies that the SPI may, with the approval of the SBE, identify school districts in need of intervention if a district meets both of the following criteria:</p> <p>(1) The school district “did not improve the outcomes” for three or more pupil subgroups identified pursuant to <i>EC</i> 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.</p> <p>(2) The CCEE has provided advice and assistance to the school district pursuant to <i>EC</i> Section 52071 and submits either of the following findings to the SPI:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(A) That the school district has failed, or is unable, to implement the recommendations of the CCEE.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(B) That the inadequate performance of the school district, based upon the evaluation rubrics, is either so persistent or acute as to require intervention by the SPI.</p> <p>(A parallel set of conditions is set forth in <i>EC</i> Section 52072.5 for county offices of education and similar conditions in <i>EC</i> Section 47607.3 for charter schools that also include possible revocation of a charter school)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beyond the identification and weighting of indicators to identify the needs for intervention, what are the state and local goals from which to evaluate performance to determine the needs for technical assistance? • Should the new accountability system also include identification to support continuous improvement, such as acknowledgement for improvements (e.g., California Distinguished Schools) and providing service and support (e.g., serving as an exemplary peer provider through the CCEE)?

Technical Assistance and Intervention		
ESSA	LCFF	Comments
<p>Intervention- Comprehensive Support and Improvement</p> <p>States must annually notify LEAs of schools that are identified for comprehensive support; LEAs must develop and implement a comprehensive and support improvement plan that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is informed by all indicators in the statewide accountability system, including student performance against state goals • Includes evidence-based interventions • Is based on a school-level needs assessment • Identifies resource inequities to be addressed • State must approve plan and monitor intervention 	<p>Technical Assistance</p> <p><i>EC</i> sections 52071 and 52071.5 specifies that the technical assistance may include, among other things, any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of LEA strengths and weaknesses in regard to the applicable state priorities, including a review of effective, evidence-based programs that apply to the LEA’s goals; • Assignment of an academic expert or team of academic experts to assist the LEA in identifying and implementing effective programs designed to improve the outcomes for all pupil subgroups identified in <i>EC</i> Section 52052; • Solicitation of another LEA to act as a partner to the LEA in need of technical assistance; and • Request that the SPI assign the CCEE to provide advice and assistance to the LEA (or in the case of the SPI, assign the CCEE to advise and assist the COE). <p>Intervention</p> <p><i>EC</i> sections 52072 and 52072.5 specifies that school districts and county offices of education identified as needing intervention, the SPI may, with the approval of the SBE, do one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make changes to an LCAP adopted by the governing board of the school district. • Develop and impose a budget revision, in conjunction with revisions to the LCAP, that the SPI determines would allow the school district to improve the outcomes for all pupil subgroups identified pursuant to <i>EC</i> Section 52052 in regard to state and local priorities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ESSA primarily focuses on schools while LCFF is LEA-directed. • The LCFF designs a multi-tiered system of support that includes the COE, the CCEE, and the SPI/CDE. • What is the role of the state systems of support in ESSA? • What are the similarities and differences between the ESSA comprehensive support and improvement plan and the LCAP?

Technical Assistance and Intervention		
ESSA	LCFF	Comments
<p>Intervention-Targeted Support and Improvement</p> <p>State must notify LEAs of schools where any subgroup is persistently underperforming for targeted support; schools must develop a targeted support and improvement plan that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes all indicators in the statewide accountability system, including student performance against state goals • Includes evidence-based interventions • Is approved and monitored by the LEA • Will result in additional action if unsuccessful after an LEA-determined number of years • Identify resource inequities for subgroups 	<p>Intervention</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <i>EC</i> Section 52052 in regard to state or local priorities. • Appoint an academic trustee to exercise the powers and authority specified in this section on his or her behalf. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the relationship between the school level plans, the ESSA Targeted Support and Improvement Plan and the Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA)? • What is the role of the state in the Targeted Support and Improvement Plan?

Numerically Significant Subgroups		
ESSA	LCFF	Comments
<p>Definition of Student Group</p> <p>Includes minimum number of students for disaggregation of students by subgroup (e.g., n-size or sample size) that is universal and statistically sound</p> <p>ESSA State Plan must include achievement data disaggregated by subgroup that includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each major racial and ethnic group • Economically disadvantaged students as compared to students who are not economically disadvantaged • Children with disabilities as compared to children without disabilities • English proficiency status • Gender • Migrant Status 	<p>Definition of Student Groups</p> <p>EC Section 52052 specifies...numerically significant pupil subgroups at the school or school district, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ethnic subgroups. • Socioeconomically disadvantaged pupils. • English learners. • Pupils with disabilities. • Foster youth. • Homeless youth. • 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. • ...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. <p>Note: “n” is defined as the sample size. For example, the “n-size” of 30 designates that a subgroup sample with 30 or more students may be included in the analysis that disaggregates data by subgroup.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the state want to report out a consistent “n-size” for all student groups? ESSA recommends the minimum number of students by subgroup is universal across all groups, LCFF requires an n-size of 30 for all subgroups except foster and homeless youth can be reported with a minimum number of 15. • Will the accountability system include consistent reporting of subgroups for all accountability components (e.g., not just achievement data)? • In what ways will the accountability system measure performance, equity, and improvement for all student groups? • Will there be a universal definition for proficiency in English for ELs that will meet the federal and state accountability requirements?

12-30-15 [State Board of Education and California Department of Education]

Introduction to the Quality Standards for Graduation Rate and Preliminary Summary of the User Acceptance Testing Pilot

The evaluation rubrics are an integral part of the new accountability system. Once developed, the rubrics will direct attention to areas in need of additional support to meet the adopted standards for district and school performance relative to the state priorities. Specifically, the evaluation rubrics will: (1) assist local educational agencies (LEAs) in evaluating their strengths, weaknesses, and areas that require improvement; (2) assist county superintendents of schools in identifying LEAs in need of technical assistance and providing resources for technical assistance; and (3) assist the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI) in identifying LEAs for which technical support and/or intervention is warranted. The State Board of Education (SBE) must adopt the evaluation rubrics by October 1, 2016.

In September, the SBE reviewed a sample structure for the rubrics that organized the indicators and metrics into three policy areas: (1) *Access and Opportunity*, (2) *Graduation*, and (3) *College and Career Readiness*. The SBE also discussed an approach for defining standards and expectations for improvement through two types of standards within the evaluation rubrics: (1) *Practice Standards*, defined as qualitative narrative statements that convey research supported practices, and (2) *Quality Standards*, defined as measurement-based data displays that demonstrate local progress on the state priorities. These standards align to the SBE's evaluation rubrics policy areas and provide specific reference to practices and measurements against which an LEA may assess strengths, areas in need of improvement, and local performance.

To review the organizing structure of the evaluation rubrics from the LEA perspective, the SBE recommended that a statewide sample pilot review select components of the LCFF evaluation rubrics to help inform its development. The User Acceptance Testing (UAT) pilot consisted of over 30 LEAs (county offices of education, school districts, and charter schools). The UAT affords LEAs with an opportunity to provide input in three different phases that review the content and structure, standards and design, and online prototype of the evaluation rubrics system. The pilot LEAs provided information on the proposed content and structure using the *Graduation* policy area as an example in Phase I of the pilot. LEAs reviewed the example to determine its relevance, usefulness, and applicability to support local planning and evaluation of performance relative to the LCFF state priorities. The pilot also included a draft structure map of the evaluation rubrics that defined the key and associated indicators and a complete draft of the practice standards that cover each of the state priority areas.

Defining and Approaching Quality Standards

The sample structure for the quality standards references an approach used by Alberta, Canada (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr15/documents/sep15item14a3rev.doc>). This sample was presented to the SBE and reviewed by the UAT Phase I pilot as an option to support a continuous improvement framework within an accountability system.

Beyond the focus on outcomes, this system includes a measure of improvement that allows for growth to be considered as part of the overall performance.

The Alberta system supports the analysis of Improvement that reflects the percentage change (e.g., growth or decline) in LEA performance. Improvement is classified in one of five ways – Improved Significantly, Improved, Maintained, Declined, and Declined Significantly. The Alberta system also supports the analysis of Outcome that reflects LEA performance relative to the statewide distribution. The Outcome five-point classification includes – Very High, High, Intermediate, Low, and Very Low. The system then combines Improvement and Outcome to create an overall rating. This overall rating or Composite classification includes – Excellent, Good, Emerging, Issue, and Concern that can serve to identify where technical assistance or intervention may be warranted.

The table below presents an overview of the Improvement and Outcome Classifications and how these can be combined to create the overall rating or Composite Classifications. For example, an LEA that scores Maintained on Improvement and Low on Outcome would yield Issue, designated by the color orange, on the overall rating. This designation could then be used to determine the need for technical assistance.

Improvement	Outcome				
	Very High	High	Intermediate	Low	Very Low
Improved Significantly	Excellent	Good	Good	Good	Emerging
Improved	Excellent	Good	Good	Emerging	Issue
Maintained	Excellent	Good	Emerging	Issue	Concern
Declined	Good	Emerging	Issue	Issue	Concern
Declined Significantly	Emerging	Issue	Issue	Concern	Concern

Overview of UAT Phase II

The recent enactment of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) presents an opportunity to align the new federal requirements with local and state accountability and improvement. The broadening of indicators in the ESSA used for accountability is consistent with the concept and approach under development for the evaluation rubrics. The evaluation rubrics development process continues, and will be coordinated with the development of new approaches to local, state, and federal accountability.

Given the references to graduation rate in both the LCFF state priorities and ESSA, the Phase II UAT expanded upon the graduation rate example provided in Phase I. Specifically, this example provided the calculation of Improvement and Outcome using statewide data based on the methodology that is used by Alberta, Canada. LEAs received a packet of materials that are located on the WestEd LCFF Web site

(http://lcff.wested.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/EvalRubricsUAT_PhaseIIReviewerGuidance.pdf).

Follow-up telephone interviews were conducted with each UAT LEA participant to collect responses to the following questions:

- Does the color-based classification approach support local accountability? Continuous improvement? Please explain.
- What aspect(s) of the rationale/analysis used to determine the quality standard is most compelling?
- Based on what you know about ESSA, should local, state, and federal standards used for accountability be the same or different? In other words, should the quality standards for the evaluation rubrics be the same as federal accountability standard? Please explain.
- What additional advice or questions do you have at this time?

Excerpts from the UAT Phase II packet are presented below to display the graduation rate example that is based on the Alberta accountability system. The example begins with the basis for collecting and reporting the graduation rate followed by an analysis and proposed recommendations for establishing a quality standard for graduation rate.

Example Analysis of Graduation Rate to Inform Quality Standard

Background: In order to graduate from California public high schools, students must complete specified state and local graduation requirements. Local school districts have the authority and responsibility for establishing high school graduation requirements. These requirements vary among school districts. However, California *Education Code (EC)* Section 51225.3 specifies that students must pass a minimum set of required courses and an exit examination³. These requirements should be viewed as minimums and support for the regulations are specified by local school boards.⁴

Since 2009–10, the CDE has reported four-year cohort graduate rates, which identify a "cohort" or group of students that could potentially graduate during a four-year time period (grade nine through grade twelve). This cohort is then "adjusted" by adding students who transfer in to the cohort and subtracting the students who transferred to another school that offers a high school diploma, emigrated to another county, or died during the years covered by the cohort rate. Students who drop out during the four-year period remain in the adjusted cohort, as well as students who complete grade 12 and exit the educational system without graduating. Students who take longer than four

³ Senate Bill (SB) 172 (Liu) was signed by the Governor to suspend the administration of the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE) and the requirement that students pass the CAHSEE to receive a high school diploma for the 2015–16, 2016–17, and 2017–18 school years effective January 1, 2016.

⁴ Retrieved from: <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/gq/hs/hsgrgen.asp> (December 6, 2015)

years to graduate or remain enrolled after four years are also included as part of the cohort.

Students from the cohort who: (1) pass the General Education Development (GED) test, (2) complete requirements necessary to obtain a special education certificate of completion, or (3) remain enrolled in the 9–12 instructional system without a high school diploma are included in the total cohort population (denominator), but they are not included as graduates or dropouts in the cohort outcome calculations in either the cohort graduation or cohort dropout rates. However, these groups of students receive separate completer rates (GED Completer Rate, Special Education Completer Rate, and Still Enrolled Completer Rate). Thus, the cohort graduation rate and the cohort dropout rate will not sum to 100 percent when one or more of these other completer rates exist within the cohort.⁵

Analysis: Graduation rates are a commonly collected metric with most states using comparable definitions. California has shown a steady increase in graduation rates over time, yet gaps between student groups persist. The table below shows California’s 4-year cohort graduation rate from 2009–10 through 2013–14.

	2009–10	2010–11	2011–12	2012–13	2013–14
All Students	74.7%	77.1%	78.9%	80.4%	81.0%
Hispanic	68.1%	71.4%	73.7%	75.7%	76.6%
American Indian	67.3%	68.5%	72.4%	72.8%	70.6%
Asian	89.0%	90.3%	91.1%	91.6%	92.4%
Pacific Islander	72.3%	74.9%	77.0%	78.4%	80.4%
Filipino	87.4%	89.9%	90.8%	91.6%	92.2%
African American	60.5%	62.8%	66.0%	68.1%	68.2%
White	83.5%	85.7%	86.6%	87.7%	87.6%
Low Income	68.0%	71.1%	73.0%	74.8%	75.6%
English Learner	56.4%	61.5%	62.0%	63.1%	65.4%
Foster Youth	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Students with Disabilities	56.7%	59.5%	61.1%	61.9%	62.3%

In order to demonstrate the classification system that is consistent with the Alberta accountability methodology, statewide data were analyzed to calculate Outcome and Improvement. Outcome was derived from the three-year average of the cohort graduation rate while Improvement was calculated by measuring the three-year percentile change in cohort graduation rate (e.g., percent growth or decline).

⁵ Cohort Graduation explanation adapted from Ed-Data: <http://www.ed-data.org/article/Student-Level-Data-and-Dropout-Graduation-Rates> (retrieved December 6, 2015)

Based on the three-year averages of Outcome and three-year Improvement calculations, the table below shows the statewide distribution of results by decile.⁶ This provides a measure of relative standing for each LEA performance on Outcome and Improvement relative to the statewide distribution.

Percentile	Outcome – 3-Year Average	Improvement – 3-Year Percentile Change
90 th	96.1%	6.5%
80 th	94.3%	3.9%
70 th	92.3%	2.3%
60 th	90.7%	1.4%
50 th	88.8%	0.7%
40 th	86.4%	-0.2%
30 th	83.3%	-1.2%
20 th	78.7%	-2.8%
10 th	44.8% and below	-6.2%

Recommended Evaluation Rubrics Standard: California’s current federal accountability standard/target for graduation rate is 90 percent. Based on the analyses presented above, the 60th percentile corresponds to the 90 percent graduation rate for Outcome. The percent change at the 60th percentile is 1.4 percent growth for Improvement. Therefore, the current policy of a 90 percent graduation rate could be adjusted to correspond to the 60th percentile as the quality standard. Achieving at the 60th percentile or greater for Outcome and Improvement is then classified as “Very High and High.” Based on current data, approximately 40 percent of LEAs would meet or exceed this standard.

Outcome	Very Low	Low	Intermediate	High	Very High
	78.6% or below	78.7 to 83.2%	83.3 to 90.6%	90.7 to 96.0%	96.1% or above
Improvement	Declined Significantly	Declined	Maintained	Improved	Improved Significantly
	-2.9% or below	-1.3 to -2.8%	-1.2% to 1.3%	1.4% to 6.4	6.5% or above

Preliminary Summary and Next Steps

To solicit input from LEAs on the process to align the ESSA with the LCFF, the UAT participants responded to the following:

⁶ To calculate the deciles, the three-year graduation rate averages and percentile change were rank ordered from lowest to highest. The results were then divided into 10 equally sized groups or bands. Note that the deciles reflect the distribution of the results. Because graduation rates are clustered or skewed, the 50th percentile point falls above the average.

- Based on what you know about ESSA, should local, state, and federal standards used for accountability be the same or different? In other words, should the quality standards for the evaluation rubrics be the same as federal accountability standard? Please explain.

A preliminary review of the responses reveals that users were generally in favor of aligning the federal accountability requirements with the state accountability requirements to create one coherent statewide accountability system. Although, given what is known at this time, the respondents clarified that the system must include multiple measures and local measures to generate meaningful results. Users also reported that one coherent system that does not require the duplication of submission of information and separate generation of reports for multiple accountability reports should be a goal for the new statewide accountability system.

Overall, the LEAs were pleased to see the ESEA reauthorized and viewed this as an opportunity to “get it right” this time. Therefore, the UAT participants support the proposal to add another phase to the pilot testing of the rubrics in order to have more time to review the research on all of the indicators and metrics to make a final selection for the “other” indicators as required by the ESSA. Further information and discussion on the specific alignment of standards and the role of growth in the context of a continuous improvement accountability system is necessary to ensure the final selection of indicators is relevant for the rubrics and state accountability system.

To establish the context for moving forward with aligning the federal and state accountability systems, a comprehensive summary of the UAT responses from Phase I and II will be shared with the UAT participants. A final summary of these responses will be posted on the WestEd LCFF Web site. The summary of responses will be also presented at future SBE meetings to help frame the conversation and direction of developing the evaluation rubrics system. Given the revised timeline to adopt the LCFF evaluation rubrics (Attachment 3), the UAT pilot process will be revised from the initial schedule of three phases to include a Phase IV. This will allow for an additional phase to present further options for growth and outcome on all of the proposed indicators and metrics for the ESSA and LCFF to support a coherent statewide accountability system.

12-30-15 [State Board of Education]

**Timeline for the Proposed Transition to a New Accountability System,
 Including Communication, Resources, and Outreach**

The Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP), along with the Annual Update, the evaluation rubrics, and the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence (CCEE) support structure all function as components of the new accountability system. The California Department of Education (CDE) is developing more resources to support districts with the implementation of the funding formula that are available on the CDE Web site. These include questions and answers to commonly asked questions, an electronic template, funding snapshots, and the CDE LCAP Support Team. Below is additional information about best practices, including examples of executive summaries that succinctly describe local goals and planned actions to improve student outcomes.

In November, the State Board of Education (SBE) reviewed a draft implementation plan and requested the CDE provide a detailed work plan to outline the next steps to implement specific action items to transition to the new accountability system. Given the passage in December 2015 of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), the CDE will develop a draft work plan to integrate the required components for the federal accountability system. The timeline below will be revised to reflect the additional time that is necessary to integrate the federal accountability requirements with the draft framework and work plan for the new accountability system as the components of ESSA evolve through the regulatory process.

Timeline for the Proposed Transition to the New Accountability System

SBE Meeting	Proposed Transition to ESSA Requirements	Development of LCFF Evaluation Rubrics
January 2016	Solicit applications for the Title I Committee of Practitioners (COP). Anticipate U.S. Department of Education (ED) providing guidance with intent to publish rules and regulations within six months. Public hearing on Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) on January 11, 2016, from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.(EST) and January 19, 2016, from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. (PT).	Present example of quality standards and expectations for improvement using graduation rate as the example (Attachment 2).

SBE Meeting	Proposed Transition to ESSA Requirements	Development of LCFF Evaluation Rubrics
March 2016	The State Board of Education Screening Committee recommendations for appointments to the Title I COP.	Present the SBE with final design features of the evaluation rubrics based on User Acceptance Testing (UAT) and feedback.
May 2016	California Department of Education (CDE) solicits input from stakeholders.	Present the SBE with update on use and evaluation of the rubrics prototype.
July 2016	CDE drafts ESSA State Plan to conform to rules and regulations. CDE solicits input from stakeholders. Proposed concepts for integrating federal requirements with state accountability.	Finalize evaluation rubrics based on guidance from the SBE, feedback from local educational agencies (LEAs), county offices of education (COEs) and as appropriate input from stakeholders.
September 2016	CDE revises early draft of ESSA State Plan based on stakeholder input.	Final Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) Evaluation Rubrics for SBE Adoption.
November 2016	Draft ESSA State Plan for SBE Review.	
January 2017	CDE revises ESSA State Plan based on stakeholder feedback and submits to SBE for approval at January meeting. CDE then submits approved ESSA State Plan to ED; ED has up to 120 days to review ESSA State Plan.	
June 2017 (or earlier)	Accepted ESSA State Plan is published.	
July 2017	New Accountability System begins August 2017.	

Communication and Outreach

A summary of the communication and outreach sessions that have been completed since the November 2015 SBE meeting are presented below. The new accountability system will support continuous learning and improvement, equity, and transparency and will be grounded in state and local partnerships to sustain its implementation.

- *Policy Stakeholder Session* – On December 18th 2015, WestEd convened representatives from statewide and community-based organizations to review the draft quality standards for the proposed key indicators in the draft evaluation rubrics. The mock-ups shared with the group were the same sections reviewed and tested through the User Acceptance Testing (UAT) Phase II pilot process. The input provided will be used to help inform the development of the standards and display options of the evaluation rubrics.
- *User Acceptance Testing (UAT)* – representatives from over 30 LEAs participated in the UAT Phase I. These LEAs provided input on draft practice and quality standard content for the *Graduation* section of the evaluation rubrics (<http://lcff.wested.org/local-control-funding-formula-evaluation-rubrics-examples-october-2015/>). Participants provided information on local data management practices, design options for data displays and analyses that are user friendly, helpful for local reflective processes, and to determine if technical assistance is necessary. LEAs responded to structured interview questions to help clarify the connection points to the workflow process through their anticipated use of the rubrics (<http://lcff.wested.org/evaluation-rubrics-phase-i-user-acceptance-testing-reflection-questions/>). Specifically, participants explained the potential interaction between the evaluation rubrics and the planning and development processes for the LCAP and Annual Update development, in addition to other strategic plans and school site plans. Representatives from COEs provided input on the process completing mock district reviews as the role of the service provider. The review of the example evaluation rubrics content helped clarify from the LEAs perspective, what is necessary for planning, reflecting, and evaluating processes to support county, district, and school plans. A preliminary overview of the UAT Phase II is presented in Attachment 2.

Resources

Implementation of the new funding formula and LCAPs have dramatically changed the budgeting process for LEAs. The elimination of more than 40 state categorical programs and a shift away from compliance means less time tracking categorical funds and more time creating systems of support for local students. Recent and substantial funding increases are accelerating improvements. There is evidence of more parent and community engagement, greater collaboration between fiscal and curriculum leaders, improved three-year planning processes, and a focus on the State's educational priorities.

The SBE and the CDE are continuing to gather feedback on the LCAP template and process with the goal of making another round of improvements before the 2017–18 school year. To date, the vast majority of stakeholders have urged the SBE to keep the current template in place for this year. Future changes will build on existing strengths and address identified barriers to the LCAP serving as a meaningful planning tool that results in clear communication of how local strategic resource decisions are intended to reach specific student outcome goals.

- To support local planning and budgeting, the online posting of resources specific to LCFF information and implementation is located on the CDE LCFF Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/index.asp>. Additional Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) have been posted to help clarify the LCAP process.
- Information on the development of the LCFF evaluation rubrics is located on the WestEd LCFF Web site at <http://lcff.wested.org/>.
- Regular information updates are distributed to local educational agencies (LEAs) and interested stakeholders through the CDE LCFF listserv. To receive updates regarding the LCFF via e-mail notification, subscribe to the LCFF listserv by sending a "blank" message to join-LCFF-list@mlist.cde.ca.gov.

The list of resources below provides some examples of LEAs that coordinated and synthesized LCAP content through the use of executive summaries.

LCAP Executive Summaries

- Chula Vista Elementary School District
(<http://www.cvesd.org/Documents/LCAP%20Executive%20Summary%20Template.pdf>)
- Fallbrook Union Elementary School District
(<http://www.fuesd.k12.ca.us/cms/lib5/CA01000513/Centricity/Domain/1/LCAP%20Executive%20Summary%202015-16%20updated.pdf>)
- Huntington Beach Unified School District
(<http://www.hbusd.edu/ourpages/auto/2015/6/10/43671366/LCAP%202015%20Executive%20Summary%20FINAL.pdf>)
- Jurupa Unified School District
(<http://www.jusd.k12.ca.us/departments/education/Funding%20and%20Program%20Accountability/SiteAssets/SitePages/LCAP/JUSD%20Executive%20Summary%20LCAP%2015-16%2006.04.2015.pdf>)
- Piedmont Unified School District
(<http://www.piedmont.k12.ca.us/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/LCAP-Executive-Summary-15-16-FINAL.pdf>)
- San Diego Unified School District
([http://www.boarddocs.com/ca/sandi/Board.nsf/files/9XR3AR05F66E/\\$file/LCAP%20Executive%20Summary%20June%20-%202015.pdf](http://www.boarddocs.com/ca/sandi/Board.nsf/files/9XR3AR05F66E/$file/LCAP%20Executive%20Summary%20June%20-%202015.pdf))

12-30-15 [State Board of Education and California Department of Education]

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

Education Code Section 52064.5.

(a) On or before October 1, 2015, 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 expectation for improvement in regard to each of the state priorities described in subdivision (d) of Section 52060.

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 and 2014–15 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.