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Introducing the drivers for whole system reform

‘Whole system reform’ is the name of the game and ‘drivers’ are those policy and strategy levers that have the least and best chance of driving successful reform. A ‘wrong driver’ then is a deliberate policy force that has little chance of achieving the desired result, while a ‘right driver’ is one that ends up achieving better measurable results for students. Whole system reform is just that – 100 per cent of the system – a whole state, province, region or entire country. This paper examines those drivers typically chosen by leaders to accomplish reform, critiques their inadequacy, and offers an alternative set of drivers that have been proven to be more effective at accomplishing the desired goal, which I express as

... the moral imperative of raising the bar (for all students) and closing the gap (for lower performing groups) relative to higher order skills and competencies required to be successful world citizens.

As an advance organiser I suggest four criteria – all of which must be met in concert – which should be used for judging the likely effectiveness of a driver or set of drivers. Specifically, do the drivers, sooner than later,

1. foster intrinsic motivation of teachers and students;
2. engage educators and students in continuous improvement of instruction and learning;
3. inspire collective or team work; and
4. affect all teachers and students – 100 per cent?

Thus intrinsic motivation, instructional improvement, teamwork, and ‘allness’ are the crucial elements for whole system reform. Many systems not only fail to feature these components but choose drivers that actually make matters worse.

The key to system-wide success is to situate the energy of educators and students as the central driving force. This means aligning the goals of reform and the intrinsic motivation of participants. Intrinsic energy derives from doing something well that is important to you and to those with whom you are working. Thus policies and strategies must generate the very conditions that make intrinsic motivation flourish. This is as basic as the human condition. After minimal needs are met what turns most people on is being effective at something that is personally meaningful, and which makes a contribution to others as well as to society as a whole. Personal contributions are all the more gratifying when they are part of a team effort melding personal and social goals. Policies and strategies that do not foster such strong intrinsic motivation across the whole system cannot be a source of whole system reform. Furthermore, strategies that do not develop increased capability (the skills to do something well) are similarly destined to failure. In other words, both strong motivation and enhanced skills on a very large scale are required.
The interest in whole system reform has been fueled recently by better analyses of how different countries are faring in international benchmark comparisons. OECD’s Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) 2009 results received the strongest media coverage ever as it released its latest results on 7 December 2010 (OECD, 2010a). At the same time McKinsey and Company published its insightful analysis of how ‘improved school systems keep getting better’ (Mourshed et al, 2010). The McKinsey report examined 20 entities (countries or sub-regions of countries) including developing countries going from ‘poor to fair’, ‘fair to good’, ‘good to great’, and ‘great to excellent’.

In both the PISA and McKinsey reports the top five countries in literacy, science and mathematics are Korea, Finland, Hong Kong, Singapore and Canada (Shanghai scored best on literacy but is not a country, and is likely not to be very representative of China as a whole). In this paper I use the United States and Australia as examples. Both countries have recently launched ambitious national education reform initiatives. Both have acknowledged a strong sense of urgency for reform – the US because it has fallen steadily from one of the top-performing systems in the world to its current ranking of 17th, 31st and 23rd in reading, mathematics and science respectively, according to the most recent PISA results (OECD, 2010a). Australia has fared better, at 9th, 15th and 10th respectively, but has stagnated over the last decade.

The combination of lack of progress in many of the English speaking countries, intra-country economic and social problems, and global competition has created a transparent sense of urgency among political leaders to get better whole system reform results as quickly as possible. In other words, policy makers are desperate for ‘drivers that work’.

An effective driver is a policy (and related strategies) that actually produces better results across the system. An effective driver is not something that sounds plausible; it is not something that can be justified by a cavalier (as distinct from a carefully considered) reference to research. Nor is it an urgent goal (such as moral purpose); rather, drivers that are effective generate a concerted and accelerating force for progress toward the goals of reform. An effective driver is one that achieves better measurable results with students.

The four ‘wrong’ drivers I discuss in this paper are compelling on the surface, and have a lot of face-value appeal for people with urgent problems. They will be hard to dislodge. The politics will be fierce because leaders want immediate results, and are susceptible to what look like plausible solutions but turn out to be silver bullets. I believe, however, that we will see some breakthroughs soon, for several interrelated reasons:

- the evidence that the wrong drivers don’t work is increasingly clear and compelling;
- there are positive alternative solutions in play that do work and are also clear and compelling; and, most encouragingly
- it is almost inevitable that those most committed to reform, and most perplexed by the lack of progress, will figure it out because they are used to solving complex social problems. I expect, for example, that Bill and Melinda Gates, and key political and policy leaders in the US and Australia will be open to the arguments and evidence put forward in these pages.

In this paper I am only interested in drivers that

- evidently cause whole system improvements;
- are measurable in practice and in results; and
- for which a clear case can be made that strategy X produces result Y.

By contrast, an ineffective driver would be one that

- while sounding good actually does not produce the results it seeks;
- may make matters worse; and

The right drivers are effective because they work directly on changing the culture.
Choosing the wrong drivers for whole system reform

In the rush to move forward, leaders, especially from countries that have not been progressing, tend to choose the wrong drivers. Such ineffective drivers fundamentally miss the target. There are four main ‘wrong driver’ culprits that I discuss with their matched pairs that refer to the more effective alternative. In all cases choosing a combination of the drivers makes matters significantly worse (or better). The culprits are

1. **accountability**: using test results, and teacher appraisal, to reward or punish teachers and schools vs capacity building;
2. **individual teacher and leadership quality**: promoting individual vs group solutions;
3. **technology**: investing in and assuming that the wonders of the digital world will carry the day vs instruction;
4. **fragmented strategies** vs integrated or systemic strategies.

Although the four ‘wrong’ components have a place in the reform constellation, they can never be successful drivers. It is, in other words, a mistake to lead with them. Countries that do lead with them (efforts such as are currently underway in the US and Australia, for example) will fail to achieve whole system reform. Even worse, chances are that such strategies will cause backward movement relative to other countries that are using the right drivers. As we consider each of the four problem strategies, it is worth noting in advance that none of the top-performing countries in the world led their reforms with these four current favourites (although elements of the four components eventually take their proper place in the reform agenda).

I need to be clear here. The four ‘wrong drivers’ are not forever wrong. They are just badly placed as lead drivers. The four ‘right drivers’ – capacity building, group work, pedagogy, and ‘systemness’ – are the anchors of whole system reform. You don’t have to give up your affinity to accountability, individual quality, technology, and favored quality components of the reform package. Stated another way, I am not talking about presence or absence or even sequence, but rather dominance. Dominance is another word for saying what system leaders state and acknowledge as the anointed, explicitly articulated lead drivers. The encouraging news is that the judicious use of the four right drivers ends up accomplishing better the goals that those espousing the wrong drivers are seeking. And it does so in a fundamentally more powerful and sustainable manner.

The right drivers – capacity building, group work, instruction, and systemic solutions – are effective because they work directly on changing the culture of school systems (values, norms, skills, practices, relationships); by contrast the wrong drivers alter structure, procedures and other formal attributes of the system without reaching the internal substance of reform – and that is why they fail.

The glue that binds the effective drivers together is the underlying attitude, philosophy, and theory of action. The mindset that works for whole system reform is the one that inevitably generates individual and collective motivation and corresponding skills to transform the system.

The essence of this paper is that if you want to be successful at whole system reform, then base your dominant set of strategies on the four right drivers in combination. If you have a tendency to gravitate to one or more of the four wrong drivers you need to diminish their role proactively; know that the four underlying right drivers are what counts and make them prominent. The glue that binds the effective drivers together is the underlying attitude, philosophy, and theory of action. The mindset that works for whole system reform is the one that inevitably generates individual and collective motivation and corresponding skills to transform the system. It is okay to use the full constellation of eight drivers along the way, as
long as you make sure the less effective four play a decidedly second fiddle role to the right four. This distinction is critical because the evidence is clear: the wrong four as drivers de-motivate the masses whose energy is required for success; the right four drivers do the opposite. Countries that are successful (increasingly on a sustained basis) have figured this out and will only get stronger. All systems need to shift toward the right constellation of drivers because this will give them success, and will result in global advances. Every country that gets better educationally becomes a better neighbour. The moral imperative in education is about the whole world advancing. Systems that embrace the four right drivers using the so-called wrong drivers in a supportive role can win at home as they win abroad.

Before turning to the four flawed drivers (and their more effective counterparts) we need to consider the national reforms currently being pursued in the United States and in Australia. These are big audacious efforts that I cannot do justice to in this brief paper but we can get a good appreciation of their profile and main elements.

The US and Australia

The US

The Obama administration and the Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan, have launched a massive reform effort that generally goes under the banner of ‘race to the top’. The best accessible version is contained in A Blueprint for Reform (US Department of Education, 2010a). American aspirations include leading the world ‘once again’ in college completion by 2020. ‘Our goal’, says Obama, ‘must be to have a great teacher in every classroom and a great principal in every school’ (p 1). Four pillars are seen in such a system:

- new world class standards and corresponding assessments;
- a robust data system that tracks student achievement and teacher effectiveness;
- improving teacher and principal quality through recruitment, training and rewarding excellence; and
- turning around the 5000 worse-performing schools (out of a total of 100,000) in the country.

Put another way, the big drivers include: new world class standards; aligned assessments, and focused feedback including student performance and teacher effectiveness often tied to merit pay or similar rewards. For example 48 states, two territories and the District of Columbia have developed a new set of Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in English Language Arts (ELA), and in Mathematics from Kindergarten to Grade 12. These standards are positioned as rigorous, relevant to higher-order skills, informed by the standards in top-performing countries like Singapore, and as evidence- and research-based.

Two consortia have been funded by the Federal Government to develop new assessments for the CCSS set of standards. One group, the Partnership for Assessment for Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) is developing ‘summative’ evaluations in the two K-12 strands (ELA and Mathematics) including ‘through-course assessments’ that will be administered three times during the school year (and a 4th time at the end of the year) for all students in Grades 3 through 8. The assessments will include performance-based higher-order skills. The whole apparatus will be heavily supported by technology of assessment and easy access to data with accompanying resources and tools. The system will be completed by 2015.

The second group is the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC). Their mandate is to strategically ‘balance’ summative, interim and formative assessment through an integrated system of standards, curriculum, assessment, instruction and teacher development, while providing accurate year-to-year indicators of students’ progress toward college and career readiness.

(Center for K-12 Assessments for the Common Core State Standards, 2011).
They will integrate performance tasks, computer adaptive assessments (whereby teachers can access 40–65 questions per content area) for immediate online scoring and response, measurement of growth, and accountability reports. They too will complete their task by 2015.

Another part of the reform package in the US consists of the development of updated standards for teachers, such as the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2011). Similar standards exist for administrators focusing on leadership.

**Australia**

Australia has remarkably similar ambitions and strategies. All education ministers, Commonwealth, State and Territory, agreed in late 2008 to the *Melbourne Declaration on Education and the Goals for Young Australians* (MCEETYA, 2008), which outlined new goals for schooling. This declaration identifies key strategies and initiatives that Australian governments will undertake to support the achievement of the educational goals. Those related to schooling are articulated through the *National Education Agreement* (COAG, 2008). Four areas of reform have received particular priority and include

- developing a national framework of schooling, linking Australian government funding to state and territory outcomes for schooling;
- increasing school level transparency and accountability, to improve student and school performance;
- closing the gap in educational outcomes between Indigenous and non-Indigenous students; and
- developing and implementing a national curriculum across all learning areas from kindergarten to year 12.

In order to support these key reform priorities, National Partnerships have been established (COAG, 2008b), representing a new approach to funding and working collaboratively across all school systems, aiming to

- address disadvantage in low socio-economic status school communities;
- provide a greater focus on literacy and numeracy, including building the evidence base of what works to improve literacy and numeracy outcomes;
- improve teacher quality, including leading work on national teacher workforce reform in relation to pre-service teacher education, teacher standards, teacher registration, professional standards for school leaders and performance management.

Three newly established key national agencies play a major role in this equation – the Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority, the Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership, and Education Services Australia. As in the US, the reform strategy is to drive reform by better standards, assessment, monitoring, intervention and development.

As in the US, the reform strategy is to drive reform by better standards, assessment, monitoring, intervention and development.

As one more important point, Australia has an additional whole system constraint – there are three publicly funded educational sectors:

- the public sector (what we would call the public education system in North America);
- the Independent Sector (private schools, which are funded by the public purse); and
- the Catholic sector (also funded publicly).

With this structure and tradition ‘systemness’ poses a further challenge.

I will say flat out, for reasons that will become clear in the ensuing pages, there is no way that these ambitious and admirable nationwide goals will be met with the strategies being used. No successful system in the world has ever led with these drivers. They cannot generate on a
large scale the kind of intrinsic motivational energy that will be required to transform these massive systems. The US and Australian aspirations sound great as goals but crumble from a strategy or driver perspective. At best they can tighten up an otherwise loose system and get temporary pockets of improvement, but can never establish the conditions for whole system reform. These wrong drivers are ineffective because they fail to get at changing the day-to-day culture of school systems. Let’s take a closer look.

**Focusing on accountability (vs capacity building)**

It is understandable that politicians and their public go for ‘rigorous and fair accountability’ at all levels’ especially if, as is the case with the US, they have invested heavily for 30 years with little or no progress to show for it (US Department of Education, 2010a). The same observation holds for Australia – ‘greater accountability of schools’ across the nation (Australian Government, 2010).

A focus on accountability uses standards, assessment, rewards and punishment as its core drivers. It assumes that educators will respond to these prods by putting in the effort to make the necessary changes. It assumes that educators have the capacity or will be motivated to develop the skills and competencies to get better results. It is true that in both cases there is money, and an investment in capacity building (but, as we shall see, it tends to be individualistic rather than collective, and is based on rewarding higher performers financially). Even the money is not sustainable because the public will only support continuous spending if the investment is paying off, and the investments in question will not, cannot succeed on any convincing level. Strange as it sounds, leading with accountability is not the best way to get accountability, let alone whole system reform. The four right drivers actually produce deeper, more built-in accountability of action and results.

To be clear, it is not the presence of standards and assessment that is the problem, but rather the attitude (philosophy or theory of action) that underpins them, and their dominance (as when they become so heavily laden that they crush the system by their sheer weight). If the latter is based on the assumption that massive external pressure will generate intrinsic motivation it is patently false. Instead (and this will require combining the right elements of all four driver sets) what is required is to build the new skills, and generate deeper motivation. Change the underlying attitude toward respecting and building the profession and you get a totally different dynamic around the same standards and assessment tools. Furthermore, focusing on standards and assessments does not highlight adequately the instructional improvements that are the core driver in the equation. Put slightly differently it is the learning-instruction-assessment nexus that is at the heart of driving student achievement.

For whole system reform to occur, lead drivers, as I have said, must get at the motivation and competency development of the vast majority of educators. Accountability measures plus sticks and carrots do not and cannot, ever accomplish this feat. Higher, clearer standards, combined with correlated assessments are essential along the way, but they are not going to drive the system forward. Whole system success requires the commitment that comes from intrinsic motivation and improved technical competencies of groups of educators working together purposefully and relentlessly. Accountability in the form we are seeing in the US and Australia does not build widespread capacity, nor does it increase
intrinsic motivation. Do testing, but do less of it and, above all, position assessment primarily as a strategy for improvement, not as a measure of external accountability. Wrap this around with transparency of practice and results and you will get more accountability all round.

Playing down blatant accountability to get more real accountability is a hard argument to grasp, but we get some great insight from one of the findings in the McKinsey study of 20 strongly improving systems (Mourshed et al, 2010). In all of these systems the McKinsey group measured the number of interventions that could be classified as ‘accountability’ based, and the number that focused on ‘professional learning’ (capacity building). Accountability interventions included externally conducted performance assessments with consequences, school inspections and reviews and the like; capacity-building referred to investments in collaborative practices, coaching technical skill building and so on. What they found was this: in the improving systems in the developing countries (those going from awful to adequate) the interventions were split 50/50 – an equal proportion of accountability and capacity-building activities; in the good to great countries the percentages were 78 per cent professional learning, and 22 per cent accountability. In short, even in the worst cases (‘awful performance’) accountability was a co-equal driver, not a dominant one.

The net result of excessive testing is that, instead of teachers being swept up to ride waves of successful reform, they will be crushed by a veritable tsunami of standards and assessments. The US approach, as of now, requires that English Language Arts and Mathematics be assessed for all students in Grades 3 through 8, along with summative assessments four times a year. Even in sheer accountability terms there will be such a massive amount of data that teachers, let alone the public, will not be able to grasp what is happening. Moreover the current standards-assessment imposition is so great that it will end up squelching any possibility that the higher-order skills (which require engagement and ingenuity) will be accomplished, even though some of these skills are in the set. What sets out as progressive for the 21st century ends up going backwards. Make no mistake about it, the higher-order skills – critical thinking and reasoning, problem solving, communication (including listening), collaboration, digitally-based learning, citizenship – will become the new average for the rest of this century. The four wrong drivers block any possibility of heading down this critical path.

In the final section of this paper I will address the question of how to get better accountability without loading it directly with negativity, but I can say here that high-stakes accountability will only motivate a small percentage of teachers and, even if motivated, only a minority will know what changes to make in instruction to get better results.

Nor will turning around the bottom 5 or 10 per cent, or enabling charter or special schools to start afresh, get us very far. It is the whole system that must get better, and in fairly short order – 6 or 7 years or so; 5 per cent here, 10 per cent there, do not add up. In fact not even most of these low-performing schools will improve, or stay improved, if the wider system is not on the move as well. Partial solutions get partial results.

In the meantime, I repeat that no system in the world has ever achieved whole system reform by leading with accountability. As the ‘right drivers’ progress (capacity building and team work for example) transparency of results and practice will be key to securing public commitment to education, and to elevating the status of the profession. This vertical accountability (transparency at the classroom, school, district, state levels) is essential for sustainable progress. However, it must be wrapped in a prevailing attitude of capacity building, engagement, and trust building – the latter producing greater lateral accountability among peers, which is absolutely critical for whole system reform.
**Individual Quality (vs Group Quality)**

This is a tricky one because it looks so rationally obvious – teacher and school leader quality are the two most critical factors; therefore improve them directly through incentives, teacher appraisal, development and punishment for those who lag behind. This logic is deceptively fatal for whole system reform.

The problem starts innocently enough, with the much cited finding about two students who start at the 50th percentile: Student A has very good teachers for three years in a row; Student B has poor teachers for this period of time. At the end of the third year, student A is at the 75th percentile, and student B at the 25th percentile – a difference of 50 percentile points or the equivalent of at least one full year ahead or behind. So, the wrong driver takes over and we get merit and performance pay for the top 15 per cent, tough measures for the bottom 10 per cent, and teacher evaluation with new effectiveness measures. You will appreciate here that the solution has compounded the problem – a kind of double jeopardy that combines wrong-headed accountability with individualistic application – drivers one and two in cahoots.

Teacher appraisal and feedback would seem to be a good idea (CCSSO, 2011; Gates, 2010; Jensen and Reichl, 2011). This strategy is justified on the basis that feedback improves performance. The logic is reinforced by the finding that focused feedback to students has the most powerful impact on student learning of all pedagogical practices (Hattie, 2009). It should be the same for adults. Note, however, that student feedback only works when it is embedded in a classroom culture that is supportive of learning. The same is true for teachers. Teacher appraisal will not work unless it is embedded in a school culture of learning where teachers are motivated to learn from feedback. Hattie’s findings are over-interpreted if you just take the literal notion that all good feedback is automatically beneficial. As he puts it, ‘it is the willingness to seek negative evidence (seeking evidence where students are not doing well) to improve the teaching … the keenness to see the effects on all students, and the openness to new experiences that makes the difference’ (p. 181). This is a cultural phenomenon not a procedural one. The practice of integrating feedback into actions that result in improvement is embraced by teachers and their leaders essentially because their culture values it. That is why it works. Throw a good appraisal system in a bad culture and you get nothing but increased alienation. When the Grattan report says that their proposed appraisal system ‘will require a change in culture’ it is fundamentally correct (Jensen and Riechl, 2011). This innocent little phrase ‘change in culture’ is the Elephant in the room. This is the very Elephant that the four right drivers are dying to ride. Culture is the driver; good appraisal is the reinforcer, not the other way around.

The problem is that no nation has got better by focusing on individual teachers as the driver. Better performing countries did not set out to have a very good teacher here and another good one there, and so on. They were successful because they developed the entire teaching profession – raising the bar for all. Systems are successful as systems because 95 per cent or more of their teachers become damn good. How long do you think it will take the US, for example, to get to the 95 per cent+ level using the current strategies?

The fallacy – to which the US, with its ‘rugged individual’ traditions, is particularly susceptible – is that success does not come from ad hoc individuals beavering away but rather from strategies that leverage the group. We can use a revealing study from Carrie Leana (2011) a business professor at the University of Pittsburg. She starts with the well-known finding that the
patterns of interaction among teachers and between teachers and administrators when focused on student learning make a large measurable difference on student achievement and sustained improvement. This is called ‘social capital’, which she contrasts with ‘individual capital’ that is based on

the widespread belief in the power of teacher human capital to transform public education [which] is one of the cornerstones of current reform efforts.

This dependence on human capital to carry the day is, of course, our wrong driver.

Leana set out to test the relationship between the power of human and social capital. She and her team followed over 1,000 4th and 5th Grade teachers in a representative sample of 130 elementary schools across New York City. The human capital measures included teacher qualifications, experience and ability in the classroom. Social capital was measured in terms of the frequency and focus of conversations with peers that centered on instruction, and that was based on feelings of trust and closeness between teachers. She studied the impact on mathematics achievement over a one-year period.

Leana uncovered several interrelated themes directly related to my argument here. If a teacher’s social capital was one standard deviation higher than the average, her students’ mathematics scores increased by 5.7 per cent. It is of course the case that teachers with high ability outperform teachers with low ability, but that is not the big driver. Leana reports that teachers who were both more able (high human capital), and had stronger ties with their peers (high social capital) had the biggest gains in math achievement. She even found that low-ability teachers perform as well as teachers of average ability ‘if they have strong social capital’ in their school (p 10, italics in the original). In short, high social capital and high human capital must be combined, and of the two the former is more powerful.

Recall that human capital refers to the teacher’s cumulative abilities, knowledge, and skills developed through formal education and on-the-job experience. Social capital is not a characteristic of the individual but instead resides in the relationships among teachers and between teachers and principals. Leana’s findings mean that having bad working conditions (low social capital) makes good teachers less effective, and makes poor teachers get even worse. Her findings also mean that the goal is to develop in concert both high human and high social capital. More than that – high social capital is a powerful strategy to leverage human capital.

Imagine that you would become a better teacher just by virtue of the fact that you are on the staff of a particular school in a particular district in a particular state or country. That is the power of social capital.

Even more disturbing for those riding the wrong drivers is the realisation that even if driver one (standards, assessment-based accountability) produces some increase in human capital, it will be swamped by the failure to pay equal attention to social capital. You do not have to choose one over the other, but make sure that strategies based on team work are more prominent.

The good news is that the right drivers in combination – capacity building and group development – generate greater success and greater accountability. Dylan Wiliam (2011) captures this phenomenon in his book Embedded Formative Assessment. He shows how five key strategies of formative assessment strengthen both instruction and achievement. These strategies

- clarify learning intentions and criteria for success;
- engineer effective learning experiences;
provide feedback to learners;
establish active learners as instructional resources for each other; and
develop learners as the owners of their own learning.

This is really our instruction-achievement nexus. Simultaneously it builds capacity and addresses accountability. Student assessment data are positioned primarily as a strategy for instructional improvement and serve secondarily as external public accountability. The causal sequence is the right one – get more instructional improvement and you get more accountability. Everybody wins. For this to happen it requires new capacities across the entire profession.

By adding social capital-based strategies you get multiple benefits. For example, focused collaborative practices mobilise and customise knowledge in the system, enabling teachers to know what other teachers do and to learn from them. In addition to leveraging instructional capacity, purposeful collaboration serves as the most effective form of lateral accountability. When combined with transparency of results, the whole apparatus fosters both collective ownership of educational practice and accountability to the public. Finally, these actions represent the best route to developing a trusted and respected profession. This is what successful countries are doing. They are producing social not just human capital.

In short, individual rewards and incentives and other investments in human capital do not motivate the masses. If you want to reach the goal faster you must invest in capacity building, and use the group to get there. There is heaps of evidence staring policy makers in the face that it is the collaborative group that accelerates performance, including squeezing out poor performers as teaching becomes less private and more collaborative. These results occur because

the day-to-day pressure and support is built into the work. It is social capital leveraging human capital that has the quality and speed essential for whole system reform.

Thus changing social capital is the powerful strategy. I am not saying rely on the group by itself. Rather the judicious mixture of high expectations, relentless but supportive leadership, good standards and assessment, investments in capacity building, transparency of results and practice is what produces better results, and better accountability. This is how Ontario, for example, improved literacy and numeracy across the whole system and went from 68 per cent high school graduation rate to 81 per cent in 6 years (for more on collective capacity building see Fullan, 2010a).

As with accountability there is a developmental sequence here. If the teaching force has low capacity more directive support will be required at the beginning; not heavy-handed accountability but direct development of teachers through professional learning of effective instructional practices. As teacher and leader capacity become stronger, peers become the greater driving force, as the McKinsey study found. By mobilising peers, leaders accelerate whole system reform (you actually cannot get whole system reform without peer power), and establish conditions for sustainability. Every high performing system studied by the McKinsey group combined policies to attract and develop a high quality teaching force along with strategies and incentives for leaders and peers to work together. Successful countries did not get that good just by attracting different people to the profession. They also and simultaneously changed the profession on the ground by building collaborative cultures focused on developing educator commitment and competence, thereby obtaining better outcomes for all.

Many leadership-driven solutions suffer from the same individualistic flaw. It is expected that attracting and developing new leaders will help change the system. New high-quality leadership academies are the result. The search
is on for high-performing principals – attract them, develop them, reward them. I want to be careful here. The best of these programs are valuable as part of the mix, but don’t expect them to change the system, especially with the combination of drivers we are talking about. Look what is happening. The new leader is saddled with managing a highly charged and punitive accountability system, along with the management of an increasingly controversial performance management system. If the other pieces that we have been talking about do not work, and there is no evidence anywhere that they do work for whole system reform, saddling great new leaders with running a dysfunctional system cannot possibly do any good for the individuals or the systems they are expected to transform.

There are two excellent recent contributions to the debate about how to increase the quality of teachers and principals across the board. I use them here to indicate the necessary ingredients, but also to remind the reader what the essence of the solution needs to be. It needs to include an explicit strategy to develop the group as well as the individual. It is easy to miss this collective component because it is one step more complicated than dealing with individuals.

Allan Odden’s *Human Capital in Education* gets most of it right but underplays the key factor of social capital (Odden, 2011). Ironically his book is peppered with examples of the power of collaborative work teams, but he fails to recognise them as social capital. The core issue for Odden, as I have been arguing, is the ‘continuous improvement of instruction linked to personalized student learning’. He then systematically addresses the human capital system that will be required:

- recruiting and staffing top talent;
- measuring teacher performance;
- induction and professional development;
- new policies for licensure, tenure, evaluation, and dismissal;
- compensation;
- strategic talent management for principals; and more generally

organising to implement strategic human capital management in education.

(Odden, 2011)

There are two problems. First, it is easy for system leaders to go about developing such a system without realising that the heart of the matter is **instructional improvement linked to student learning** – all teachers, all the time. The second shortcoming is the aforementioned need to single out collaborative cultures as vital for developing all teachers, vital for accelerating the pace and quality of reform, and vital for lateral and vertical accountability.

The other great contribution to this debate is the background report produced by OECD for the International Summit on the Teaching Profession, hosted by Arne Duncan and other state leaders in New York in March, 2011. The report is entitled, *Building a High-quality Teaching Profession: Lessons from Around the World* (OECD, 2011). As with Odden, the right lessons are there, but a new crucial one is added. With respect to the former there are solid chapters on ‘recruitment and initial preparation of teachers’; ‘teacher development, support, careers and employment conditions’; and ‘teacher evaluation and compensation’. The new lesson is ‘teacher engagement in education reform’ which essentially concludes that you cannot get there without widespread teacher ownership.

Teacher ownership is certainly a tough nut to crack. If the quality of the teacher is the premier factor related to student learning and if you want whole system transformation then it must be virtually all teachers who own the reform. You simply cannot get around this – all the successful systems have recognised this one fact. In its section on ‘achieving educational reform that works’ the OECD report states it this way:

*In moving beyond consultation to involvement the reform process becomes oriented towards transforming schools into learning organizations with teachers in the lead.*

(OECD, 2011, p 52)
And don’t make the mistake of thinking because you involve some teachers in key deliberations that you have involved the profession. Rather what works is the daily experience of all teachers – peers working with peers in a purposeful profession that is effective at what it does while it embraces public accountability. We are, after all, talking about changing the day-to-day culture of the teaching profession.

Ownership is not just for commitment. The process of ownership, represented by the flip side of the wrong drivers, develops strong instructional expertise on an ongoing basis. Motivation and expertise go hand in hand. I hope it is also abundantly clear that the two wrong drivers discussed so far undermine widespread ownership and its twin powers of motivation and competence across the profession.

Policy makers in a hurry are prone to choose the wrong drivers. Thus, when they see good reports such as those by Odden and OECD, they are likely to fix on the wrong solutions and hence miss the heart of the matter. The essence of whole system success is continuous instructional improvement closely linked to student engagement and success, again for all students. The drivers that work motivate teachers to engage in instructional improvement with peers. Revealingly, the reverse causal sequence is just as crucial; that is, increasing instructional improvement causes motivation to increase – what we call ‘the moral imperative realised’ (Fullan, 2011). Success means greater efficacy and the latter breeds greater commitment.

The holy grail of teacher quality is only a proxy for effective instruction. Once you dwell on instruction the whole system can be mobilised to that end.

The question of ownership and engagement is the crucial factor. The right drivers embed both of these for students and teachers. Similar extensions of policies and strategies aimed at generating ownership on the part of parents, communities, business leaders and the public at large will also be required. It is beyond the scope of this paper to take up these matters, but a high-quality, transparent education will go a long way in reassuring the public.

If you want the instructional practices-student engagement/achievement nexus to be the centre of attention do two things: name it as the focus, and use the group to get more of it. The holy grail of teacher quality is only a proxy for effective instruction. Once you dwell on instruction the whole system can be mobilised to that end. It won’t be heavy handed accountability, teacher appraisal, rewards and incentives, and the like that will move big systems. Movement on this scale can only be realised through actual improvements in instructional practice. The latter, as I have said, is tightly connected to the intrinsic motivation of teachers and their peers to do the job well. Policies that focus on both human and social capital and do this with transparency of practice and results will create all the pressure and support that is needed for effective accountability.

In conclusion, I want to underscore what is said in OECD’s (2011) Chapter 4, Teacher Engagement in Education Reform. If policy makers don’t ‘get’ this one, I can guarantee you they will choose the wrong drivers every time in each of our pairs. If we let the wrong drivers have their way they will undercut intrinsic motivation, and group development. If accountability-driven standards and assessment do not kill you, individualistic appraisal will come along to make sure you are dead. The right drivers, by contrast, energise the group and the individuals therein.
**Technology (vs instruction)**

Ever since the first laptop emerged almost 40 years ago technology has been winning the race over pedagogy; that is, technology gets better and better, while instruction doesn’t. The notion that having a laptop computer or hand-held device for every student will make her or him smarter, or even more knowledgeable is pedagogically vapid. Picasso once said that the trouble with computers is that they provide the answers.

Technologies’ prodigious power leads many of us to rely heavily on linking the ‘digital dude’ to an endless knowledge source. The report *Digital Learning* now provides a good example of the overpromising that comes from using a driver that cannot get you there (Bush and Wise, 2010). It starts this way:

> By unleashing the power of digital learning, America has the ability to realize that vision [a vision that maximizes every child’s potential for learning ... today.

Not without smart pedagogy it won’t. The Bush, Wise report acknowledges the importance of instruction, but I am afraid that the wrong driver – technology as solution – is the more seductive partner.

Fortunately there are some signs, and more importantly some developments that indicate that pedagogy is seeking the driver’s seat. The main policy document from the US gets it right – *Learning Powered by Technology* (US Department of Education, 2010b). The essential idea is to get the right learning embedded in the technology – a task that many of us are working on these days. I know that harnessing technology is the goal of current policy documents but the means of so doing involves the flip side of the drivers that I have been critiquing in this paper.

The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation again could become a strong catalyst for this new work; not their more high-profile work on Measuring Effective Teaching (MET), which will come in handy later (but please not now as a driver), but their more fundamental work of fuelling the next generation of learners by co-designing, with teachers and students, high-quality digitally based material that will furnish dynamic learning experiences – complete with access to data and to flexible but high quality instructional practices that will, for example, enable the learning of literacy and mathematics at a deep and efficient level. All of this, of course, will be powered by latest and evolving technology, but for a change it will be in the service of instruction. There are other similar developments, including one we are working on to produce Hollywood-quality digital curriculum content that will engage and entertain students, orchestrated by teachers who will be experts in both technology and pedagogy.

I hate to sound like a broken twitter but no other successful country became good through using technology at the front end. Without pedagogy in the driver’s seat there is growing evidence that technology is better at driving us to distraction, and that the digital world of the child is detached from the world of the school. As OECD’s surveys carried out in 2008 show, frequency of use of computers at home is not paralleled by use at schools; most digital use is related to the internet or to entertainment; and school use for educational engagement and deep learning (for example of higher order skills) goes missing (OECD, 2010b).

**There is no evidence that technology is a particularly good entry point for whole system reform**

Teachers need to get grounded in instruction, so they can figure out with students how best to engage technology. There is no evidence that technology is a particularly good entry point for whole system reform, but it will be a dramatic accelerator if we can put instruction, and skilled motivated teachers and students in the lead. Once this instructional-digital powerhouse gets under way, students will motivate teachers as
much as the other way around. This is the new work that will be necessary to reverse the trend of technology racing ahead of pedagogy.

The good news (mostly) is that the further development of technology has a life of its own. It will get more and more powerful, cheaper and more available. In the latest work, learning and instruction become the driving forces, so that we will ride the technology wave instead of being at the mercy of a powerful but intrinsically aimless phenomenon.

**Fragmented (vs systemic)**

Along with cultural traditions of individualism come tendencies to focus on single rather than systemic solutions. Thus the US, for example, has a habit of breaking things into pieces – and what looks like a system is not, because the pieces are not well connected. This problem is aggravated when some of the pieces are the wrong ones to begin with. Standards over here, assessments over there, and teacher appraisal and incentives in still another box: what can be portrayed as a system (the pieces are there, and can be made to sound comprehensive) is not integrated as a coherent whole, and thus does not function ‘systemically’. Implementation then becomes a hodgepodge. Countries without systemic capacities have great front end, episodic fanfare but have a constitutional inability to put things together during implementation.

Systemic does not mean that the various elements can be described as linked. This is only systemic in theory. It is practice that counts. Thus systemic strategies both require and support on-the-ground improvement efforts in every school and every district. This is why the ‘right’ sides of drivers one, two and three are the winners. Capacity building, group work and deep pedagogy, accelerated by technology, are in effect processes that support, indeed require, all schools to engage in the improvement of practice. The natural definition of systemic means that all elements of the system are unavoidably interconnected and involved, day after day. In a systemic world evidence-based learning really is the daily work. Systemic is experiential not theoretical. In other words the four wrong drivers are not ‘systemic’ by this definition.

Without a systemic mindset, countries fail to focus on the right combination with the right mindset. In the successful countries it is clear that there is an absolute belief that quality education for all is crucial to their future (OECD, 2011). These countries then approach the task with the knowledge that everyone must be part of the solution. They know that teachers are key to improvement and can only work effectively when they are supported. They make major, coordinated efforts to improve the quality of teachers through various forms of support: from recruitment to the profession at initial teacher education through the early years of teaching, continuous learning on the job, good working conditions including team development, and differentiated roles of leadership as the career evolves. The McKinsey group drew the same conclusion:

*it’s a system thing, not a single thing.*

(Mourshed et al, 2010, p 37)

In the absence of a system mindset individual pieces, each of which contains half-truths, are pitted against each other as vested interests bash each other with proverbial baseball bats. No one wins; the system loses every time.

All of the successful systems have come to trust and respect teachers. I use the phrase ‘come to trust and respect’ advisedly because trust is as much an outcome of doing the right things as it is a starting point. For the US and Australia the issue of teacher trust and respect represents a huge ‘chicken and egg’ dilemma. If you don’t have trust how do you get it? Let me provide an odd-sounding answer from our motion leadership work (Fullan, 2010b). If you want to break the cycle of distrust you have to respect others ‘before they have earned the right to be respected’ … and then do the things that build competencies and trust over time.
This dynamic, of committing to respect before it is well-established, is something that non-systemic oriented people don’t get easily. When Finland and Singapore began their reforms 40 years ago they did not have a profession that warranted respect, but they set about to build such a system. This is essential for whole system reform. Unless the US and Australia back off low-trust strategies, and start engaging the profession in the solution (OECD’s (2011), Chapter 4, Teacher Engagement in Education Reform) they will get neither the commitment nor the skills sufficient for whole system success. The funny thing about systemic implementation is that it ends up building greater accountability into the system among teachers and others than can be obtained by more overt accountability measures. This does not occur overnight but it can be achieved in reasonably brief timelines – half a dozen years as the McKinsey group found – if you employ the right combination of drivers. It is time for a fundamental shift in strategy.

**Implications**

My main purpose in this paper has been to shift policy makers’ thinking away from big drivers that are counterproductive. Thus the first idea is to focus on the actual limitations of current levers – limitations that are fatal to the goal of whole system reform. I do not for a moment want to convey that everything about accountability, individualism, technology and given pieces of the reform packages is worthless. These elements have their place in a more fully developed system. My main point is that these four policy/strategy levers are miscast as drivers of whole system reform. Used alone or as the central drivers they certainly will not get us where we need to go and, very probably, will do more harm than good.

In the cases of the US and Australia one could argue that since their seemingly comprehensive reforms are very recent that it is unfair to judge them. They have not yet had a chance to have an impact. I hope I have made it clear that there is no way that the four ‘wrong drivers’ can motivate the masses, which is required for whole system reform. At the same time, we have a growing number of examples that basing one’s strategy on the alternative set of drivers that I have proposed actually does work, if you have the commitment and persistence to put them into place. These drivers work because they directly change the culture of teaching and learning. It is time for a different mindset and associated set of policies and strategies. The greater one’s sense of urgency the more one should re-route whole system reform.

This is not the place to develop a detailed alternative plan, although the latter is well contained in the references to the successful systems including Ontario that I have been citing in this paper. Instead let me position the solution as four interrelated components.

**The heart of the matter**

The ‘heart of the matter’ consists of focusing on four systemically related big drivers that work.

1. The learning-instruction-assessment nexus
2. Social capital to build the profession
3. Pedagogy matches technology
4. Systemic synergy

My main purpose in this paper has been to shift policy makers’ thinking away from big drivers that are counterproductive.

The first of these is about making sure that the centrepiece of action is based on learning and instruction. In this regard, relentless development of what we call ‘capacity building’ – to make learning more exciting, more engaging, and more linked to assessment feedback loops around the achievement of higher order skills (which I have called the new average) – is the main agenda. There is a lot going on in the world in this respect, but it has to be harnessed and made more widespread. Part and parcel of this work is the deep commitment to the moral purpose of raising the bar and closing the gap for all students.
Second, use the group to accomplish the new learning-instruction culture. More specifically, approach the solution as a social capital proposition to build the new teaching profession. This will require building collaborative cultures within and across schools. Within this approach there is a crucial role for key personnel and other human capital polices and strategies – those very components that have been spelled out well by Odden (2011) and OECD (2011). However, if development of individuals is not surrounded by a culture of developing social capital it will fail.

Third, go all out to power new pedagogical innovations with technology. As I noted, there are numbers of these developments currently under way that are aimed at the next generation of learners. What makes these advances crucial is that they combine so many elements needed for success: engagement; entertainment; ease of access to information and data; group work; humanity; social relevance; and so on. In a word they make education easier and more absorbing. Learning and life become more seamless.

Fourth, the set of good drivers must be conceived and pursued as a coherent whole. This is not as difficult as it seems. There are only a few key components. Focus on the right ones, and treat them as feeding on each other. They actually serve as mutually supportive and interactively corrective. The strengths of one complement the weakness of another, and vice versa (for example, transparency helps with accountability as it adds to capacity building); each driver is generative in serving two or more purposes simultaneously (for example, peer learning and accountability are promoted equally within the same strategy). Do not make the mistake of thinking because you have the right pieces that you have a system. The four right drivers must be conceived and designed as working interactively. Recall that the main criterion of systemic reform is that all schools and districts are engaged in improvement efforts, while being aware that they are part of a bigger phenomenon to change the world.

The drivers I am recommending create the very fundamentals that I started with in this paper – learning and teaching become driven by the individual and collective intrinsic motivation that has permanent staying power. This is what the successful world systems are doing, and if countries lagging behind do not change their ways the gap will become larger and larger. Societies that do not respond well will suffer. They will suffer internally in body and soul, and will suffer on the world stage. It is not far-fetched to link lack of progress over subsequent decades to societal disintegration in affected countries.

There is a choice and some countries have made it. Replace the juggernaut of wrong drivers with lead drivers that are known to work.
Choosing the wrong drivers for whole system reform
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Introduction

This document, prepared by Michael Fullan and California Forward (CA Fwd), proposes a course of action for the recently created California Collaborative for Educational Excellence (CCEE). It seeks to build upon existing structures and the good work already in progress, and to capture the best ideas and advice from leaders in California with deep knowledge of the system and a proven record of success mobilizing whole system reform. After briefly presenting the larger context of changes in governance underway in California and the current move towards local control, it delineates some of the key actions CCEE, county offices and districts could champion to become forces for positive change in California’s education sector.

Governance in California is undergoing tectonic changes. Some of these changes are the result of deliberate policies to shift authority and responsibility to community level governments with the expectation that those agencies will deliver better results. The Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) and Public Safety Realignment are two highly visible examples of what Governor Jerry Brown has termed subsidiarity.

Other state innovations – including the requirement for Sustainable Community Strategies and Integrated Water Management Plans – explicitly encourage local governments to work together to accomplish multiple goals that cannot be achieved without cooperation, innovation and learning. And still other changes – including self-initiated alliances among K-12 schools and county offices of education, community colleges, and four-year universities – are examples of community-level leaders responding to needs unmet by higher levels of government. These trends are not unique to California, and reflect a new way of advancing the public interest with leadership emerging at an optimal decision making level to address public needs.

These changes are instigated and reinforced by several factors and trends. Among them: Public agencies are facing fiscal pressures requiring them to control costs and improve results. Integrated services – including educational and social services – have been proven to be cost-effective, but are hard to engineer at the state or federal levels. Distinct cultural needs of communities and regions require tailored approaches, even to achieve common statewide outcomes. And civic involvement and public support are both critical to improvement efforts, and best incorporated at the community level.

In this context, the creation of the CCEE is an important opportunity to advance the successful implementation of K-12 educational reforms, as well as to model a new and essential function for better state governance.
A New State Interest: Improving Capacity at the Local Level

The early implementation of both educational and public safety reforms has revealed some of the concerns associated with shifting from state-centered to community-centered governance. Many of those concerns relate to the varying capacities of local government to make good use of their new authority. While capacity-building efforts have emerged – involving regional collaborations, professional associations, nongovernmental organizations, and philanthropy – the state has an interest in accelerating capacity building to demonstrate the potential of the reforms, and to replace the distrust that underlies many of the concerns regarding subsidiarity with confidence in community decision-makers.

The Governor and the Legislature recognized this new state interest in establishing the CCEE. Now, the leadership of the CCEE has the opportunity to operationalize the new entity in a way that further defines and advances this interest, while simultaneously fortifying implementation efforts, establishing momentum, and solidifying support for the overall reform.

As the CCEE proceeds, it will be important to promote “systemness,” a concept emerging in the field of whole state change. Systemness can be defined as a growing awareness at all levels that people are involved in a transformation whereby they are contributing to the larger system, as well as personally gaining value from it. This collective realization that people are part of a new fundamental change that benefits both them and the state can be quite powerful.

The Opportunity for the CCEE: Accelerating Learning

The CCEE has the opportunity to become an agile learning organization that builds capacity in local school districts. That mission should be informed by the new ways that successful public agencies more generally are working to improve results across the spectrum of public outcomes.

At its essence, this new governance model relies more on data to understand issues, craft strategies, assess progress and make refinements. Exemplar public sector organizations assertively look to adapt proven practices. They document and share
their setbacks and successes to accelerate their own learning. They proactively collaborate with other public agencies, nonprofit and civic entities to assemble resources and expertise, and develop the more comprehensive responses that are required to improve results – responses, for example, that address issues outside of the classroom that inhibit learning. In short, these agencies and alliances are developing internal capacity and commitment to continuous improvement to yield better results.

New policies, such as the requirement to develop Local Control and Accountability Plans (LCAPs), and new support agencies, especially the CCEE, offer rare opportunities to define new organizational norms, build new capacities, and encourage a culture of learning in organizational design and operations. The CCEE can make the most of that opportunity by modeling a learning organization from the start, as well as supporting the efforts of local agencies to develop that capacity and culture.

California’s governance challenges are compounded by the size and diversity of the state’s regions and communities. Taking improvements to scale in California has often been as challenging as identifying potential reforms. The strategies and tactics that will be proposed here – such as developing a deep understanding of needs, developing networks of expertise at the county or regional level, and connecting districts with similar challenges – are the only practical way to have a positive influence across the spectrum of local educational agencies and breadth of the state.

The governance changes underway in California are profound. They reflect a mature understanding by civic leaders that public agencies need to work differently to deliver better results. They also create opportunities to incorporate public sector innovations, especially those focused on the drivers of positive change and the capacity to manage change. Through the LCFF and the CCEE, the Governor and the Legislature have created a foundational opportunity to replace compliance-based oversight with an excellence-oriented strategy intended to inspire, inform and connect professionals throughout California.

Creating a Force for Positive Change

Over the next few years California’s education sector can successfully fulfill its promise of delivering high quality education to all students and become one of the most improved systems in America and internationally. Forces at all levels are aligning in ways that are seen only once in a generation.
There is increasing consensus about the importance of moving away from the wrong drivers for school reform - high stakes accountability, technology, human capital solutions, and ad-hoc policies - named "wrong" because they do not produce the desired outcomes of improved learning for all students. There is increased agreement about the need to shift toward the right drivers - capacity building, pedagogy, social capital solutions, and system coherence – “right,” because they are proven to produce the intended outcomes.

This important change in direction requires fundamental shifts in how individuals across the entire system fulfill their professional roles. Additionally, clarity and precision is needed to mobilize the right drivers thoughtfully, strategically, and continuously.

The CCEE has enormous potential to become a trusted and effective ally in the effort to create capacity and ownership of a right-drivers agenda in school districts. As importantly, the CCEE can help prevent a return to a wrong-drivers mindset.

There is increasingly precise knowledge about what it takes to develop effective education reform, and there is abundant internal expertise within California that can be mobilized to make CCEE an effective force of positive change.

Effective change is a process of shaping and reshaping ideas while building capacity, ownership, and shared mindsets. In this spirit, the following ideas are presented as a work in progress, open to be reshaped and refined through interaction with key stakeholders in ongoing dialogue.

---

**California Education Code Section 52074**

(a) The California Collaborative for Educational Excellence is hereby established.

(b) The purpose of the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence is to advise and assist school districts, county superintendents of schools, and charter schools in achieving the goals set forth in a local control and accountability plan adopted pursuant to this article.

(c) The Superintendent shall, with the approval of the state board, contract with a local educational agency, or consortium of local educational agencies, to serve as the fiscal agent for the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence. The Superintendent shall apportion funds appropriated for the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence to the fiscal agent.

(d) The California Collaborative for Educational Excellence shall be governed by a board consisting of the following five members:

1. The Superintendent or his or her designee.
2. The president of the state board or his or her designee.
3. A county superintendent of schools appointed by the Senate Committee on Rules.
4. A teacher appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly.
5. A superintendent of a school district appointed by the Governor.

(e) At the direction of the governing board of the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence, the fiscal agent shall contract with individuals, local educational agencies, or organizations with the expertise, experience, and record of success to carry out the purposes of this article. The areas of expertise, experience, and record of success shall include, but are not limited to, all of the following:

1. State priorities as described in subdivision (d) of Section 52060.
2. Improving the quality of teaching.
3. Improving the quality of school district and schoolsite leadership.
4. Successfully addressing the needs of special pupil populations, including, but not limited to, English learners, pupils eligible to receive a free or reduced-price meal, pupils in foster care, and individuals with exceptional needs.

(f) The Superintendent may direct the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence to advise and assist a school district, county superintendent of schools, or charter school in any of the following circumstances:

1. If the governing board of a school district, county board of education, or governing body or a charter school requests the advice and assistance of the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence.
2. If the county superintendent of schools of the county in which the school district or charter school is located determines, following the provision of technical assistance pursuant to Section 52071 or 47607.3 as applicable, that the advice and assistance of the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence is necessary to help the school district or charter school accomplish the goals described in the local control and accountability plan adopted pursuant to this article.
3. If the Superintendent determines that the advice and assistance of the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence is necessary to help the school district, county superintendent of schools, or charter school accomplish the goals set forth in the local control and accountability plan adopted pursuant to this article.
Envisioning the Mission

The CCEE can be a light, agile learning organization that builds capacity in districts by:

- constantly reading the landscape of district performance and needs
- collaborating with districts to identify the needs that, if addressed, can maximize impact on the learning of students, the professional capacity of teachers, and the learning leadership of school and system leaders
- matching learning needs of districts with individuals, local education agencies, or organizations with the expertise, experience and a record of success building capacity for system improvement (referred to as “assistance providers”)
- coordinating precision of collaboration efforts between districts and assistance providers to produce valuable organizational learning and capacity at the district, county and state levels

Creating Capacity for Transformational Change

The CCEE will become a valued asset to the system if it:

- successfully identifies key areas of need in districts with regards to capacity building for improvement of teaching practice and student learning
- establishes a valued repository of current, proven expertise and resources available to develop those capacities
- effectively brokers capacity building resources adequate to the context and learning needs of districts, to increase their ability to improve from within
- monitors progress, identifies and builds success around district improvement and makes it visible across the state

These key areas of activity are further described below.

Identifying capacity needs involves gaining as precise a picture as possible of the district performance landscape and engaging with the field to identify the most prominent areas of need where assistance can maximize impact on teacher professional capacity, learning leadership, and student learning. Examples of possible areas of need are: Learning and Pedagogy in the Language Arts and Social Sciences, Learning and Pedagogy in Math and Science, College Readiness, Systemness, Common Core Standards Implementation, LCAP Development, and Parent Engagement. This
activity also involves constant monitoring of progress on key, meaningful indicators to identify needs as they evolve over time.

**Establishing a repository of proven expertise/capacity** is crucial if CCEE is to become an effective, trusted partner in supporting district improvement. First priority as potential assistance providers should be given to school districts and practitioners with strong credentials developing capacity for system improvement. Expertise and success supporting other systems to improve can be considered a plus. External providers should be assessed very carefully to include only those willing and able to listen to and learn from the supported system, capable of catalyzing the internal capacity of the district to improve itself, and committed to the deep collaboration and involvement needed to get the work of improvement done.

**Brokering assistance** involves supporting those districts who request assistance as well as those identified in need of improvement (whether or not they request support). At minimum, CCEE can facilitate contact between districts in need of support with assistance providers. Perhaps more importantly, CCEE could also ensure the effectiveness of assistance by building buy-in on both sides (matching interest with capacity) and supporting districts in:

1. developing a focus on needs identified by districts yielding the highest impact on student learning and teacher and leadership capacities
2. developing strategies that have a defensible theory of action explaining the steps to be taken to improve district capacity and their intended impact on student learning, teacher practice, and school leadership
3. establishing clear expectations regarding content, process, duration and intensity of assistance
4. defining and tracking ambitious target goals related to student learning

It is likely that some districts who need assistance won’t want it. In such cases, the state should define mechanisms to require the district to take part in an assistance partnership. However, it will be crucial for CCEE to cultivate relationships of trust and support as early in the process as possible. This could involve, for example, engaging with districts in analyzing data on performance, offering a range of options for assistance, establishing conditions for trust and effective collaboration, and making visible and celebrating early success.
Analyzing existing measures of performance and engaging with districts in need of support to gain an accurate understanding of the capacity needs of the district will be key to identifying the most effective assistance options. Methods/levels of assistance for consideration are:

A. **District-to-district.** This may involve existing or new district collaboratives or pairings between districts. It will be crucial to create conditions for focused, results-oriented, and sustained collaboration. A format worth exploring is one where two or more districts face a similar challenge and devise a solution collectively.

B. **District success coaches.** This involves identifying and nurturing a cadre of proven individuals or teams – including educators and school and district leaders – with proven capacity and reputation as effective practitioners and leaders who immerse as coaches on loan in supported districts. This strategy simultaneously builds capacity and develops future system leaders.

C. **External providers.** It is crucial to identify providers willing and able to differentiate assistance based on district needs, capable of building the internal capacity of districts, and committed to the deep collaboration and involvement needed to successfully improve. The CCEE can serve as a highly selective filter of assistance providers, cautious of vendors with a record of one-time, one-size-fits all solutions and a default stance of intervention over capacity building.

---

**Effective Collaborations: Emerging Knowledge**

**Authentic match of learning interest of supported district with capacity of assistance provider:** A necessary implication is the importance of taking the time to thoughtfully identify, in collaboration with districts, capacity needs and best available assistance.

**Clear definition of a problem of practice** with three key features: the problem of practice is of interest to the district, it is precise and small enough to be workable, and important enough to yield considerable improvement if solved, and the assistance provider has a proven record of success in building capacity around that or similar problems of practice.

**Shared commitment to sustained collaboration:** This includes creating a cross-sectional leading team in the supported district that will ensure that the hard work of improvement gets mobilized across the system; ensuring follow up capacity on the part of the assistance provider; and developing clear agreed upon strategies, timelines, roles, responsibilities and norms of collaboration.

**Valuable learning for both parts:** It will be important to be cautious of an external intervention mindset taking over the provision of assistance. No assistance providers can fix a district. They can engage in collaboration with the district so that it changes from within. As a general principle of mutual learning, assistance providers should have the right answers at the end of the meeting, not at the beginning.

**Shared development of a thoughtful strategy for action** with a clearly formulated and testable theory of action that explains which actions will lead to which outcomes.

**Definition of key observable/measurable indicators** to know whether and how the desired changes are happening. It will be crucial to constantly monitor progress, identify areas of struggle, and re-shape the strategy and associated theory of action as needed.
To encourage ownership for engagement and solutions, it may make sense to develop a shared cost model to which districts contribute, similar to the functioning of California's Fiscal Crisis & Management Assistance Team (FCMAT).

**Monitoring progress on key, meaningful indicators will be crucial** to inform action, reshape strategies as needed, and identify success. Strategic communication to make success visible to the system and the larger public - for example, media illustrating effective pedagogy, leadership, and whole system reform - will develop a shared mindset of hope, efficacy, and support. In this way, CCEE will simultaneously develop a positive discourse around the right drivers, build desire, ownership and capacity to improve, and stay accountable to the system and the larger public.

**Critical Considerations**

**Light, Flat Learning Organization**

Effectiveness does not require complex structure. A small, flat organization that identifies key needs, connects demand with high quality supply, and monitors quality of assistance and collaboration is the best solution. If CCEE moves ahead with the strategy of deploying district coaches, the organization can serve as the convener of these coaches, bringing them together with some regularity to discuss progress, identify key obstacles and collectively re-shape strategies.

**High-Profile, Active Advisory Board**

Clarity about what CCEE should do and how it should conduct operations will emerge from doing and learning from the work. CCEE would greatly benefit from getting some of the best minds – nationally and internationally – in the education reform field to serve as small and active advisory board. A small group of outstanding and respected leaders with a strong record of leading and executing successful whole system reform at the district, county, state or national level could serve as a corporate board who meets with some periodicity to help shape CCEE’s strategy, monitor progress, and re-shape the approach in the process of building capacity and ownership. The advisory board would also serve as a live repository of knowledge and resources that could be deployed to facilitate CCEE’s capacity building efforts, while building capacity within CCEE itself.
If the idea of an advisory board is adopted, it will be important to build a simple accountability structure to ensure ownership and engagement of board members.

Some ideas include: explicitly establishing that collaboration should prevail over individual contributions; creating two year terms with the possibility of extension based on previous involvement and performance of the advisor; developing clear terms with regards to time commitment, dates and content of activities expected from board members; and establishing that any compensation would be based on delivery of commitments as an active advisor.

**Start Slow To Get Far and Deep**

It will be worth CCEE’s time to take at least six months working with its advisory board to take the pulse of the system, visit successful systems to learn what it takes to get the work of improvement done, and devise CCEE’s strategic plan - what to do first?, how to support it?, who will do it? An effective approach is to start small, get some success, learn in the process, re-shape the approach to incorporate the learning, and gradually evolve a strategy to disseminate the work of improvement to a larger number of districts. If, for example, 300 districts were identified in need of serious improvement, CCEE should consider starting with twenty, rather than trying to reach all 300 at once.

---

**Do’s and Don’ts for CCEE**

Explicitly formulating what not to do and how not to do it can be a helpful guide when there is risk of flipping back into old habits despite the intention to do things differently.

- Don’t create a new bureaucracy – **keep a small, flat, agile organization** that can learn and adapt quickly
- Don’t make the hard work of improvement complicated - **keep it simple**
- Don’t try to come up with answers or solutions too quickly – **start slow to get deep and far**
- Don’t assume the same solution will work for all districts – **differentiate support**
- Resist anything that can be turned into a compliance exercise – **learning is the work**
- Don’t try to do it without the districts – **engage in a learning partnership** with them
- Don’t try to do it to districts - **help them improve from within**
- Don’t assume you can find the best solutions on your own – **leverage the best available minds and expertise**
- Don’t let distractors run the show – **help districts maintain focus on a small number of ambitious goals**
Think Sustainable from the Start

Sustainability should be one of the first things to think about, not the last. It is crucial to think of sustainability in two ways:

1. Ensuring a clear link between assistance and collaboration between districts that positively impacts the people doing the work in schools and classrooms - school leaders, teachers, and students. Capacity and ownership are the foundation for sustainability.

2. Strategizing from the start to secure an ongoing budget will be crucial to create a structure of state-wide improvement with staying power.

Conclusion

California’s education sector has a golden opportunity to fulfill its promise of delivering high quality education to all students and become one of the most improved systems in America over the next few years. The ideas outlined here are offered to contribute to making California Collaborative for Educational Excellence a trusted and effective ally in the quest for substantial improvement across the educational system in California.
State Board Sets Principles and Timeline for Developing State Accountability System

The California State Board of Education (SBE) has set guiding principles and an initial timeline for establishing California’s new state accountability system. The new system will center around the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), Local Control and Accountability Plans (LCAPs) and annual updates. The guiding principles articulate the Board’s goals for system planning. The timeline outlines future topics for discussion as well as specific details for the development of evaluation rubrics.

“The state’s new accountability system will take into account multiple measures across the eight state priority areas outlined in LCFF, allowing us to focus on a broader set of outcomes than in the past,” explained SBE president Mike Kirst.

In May, Board members expressed a shared opinion that the October 2015 deadline for the evaluations rubrics, tools to help measure district and charter progress toward state priorities and local goals, needed to be adjusted. Stakeholders agreed and advocated for a revised timeline with lawmakers and the governor. As a result, recent legislation signed by the governor extends the deadline to October 2016 for the SBE to establish the rubrics.

The additional development time will be used to ensure the evaluation rubrics are built on a solid foundation of research and data analysis. It is also consistent with SBE’s overall timeline for developing a state accountability system.
“Our timeline ensures cohesion among the LCFF, local plans and evaluations rubrics,” explained Kirst. “Stakeholders must continue to be engaged and informed so they can weigh in on our deliberations,” added Kirst.

Guiding Principles for Accountability System Planning

Articulate the state’s expectations for districts, charter schools and county offices of education.

- Promote a broad understanding of the specific goals that need to be met at each level of the educational system.

Foster equity.

- Create support structures, including technical assistance for districts and schools, to promote success for all students regardless of background, primary language, or socioeconomic status.
- Continue to disaggregate data by student subgroup for both reporting and accountability purposes.

Provide useful information that helps parents, districts, charter schools, county offices of education and policymakers make important decisions.

- Assist and engage parents, educators and policymakers through regular communication and transparent, timely reporting of data so they can take action appropriate to their roles.

Build capacity and increase support for districts, charter schools and county offices.

- Seek to build capacity at all levels by reinforcing the importance of sound teaching and learning practices and providing necessary support to help schools reach their goals.
- Create multiple ways to celebrate district and school success based on state identified and locally designated metrics. Intervene in persistently underperforming districts to build capacity along a continuum of increasing support and attention through state and regional mechanisms of support. Ensure there are services and skills necessary to meet the needs of the students and families they serve.

Encourage continuous improvement focused on student-level outcomes, using multiple measures for state and local priorities.

- Focus on ongoing improvement of student outcomes, including college- and career-readiness, using multiple measures that reflect both status and growth. This means, in part, making determinations based on some version of the following two foundational questions:
  → How well is this school/district performing?
  → Is the school/district improving?
- Tie accountability determinations to multiple measures of student progress, based on the state priorities, integrating data from various forms of assessment, some of which will be locally-determined. Balance validity and reliability demands with the ability to clearly and simply explain results to stakeholders, including the use of a multiple measures dashboard.
Promote system-wide integration and innovation.

- Purposely and effectively integrate each accountability system component, including groups and technologies, creating a coherent, effective and efficient support structure for districts, charter schools and county offices of education.
- Recognizing that there is a new context for accountability in the state, the coming years will provide new insights at all levels of the educational system. To that end, it is important to encourage continued learning, innovation, and improvements related to the accountability system as a whole, core elements of the system, and the impact of the system on individual schools and districts.

**Initial Timeline for Establishing a State Accountability System**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBE Meeting</th>
<th>Proposed Transition to New Accountability System</th>
<th>Development of LCFF Evaluation Rubrics</th>
<th>Update on LCAP Template / Implementation Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>SBE Information Memorandum on states' emerging accountability systems.</td>
<td>SBE Information Memorandum that summarizes research related to indicators of college and career readiness, early warning systems, and indicator selection.</td>
<td>Field test the electronic LCAP template.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2015 SBE Meeting</td>
<td>Review and reflections of emerging college and career accountability systems from other states that can inform the design of California’s system.</td>
<td>Present SBE updated evaluation rubrics development plan and seek feedback regarding policy frame for the evaluation rubrics.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Period</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2015 - September 2015 Development Activities completed by CDE/SBE/ &amp; WestEd Staff</td>
<td>Develop an Information Memorandum that reviews California accountability components relative to the LCFF state priorities and SBE guiding principles.</td>
<td>Develop evaluation rubrics prototypes. Analyze data and present findings in an SBE Information Memorandum to define California context for the LCFF evaluation rubrics.</td>
<td>Analysis of LCAP electronic template pilot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2015 SBE Meeting</td>
<td>Present recommendations for proposed policy framework that articulate expectations for districts, schools, charter schools and county offices of education. These recommendations will create support structures to foster transparency, flexibility, and equity.</td>
<td>Present recommendations for proposed policy framework to structure the evaluation rubrics prototype to align with the SBE's policy frame. Discuss the decision points on standards and expectations for improvement and parameters for local metrics to support the proposed framework.</td>
<td>Report on LCAP electronic template pilot test results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2015 - December 2015 Development Activities</td>
<td>Analysis of “underbrush” of the existing accountability statutes and regulations that may need to be modified to align with and support California’s new accountability system.</td>
<td>Provide process to gather user feedback for select components of the evaluation rubrics based on state representative sample of LEAs participating in User Acceptance Testing (UAT).</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/nr/yr15sberel01.asp
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Meeting Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 2015 SBE Meeting</td>
<td>Recommendations for a Framework and Implementation Plan for Accountability System – Comprehensive design architecture with specifications reflecting policy implications for a new accountability system.</td>
<td>Update on UAT piloting select components of the LCFF evaluation rubrics design options and integration of data.</td>
<td>Lessons learned from submitting Year 2 LCAP and first year Annual Update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2016 SBE Meeting</td>
<td>Develop components that provide useful information that helps parents, districts, charter schools, and county offices of education and policymakers make important decisions.</td>
<td>Present the SBE with final design features of the evaluation rubrics based on user pilot experiences and feedback.</td>
<td>Present the proposed electronic LCAP template to be released in February 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>Discuss strategies to build capacity and increase support for districts, charter schools and county offices.</td>
<td>Present the SBE with update on use and evaluation of the rubrics prototype.</td>
<td>Discussion on efforts to diagnose and respond to challenges through school-based quality improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td>Present system elements that encourage continuous improvement focused on student-level outcomes, using multiple measures for state and local priorities.</td>
<td>Finalize evaluation rubrics based on guidance from the SBE, feedback from LEAs, COEs and as appropriate input from stakeholders.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
July 2016 | Promote system-wide integration and innovation. | Final LCFF Evaluation Rubrics for SBE Adoption. | N/A

For more information about the Board’s efforts on school accountability, please contact Julie White, SBE Communications Director at jwhite@cde.ca.gov or visit the California State Board of Education Web site [http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/].
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Executive Summary

Senate Bill No. 828 (“SB 828”) allocated $20 million of one-time funding to the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence (“CCEE”) “to establish a statewide process to provide professional development training” to county offices of education (“COEs”), school districts, and charter schools (collectively, “LEAs”) regarding the use of the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the template for the Local Control and Accountability Plan and Annual Update (“LCAP”). This Final LCFF Professional Development Training Implementation Plan (“Final PD Plan”) describes the four primary components of the professional development training.

Component I consists of a fall and a spring set of workshops offered at six to nine locations across the state with the intent of providing a common foundation for interpreting, understanding, and using the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the LCAP Template. A full complement of nine workshops are scheduled in November 2016.

Component II involves training local trainers and using a collaborative process to create an aligned Content Library (“Library”) for use in those trainings. The CCEE will identify Regional Lead COEs to help train local trainers and ensure that all LEAs have access to the trainings. The Library will initially focus on the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics. The Library will then expand to include content on the LCAP Template. After that, the Library will expand further and be revised to concentrate on using the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the LCAP Template as tools to support continuous improvement.

Component III consists of two tiers of support networks designed to operate like professional learning communities. The first-tier networks, called Professional Learning Networks (“PLNs”), are run by COEs as well as statewide associations and non-profit organizations and are for LEA governing board members and staff as well as local stakeholders. The second-tier networks, referred to as Professional Learning Exchanges (“PLXs”), are run by the CCEE and are designed for PLN facilitators. This component focuses on using the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the LCAP Template as tools to support continuous improvement. Many PLNs may narrow this focus further to a specific state priority or a specific student group such as English learners; and the CCEE will activity solicit such proposals if needed. PLNs may not focus on adopting or implementing a specific program. While most of the PLNs will not start until 2017-18, 28 Early Adopter PLNs have been selected to start by January 1, 2017.

Component IV is an LCFF Support Desk, staffed by CCEE employees or contractors, to provide responses to certain inquiries that may arise at the local level regarding the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the LCAP Template. After consulting with the State Board of Education, the California Department of Education, and California County Superintendents and Educational Services
Association, the Support Desk will respond to substantive inquiries regarding the use of the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the LCAP Template as tools for continuous improvement. The Support Desk will not respond to any other inquiry such as compliance, policies, or technical inquiries and will not be established to respond to urgent inquiries.

The Final PD Plan also includes a description of how CCEE staff intend to evaluate each of these components (including the survey required by SB 828) and other items such as additional staffing and the overhead cost charged by Riverside COE as the CCEE’s fiscal agent.

The budget for the Final PD Plan budget is summarized below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Summary</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component I: Annual Workshops</td>
<td>$1,350,000</td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
<td>$3,650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component II: Aligned Local Trainings</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td>$725,000</td>
<td>$725,000</td>
<td>$2,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component III: Networks</td>
<td>$1,475,000</td>
<td>$3,800,000</td>
<td>$3,800,000</td>
<td>$9,075,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component IV: Support Desk</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
<td>$1,025,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Items</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$2,050,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$5,500,000</td>
<td>$7,250,000</td>
<td>$7,250,000</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A more detailed budget is offered in Appendix I. Appendix II is a detailed description of the input process that CCEE staff used to develop the Final PD Plan.

In sum, the Final PD Plan establishes a statewide structure that supports the successful unveiling of the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the LCAP Template, incorporates the perspective of multiple stakeholders (COEs, district superintendents and administrators, site principals and teachers, community stakeholders, and many others), and focuses on strengthening many of the key tenets of LCFF such as continuous improvement, collaboration, and equity.
INTRODUCTION

As part of the 2016-17 budget agreement, the Legislature approved and the Governor signed Senate Bill No. 828 ("SB 828"), which allocated $24 million to the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence ("CCEE") for two goals: (i) at least $20 million “to establish a statewide process to provide professional development training to school districts, county offices of education, and charter schools for the purpose of successfully utilizing the evaluation rubrics . . . and the Local Control and Accountability Plan and Annual Update templates” and (ii) the remainder of the funds to “implement a pilot program that will inform [the CCEE’s] long-term efforts to advise and assist school districts, county superintendents of schools, and charter schools in improving pupil outcomes.” SB 828 then provides that the CCEE shall develop and submit “implementation plans” with respect to both goals. Assembly Bill No. 1624 ("AB 1624"), which amended SB 828, provides that no funds shall be expended pursuant to either plan (or subsequent plan update) without approval of the Department of Finance. This Final LCFF Professional Development Training Implementation Plan ("Final PD Plan") describes how the CCEE intends to meet the professional development training goal; a companion implementation plan describes how the CCEE intends to meet the pilot program goal.

This document begins with an overview of the SB 828 requirements for the professional development training. It then provides a brief summary of the first three years under LCFF, including a brief analysis of those first three years. The body of this document describes each of the four major components of the professional development training, including the intended audience, the content focus, and the estimated expenditures. These components are the result of a robust input process (a complete overview of which can be found in Appendix II). Together, the four components establish a statewide structure that (i) creates a common foundation for using the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the template for the Local Control and Accountability Plan and Annual Update ("LCAP"), (ii) builds capacity at all levels for using the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the LCAP Template for continuous improvement, and (iii) is based on the centrality of county offices of education ("COEs") while also incorporating all state and local stakeholders into the statewide training process.

BACKGROUND

The motivating language for the Final PD Plan comes from SB 828 as amended by AB 1624. It directs the CCEE “to establish a statewide process to provide professional development training to” local education agencies ("LEAs") “for the purpose of successfully utilizing” the new LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the revised LCAP Template. The training must be “provided in each region of the state” and must be “available to all” LEAs.

SB 828 also requires that the CCEE governing board “submit an implementation plan to the relevant policy and fiscal committees of the Legislature, the Director of Finance, and the Legislative Analyst’s Office within 30 days of the State Board of Education’s adoption of the evaluation rubrics.” The State Board of Education ("SBE") approved the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics on September 8, 2016. Thus, in order to meet the deadline imposed under SB 828, the CCEE
Governing Board will need to approve the Final PD Plan at its meeting on October 6, 2016, and staff will then submit it to the proper recipients on October 7, 2016.

SB 828 also dictates that the Final PD Plan must “include relevant expenditure and provider information, and a timeline to commence training by no later than October 15, 2016,” and must include “information on . . . the appropriate sequence of which local educational agencies will receive the professional development training.”

Under SB 828, the content of professional development training must focus on (i) how the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics may be used for the development and implementation of an LEA’s LCAP, (ii) how the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics may be used to improve pupil outcomes and close the achievement gap for unduplicated students, (iii) how the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics may be used to inform the development of LCAPs and communicate with stakeholders, and (iv) how the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and LCAPs may be used to establish a system of continuous improvement within an LEA. Finally, SB 828 mandates that the CCEE conduct a survey of LEAs “on how they used the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics to develop and implement their most recent” LCAPs.

For the professional development training to be successful, however, it is also important to analyze and then learn from the experience of implementing LCFF during the past three years. Much was accomplished during this time. For instance, there are many examples of LEAs that demonstrated the potential of local control by engaging their communities, developing creative approaches to address unique needs, and establishing clear and transparent goals and outcomes by which they can objectively judge their success. Additionally, many LEAs have lauded the impact of having financial staff and instructional staff work together to develop the LCAP.

Yet, from a statewide perspective, the implementation has been uneven. The many successes have often been siloed – i.e., not always shared with others and not always part of a larger systemic and cultural shift. The use of and approach to LCAPs has also been too uneven, even for a policy that is designed to facilitate difference at the local level. This is particularly relevant given that the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics are completely new and the LCAP Template will be significantly revised.

Thus, what is needed is statewide professional development training that establishes a common LCFF foundation, creates greater alignment (but not standardization) across California on how to use the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the LCAP Template, and builds local capacity to use these two documents as tools to support continuous improvement across all LCFF priorities.

* See, e.g., California School Boards Association (June 2016) “Increasing LCAP Transparency and Reaffirming California’s Commitment to Local Control,” available at www.csba.org/~/media/CSBA/Files/GovernanceResources/Researchpapers/061406LCAP-Year3_Analysis.ashx.
Additionally, the training must properly situate itself within a local control policy framework that empowers LEAs and their communities while placing COEs at the center of this framework. The components described in this plan meet this need.

**COMPONENTS OF THE FINAL PD PLAN‡**

**Component I: Annual Workshops**

This component comprises two sets of annual workshops. The workshops will be free and open to all interested individuals and parties. Both sets of workshops will include six to nine events, with one set occurring in the fall and the other in the spring.

In fall 2016, there will be nine “Local Control & Continuous Improvement” workshops in November on the following dates (including two Saturdays) and at the following locations:

- Wednesday, November 2: Sacramento
- Friday, November 4: San Jose
- Saturday, November 5: San Jose
- Wednesday, November 9: Los Angeles
- Monday, November 14: Fresno
- Tuesday, November 15: Bakersfield
- Wednesday, November 16: San Diego
- Friday, November 18: Redding
- Saturday, November 19: Ontario

Registration for all November 2016 workshops is open at [www.ccee-ca.org](http://www.ccee-ca.org) and is available through October 28, 2016. Spanish interpretation will be available at all workshops if needed.

Key tenets of LCFF such as continuous improvement and equity will establish the foundation of these workshops. On top of this foundation, the primary focus of the November 2016 workshops will be on how to interpret, understand, and use the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics, with a secondary focus on the LCAP Template. For spring 2017, the focus will shift to the LCAP Template. The focus of subsequent workshops will be determined based on feedback from attendees at the first two sets of workshops, on feedback from the other components of the Final PD Plan, and from discussions with stakeholders.

The content of the November 2016 workshops is being created through a collaborative process involving the State Board of Education (“SBE”), the California Department of Education (“CDE”),

‡ While each of the four components of the Final PD Plan is described separately below, it is important to note that there will be significant interaction between them. For instance, as the LCFF Support Desk (Component IV) catalogues the inquiries that it receives, CCEE staff may develop materials that are useful for the Content Library (Component II). Similarly, feedback from the Professional Learning Networks (Component III) may be used to refine content for future workshops (Component I). Additionally, the components will be regularly refined based the results of the evaluation (see next section below) and collaboration with stakeholders.
the California County Superintendents and Educational Services Association ("CCSESA"), the Center for Education Research and Development ("CEDR") at the San Joaquin COE§ as well as many other stakeholders. (For more on the input process is helping determine the content, please review Appendix II.) Content for future workshops will be created through a similar process.

The impact of the workshops will be evaluated by various survey instruments developed to assess the change in content knowledge and to gather overall event feedback. These results will be used to fine-tune the content of future workshops.

The total estimated cost for this component (excluding the evaluation cost) is $3,650,000 over three years.

**Component II: Aligned Local Trainings**

This component comprises the training of local trainers by the CCEE and “County Regional Leads” and the creation of an aligned LCFF “Content Library” (slides, handouts, videos, and other physical or electronic content) for use by local trainers.

The CCEE, in consultation with CCSESA, will develop a process to select 10-15 COEs as “Regional Leads” to serve the 11 CCSESA regions. The Regional Leads will work with the other COEs in their region to ensure that local trainings are available to all LEAs. The Regional Leads will also provide ongoing support to local trainers in understanding the content from and use of the Library. Finally, as described below, the Regional Leads will support the CCEE in developing and refining the Library. The CCEE will provide funding to support the work of Regional Leads.

The content for the Library will be primarily created through semiannual “Collaborative Content Development and Training” meetings, the first of which will be held in early December 2016. Attendees at these meetings may be from a COE, statewide association, non-profit organization, or other education-focused entity. The CCEE will pay for the travel and lodging costs of attendees to attend Collaborative Content Development and Training meetings.

Prior to each Collaborative Content Development and Training meeting, content will be solicited from stakeholders for potential inclusion in the Library.** At each meeting, attendees will examine and discuss the proposed content and work to find areas of agreement on what content should be included in the Library. Additional content may be created at the meeting as well. After each meeting, CCEE staff – in consultation with the Regional Leads – will make a final decision as to what content will be included in the Library. Based on feedback from the field, the CCEE may also add content to the Library after consultation with the Regional Leads.

§ The State Board of Education has contracted with the CEDR to develop the interactive website for the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics.

** Ownership of all content will be kept by the creator of the content, although if included in the Library it will be accessible to and used by others.
The Library will contain aligned content that meets the needs of different audiences. For instance, there will be multiple slides explaining the data display section of the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics – some for an audience of school district superintendents, some for an audience of school board members, some for an audience of charter school principals, some for an audience of teachers and classified staff, some for an audience of parents and community members, some for a Spanish-speaking audience, etc. However, while the Library will include more than one approach to explaining a particular area of LCFF, all the approaches will be consistent with each other.

The Library will not initially include content on all LCFF-related topics. The content created at the first Collaborative Content Development and Training meeting will primarily focus on continuous improvement, equity, and the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics, although the connection between the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the LCAP Template will also be covered. The Library will then be expanded at the second Collaborative Content Development and Training meeting to include content on the LCAP Template. Expansions and improvements at future semiannual Collaborative Content Development and Training meetings will be based upon changes in law and regulations, upon the experience of CCEE staff and the local trainers, and upon discussions with stakeholders.

Local trainers must be trained by the CCEE or a Regional Lead before accessing the Library and using the content for a local training. The CCEE will work with the Regional Leads and other stakeholders to determine the best way to identify and support local trainers. A local trainer could be from a COE, statewide association, non-profit organization, or other education-focused entity.

To ensure consistency in the presentation of the content from the Library, the use of content from the Library will be subject to certain stipulations. One stipulation will be that any content from the Library must be identified as such; for instance, a presentation that uses slides from the Library will need to clearly identify which slides are from the Library. Another stipulation will be that any local training that uses content from the Library must explicitly identify any other content that is inconsistent with Library content. The CCEE will work with the Regional Leads and other stakeholders to create a document detailing these stipulations.

In order for local trainings in January to include content from the Library, the below timeline will need to be followed when possible:

» October 7-October 28: CCEE staff work with CCSESA to develop a process to identify 10-15 COEs to serve as Regional Leads.

» October 28- November 21: CCEE staff implements process to identify 10-15 COEs to serve as Regional Leads.

» December 1: The CCEE Governing Board considers and approves (i) contracts with Regional Leads and (ii) the document describing the stipulations for use of the Library.
» December 6-7 or 7-8: First Collaborative Content Development and Training meeting

» December and January: The CCEE and Regional Leads conduct trainings for local trainers

» January and February: Local trainers provide local training using content from the Library

The impact of the local trainings will be evaluated by surveys administered to and, possibly, by focus groups composed of attendees in local trainings. The feedback will be used to identify areas of strength for dissemination to other local trainers and areas that need further development or refinement.†† Similarly, the Library will be evaluated through surveys of attendees of local trainings and local trainers themselves to ensure that it contains the necessary content relevant for all audiences.

The total estimated cost for this component (excluding the evaluation cost) is $2,700,000 over three years.

Component III: Networks

This component will include two levels of networks modeled on the concept of professional learning communities.‡‡ The first level of support networks will consist of Professional Learning Networks (“PLNs”) and the hosts of the PLNs will be COEs, statewide associations, or non-profit organizations. The purpose of a PLN is to use a collaborative approach to build capacity and support deeper learning in regards to using the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the LCAP Template as tools for continuous improvement. A PLN may not be convened with the intent to adopt or implement a specific program.

The CCEE will contract with the hosts to hire a PLN facilitator (or co-facilitators) who must have at least two years of facilitation experience, two years of experience providing training on LCAPs, and/or two years of experience providing continuous improvement training. The CCEE will train the PLN facilitators. The CCEE and the respective host(s) will jointly direct and support the work of the PLN facilitators.

The hosts of a PLN select its participants, who must be connected to an LEA – i.e., they must be LEA staff or board members or must be local community members of the LEA or a combination of both. However, the PLN participants cannot all be connected to the same LEA. A PLN can be entirely new or it could be an existing group or network.

The PLNs will formally commence at the beginning of 2017-18. Prior to the start of 2017-18, the CCEE will issue a Request for Proposals (“RFP”). The anticipated criteria for the RFP will include:

†† The survey results will not be used to evaluate local trainers.
(i) a written commitment by the participants to attend each PLN meeting, (ii) the minimal attendance and participation expectations for the PLN participants, (iii) an agreement that the PLN will meet in person or virtually twice a month, (iv) an agreement that the PLN facilitator will attend the CCEE-led trainings for PLN facilitators; and (v) an agreement that the PLN facilitator attend and participate in a Professional Learning Exchange (see below). The RFP is also likely to include some competitive criteria (e.g., preferring PLNs in which the participants are connected to LEAs with high unduplicated counts).

Many PLNs will be focused on supporting continuous improvement with respect to all student groups and all state priorities. However, the 2017-18 and 2018-19 PLNs will include specific set-aside allocations for PLNs focused on certain state priorities and English learners as well as other at-risk student groups. If necessary, the CCEE will actively solicit proposals to ensure that PLNs exist that target these student groups.

While the first full year of PLNs will be 2017-18, the CCEE will also select hosts for a limited number of Early Adopter PLNs (EAPLNs). Some of these EAPLNs may focus on a specific state priority or a specific student group such as foster youth. While there will be no formal RFP process for EAPLNs, many of the aforementioned RFP conditions will apply. Additionally, these EAPLNs must be operational no later than the first half of January 2017. (See Item 7.2 for information on the EAPLNs.)

The second level of support networks will be Professional Learning Exchanges (“PLXs”), the membership of which will be composed of the PLN facilitators themselves and will be facilitated by PLX coaches hired and trained by the CCEE. The PLXs will provide collaborative support for the PLN facilitators in their work as facilitators, will provide a statewide framework to connect participants in different PLNs from different parts of the state, and will create a structure to aggregate and disseminate information consistently across the state.

The impact of this component will be evaluated by having CCEE staff or designees (i) attend PLN meetings, (ii) provide PLN facilitators with surveys to administer to PLN participants, and (iii) facilitate focus groups. The surveys will be administered periodically across all PLNs, with results provided to facilitators in order to support improvement in areas identified in the survey results. The survey results will also be tabulated across PLNs to assess the impact of the initiative as a whole and changes being made in the field as a result of participation.

The total estimated cost for this component (excluding the evaluation cost) is $9,075,000 over three years.

Component IV: LCFF Support Desk

This component consists of a mechanism for LEAs to pose LCFF-related questions. The Support Desk will be designed to respond to substantive inquiries that relate to using the LCFF Evaluation

§§ These criteria are subject to change and additional criteria may be added.
Rubrics and the LCAP Template as tools for continuous improvement. CCEE staff – in consultation with SBE, CDE, and CCSESA – will provide a response within a reasonable time period (e.g., five working days) to each inquiry.

The Support Desk will not be designed to respond to compliance or policy inquiries (e.g., “Do meetings of the Parent Advisory Committee need to be noticed?”) or technical inquiries (e.g., “I can’t find my school district on the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics access webpage.”). Additionally, the Support Desk will not be organized to respond quickly (e.g., within 48 hours) to urgent inquiries. These inquiries will all be referred to CDE, SBE, or the local COE as appropriate.

The public interface for the Support Desk will be online and will function like a “ticket” system. Individuals with questions will be asked to provide information regarding their question or problem, any relevant background information, and their contact information.***

The CCEE will hire one or more employees or independent contractors to monitor the Support Desk, to log each inquiry, and to ensure timely responses. Each inquiry and response will be sorted and logged depending on topic, permitting CCEE staff, in consultation with SBE, CDE, and CCSESA, to develop resources such as FAQs and webinars based on the information.

CCEE staff intends to launch the Support Desk in January to coincide with the statewide publication of the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics. Depending on the success of the Support Desk, it could eventually expand to respond to other types of inquiries and to inquiries from local stakeholders as well as inquiries from LEAs.

The total estimated cost for this component is $1,025,000 over three years.

**Other Parts of the Draft Implementation Plan**

**Evaluation**

The evaluation of the four components will rely primarily on the compilation and analyses of data collected through surveys and focus groups. The information will be used to provide information regarding participant perception on the four major components, on pertinent LCFF topics, and on any change in content knowledge regarding the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the LCAP Template.

Overseeing the evaluation of these components will require at least two full-time staff members, one to focus on the survey and evaluation itself and an administrative assistant to support the work. The evaluation will include the development and administration of multiple survey instruments (including the survey of LEAs on how they used the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics to develop and implement the LCAPs as required by SB 828) as well as the development of focus

*** Staff will be consulting with legal counsel regarding issues of confidentiality concerning the information submitted.
group protocols and the training and facilitation for focus groups. Data cleanup and analysis will follow the administration of each set of surveys and focus groups.

The total estimated cost of evaluation for all components is $1,500,000 over three years.

**Other Items**

In order to properly develop and execute the Final PD Plan, an additional management level staff member will be needed as well as another staff member or independent contractor who will be in charge of the logistics of the many meetings and trainings that will be held statewide. CCEE staff will also need to support of outside consultants to help with content development and with other needs that may arise. Additionally, CCEE will establish an COE advisory committee to provide ongoing insight and advice on implementation of the Final PD Plan and on future modifications to the Final PD Plan. Finally, it is important to include a contingency amount to stay within budget and to include the 1 percent overhead cost from Riverside COE as the CCEE’s fiscal agent.

The total estimated cost of these others items is $2,050,000 over three years.
### Component I: Annual Workshops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall Workshops (6-9 workshops/yr)</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Workshops (6-9 workshops/yr)</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,350,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,150,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,150,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,650,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Component II: Aligned Local Trainings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collabor. Content Dev. &amp; Training Mtgs (2/yr)</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Regional Leads</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,250,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$725,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$725,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,700,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Component III: Networks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Learning Network Facilitators</td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
<td>$3,250,000</td>
<td>$3,250,000</td>
<td>$7,650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Learning Exchange Coaches</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$975,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Costs</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,475,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,800,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,800,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,075,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Component IV: Support Desk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staffing (see plan for details)</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$275,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$375,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$375,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,025,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staffing (see plan for details)</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Groups</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$300,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$600,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$600,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,500,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staffing (see plan for details)</td>
<td>$227,500</td>
<td>$265,000</td>
<td>$265,000</td>
<td>$757,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$185,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (~5%)</td>
<td>$483,045</td>
<td>$213,218</td>
<td>$213,218</td>
<td>$909,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCOE Support</td>
<td>$54,455</td>
<td>$71,782</td>
<td>$71,782</td>
<td>$198,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$850,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$600,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$600,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,050,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * *
## Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component I: Annual Workshops</td>
<td>$1,350,000</td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
<td>$3,650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component II: Aligned Local Trainers</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td>$725,000</td>
<td>$725,000</td>
<td>$2,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component III: Networks</td>
<td>$1,475,000</td>
<td>$3,800,000</td>
<td>$3,800,000</td>
<td>$9,075,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component IV: Support Desk</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
<td>$1,025,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Items</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$2,050,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,500,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,250,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,250,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX II

LCFF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT TRAINING IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
DEVELOPMENT & INPUT PROCESS

This Appendix provides additional detail regarding the stages by which staff from the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence (“CCEE”) developed the Final LCFF Processional Development Training Implementation Plan and solicited input on its contents. During the first stage of this process, CCEE staff listed potential means to provide the required professional development training. With this list in hand, CCEE staff held internal discussions and asked for feedback from a few key stakeholders. The result was an initial list of three professional development training “buckets”. During the second stage, CCEE staff solicited input from a wider array of stakeholders on each bucket and asked for ideas for new buckets. CCEE staff incorporated this input and transformed the buckets into “strands.”

The third stage involved presenting the three strands at multiple in-person input sessions and conference calls. These strands, after some significant modifications based on the input, were renamed “components.” The final stage of the input process commenced with the CCEE Governing Board meeting on August 6, 2016, at which point Governing Board members provided direct feedback on the details of each component. At the Governing Board’s direction, CCEE staff released a revised description of each of the components on September 16, 2016, and received significant feedback on those revisions. CCEE staff also engaged in multiple directly conversations with stakeholders.

Stage 1 (Preliminary Discussions)

This stage commenced with the hiring of the four directors in February and ended shortly after the publication of the Governor’s May Revise. The work at this stage was motivated by the language of Senate Bill No. 871 (“SB 871”), which initially directed the CCEE to “establish a statewide infrastructure to provide professional development training to school districts, county offices of education, and charter schools for the purpose of successfully implementing the evaluation rubrics.”

CCEE staff engaged in preliminary discussions with staff from key legislative committees and state agencies regarding what potential ideas could be included in an initial proposal. A number of ideas were considered in this stage, including the following:

» **Basic Trainings:** At least 100 small trainings around the state on the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the template for the Local Control and Accountability Plan and Annual Update (“LCAP”).
» **Best Practices Research & Analysis**: Best practices research and analysis in a range of areas, including the use of LCAPs, LCAP engagement, the state priorities, continuous improvement models, data use, and school and district turnaround.

» **LCFF Support Team**: An LCFF Support Team to train and support a local education agency (“LEA”) that is having difficulty with implementing one or more aspects of LCFF (e.g., stakeholder engagement, data analysis) and to provide intensive support to the LEA and its stakeholders for a limited period of time as mutually agreed upon by the LEA, its LCAP authorizer (if applicable), and other appropriate stakeholders.

» **Support Guides**: Different support guides for different audiences (county offices of education (“COEs”), school districts, charter schools, community stakeholders) to provide basic information regarding ways to use the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the LCAP Template to support continuous improvement.

» **Support Networks**: A number of support networks for different audiences (COEs, school districts, charter schools, community stakeholders) focusing on how each of the network participants or their respective LEAs can use the evaluations rubrics to develop and implement LCAPs and improve pupil outcomes.

» **Trainer of Trainers**: A series of trainings to train staff from COEs on the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the LCAP Template.

» **Webinars**: A series of webinars available online on an as-needed basis, with an initial set of webinars providing a broad overview of the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the LCAP Template and a secondary set of webinars that delves more deeply into different LCFF-related concerns that are raised in the field.

» **Survey**: A survey to examine how LEAs and their stakeholders are using the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics to develop and implement their LCAPs and to measure the levels of comprehension with respect to the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the LCAP Template.

Most of the input at this stage focused on the need for a large “push” in fall 2016 dedicated to creating a strong statewide foundation of knowledge regarding the use of the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the LCAP Template. Thus, there was generally interest in and support for Basic Trainings, Support Guides, Trainer of Trainers, and Webinars; however, there was internal concern about the logistical challenges of successfully implementing the Trainer of Trainers idea. Stakeholders expressed interest in and concern regarding the LCFF Support Team. While it was seen as a creative idea that addressed a need, it was not clear whether the CCEE was the best entity to lead that work nor how it would be received by education stakeholders generally. There was a strong interest in Best Practices Research & Analysis and the Survey, but it was not clear that the former was within the scope of the training while the latter was explicitly called for in the legislation. Finally, the idea of Support Networks was quite intriguing to many but there were also many questions regarding how to operationalize this idea across the state.
Based on this input, CCEE staff identified three ideas or “buckets” to include in an initial proposal. The three buckets were: basic, large-scale workshops; an LCFF support guide; and two tiers of support networks, with the first tier designed for LEAs and local stakeholders and the second tier designed for the facilitators of the first tier.

Stage 2 (Initial Outreach)

This stage began in early June when it became clear that the final 2016-17 budget deal would include funding for professional development training on the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the LCAP Template. While SB 871 was still an active bill, it was known by then that the relevant language from SB 871 would likely be incorporated into the 2016-17 K-12 education trailer bill.

Over the course of three weeks in June, CCEE staff presented the following three buckets to key stakeholders, including staff from legislative committees, the State Board of Education (“SBE”), the California Department of Education (“CDE”), and the California County Superintendents Educational Services Association (“CCSESA”). New ideas for buckets were also solicited.

Bucket I: Large Workshops & A Webinar Series

Bucket I was a series of large-scale workshops offered across the state. Each workshop was designed for approximately 1,000 attendees from COEs, school districts, charter schools, and local communities. Bucket I also included a series of webinars providing similar but not identical content to the workshops. The workshops and webinars were to focus on how to use the new LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the revised LCAP Template as well as continuous improvement more generally.

From the input received, there was very little debate as to whether to include this bucket. (There was universal support for it.) Instead, some input focused on the optimal number of workshops. Some stakeholders felt that in-person learning was important and, thus, there should be at least 10 workshops to facilitate the maximum attendance across the state. Others felt that a small number of workshops (no more than 3) would actually make the workshops more appealing because of the perceived “exclusivity” of fewer events. Surprisingly, the ability to view similar content online instead of (or in addition to) the in-person workshops was not appealing to many respondents, though there was near unanimity that some online content was critical.

The rest of the input centered on whether the workshops and webinars should provide a baseline level of knowledge for the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the LCAP Template or whether they should focus on continuous improvement. Those supporting the former position felt that this baseline knowledge was fundamental to properly implementing LCFF, and it was the lack of this baseline that was at the root of the inconsistent application and interpretation seen with the initial LCAP Template. Those who felt that the workshops and webinars should focus on continuous improvement argued that the establishment of a common baseline is a compliance-oriented task and that the CCEE was designed to be a different kind of entity – i.e., one that was
focused on supporting the important work of collaboration and continuous improvement. From this latter perspective, any focus on compliance would undermine the image of the CCEE as well as the entire LCFF endeavor.

Based on this input and further internal discussions, the idea of a series of large-scale workshops was included in a revised proposal and designated as Strand I. The number of proposed workshops was narrowed to between four and six. Any number below four would make it logistically difficult for a large number of participants to attend; and any number greater than six would not significantly increase accessibility given the geographical diversity of the state and the limited number of locations in the state capable of hosting such a large number of people. The idea of webinars was also kept (and added to what would become Strand II in Stage 3) but was simplified to an archived webcast of the workshop itself.

In terms of workshop content, CCEE staff chose to focus on basic LCFF vocabulary and mechanics. A common language and a shared understanding of the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the LCAP Template will help to ensure a more consistent rollout of these two documents. Additionally, the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics will be completely novel to the entire field of education and very different from anything that has been previously seen. Consequently, as these workshops will be the first time most attendees see the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics, it will be crucial to provide them with a common baseline level of knowledge with respect to the rubrics. Finally, a common baseline will be critical if the CCEE is to succeed in its ultimate goal: build internal capacity within LEAs and support the use of the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the LCAP Template as tools for continuous improvement.

**Bucket II: A Local Control Guide**

Bucket II was a Local Control Guide designed to provide information on how to use the new LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the revised LCAP Template as well as continuous improvement more generally. The concept of a guide was partially modeled after the *Fiscal Oversight Guide* published by the Fiscal Crisis & Management Assistance Team and was to be updated annually. The guide was to be written to serve multiple audiences by including separate sections targeted at COEs, school districts, charter schools, and community stakeholders.

The input regarding this bucket was mixed. On the one hand, there were those who felt strongly that this was an important piece to include as part of the professional development training. According to some who held this perspective, the field needed such a reference document to answer inevitable questions regarding the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the LCAP Template. Others who supported a guide wanted a continuous improvement guide rather than a “how-to” manual with respect to using the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the LCAP Template. Those opposed to a guide were concerned that, regardless of how it was initially framed, it would become a compliance document. CCEE staff also learned that there had been an attempt to develop a guide focused on serving as a reference for answering specific LCAP-related questions. That effort was abandoned when it became clear that there were significant challenges posed to writing such a
guide and that it would likely be used to overly-standardized the use of LCAPs and ensure compliance.

CCEE staff strongly considered the possibility of developing a continuous improvement guide focused solely on how to use the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the LCAP Template as tools for continuous improvement. In the end, however, the fact that a similar endeavor had been tried and was abandoned created sufficient concern to set aside this idea with the caveat that there may be a place for such a guide after the first full year of the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics.

In place of a guide, CCEE staff added the idea of “hub” webinars in the revised proposal as Strand II. The concept was to develop and produce online seminars for viewing at host locations followed by a discussion of the seminar’s content. The impetus for this idea came from the concern that neither Bucket I or Bucket II connected the CCEE with the multitude of entities in the field, predominately COEs, that are engaged to training local LEAs and stakeholders. Additionally, many respondents noted the lack of technology being used in any of the buckets.

**Bucket III: Support Networks**

Bucket III involved two tiers of support networks. The first-tier networks consisted of LEA staff or community stakeholders and were facilitated by an employee or contractor of a COE, state agency, statewide association, or non-profit organization. These networks were required to meet regularly and be modeled after professional learning communities. The purpose of these networks was to utilize a shared learning process to support more systemic changes within an LEA. The second-tier networks were for the facilitators of the first-tier networks and were to be facilitated by CCEE staff. These second-tier networks provided a means to support the first-tier facilitators and create a more aligned statewide support system for LCFF-related work.

Like in Stage 1, the input received on this bucket was generally positive but included many questions and concerns regarding the details of the bucket. Questions included who would develop the content, who would select the facilitators and the participants for the first-tier networks, how would the first-tier networks be chosen, when would the first-tier networks start, and how frequently would the first-tier networks meet.

One alternative to the networks was proposed: to use the funding instead for one-on-one work between COEs and their local school districts on how to use the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the LCAP Template. The argument for this alternative was that this was the best means to build capacity within COEs and their districts.

The idea of the support networks was retained in the revised proposal as Strand III and CCEE staff attempted to address the questions raised regarding the details of the networks. CCEE staff did not feel that the proposed alternative would lead to the same outcomes as the networks. While both were intended to build capacity at the local level, only the networks created a statewide system that could aggregate and disseminate information in an aligned way. In contrast, the proposed alternative to exclusively fund one-on-one work between COEs and their local school
districts could potentially create additional silos of success seen in the rollout of the initial LCAP Template. At the same time, CCEE staff understood and supported the basic idea of encouraging one-on-one work between COEs and their local school districts. Thus, as this bucket was revised as Strand III it included some additional funding to support this type of one-on-one interaction as long as it was an add-on to a COE-created network.

**Stage 3 (Formal Input Sessions)**

For this stage, the three buckets were refined into the three formal “Strands” described in more detail below and a list of potential additional strands. To solicit input on the strands, they were presented at three in-person input sessions offered at three key locations across the state and on four input conference calls. The details of these input sessions are summarized in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>June 30</th>
<th>July 6</th>
<th>July 12</th>
<th>July 14</th>
<th>July 14</th>
<th>July 18</th>
<th>July 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>In-person</td>
<td>In-person</td>
<td>In-person</td>
<td>Conf Call</td>
<td>Conf Call</td>
<td>Conf Call</td>
<td>Conf Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Alameda COE</td>
<td>LACOE</td>
<td>Kings COE</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attendees at these input sessions were also asked to complete an input form. In total, 143 forms were collected, including 79 from various county superintendents and their staffs.

In addition to these input session and input forms, CCEE staff gave a modified presentation to the Business and Administration Services Committee of CCSESA. There were also one-on-one discussions held with staff from COEs, advocacy organizations, the Department of Finance, the Legislature, CDE, SBE, and CCSESA.

**Strand I: Large Workshops**

Strand I was a series of 4-6 large-scale workshops across the state to be offered in October. Each workshop was to be located in facilities with a capacity for at least 500 attendees (and possibly over 1,000 if needed). The workshops were free and open to all audiences. At least one of the workshops was to be recorded and made available online. The workshops focused on basic LCFF vocabulary and mechanics and included information on the look and feel of the new LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the revised LCAP Template. This workshop content was to be presented in such a way as to enable deeper use of the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the LCAP Template as two tools to support continuous improvement within LEAs.

The quantitative and qualitative responses from the input sessions to this strand were quite positive. Ninety-two percent of attendees who responded agreed or strongly agreed that they would register for a workshop; the same percentage of COE attendees agreed or strongly agreed as well. Slightly higher percentages (both generally and for COE attendees) agreed or

---

* Given the limited nature of the presentation, no input forms were collected.
strongly agreed that they would forward a notice of a workshop to others. This strong level of support was illustrated by one attendee who wrote that this strand was “[a] positive way to . . . disseminate the content to a large contingent across the state, as well as [give] a large-scale understanding around the intent of the rubrics, creating common understandings across the state.”

As in the previous stage, there was strong interest in the content of the workshops. While there was again some concern regarding whether this strand was too focused on compliance – e.g., “Essential to keep focus on continuous improvement, and on LCAP and rubrics as tools to generate and review local data. Strand 1 needs to support this process and not provide rules to govern local decision-making” – most comments were supportive of using the workshops to establish a common baseline. For example: “[G]ive the ‘non-negotiables’ for the evaluation rubrics and the LCAP template”; “I think it would be important to try to come to agreement . . . about vocabulary [for the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the LCAP Template]”; and “I would feel that hearing the most recent information [on the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the LCAP Template] will help guide my work.”

The main concerns raised regarding this strand focused on the audience. Specifically, some attendees were concerned that a workshop with the same content (repeated multiple times at the different locations) was not appropriate for all audiences given their different perspectives and levels of knowledge. While the attendees who made this point were often referring to the difference between LEA staff and local stakeholders, it was also raised with respect to the differences among LEAs themselves. “It seems,” one attendee wrote, that “LEAs are at very different places re their LCAPs, so that a 1-day one-size-fits-all may not have max impact.” A related concern was whether it was best to invite all audiences or whether the workshops could be structured to meet the needs of the different audiences. One attendee suggested, for instance, that there be “customized breakout sessions to address the various needs of [workshop] participants.”

There were also a number of attendees who urged the incorporation of a trainers of trainer model, especially with COEs, into the workshops. Two attendees wrote: “Utilize COEs to assist with trainings (Trainer of Trainers)” and “Use TOT [i.e., trainer of trainers] model for content, partner w/ COEs to deliver.”

In response to the generally supportive input to this strand, the basic parameters of Strand 1 remained the same and were incorporated into the draft implementation plan as Component I. With respect to the concern over audience, CCEE staff agreed that there will be many different perspectives and levels of knowledge among workshop audiences (both between LEAs and non-LEAs and between LEAs themselves). Yet the need to establish a common baseline necessitated a workshop that contains mostly the same content. While this meant that the workshops might be more helpful for some audiences than others, it is also possible that audiences who think they already know all the basic information, vocabulary, and mechanics related to LCFF may find that they do not. Moreover, the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics will be new for everyone and,
thus, there will a strong need for a common baseline at least with respect to the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics.

In terms of determining the structure of the workshops (e.g., will there be breakout sessions?) and the exact content of the workshops, CCEE staff convened other staff from SBE, CDE, CCSESA, and the Center for Center for Educational Development and Research (“CEDR”) at the San Joaquin COE. This working group began working on the content.

**Strand II: Hub Webinars**

Strand II was a series of online seminars offered quarterly and focusing on different key issues. The CCEE would identify the topics in collaboration with key stakeholders and produce each online seminar. The intent was not for the seminar to provide the “right” answer to a question but rather to offer a multitude of perspectives on important LCFF-related issues (e.g., the use of supplemental and concentration funds for school-wide or LEA-wide purposes). Each seminar was to be viewed at “host” locations throughout the state and be followed by a discussion on the issue addressed in the seminar. The hosts ideally were to be COEs but could also be state agencies, statewide associations, or non-profit organizations. The post-seminar discussions were to be led by a trainer selected by the host and the hosts would also select and invite the participants. The CCEE was to collectively train the trainers on the content of the seminar and provide tips on how to facilitate difficult discussions.

The quantitative input on this strand was also quite positive. Ninety percent of all attendees who responded agreed or strongly agreed that they would register to host a webinar (including the post-webinar discussion), 96 percent agreed or strongly agreed that they would attend a webinar as a participant, and 99 percent agreed or strongly agreed that they would forward a notice of a webinar to others. The corresponding percentages for COE attendees was 99 percent, 96 percent, and 99 percent, respectively.

Nevertheless, the general qualitative feedback – both via the input forms and the discussions at the input sessions – was noticeably different. Many attendees, particularly those from COEs, questioned how these hub webinars were connected to the local trainings that COEs would offer. (Similar concerns were raised in the feedback to Strand I.) “Consider local trainer capacity building as a way to expand training and staffing reach by leveraging local relationships, expertise, contexts,” advised one attendee. A COE attendee wrote that “[t]his is the work that we are doing as individual COEs [referring to local trainings], so it would be nice to have collective partners to collaborate with to build trainings that support district needs.” Another attendee suggested “collaborating together [the CCEE and local trainers] to be consistent with information as well as provide a broader context could have real merit.”

---

† At various points throughout this stage, this strand was referred to as the “Hub Webinar” Strand or the “Hub Seminar” Strand. The former is used here because it was used the most.
The best way to reconcile the differences between the quantitative and qualitative feedback is that the hub webinars, while providing a limited opportunity for collaboration, also served to highlight the fact that the strands, particularly Strands I and II, contained little collaborative coordination between the CCEE and local training entities such as COEs.

CCEE staff agreed with this input, which underscored a major flaw in the strands. As a result, CCEE staff substantially modified the details of Strand II such that its successor, Component II, became a series of collaborative trainings for local trainers.

One issue that arose most acutely with the possibility of collaborative trainings for local trainers was whether to collaborate solely with COEs or whether to also include a wider array of stakeholders. Some attendees were concerned about “quality control” and the possibility of non-COE trainers offering different answers than COE trainers. One attendee warned that “COEs can be objective about the use of these template and rubric. Special interest groups will focus on their agendas.” Additionally, there was concern that some non-COE trainers, particularly advocacy groups, could use their CCEE-connected local trainings to increase local political or legal pressure on particular LEAs. The fundamental issue raised by these comments stems from the fact that, as one attendee stated, COEs “are the ones on the front lines of this work” while “according to statute, [advocacy groups] are not involved in the development nor the review of LCAPs.”

CCEE staff fully acknowledges the special role that COEs play under LCFF, both with respect to approving LCAPs and providing technical assistance. At the same, to only permit COEs to participate in the collaborative trainings is contrary to the intent of LCFF and would actually undermine its success. Local control is intended to empower LEAs and their local stakeholders. When conflict has arisen at the local level, the root cause of the disagreement (irrespective of the legal, policy, or political arguments) is often a misalignment of expectations. A collaborative training involving COEs as well as statewide associations and non-profit organizations directly addresses and minimizes the possibility of a continued misalignment of expectations. Moreover, on a practical level, statewide associations and non-profit organizations are going to continue to provide local trainings and operate at the local level. It makes more sense to incorporate their local trainings into a larger array of aligned trainings rather than allow them to remain disconnected. Therefore, the collaborative trainings proposed in Component II would be designed primarily for COE trainers but would be open to any trainer from statewide associations or non-profit organizations.

Strand III: Networks

Strand III consisted primarily of two layers of support networks. For the first layer of support networks – the grassroots networks – the CCEE would contract with COEs as well as state agencies, statewide associations, or non-profit organizations to host one or more grassroots networks. The purpose of the grassroots networks was to use a collaborative approach based on the idea of professional learning communities to support deeper learning in regards to using the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the LCAP Template as tools for continuous improvement.
The host entity hired a facilitator for each grassroots network and the CCEE trained the facilitators. The CCEE and the host jointly directed and supported the work of the grassroots facilitators. The host selected the grassroots network’s participants, who could be LEA board members or staff (e.g., LCAP leads) or who could be local community members or a combination of both. A grassroots network could be entirely new or it could be an existing group or network. Hosts could also agree to jointly host one or more networks. The grassroots networks were to meet weekly and begin no later than November 2016. Therefore, the grassroots facilitators needed to be ready to start by October 1, 2016 so that they could be trained and conduct initial outreach to the participants of their networks.

The second layer of support networks – the weaver networks – was composed of the grassroots facilitators themselves and was facilitated by weaver facilitators hired and trained by the CCEE. These weaver networks functioned similarly to the grassroots networks and were also be based on the idea of professional learning communities to support deeper learning.

Strand III included an optional COE add-on that provided the possibility of additional funding for a COE’s LCAP team to provide deeper one-on-one support to select districts within the county. In order to be eligible for the additional funding, a COE needed to create a grassroots network and any district that benefited from the deeper one-on-one support needed to participate in that grassroots network.

The quantitative and qualitative input for this strand was generally very positive. Eighty-three percent of attendees who responded agreed or strongly agreed that they would submit a Request for Proposals (“RFP”) to host a grassroots network (it was 90 percent of COE attendees) and 95 percent agreed or strongly agreed that they would participate in a grassroots network. The qualitative input was similar: “[W]e would definitely want to make sure our districts were in a network”; “Strand III was the most exciting”; “This is the most useful idea generated”; “This is my favorite strand.”

Moreover, as word of the networks spread and attendees became aware of the idea prior to attending an input session, interest and excitement in the possibility of the networks grew. At the first in-person input session, for instance, 67 percent responded that they agreed or strongly agreed that they would submit an RFP to host a grassroots network. By the third in-person input session, every attendee who responded agreed or strongly agreed that they would submit an RFP to host a grassroots network.

One significant area of concern for a large number of attendees was the frequency of the required grassroots networks meetings. When asked whether meeting weekly was “manageable,” 73 percent of attendees responded that they disagreed or strongly disagreed. The reasons most often given for the concern was that adding a weekly meeting – whether it was virtual or in person – to the schedules of already overworked education leaders or parents (the two most likely participants in grassroots networks) would make it difficult to recruit and retain
participants for grassroots networks. Additionally, there needed to be time left to “get the work done.”

The grassroots networks meetings were intended to change systems and culture through collaboration and collective sharing. Meeting once a month limited grassroots network meetings to at most 10 times a year (excluding summer); this is simply not enough to change systems and culture. Moreover, one of the compelling reasons for meeting so frequently was the ability for network meetings to provide a peer accountability mechanism to encourage that systemic and cultural change. In the end, however, the breadth of concern was sufficient to induce a change. Rather than a requirement to meet weekly, grassroots network were required to meet twice a month with option to meet less frequently if the CCEE and the host agreed on an alternative mechanism to create a peer accountability mechanism that supports systems and cultural change.

The second primary concern of a large number of attendees was the RFP timeline, specifically that it would be difficult to hire the right grassroots facilitators and recruit and confirm participants for the grassroots networks by October and November. The rationale behind the timeline was that (i) it could not wait because the work of the grassroots networks was crucial to helping local control succeed and shifting the field away from a focus on compliance, (ii) starting grassroots networks in the spring would be too late to impact the development of 2017-18 LCAPs (adopted June 2017), and (iii) since the implementation plan was initially thought to span only two years, waiting to delay the start of the grassroots networks would mean that they would be functional for significantly less than two years.

The input sessions and other subsequent conversations were critical to understanding how starting the grassroots networks later would actually be better for helping local control succeed and shifting the field away from a focus on compliance. The point was raised on a number of occasions that in order for the grassroots networks to function similar to professional learning communities and to support deeper learning, there needed to be a common foundation on which to begin. Moreover, given that the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics will be completely new, it was wiser to support a smooth initial rollout of the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics rather than shove grassroots networks on the field and expect deeper learning to occur immediately. The final reason to delay the start of the grassroots networks was the confirmation that the span of the implementation plan was actually three years rather than two. Thus, the decision was made to delay the start of the RFP process until spring 2017, with the grassroots networks slated to begin in 2017-18.

Other Potential Strands Under Consideration

A number of other potential strands were also considered. They were:

» **Continuous Improvement Guide**: This guide provided resources to support continuous improvement using the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the LCAP Template.
» **Best Practices Research & Analysis**: This research and analysis focused on best practices on using the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the LCAP Template as tools for continuous improvement.

» **Advice Line**: An advice line built on the email address already offered by the California Department of Education.

» **LCFF “Urgent Care”**: This service enabled COEs, school districts, and charter schools to request immediate and urgent support from the CCEE (and possibly its partners such as CDE, CCSESA, and SBE) if a significant issue arose related to the use or interpretation of LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the LCAP Template.

» **Buddy System**: This system involved the pairing of like-LEAs to collaborate and learn from each other regarding the use of the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the LCAP Template as tools for continuous improvement.

These potential strands did not generate much interest or feedback nor was there a specific prompt about them in the input form. At the same time, some individual conversations during this stage flagged the Advice Line as an idea worth exploring further. A comparison was made to the highly successful CAASPP hotline that operates during SBAC testing periods. The point was also raised that CDE monitored an email address to submit LCAP-related questions and there was interest in how an expanded version of this support could also help with evaluations rubrics. Thus, after conversations with CDE, an Advice Line was added as Component IV.

**Stage 4 (Refinement)**

This stage commenced with the publication of the draft LCFF Professional Development Training Implementation Plan (“Draft PD Plan”) on July 25, 2016, in preparation for the meeting of the CCEE Governing Board on August 4, 2016. The Draft PD Plan included four components. As directed by the Governing Board, the description of the four components were revised and released on September 16, 2016, in order for the Governing Board and the public to provide additional feedback. The result is the Final LCFF Professional Development Training Implementation Plan (“Final PD Plan”), which will be presented to the Governing Board for consideration on October 6, 2016.

**Component I: Annual Workshops**

This component included annual workshops focusing on establishing a common baseline for using the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the LCAP Template. The exact content of these workshops would be collaboratively determined between staff from the CCEE, SBE, CDE, CCSESA, and CEDR. Other entities could be invited as well. The workshops would be free and open to all audiences (i.e., LEAs as well as state and local stakeholders). The CCEE would work with SBE, CDE, CCSESA, and the other statewide associations and non-profit organizations to advertise and promote the workshops.
There would be five initial workshops in the fall of 2016, and a similar number planned for each subsequent fall. These workshops would be spread across the state in strategically selected locations such that as much of the state as possible would be within 100 miles or less than a 3-hour drive to at least one location. The initial proposed locations for 2016-17 were Redding, Sacramento, Fresno, Palmdale, and Temecula.

The workshops were to be evaluated through surveys to assess the change in content knowledge as well as overall event feedback. The estimated cost for this component (excluding the cost of the survey and evaluation) under the Draft PD Plan was $1,500,000 over three years.

The revised description of Component I contained two major changes. One change was that more fall 2016 workshop locations were added and some of the previous proposed locations were shifted. The final locations were (in chronological order): Sacramento, San Jose, Los Angeles, Fresno, Bakersfield, San Diego, Redding, and Ontario. The other main change was the addition of a second set of workshops in the spring. The spring 2017 set of workshops would focused more on the LCAP Template than the fall 2016 workshops.‡

The feedback on the draft version and the revised version of Component I was very positive from both the Governing Board and the public, especially in regards to the additional locations for the fall 2016 workshops and the addition of the second set of spring workshops. One consistent concern that was raised was in regards to the content of the workshops and the process to develop the content. In anticipation of this concern, CCEE staff had initiated (just prior to the August CCEE Governing Board meeting) a robust collaborative and transparent input process for developing the content for the fall 2016 workshops. This process involved three initial meetings with a small group of stakeholders (SBE, CDE, CCSESA, and CEDR), two meetings with a larger group of stakeholders that included representatives from 12 statewide associations and 12 non-profit organizations, and three public meetings designed for practitioners (i.e., typical workshop audience members). This entire two-month process began on August 2 and will conclude October 4.

The only other consistent concern that arose was with respect to the fact that the workshops were designed for all audiences (not just LEA board members and staff) to the fall 2016 workshops. This concern, which was also raised previously in the process, focused on whether workshops designed for all audiences would make the workshops less helpful for everyone, especially LEAs. CCEE staff still believes that designing a workshop for all audiences is the best approach. The need to establish a common baseline necessitated a single workshop for all audiences. This is particularly true for the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics as they are new for everyone. Additionally, the workshops will be designed for teams from LEAs. This approach takes advantage of the different perspectives and knowledge levels that attendees will bring, enabling all

‡ SBE delayed approving the revised LCAP Template from September 2016 (before the fall 2016 workshops) to November 2016 (during the fall 2016 workshops). As a result, it is infeasible for the fall 2016 workshops to include details of the revised LCAP Template.
audiences to benefit from the experience. It also encourages LEAs to empower and involve community stakeholders in the learning and decision-making processes.

**Component II: Collaborative Trainings for Local Trainers**

This component included a series of collaborative trainings for local trainers who are engaged in providing training to LEAs and local stakeholders. For the first collaborative training, all local trainers statewide would gather together in a single location. Subsequent collaborative trainings would be held at least quarterly and would be regional. At each collaborative training, staff from the CCEE, SBE, CDE, CCSESA, and CEDR would provide the initial content but the local trainers would collaboratively and collectively review the content, make modifications, and develop new content as needed in conjunction with staff from the CCEE, SBE, CDE, CCSESA, and CEDR. The local trainer could be from a COE, a state agency, a statewide association, or non-profit organization.

Initially, the content of these collaborative trainings – and, thus, the content of the resultant local trainings – was to build on the content from the Component I workshops with the aim of strengthening the common foundation for using the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the LCAP Template. As the comfort level with using the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the LCAP Template grew, however, the content of the collaborative trainings and the local trainings would change, with the focus shifting from such things as basic terminology and mechanics to a focus on using the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics and the LCAP Template as tools to support continuous improvement within LEAs. The focus for the local trainings would also shift to permit more differentiation in order to meet the needs of specific audiences. At each collaborative training (except for the first one), the local trainers would be expected to report back on the successes and challenges of the local trainings in order to help all local trainers improve their local trainings.

Any local training sponsored by one or more hosts (i.e., COEs, state agencies, statewide associations, and non-profit organizations) and led by the local trainers trained at the collaborative trainings would be able to advertise and promote the local training as co-sponsored by the CCEE. However, hosts must sign a contract with the CCEE that included certain criteria such as (i) the local trainings provided by the host must be limited to the content prepared through the collaborative trainings, and (ii) the host must provide the CCEE in advance with certain information on its local trainings such as copies of handouts, dates and locations of the local trainings, and attendance at local trainings.

The impact of the local trainings was to be evaluated by feedback collected from attendees and by focus groups composed of participants in local trainings. The feedback for both would be collected through post-training surveys that are administered to all attendees as well as focus groups to identify specific areas of need for further development or refinement. The total estimated cost for this component (excluding the cost of the survey, focus groups, and evaluation) under the Draft PD Plan was $1,425,000 over three years.
The revised version of Component II further refined the mechanics of collaboratively developing content for the local trainers. It labeled the collection of the aligned content as the “Content Library.” The revised version also added conditions on accessing and using the content such as providing “certification” of local trainers for those who attend the collaborative trainings and requiring an agreement to only use content from the Library in CCEE co-sponsored local trainings. Additionally, the revised description added a stipend to local training organizations to support the cost of offering local trainings and to partially offset the cost of participating in the development of the Library.

The feedback on draft version and the revised version of Component II was mixed. While there was general agreement in regards to the need for aligned content, there was significant concern and opposition to the restrictions placed on the use of content from the Library and a feeling that the CCEE was not establishing a collaborative or realistic process for using the content from the Library for local trainings.

CCEE staff responded with further outreach and discussion with key stakeholders, especially COEs and CCSESA. Based on the additional input, Component II was further revised by creating Regional Lead COEs (based on the 11 CCSESA regions) to help train local trainers and develop the Library and by loosening the restrictions on the use of content from the Library. To reflect these changes, the title of Component II was changed to “Aligned Local Trainings” to underscore the focus of the component.

Component III: Networks

This component included two levels of support networks modeled on the concept of professional learning communities. The first level of support networks consisted of “grassroots networks” and the hosts of these networks were COEs, state agencies, statewide associations, or non-profit organizations. The CCEE would contract with these hosts to hire the grassroots facilitator and select the grassroots networks participants, who could be LEA board members or staff (e.g., LCAP leads) or who could be local community members or a combination of both.

The grassroots networks were to commence at the beginning of 2017-18. The CCEE would issue a non-competitive Request for Proposals (“RFP”) in early 2017. While the first full year of grassroots networks would be 2017-18, the CCEE would also contract with up to 10 hosts to be early adopters of grassroots networks. Additionally, these early adopters must be able to hire a grassroots facilitator and the grassroots networks must start meeting no later than the first half of January 2017.

The second level of support networks would be the “weaver networks,” which would be composed of the grassroots facilitators themselves and would be facilitated by weaver facilitators hired and trained by the CCEE. These weaver networks would provide collaborative support for the grassroots facilitators in their work as facilitators, a statewide framework to connect

§ Initially, this was called the “Content Universe.”
participants in different grassroots networks from different parts of the state, and a statewide structure to aggregate and disseminate information across the state.

This component also included an optional COE add-on that offered additional funding for COE LCAP approval teams to provide deeper one-on-one support to selected districts within the county. In order to be eligible for the additional funding, however, a COE would need to create a grassroots network and any district that would benefit from the deeper one-on-one support would need to participate in that grassroots network.

The impact of the networks would be evaluated through the administration of survey instruments as well as focus groups composed of participants in grassroots networks. The total estimated cost for this component (excluding the cost of the survey and evaluation) under the Draft PD Plan was $13,500,000 over three years.

The revised version of Component III was quite similar to the draft version except that the grassroots networks were renamed as “Professional Learning Networks” (“PLNs”), the weaver networks were renamed as Professional Learning Exchanges (“PLXs”), and the facilitators of weaver networks (i.e., PLXs) were renamed as PLX Coaches. The only major change was that the optional COE add-on was eliminated.

The feedback on the draft and revised version of Component III was very positive. Respondents suggested only a few suggested changes and most were accepted. For instance, the description of the PLNs was modified to include PLNs focused specifically on the needs of English learners as well as other student groups. In response to strong demand to host an Early Adopter PLN (“EAPLN”), CCEE staff significantly expanded the number of potential EAPLNs beyond ten. Finally, the EAPLN contract included a set of minimum qualifications and expected functions due to concerns over who an EAPLN host might select as a facilitator.

Component IV: Advice Line

This component build on CDE’s email account set up to accept LCAP-related questions. It would be expanded to include responding to questions related to the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics as well. Answers would be provided timely after a process for staff from CCEE, SBE, CDE, and CCSESA to vet the answers. Questions and responses would be logged so that they can be referred to or used later. The total estimated cost for this component under the PD Draft Plan was $675,000 over three years.

The revised description of Component IV added that questions would be processed similar to a “ticket” system and would be accessible online as well as via email.

The response to the draft and the revised version of Component IV was limited. However, some expressed concern that the Advice Line could be overwhelmed with questions. Additionally, the type of questions that the Advice Line might receive (technical and legal as well as substantive)
would not be appropriate for the CCEE to answer – i.e., other entities such as CDE or COEs were better positioned to respond.

CCEE staff agreed with these concerns and significantly scaled back the scope of this component. As a result, this component focused solely on substantive LCFF-related inquiries and ensured a response within a reasonable time period (e.g., five working days) to each question. CCEE staff will consult with SBE, CDE, and CCSESA before responding. Technical or compliance inquiries will be referred to CDE, SBE, or the appropriate COE. As a result, the component no longer connected to CDE’s LCAP email address. To reflect the changes to this component, its titled was changed to “LCFF Support Desk.”
## 2016-17 State Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduation Rate</strong></td>
<td>Status compared with average 4-year cohort graduation rate for 3 years prior to “Status” year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suspension Rate</strong></td>
<td>Status compared with pupils suspended at least once in school year divided by number of enrolled students in year prior to “Status” year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English Learner Proficiency</strong></td>
<td>Status compared with percent of ELs that moved up at least one CELDT level or that were reclassified for 3 years prior to “Status” year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English Language Arts Assessment</strong></td>
<td>Status compared with proficiency rate on English Language Arts Smarter Balanced Assessment for grades 3-8 in year prior to “Status” year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mathematics Assessment</strong></td>
<td>Status compared with proficiency rate on Mathematics Smarter Balanced Assessment for grades 3-8 in year prior to “Status” year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College &amp; Career Readiness</strong></td>
<td>There will be no performance category provided for this state performance indicator in January 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chronic Absenteeism</strong></td>
<td>There will be no performance category provided for this state performance indicator in January 2017.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2016-17 LOCAL PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Basics ( Appropriately Assigned Teachers, Access to Curriculum-Aligned Instructional Materials, and Safe, Clean and Functional School Facilities) - Priority 1

*Standard:* LEA annually measures its progress in meeting the Williams settlement requirements at 100% at all of its school sites, as applicable, and promptly addresses any complaints or other deficiencies identified throughout the academic year, as applicable; and provides information annually on progress meeting this standard to its local governing board and to stakeholders and the public through the evaluation rubrics.

Implementation of State Academic Standards - Priority 2

*Standard:* LEA annually measures its progress implementing state academic standards and reports the results to its local governing board and to stakeholders and the public through the evaluation rubrics.

Parent Engagement - Priority 3

*Standard:* LEA annually measures its progress in (1) seeking input from parents in decision making and (2) promoting parental participation in programs, and reports the results to its local governing board and to stakeholders and the public through the evaluation rubrics.

School Climate (Local Climate Surveys) - Priority 6

*Standard:* LEA administers a local climate survey at least every other year that provides a valid measure of perceptions of school safety and connectedness, such as the California Healthy Kids Survey, to students in at least one grade within the grade span(s) that the LEA serves (e.g., K-5, 6-8, 9-12), and reports the results to its local governing board and to stakeholders and the public through the evaluation rubrics.

Coordination of Services for Expelled Students (COE Only) - Priority 9

*Standard:* COE annually measures its progress in coordinating instruction as required by Education Code Section 48926 and reports the results to its local governing board and to stakeholders and the public through the evaluation rubrics.

Coordination of Services for Foster Youth (COE Only) - Priority 10

*Standard:* COE annually measures its progress in coordinating services for foster youth and reports the results to its local governing board and to stakeholders and the public through the evaluation rubrics.

*For a local performance indicator, an LEA would use the standard to self-assess its performance as (i) Met, (ii) Not Met, or (iii) Not Met for Two or More Years*
# LCFF STATE PRIORITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Priority</th>
<th>Corresponding Performance Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Basics</td>
<td>Basics (Local)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Implementation of State Academic Standards</td>
<td>Implementation of State Standards (Local)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Parent Engagement</td>
<td>Parent Engagement (Local)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pupil Achievement</td>
<td>ELA Assessment (State)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math Assessment (State)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Learner (State)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pupil Engagement</td>
<td>Graduation Rate (State)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chronic Absenteeism (State)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. School Climate</td>
<td>Suspension Rate (State)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Climate (Local)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Access to in a Broad Course of Study</td>
<td>College &amp; Career (State)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Pupil Outcomes</td>
<td>College &amp; Career (State)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Coordination of Services for Expelled Pupils*</td>
<td>Coordination of Services for Expelled Pupils (Local)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Coordination of Services for Foster Youth*</td>
<td>Coordination of Services for Foster Youth (Local)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Applies only to County Offices of Education
# State Performance Category Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Legend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>Between 11 and 30 pupils for whom data is reported for the applicable performance indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>Less than 11 pupils for whom data is reported for the applicable performance indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Data is not available or the performance indicator is not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**LOCAL CONTROL & CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT WORKSHOP**

# STATUS vs. CHANGE

**Status** is determined using the outcome from the year in which data is most recently available.

There are five levels for Status:

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

Very High is not necessarily better than Very Low. It depends on the type of State Performance Indicator (e.g., Very High is good for graduation rate but not for suspension rate).

**Change** is the difference between the outcome from the “status” year and the prior year or an average of prior year outcomes.

There are five levels for Change:

- Increased Significantly
- Increased
- Maintained
- Declined
- Declined Significantly

Increased Significantly is not necessarily better than Declined Significantly. It depends on the type of State Performance Indicator (e.g., Increased Significantly is good for graduation rate but not for suspension rate).

**Status** and **Change** are combined in the below manner in what is referred to as a “Reference Charter.” Each State Performance Indicator has at least one unique Reference Chart. In some instances, a State Performance Indicator will have several Reference Charts applicable for different types of LEAs and different types of schools.

## CHANGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>Declined Significantly</th>
<th>Declined</th>
<th>Maintained</th>
<th>Increased</th>
<th>Increased Significantly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
## APPLICABILITY OF PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Performance Indicator</th>
<th>COE</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Charter*</th>
<th>School†</th>
<th>TK-5</th>
<th>6-8</th>
<th>9-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Absenteeism</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension Rate</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Learner</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College &amp; Career</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA Assessment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Assessment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Performance Indicator</th>
<th>COE</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Charter*</th>
<th>School†</th>
<th>TK-5</th>
<th>6-8</th>
<th>9-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basics</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of State Standards</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Engagement</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Climate</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination of Services for Expelled Pupils (COE Only)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination of Services for Foster Youth (COE Only)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Certain performance indicators may not apply to a charter school depending on its charter.

† Performance indicators do not currently apply to Alternative Schools Accountability Model (ASAM) Schools.
## 2016-17 GRADUATION RATE REFERENCE CHART

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduation Rate (All LEAs and High Schools)</th>
<th>CHANGE (PRIOR 3 YEAR AVG)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very High 95% or greater</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High 90% to less than 95%</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium 85% to less than 90%</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low 67% to less than 85%</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Less than 67%</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Declined Significantly by more than 5%
- Declined by 1% to 5%
- Maintained Declined or improved by less than 1%
- Increased by 1% to less than 5%
- Increased Significantly by 5% or more

**STATUS (2014-15)**

- Very High 95% or greater
- High 90% to less than 95%
- Medium 85% to less than 90%
- Low 67% to less than 85%
- Very Low Less than 67%
# Local Control & Continuous Improvement Workshop

## 2016-17 Suspension Rate Reference Chart

*Applicable to Elementary School Districts Only*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suspension Rate (Elementary School Districts Only)</th>
<th>CHANGE (PRIOR YEAR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased Significantly by more than 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low 0.5% or less</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 0.5% to 1.5%</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 1.5% to 3.0%</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 3.0% to 6.0%</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 6.0%</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 2016-17 Suspensions Rate Reference Chart

**Applicable to High School Districts Only**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status (2014-15)</th>
<th>Change (Prior Year)</th>
<th>Increased Significantly by more than 3%</th>
<th>Increased by 0.5% to less than 3.0%</th>
<th>Maintained Declined or Increased by less than 0.5%</th>
<th>Declined by 0.5% to less than 3.0%</th>
<th>Declined Significantly by 3.0% or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td></td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td></td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LOCAL CONTROL & CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT WORKSHOP

### 2016-17 SUSPENSION RATE REFERENCE CHART

**Applicable to Unified School Districts Only**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suspension Rate (Unified School Districts Only)</th>
<th>CHANGE (PRIOR YEAR)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low 1.0% or less</td>
<td>Increased Significantly by more than 2%</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Increased by 0.3% to less than 2.0%</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Maintained Declined or increased by less than 0.3%</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Declined by 0.3% to less than 2.0%</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Declined Significantly by 2.0% or more</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATUS (2014-15)</th>
<th>Very Low 1.0% or less</th>
<th>Low Greater than 1.0% to 2.5%</th>
<th>Medium Greater than 2.5% to 4.5%</th>
<th>High Greater than 4.5% to 8.0%</th>
<th>Very High Greater than 8.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Local Control & Continuous Improvement Workshop

## 2016-17 Suspension Rate Reference Chart

Applicable to Elementary Schools* Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suspension Rate (Elementary Schools* Only)</th>
<th>CHANGE (PRIOR YEAR)</th>
<th>status (2014-15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>Increased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significantly</td>
<td>by 0.3% to less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by more than 2.0%</td>
<td>than 2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low 0.5% or less</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Greater than 0.5% to 1.0%</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Greater than 1.0% to 3.0%</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Greater than 3.0% to 6.0%</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High Greater than 6.0%</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes charter schools and any school in which TK-5 enrollment is greater than enrollment from any other grade span
2016-17 SUSPENSION RATE REFERENCE CHART

Applicable to Middle Schools* Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATUS (2014-15)</th>
<th>Suspension Rate (Middle Schools* Only)</th>
<th>CHANGE (PRIOR YEAR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased Significantly by more than 4.0%</td>
<td>Increased by 0.3% to less than 4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes charter schools and any school in which 6-8 enrollment is greater than enrollment from any other grade span
# Local Control & Continuous Improvement Workshop

## 2016-17 Suspension Rate Reference Chart

*Applicable to High Schools* *Only*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status (2014-15)</th>
<th>Suspension Rate (High Schools* Only)</th>
<th>Change (Prior Year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased Significantly by more than 3.0%</td>
<td>Increased by 0.3% to less than 3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes charter schools and any school in which 9-12 enrollment is greater than enrollment from any other grade span*
## 2016-17 ENGLISH LEARNER REFERENCE CHART

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGLISH LEARNER (All LEAs and all Schools)</th>
<th>CHANGE (PRIOR YEAR)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Declined Significantly by more than 10.0%</td>
<td>Declined by 1.5% to 10%</td>
<td>Maintained Declined or improved by less than 1.5%</td>
<td>Increased by 1.5% to less than 10.0%</td>
<td>Increased Significantly by 10.0% or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High (85% or greater)</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (75% to less than 85%)</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (67% to less than 75%)</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (60% to less than 67%)</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low (Less than 60%)</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LOCAL CONTROL & CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT WORKSHOP

### 2016-17 ELA ASSESSMENT REFERENCE CHART

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3-8 ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS ASSESSMENT (ALL LEAs, Elementary Schools, and Middle Schools)</th>
<th>CHANGE (PRIOR YEAR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Declined Significantly by more than 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High 75% or greater</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High 60% to less than 75%</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium 51% to less than 60%</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low 20% to less than 51%</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Less than 20%</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LOCAL CONTROL & CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT WORKSHOP

## 2016-17 MATH ASSESSMENT REFERENCE CHART

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATUS (2015-16)</th>
<th>3-8 MATH ASSESSMENT (ALL LEAs, Elementary Schools, and Middle Schools)</th>
<th>CHANGE (PRIOR YEAR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Declined Significantly by more than 5%</td>
<td>Declined by 1% to 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High 70% or greater</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High 51% to less than 70%</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium 40% to less than 51%</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low 15% to less than 40%</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Less than 15%</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The LCFF Evaluation Rubrics will include descriptions of research-supported and evidence-based practices related to the indicators that may be helpful to LEAs in their analysis of progress. These “Statements of Model Practices” are organized to correspond to the organization of the indicators in the data analysis tool.

The Statements of Model Practices component of the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics System will complement the Data Analysis Tool by:

» Providing qualitative statements describing examples of effective practices and processes for LEAs to consider and compare to existing practices and processes in place;

» Describing additional actionable information not obtained from quantitative analysis of the indicators alone; and

» Providing additional data that can assist users in instructional decision making and improving student achievement at the system, school and classroom levels.

Users will directly access the Statements of Model Practices from the main landing page and also access relevant Statements of Model Practices from the data analysis tool interface. This interface will support users in reflecting on local actions relative to the model practices while they are reviewing data on performance.
The LCFF Evaluation Rubrics will include links to existing resources and sources of expert assistance (e.g., CDE Digital Library, CDE LCFF Resources webpage, the Web site for the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence). These links will connect users to more detailed information about implementing specific programs or services that align with the statements of model practices.

The links will:

» Be organized by indicators as optional resources for use by LEAs and stakeholders; and

» Evolve over time, for example, directing users to a centralized clearinghouse of successful local practices, information about local or regional networks, etc., including the currently planned Collaboration in Common online resource exchange.

The initial set of external resources will correspond to the Statements of Model Practices.
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#### Golden State Unified School District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chronic Absenteeism</th>
<th>Suspension Rate</th>
<th>College/Career</th>
<th>English Learner</th>
<th>Graduation Rate</th>
<th>ELA Assessment</th>
<th>Math Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Students</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>American Indian</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asian</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>¥</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>¥</td>
<td>¥</td>
<td>¥</td>
<td>¥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>African American</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>¥</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>¥</td>
<td>¥</td>
<td>¥</td>
<td>¥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English Learner</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>¥</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>¥</td>
<td>¥</td>
<td>¥</td>
<td>¥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Filipino</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foster Youth</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>¥</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>¥</td>
<td>¥</td>
<td>¥</td>
<td>¥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homeless</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pacific Islander</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>¥</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>¥</td>
<td>¥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socioecon.</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>¥</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>¥</td>
<td>¥</td>
<td>¥</td>
<td>¥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stud. w/ Disability</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>¥</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>¥</td>
<td>¥</td>
<td>¥</td>
<td>¥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two or more Races</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>¥</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>¥</td>
<td>¥</td>
<td>¥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>¥</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>¥</td>
<td>¥</td>
<td>¥</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## GOLDEN STATE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chronic Absenteeism</th>
<th>Suspension Rate</th>
<th>College/Career</th>
<th>English Learner</th>
<th>Graduation Rate</th>
<th>ELA Assessment</th>
<th>Math Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Learner</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Youth</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioecon.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stud. w/ Disability</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more Races</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUPPORT & TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

California’s local, state and federal accountability and continuous improvement system includes three levels of supports to LEAs (including school districts, county offices of education, and charter schools) and schools to promote continuous improvement and equity, as shown below.

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

The foundation of the system is supporting all LEAs and schools to improve outcomes and opportunities for all students, and to narrow disparities among student groups, across the LCFF priorities and any local priorities. The importance and value of local decision making and flexibility are central to the success of the LCFF. Improving student success, increasing public trust, and supporting engagement in local decision making require shared responsibility and accountability first and foremost at the local level.
A primary goal of the first level of support is to provide all LEAs and schools with early support so that they do not require more intensive assistance in the second and third levels of support, based on low performance. The LCFF Evaluation Rubrics support all LEAs and schools by showing student performance on the state and local performance indicators and by highlighting disparities among student groups on those indicators. This will assist LEAs and schools as they review and annually update their LCAPs and site plans, respectively. LCFF also requires differentiated assistance (Level 2) for a subset of LEAs that are struggling to meet students’ needs, followed by more rigorous intervention (Level 3) for any of those LEAs that have not improved student performance after several years of assistance.

The approach for determining LEA eligibility for differentiated assistance and intensive intervention based on student group performance in each LCFF priority area is summarized here:

» A school district or county office of education is eligible for technical assistance if any student group met the (below) Criteria for two or more LCFF priorities.

» A school district or county office of education is eligible for intervention if three or more student groups (or all the student groups if there are less than three student groups) met the (below) Criteria for two or more LCFF priorities in three out of four consecutive years.

» A charter school is eligible for technical assistance and may be referred to the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence if three or more student groups (or all the student groups if there are less than three student groups) met the (below) Criteria for one or more state or school priority identified in the charter for three out of four consecutive school years. When determining a charter school’s eligibility for technical assistance or referral to the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence, an authorizer may consider only performance on indicators that are included in the charter school’s underlying petition.
Criteria for Determining LEA Eligibility for Differentiated Assistance and Intensive Intervention

Basics (Priority 1)
   » Not Met for Two or More Years on Local Performance Indicator

Implementation of State Academic Standards (Priority 2)
   » Not Met for Two or More Years on Local Performance Indicator

Parent Engagement (Priority 3)
   » Not Met for Two or More Years on Local Performance Indicator

Pupil Achievement (Priority 4)
   » Red on both ELA Assessment Indicator and Math Assessment Indicator OR
   » Red on ELA Assessment or Math Assessment Indicator AND Orange on the other Indicator OR
   » Red on the English Learner Indicator (English learner student group only)

Pupil Engagement (Priority 5)
   » Red on Graduation Rate Indicator OR
   » Red on Chronic Absenteeism Indicator

School Climate (Priority 6)
   » Red on Suspension Rate Indicator OR
   » Not Met for Two or More Years on Local Performance Indicator

Access to and Outcomes in a Broad Course of Study (Priorities 7 & 8)
   » Red on College/Career Indicator

Coordination of Services for Expelled Pupils – COEs Only (Priority 9)
   » Not Met for Two or More Years on Local Performance Indicator

Coordination of Services for Foster Youth – COEs Only (Priority 10)
   » Not Met for Two or More Years on Local Performance Indicator
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## Gold Rush Middle School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chronic Absenteeism</th>
<th>Suspension Rate</th>
<th>College/Career</th>
<th>English Learner</th>
<th>Graduation Rate</th>
<th>ELA Assessment</th>
<th>Math Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Learner</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Youth</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeco.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stud. w/ Disability</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more Races</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**GOLD RUSH MIDDLE SCHOOL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chronic Absenteeism</th>
<th>Suspension Rate</th>
<th>College/ Career</th>
<th>English Learner</th>
<th>Graduation Rate</th>
<th>ELA Assessment</th>
<th>Math Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Learner</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Youth</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stud. w/ Disability</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more Races</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                        | 2                   | 0               | N/A             | 2              | 0              | N/A            | 4               |
|                        | 4                   | N/A             | 4               | N/A            | 5              | 6              |                 |