California State Plan to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators

July 2015

Prepared by:
Professional Learning Support Division
Instruction and Learning Support Branch
California Department of Education
1430 N Street, Suite 4309
Sacramento, CA 95814–5901
Phone: (916) 323-8901
FAX: 916-319-0136

The California State Board of Education (SBE) and the California Department of Education (CDE) respectfully submit to the U.S. Department of Education (ED) a plan of current and future work related to gaps in equitable access to excellent educators for all students. This plan responds to Education Secretary Duncan's July 7, 2014, letter to state educational agencies (SEAs), augmented with guidance published on November 10, 2014. California's work to date complies with (1) the requirement in Section 1111(b)(8)(C) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) that each state's Title I, Part A plan include information on the specific steps that the SEA will take to ensure that students from low-income families and students of color are not taught at higher rates than other children by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers, and the measures that the agency will use to evaluate and publicly report the progress of the agency with respect to such steps; and (2) the requirement in ESEA Section 1111(e)(2) that a state's plan be revised by the SEA if appropriate.

This document details a theory of action and progress toward achieving equitable access to excellent teachers and leaders for all students. It provides information regarding the initiatives embarked upon by the CDE, under the leadership of State Superintendent of Public Instruction (SSPI) Tom Torlakson, the SBE, and the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC), a collaborative partner in the State's efforts to improve teacher quality, teaching quality, and instructional leadership.

Section 1: Introduction

California has long been committed to working with diverse stakeholders to provide a high quality education to all students regardless of socioeconomic status or background. Educational equity has been a thoughtfully and deliberatively discussed priority for many years. The state is already implementing a number of ambitious and proactive research-based strategies and initiatives designed to achieve the objectives described in the ESEA, but more needs to be done. We plan to leverage and expand upon this work to recruit, prepare, and maintain a highly skilled educator workforce for the benefit of all students and to promote equitable access to an excellent education for students from historically underserved communities, in particular.

The CDE is proud to share the progress to date. With a fresh perspective and impetus on continuous improvement within our education system, we also appreciate the opportunity to look at what must still be accomplished to ensure that students from low-income and historically underserved families are not disproportionately attending schools taught and led by inexperienced or unqualified teachers and principals.

It is important to note that this plan addresses the equity gaps identified by the current data and the stakeholders who were engaged in the plan development process this spring. The CDE will convene stakeholders annually to review data, examine equity gaps, and identify opportunities to improve upon the strategies. Using this information, the CDE will prepare a report on the progress of the California State Plan to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators and present it to the SBE on an annual basis. This plan will be implemented within California's unique context and in tandem with the implementation of several other important reform efforts currently underway.

The importance of local control in California. Given the size and diversity of the state, California's education system is founded on the belief that many education decisions should appropriately be made by local educational agencies (LEAs) and their communities of stakeholders. Each of California's LEAs has the authority and responsibility for developing and maintaining its own locally bargained contractual agreements with its employees. The ability for agencies to attract, retain, and provide professional learning for teachers and principals is fundamentally dependent on local contexts, and, therefore, is a matter best addressed by the stakeholders most familiar with those contexts.

California's new education funding system, the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), furthers this local engagement and autonomy by providing additional funds for agencies serving high-need students and by requiring public engagement in making plans to improve the academic outcomes for those students. In the 2015–16 California State Budget, an increase of $6 billion has been provided to continue the state's transition to the LCFF. This formula commits additional funding to districts serving English learners, students from low-income families, and youth in foster care. LCFF requires LEAs to develop their own plans for improving student outcomes in consultation with the whole school community, including parents, students, teachers, and administrators. Further,

those local plans are reviewed and refined in collaboration with California's County Offices of Education, ensuring that LEA's receive timely and informed technical assistance.

While California has been involved in a number of statewide initiatives to support educator equity, the LCFF provides an opportunity to capitalize on those efforts, bringing to bear local expertise and additional funds that are essential for identifying and addressing equity gaps. The LCFF is described more thoroughly in Strategy 4A of this plan.

Dedicated funding to support educator excellence. The 2015 California State Budget provides $490 million in one-time funds to LEAs to support educator effectiveness. The funds may be expended for up to three fiscal years through 2017–18. These funds, allocated on a per educator basis, can be used for the following:

- Beginning teacher and administrator support and mentoring
- Professional development, coaching, and support services for teachers who have been identified as needing improvement or additional support
- Professional development for teachers and administrators that is aligned to the state academic content standards
- Promote educator quality and effectiveness, including, but not limited to, training on mentoring and coaching certificated staff and training certificated staff to support effective teaching and learning

Coherence across reform efforts. The LCFF is just one of several important reforms currently being implemented in California designed to improve student outcomes. With the adoption of new academic content standards beginning in 2010, the State has taken advantage of the opportunity to reexamine existing practices and policies to ensure they support and lead to excellence in teaching and leading in California public schools.

- *Greatness by Design:* Since 2012, much of California's work to improve educator excellence has been grounded in *Greatness by Design: Supporting Outstanding Teaching to Sustain a Golden State (GbD*), a report from the California Educator Excellence Task Force (EETF). The EETF was comprised of more than 50 education stakeholders—including parents, K–12 educators, postsecondary educators, researchers, and community leaders—and was charged with drafting recommended actions that could be woven together into a coherent system that would produce exceptional teachers and principals.

  More information regarding the EETF and *GbD* is available on the CDE EETF Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/eo/in/ee.asp. The *GbD* recommendations address a wide range of education issues in California, focusing broadly on recruitment, preparation, induction, professional learning, evaluation, and

leadership. Implementation of many of the *GbD* recommendations is well underway.

- California's Statewide Special Education Task Force Recommendations: In 2013, prompted by SBE President Michael Kirst and CTC Chair Linda Darling-Hammond, California convened a group of 34 representative stakeholders to study why students with disabilities are not succeeding at the same levels as their general education peers. The statewide Special Education Task Force was convened to ensure success for all of the state's children and is directly tied to the state's work to ensure equitable access to highly qualified teachers. Task Force members were charged with identifying needed changes in policy and practice.

  The Task Force recommendations call for a unified education system in which all children, including students with disabilities, are considered general education students first and foremost. The Task Force membership included parents, teachers, school and district administrators, university professors, members of the policy community, and other stakeholder groups. A list of Task Force members and their affiliations is available on the San Mateo County Office of Education Statewide Special Education Task Force Web page at http://www.smcoe.org/assets/files/about-smcoe/superintendents-office/statewide-special-education-task-force/Final%20TF%20Membership%2004.07.14.pdf.

- California's English Language Arts/English Language Development Curriculum Framework: In July 2014, the SBE adopted the *English Language Arts/English Language Development Framework for California Public Schools (Framework).* This is the first time in the nation that a state has adopted dual guidelines in one publication for both English language arts (ELA) and English language development (ELD). By combining both sets of standards into a coherent curriculum framework, California has made clear that its goal is to prepare all students for literacy in the 21st century.

  The *Framework* provides guidance to teachers implementing the CA Common Core State Standards (CCSS) for ELA/Literacy as well as the CA ELD Standards, including instructional strategies and resources such as vignettes and models that teachers may use to strengthen the learning for every student. It provides guidance to schools and districts on curriculum, instructional programs, assessment, leadership, professional learning, and issues of equity and access. The *Framework* was developed by educators and literacy experts, most of whom are teachers in California classrooms. The *Framework* and resources to support its implementation are available on the CDE SBE-Adopted ELA/ELD Framework Chapters Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/rl/cf/elaeldfrmwrksbeadopted.asp.

California is committed to creating coherence across existing and new reform efforts so that they build on and leverage one another rather than create confusion and contradictions as implementation of each of the initiatives progresses.

Section 2: Equity Gaps

California's Students

California's K–12 system is comprised of more than 6.2 million students who attend more than 10,000 schools in 1,028 school districts and 1,175 charter schools. The number of California public school students is greater than the entire population of more than 30 other states combined.

California students are among the most ethnically diverse in the nation.

Table 1: California Student Demographics: 2013–14

Ethnicity	Number of students	Percentage
African American not Hispanic	384,291	6.16%
American Indian or Alaska Native	38,616	0.62%
Asian	542,540	8.70%
Filipino	151,745	2.43%
Hispanic or Latino	3,321,274	53.25%
Pacific Islander	32,821	0.53%
White not Hispanic	1,559,113	25.00%
Two or More Races Not Hispanic	167,153	2.68%
None Reported	39,119	0.63%
Total	6,236,672	100.00%

Source: *CalEdFacts* 2013-14. Available on the CDE Fingertip Facts on Education in California *CalEdFacts* Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/cb/ceffingertipfacts.asp.

Based on 2013–14 data, nearly 75 percent of California's student population is designated as minority with the largest population of minority students reported as being Hispanic or Latino.[1] As a majority-minority state, California currently does not have an official definition of "minority" but given the large percentage of our student population designated minority, it is imperative that we work with stakeholders to develop a definition that more accurately describes historically underserved students. For the purposes of this iteration of the plan and to align with the teacher and student data that has been collected, **minority students** are defined as all students who are American

[1] Source: *CalEdFacts* 2013-14. Available on the CDE Fingertip Facts on Education in California *CalEdFacts* Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/cb/ceffingertipfacts.asp.

Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, African American, Filipino, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic, or Two or More Races Not Hispanic. The CDE will continue to collect data as needed for the EEP and will also explore the recommendations from the SBE and stakeholders regarding additional data collection needs.

Poor students are defined for the purposes of this plan as those who are eligible to receive Free or Reduced-Price Meals. In 2013–14, 3,707,508, or 59.4 percent, of California students were designated "poor," and are referred to as socioeconomically disadvantaged (SED) throughout the plan.

California's Teachers

Nearly 300,000 teachers are employed in California public schools. The vast majority, or 98 percent, of these teachers are fully credentialed.

Table 2: Teachers Serving in California Public Schools with Full Authorization versus Intern Credentials, Permits, and Waivers Issued: 2013–14

	Number of Teachers	% of Total
Fully Credentialed Teachers	282,495	98.0%
University Intern Credentials	2,186	0.8%
District Intern Credentials	426	0.1%
Provisional Intern Permit (PIP)	260	0.1%
Short-Term Staff Permit (STSP)	906	0.3%
Variable Term Waivers	198	0.1%
Limited Assignment Teaching Permit	1,768	0.6%
Total	**288,239**	**100.0%**

Source: CTC, *Teacher Supply in California: A Report to the Legislature: Annual Report: 2013-2014 available at* http://www.ctc.ca.gov/reports/TS-2013-2014-AnnualRpt.pdf

An **inexperienced teacher** is defined for the purposes of this plan as a teacher who has two or fewer years of teaching experience. In 2013–14, 27,529 inexperienced teachers were teaching in California schools, 9.6 percent of all teachers.[2]

An **unqualified teacher** is defined for the purposes of this plan as a teacher who is assigned based on the issuance of a Provisional Intern Permit (PIP), Short-term Staff Permit (STSP), or Variable or Short-term Waiver. In 2013–14, there were 1,364 unqualified teachers teaching in California schools. This represents 0.5 percent of the teacher workforce.

[2] Source: DataQuest Staff Service and Inexperience Report for 2013–14

- Provisional Intern Permits are available when the employing agency knows that there will be a teacher vacancy, yet is unable to recruit a suitable candidate. A bachelor's degree, passage of the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST), and specific course work or experience is required. The permit is issued for one year and may be renewed once if the individual takes all the subject matter exams listed on the document and does not pass. Only two provisional internship documents of any kind may be issued to an individual.

- Short-term Staff Permits may be requested by an employing agency when there is an acute staffing need. A bachelor's degree, passage of the CBEST, and specific course work or experience is required. The permit is issued for one year, cannot be renewed, and is available to a candidate only once in a lifetime.

- Variable and Short-term Waivers may be requested by an employer on behalf of an individual when the employer is unable to find credentialed teachers or individuals who qualify for an emergency permit.

    - Variable Term Waivers provide the employing agency up to one year or for a period set by the CTC to: 1) allow individuals additional time to complete a credential requirement; 2) facilitate assignment in school programs addressing issues of educational reform; 3) allow geographically isolated regions with severely limited ability to develop personnel time to hire personnel; or 4) obtain waivers for situations when all other efforts to find appropriately credentialed teachers have been exhausted.

    - Short-term Waivers may be approved at the local level to provide the employing agency with one semester or less to address unanticipated, immediate, short-term organizational needs by assigning only individuals who hold basic teaching credentials to teach outside their credentialed authorizations with the consent of the teacher. They may be issued once to any individual teacher and only once for a given class and cannot be used for a non-teaching assignment.

An **intern teacher** is defined for the purposes of this plan as a teacher who is assigned a District or University Intern Credential. In 2013–14, there were 2,612 intern teachers teaching in California schools. Intern teachers represent 0.9 percent of the teacher workforce.

In California, there are two types of initially issued Intern Credentials: District and University. District Intern programs require the intern to satisfy specific requirements and complete a program that is developed and implemented by a school district or county office of education in accordance with a Professional Development Plan. The intern is assisted and guided through the approved training period. University Internship Programs are a cooperative effort between a school district and an institution of higher education. The university intern must satisfy specific requirements. The internship

program must be approved by the CTC prior to enrolling students and may not be available in all school districts.

An **out-of-field teacher** is defined for the purposes of this plan as a teacher who is assigned a Limited Assignment Teaching Permit. In 2013–14, there were 1,768 out-of-field teachers teaching in California schools; this number represents 0.6 percent of the teacher workforce.

A Limited Assignment Teaching Permit may be issued at the request of an employing school district, county office of education, charter school, or state agency to fill a staffing vacancy or need. They are issued for a one-year period and can be reissued in any one subject or special education specialization area twice if the holder completes the renewal requirements and the employing agency requests the permit. Employing agencies are required to have a current Declaration of Need on file with the CTC before the permit can be issued. Individuals must hold a valid California general or special education teaching credential based on a bachelor's degree and professional preparation program, including student teaching, have an assigned experienced educator in the subject or specialization area of the limited assignment if the applicant has not obtained permanent status, and consent to serve on the Limited Assignment Permit.

Data Tables[3]

The CDE has drawn upon data collected via the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS), CTC, and *CalEdFacts* to create data profiles (shown below) that provide information regarding the rates at which poor and minority children are taught by inexperienced, unqualified, out-of-field, and intern teachers compared to the rates at which other children are taught by these teachers.

At the request of stakeholders, to provide a more precise depiction of statewide gaps, the CDE prepared equity gap data with California's 10,258 schools organized by student demographics into deciles. The tables below compare the 1,036 schools in decile 1 to the 1,036 schools in decile 10.

Key to acronyms:

- LMD=lowest minority decile
- HMD=highest minority decile
- LPD=lowest poverty decile
- HPD=highest poverty decile

[3] **Note:** The count of total teachers noted in these tables is greater than the total noted in the California's Teachers section because, with this data, teachers teaching at multiple schools have been counted more than once.

As summarized by Table 3, 10.2 percent of teachers in California's schools with the highest percentage of minority students have been teaching for 2 or fewer years, while 8.6 percent of teachers in schools with the lowest percentage of minority students have been teaching for 2 or fewer years. This represents an equity gap of 1.6 percent.

Table 3: Inexperienced Teachers by Minority Decile

Minority Decile Rank	Total Enrollment	Minority Enrollment	% Minority Students	Total Teachers	Number of Inexperienced Teachers	% Inexperienced Teachers
LMD	354,327	87,518	**24.7%**	18,191	1,562	**8.6%**
HMD	581,638	579,484	**99.6%**	27,423	2,792	**10.2%**
Statewide Total	6,236,672	4,677,559	**75.0%**	293,835	28,136	**9.6%**

As shown in Table 4, 10.6 percent of teachers in schools with the highest percentage of SED students have been teaching for 2 or fewer years, while 8.2 percent of teachers in schools with the lowest percentage of SED students have been teaching for 2 or fewer years. This represents an equity gap of 2.4 percent.

Table 4: Inexperienced Teachers by SED Decile

SED Decile Rank	Total Enrollment	SED Enrollment	% SED Students	Total Teachers	Number of Inexperienced Teachers	% Inexperienced Teachers
LPD	600,507	51,031	**8.5%**	27,782	2,279	**8.2%**
HPD	466,358	452,449	**97.0%**	22,448	2,379	**10.6%**
Statewide Total	6,236,672	3,809,816	**61.1%**	293,835	28,136	**9.6%**

As illustrated by Table 5, 1.5 percent of teachers in schools with the highest percentage of minority students hold a PIP, STSP, or Waiver; while 0.7 percent of teachers in schools with the lowest percentage of minority students hold a PIP, STSP, or Waiver. This represents an equity gap of 0.8 percent.

Table 5: Unqualified Teachers by Minority Decile

Minority Decile Rank	Total Enrollment	Minority Enrollment	% Minority Students	Total Teachers	Number of Unqualified Teachers	% Unqualified Teachers
LMD	354,327	87,518	**24.7%**	18,191	129	**0.7%**
HMD	581,638	579,484	**99.6%**	27,423	400	**1.5%**
Statewide Total	6,236,672	4,677,559	**75.0%**	293,835	3,218	**1.1%**

As shown in Table 6, 1.4 percent of teachers in California's schools with the highest percentage of SED students hold a PIP, STSP, or Waiver; while .9 percent of teachers in schools with the lowest percentage of SED students hold a PIP, STSP, or Waiver. This represents an equity gap of 0.5 percent.

Table 6: Unqualified Teachers by SED Decile

SED Decile Rank	Total Enrollment	SED Enrollment	% SED Students	Total Teachers	Number of Unqualified Teachers	% Unqualified Teachers
LPD	600,507	51,031	**8.5%**	27,782	240	**0.9%**
HPD	466,358	452,449	**97.0%**	22,448	325	**1.4%**
Statewide Total	6,236,672	3,809,816	**61.1%**	293,835	3,218	**1.1%**

As shown in Table 7, 1.4 percent of teachers in schools with the highest percentage of minority students are intern teachers while .3 percent of teachers in schools with the lowest percentage of minority are intern teachers. This represents an equity gap of 1.1 percent.

Table 7: Intern Teachers by Minority Decile

Minority Decile Rank	Total Enrollment	Minority Enrollment	% Minority Students	Total Teachers	Number of Interns	% Interns
LMD	354,327	87,518	**24.7%**	18,191	60	**0.3%**
HMD	581,638	579,484	**99.6%**	27,423	388	**1.4%**
Statewide Total	6,236,672	4,677,559	**75.0%**	293,835	2,188	**0.7%**

As shown in Table 8, 1.1 percent of teachers in schools with the highest percentage of SED students are intern teachers while 0.4 percent of teachers in schools with the lowest percentage of SED students are intern teachers. This represents an equity gap of 0.7 percent.

Table 8: Intern Teachers by SED Decile

SED Decile Rank	Total Enrollment	SED Enrollment	% SED Students	Total Teachers	Number of Interns	% Interns
LPD	600,507	51,031	**8.5%**	27,782	103	**0.4%**
HPD	466,358	452,449	**97.0%**	22,448	249	**1.1%**
Statewide Total	6,236,672	3,809,816	**61.1%**	293,835	2,188	**0.7%**

As shown in Table 9, 0.4 percent of teachers in schools with the highest percentage of minority students hold a Limited Assignment Permit, while 0.5 percent of teachers in schools with the lowest percentage of minority students hold a Limited Assignment Permit. This represents an equity gap of 0.1 percent, with a higher percentage of out-of-field teachers serving in low-minority decile schools.

Table 9: Out-of-field Teachers by Minority Decile

Minority Decile Rank	Total Enrollment	Minority Enrollment	% Minority Students	Total Teachers	Number of OOF Teachers	% OOF Teachers
LMD	354,327	87,518	**24.7%**	18,191	90	**0.5%**
HMD	581,638	579,484	**99.6%**	27,423	114	**0.4%**
Statewide Total	6,236,672	4,677,559	**75.0%**	293,835	1,732	**0.6%**

As shown in Table 10, 0.3 percent of teachers in schools with the highest percentage of SED students hold a Limited Assignment Permit while 0.5 percent of teachers in schools with the lowest percentage of SED students hold a Limited Assignment Permit. This represents an equity gap of 0.2 percent, with a higher percentage of out-of-field teachers serving in low poverty decile schools.

Table 10: Out-of-field Teachers by SED Decile

SED Decile Rank	Total Enrollment	SED Enrollment	% SED Students	Total Teachers	Number of OOF Teachers	% OOF Teachers
LPD	600,507	51,031	**8.5%**	27,782	129	**0.5%**
HPD	466,358	452,449	**97.0%**	22,448	71	**0.3%**
Statewide Total	6,236,672	3,809,816	**61.1%**	293,835	1,732	**0.6%**

California shared the equity gap data above with participants at the stakeholder meetings held on June 9 and 10, 2015. There was much discussion at both of these meetings regarding the relatively small size of the equity gaps. Eventually, California chose to perform a root cause analysis in the area where the equity gap is most evident—the gap between the percentage of inexperienced teachers in schools with relatively high numbers of SED and minority students and the percentage of inexperienced teachers in schools serving relatively low numbers of SED and minority students. The discussion with stakeholders is expanded upon in the next section of this document.

Section 3: Stakeholder Engagement

Stakeholder engagement in public education has long been a priority in California, recognizing the democratic values of our nation and the positive effects of an empowered citizenry. The SSPI, the CDE, and the SBE have continued this tradition and have brought together numerous stakeholder groups and task forces to consider and address issues facing California schools.

- In 2012, the SSPI, in collaboration with the CTC, convened the EETF to recommend ways to strengthen California's teacher corps. Task force members included teachers, parents, superintendents, school employees, leading academics, and business community members. The tasks force's recommendations are reported in *GbD,* which—due to its broad base of stakeholder engagement, input, and consensus—has influenced policy decisions at multiple state and local agencies and institutions, implementing a statewide vision for recruitment, distribution, preparation, induction, professional learning, and evaluation that supports high quality educators and teaching.

- Stakeholder contributions are intrinsic to the implementation of the LCFF at both the state and local levels. Since 2013, the state has organized a series of regionally-based input sessions to provide district, county, charter, and school leaders with an opportunity to offer local insights regarding various elements of the new funding system. Further, at the local level, each LEA must obtain parent and public input in developing, revising, and updating Local Control Accountability Plans (LCAPs). With the LCAP, LEAs are required to regularly engage local stakeholders in the process of using data to establish goals and define the measures that will be used to monitor and evaluate progress toward these goals. The LCFF reinforces California's commitment to wide and continuous stakeholder engagement.

CDE, SBE, and CTC staff had the opportunity to engage with stakeholders regarding equitable access to excellent educators on three separate occasions prior to the submission of this plan:

1. On May 13, 2015, the Education Trust-West, Partners for Each and Every Child, and the Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education convened a meeting at the University of California (UC), Berkeley. Meeting participants included representatives from civil rights groups and higher education, as well as representatives from the CDE, SBE, and CTC. The agenda was designed to provide state officials with valuable information and recommendations regarding next steps in developing the Educator Equity Plan.

2. On June 9, 2015, with facilitative support from the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders (GTL Center)[4] the CDE convened a meeting in Sacramento to discuss

[4] More information regarding the GTL Center is available on the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders Web page at http://www.gtlcenter.org/.

equity gaps, root causes, and strategies to promote equitable access to excellent teachers. Meeting participants included representatives from educator professional associations, civil rights groups, the CDE, the SBE, and the CTC. Members of California's Education Coalition organizations who work together to support and improve California public schools and advocate for an array of funding, programs and services were invited to attend and had the opportunity to select their own representatives to participate. The meeting was held in the afternoon to accommodate travel to and from Sacramento.

3. On June 10, 2015, Families in Schools,[5] with support from the CDE and the GTL Center, convened a meeting in Sacramento to discuss equity gaps, root causes, and strategies to promote equitable access to excellent educators. Though similar in design to the June 9 meeting, participants were representatives from California's parent community. This meeting was conducted in collaboration with Families in Schools to provide an additional opportunity for California parent voice to be clearly heard and integrated into the document.

Agendas and participant lists from these three meetings are included in Appendix A of this document. Parents, teachers, administrators, community members, policymakers and representatives from school districts, civil rights groups, and institutions of higher education participated in these meetings. Specifically, the meetings included representatives from the following organizations:

- California Teachers Association
- California Federation of Teachers
- Association of California School Administrators
- California County Superintendents Educational Services Association
- CORE Districts
- California School Boards Association
- California Association for Bilingual Education
- California Parent Teacher Association
- Families in Schools
- Bay Area Parent Leadership Action Network

[5] More information regarding Families in Schools is available on the Families in Schools Web page at http://www.familiesinschools.org/.

- Children Now
- Education Trust West
- Partners for Each and Every Child
- PICO California
- Californians for Justice
- Mexican American Legal Defense Fund
- California Alliance of African American Educators
- California School-Based Health Alliance
- Californians for Justice
- Coleman Advocates
- Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights
- Public Advocates
- Institute for Education Policy
- Stanford University
- University of California, Berkeley

To keep the discussions constructive and on point, we used structured protocols and experienced facilitators. These protocols allowed us to review equity gap data, discuss root causes behind these equity gaps, and identify strategies to address the root causes. The outcomes of the root cause and strategy discussions are discussed in the sections that follow.

The CDE will convene an annual Educator Equity meeting to ensure that the plan is implemented well and to leverage the expertise of California's diverse stakeholders in improving equitable access to excellent educators as new opportunities and challenges emerge. At this annual meeting, stakeholders will review new data regarding equitable access to excellent educators and make adjustments to the strategies contained in this plan as appropriate.

Section 4: Strategies for Eliminating Equity Gaps

Identification of Root Causes

In considering the root causes contributing to California's equity gaps, the CDE engaged in a root cause analysis that involved consultation with diverse stakeholders. The CDE recognizes the importance of drawing on data to inform this analysis, and various data points are presented below. The CDE hopes to include in future iterations of this plan even more data, particularly California-specific data, on the reasons teachers do not enter or stay in SED and high-minority schools at the same rates as in other schools.

Our goal was to identify root causes for each of our identified equity gaps so that we could then consider our strategies such that they would directly target these root causes. A theory of action for each root cause and the related strategies was developed, as presented later in this section.

Our root cause analysis process involved the following stages:

- First, we had a preliminary discussion about root causes within the CDE.
- Second, we continued this dialogue with California higher education and civil rights leaders during our May 13, 2015, stakeholder engagement meeting.
- Third, the GTL Center led a structured root cause analysis discussion for the two identified equity gaps with state-level leaders from various stakeholder associations and community organizations on June 9, 2015, and with parent representatives on June 10, 2015.
- Fourth, the CDE considered the input from stakeholders and refined our preliminary list of root causes based on this input.

May 13 Stakeholder Meeting

Although they were provided with the Equity Profile data from U.S Department of Education, California-certified data were not available to May 13, 2015, meeting participants. Conversations during the May 13, 2015 meeting encompassed a range of possible root causes for California's equity gaps, including, but not limited to:

- Insufficient support for teacher induction
- Inequitable teacher salaries
- The lack of a statewide teacher evaluation system

- Need for improved teacher preparation
- The need for more robust collection and analysis of educator data
- The need for increased family and community engagement at both the state and local levels
- Poor working conditions in high-need schools
- The need for better school leadership and better administrator preparation
- Lack of access to professional learning opportunities
- The need to support better school climate in high-need schools
- The need for incentives to draw teachers to high-need schools

June 9 Stakeholder Meeting

To better connect the equity gap data to root causes and strategies, the CDE elected to use a more structured approach to identifying root causes in the two subsequent meetings. June 9, 2015, and June 10, 2015, meeting participants received CDE-certified data (provided in the Section 2 of this document) regarding the rates at which inexperienced, unqualified and out-of-field teachers serve in high and low minority schools and in high and low SED schools. The root cause analysis discussions during these two meetings centered upon two primary challenges, or equity gaps:

1) Equity Gap #1: Inexperienced teachers serve SED students at higher rates than students with higher socioeconomic status.

2) Equity Gap #2: Inexperienced teachers serve students in minority communities at higher rates than students in predominantly white communities.

A structured process was used whereby the discussion facilitators continually asked stakeholders why the equity gap and the root causes existed. This process came from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching's work on improvement sciences. By iteratively asking why these root causes existed, it was possible to obtain a list of sub-root causes and, ultimately, a more complete set of the underlying reasons for the state's equity gaps.

Root Causes for Equity Gap #1

The first key equity gap identified was: Inexperienced teachers serve SED students at higher rates than students with higher socioeconomic status.

Stakeholders saw the root causes for this equity gap as primarily falling within two categories:

1) Teacher Recruitment: Stakeholders reported that affluent communities were seen by stakeholders as having more applicants per position, paying higher salaries, and, in some cases, purposefully selecting only teachers with at least five years of experience.

2) Teacher Retention: Stakeholders reported that a number of root causes lead new and experienced teachers to leave SED schools, creating a churn of inexperienced teachers.

A third category, teacher placement, was also brought up by stakeholders but to a far lesser degree.

The potential root causes that stakeholders identified within each of these categories are noted below.

Stakeholder-identified root causes related to **teacher recruitment:**

- Belief systems of leaders at all levels (principals, district leaders, etc.) that do not see the importance of experienced teachers for SED students
- A lack of resources
- Fewer homegrown teachers in SED schools
- The low status of the teaching profession makes recruiting enough experienced teachers for all a challenge

Stakeholder-identified root causes related to **teacher retention:**

- Teachers enter SED schools ill-prepared to work with the student populations (and to connect with the parents)
- Lack of induction supports (or insufficient or inconsistent induction supports) for new teachers in SED schools

- Tougher assignments for new teachers in SED schools, including the toughest assignments

- Lack of professional development supports for teachers in SED schools

- Lack of mental health and other supports (nurses, parent resource systems, health clinics) in SED schools lead to teachers taking on duties outside of their role, and ultimately to them leaving SED schools

- Lack of stability (of peers, of leaders, and of students) which makes it a more challenging environment with fewer peer or school leader supports

- Lower pay in SED schools (whereas in fact many feel pay should be *higher* in SED schools to counteract some of the challenges described above and below)

- Higher class sizes in SED schools

- Less attractive facilities and fewer resources in SED schools

- More intense, chaotic school environments in SED schools (students' basic needs around housing, food, health and medical issues, etc. often are not being met)

- A public narrative that equates failing schools (many of which are SED) with failing teachers, drives teachers away from such schools

- Less autonomy, more "teacher-proofing" (which doesn't respect teachers as professionals), and less creative control in SED schools drives teachers away from such schools

- The low status of the teaching profession makes retaining enough experienced teachers for all a challenge

Root Causes for Equity Gap #2

The second key equity gap identified was: Inexperienced teachers serve students in minority communities at higher rates than students in predominantly white communities.

Stakeholders saw the root causes for this equity gap as similarly falling within the two categories of teacher recruitment and teacher retention, with some discussion about

teacher placement as well. In fact, stakeholders were convinced that the overlap in root causes between these two equity gaps were nearly identical. The list of root causes below reflects only minor differences from what is presented above. Stakeholders suggested that the strategies for addressing these root causes may be nuanced for SED students versus students from minority schools, but that the root causes were fundamentally the same. Only additional potential root causes related to recruitment and retention in high-minority schools are listed below.

Additional stakeholder-identified root causes related to **teacher recruitment** in high-minority schools:

- Schools with large proportions of students from minority communities may place too much focus on hiring teachers that are demographically similar to the student population, even though they lack experience
- Language and cultural barriers prevent teachers from working in minority schools
- There are too few minority teachers in the pipeline

Additional stakeholder-identified root causes related to **teacher retention** in high-minority schools:

- Preparation programs do not adequately address working with minority populations and the many different types of diversity that may exist in these schools
- Schools do not provide the cultures and supports around languages for working with minority student populations
- Lack of professional development supports for teachers in schools with large proportions of students from minority communities

Stakeholders then grouped the root causes mentioned above into four categories and discussed potential strategies that might address these root causes for each category. These four categories included:

1. Working/learning conditions
2. The status of the teaching profession
3. Policies
4. Teacher preparation and professional capacity building

The strategies proposed by stakeholders at the June 9 meeting, as recorded, are provided in Table 11 below.

Table 11. Strategies Suggested by Stakeholders at the June 9, 2015 Meeting

Root Cause Category	Possible Strategies Suggested by Stakeholders
Working/learning conditions	• Identify ways to align social services to schools' needs and to help various agencies work together • Consider funding levels, as well as whether resources are being spent where they will matter • Explore the usefulness of school climate surveys for local school districts • Provide guidance on LCAP specifically related to improving? working and learning conditions • Share best practices via CTC guidance to help preparation programs better emphasize cultural competence • Require a certain number of hours of learning about local context and culture during administrator induction and encourage more guidance from CTC to support administrator induction • Promote administrator training on supporting teachers at each stage of recertification • Create opportunities and incentives to encourage National Board Certified Teachers (NBCTs) to work in high-need schools
The status of the teaching profession	• Create a coherent media message that is positive in reference to teachers and describes school settings that are appealing and how teachers transform people's lives and communities and are nation-builders and supporters of our democracy • Try to make teaching in high-need schools a badge of honor • Encourage intellectual engagement and collaborative conversations about elevating the professionalism of

Root Cause Category	Possible Strategies Suggested by Stakeholders
	teaching • Promote teacher leadership and distributive leadership to increase teachers' status and create true partnerships and shared ownership, and then showcase this shared decision-making • Encourage districts to highlight and celebrate teachers who have committed to working in hard-to-staff schools • Encourage districts to rewrite recruitment fliers in ways that describe teachers' interactions with each other as mentors, supporters, etc. • Promote teacher-led professional development and teacher input on how best to use resources to meet students' needs • Create brochures and public service spots showing different ethnicities of teachers
Policies	• Address equitable access through the LCAP • Address teacher placement policies • Address student discipline policies • Invest in student services • State should invest in educator professional learning
Teacher preparation and professional capacity building	• Identify high-quality preparation programs • Incorporate an equity focus into California's teaching standards and tie cultural proficiency into educator evaluations • Commit more funds to teacher preparation programs • Revamp accreditation system • Increase access to data • Encourage regional exploration of equitable access issues

Root Cause Category	Possible Strategies Suggested by Stakeholders
	• Encourage districts to explore teacher experience levels by school site • Mandate professional development for all credentialed educators • Encourage professional development programs to target local conditions and needs • Develop professional development around the California Professional Standards for Education Leaders (CPSELS) • Encourage culturally relevant professional development and professional development on cultural competence • Connect the suggested strategies to the LCAP rubrics • Allocate funds for the suggested strategies

June 10, 2015, Stakeholder Meeting

Discussion during the June 10, 2015, meeting centered upon the same two equity gaps and was structured via the same root cause analysis process utilized during the June 9, 2015, meeting. Stakeholders again identified recruitment and retention as challenges facing SED and high-minority schools. Comments from stakeholders included:

- Teachers enter with ideals but are not prepared for reality
- Teachers are not prepared to serve in communities of color
- Teachers do not have the skills to engage the parent community
- Teachers do not live in, or connect with, the school community
- Parents are more involved in white communities and place pressure on administrators to hire veteran teachers
- Difficult to recruit to rural areas

- No incentives for teachers to stay
- Teacher evaluation is inconsistent
- Higher stress levels for teachers in high-need schools
- More discipline issues in high-need schools
- Needs of students are greater in high-need schools
- Teachers are asked to assume other roles
- Student loan repayment programs incent new teachers to teach in high-need communities
- Veteran teachers have first choice of placement
- Teachers are not equipped to engage parents
- Experienced administrators are better able to attract experienced teachers to their schools

Stakeholders grouped root causes into three categories and discussed potential strategies that might address these root causes for each category. These three categories included:

1. Working conditions
2. Policies
3. Professional Development

The strategies proposed by stakeholders at the June 9 meeting, as recorded, are provided in Table 12 below.

Table 12. Strategies Suggested by June 10, 2015, Stakeholders

Root Cause Category	Possible Strategies Suggested by Stakeholders
Working conditions	• Provide incentives to experienced teachers • Communication between parents and teachers • Access to self-care

Root Cause Category	Possible Strategies Suggested by Stakeholders
	• Staff working around parent schedules • Equal resources for all schools • Access to resources should be prescribed and equitable for each district • Beyond the classroom, what is the school culture? • Help prevent teacher burn out • Make community assessment part of the interview process to ensure good match for both teachers and students • Improve conditions at school to keep experienced teachers at high risk schools • Better salaries • Supportive administrators
Policies	• Salaries should be equal • School to school mentoring programs • Evaluations of teachers and administrators should be at the state level • State grants: reserve grants that teachers can apply for to improve their schools/classes • Better partnerships between CDE, districts and social agencies to support family needs • Communication and collaboration • More community-based agencies to help parents to understand what is going on • "Good" school help "bad" school, principal incentives

Root Cause Category	Possible Strategies Suggested by Stakeholders
	• Credentialing needs to be reexamined • Tenure should not be a primary motivator • State should reserve funds to pay/incentivize/subsidize relocation of teachers/principals to work in challenging schools by becoming (living in) part of the community • Review policies on a yearly basis to ensure best practices are met in schools • Create program similar to Teach for America
Professional Development	• Parent Engagement– designed to encourage outreach to parents, collaborate, promote positive outcomes • Access to courses in self-care • Create more substantive measure to handle feedback • Give teacher grade of effectiveness (A, B, C, D, etc.) • Use student engagement, parent engagement, and student achievement and progress to evaluate teachers • Engage teachers in decision making of what professional development they receive • Create more substantive measures to keep all teachers accountable and provide professional development based on results • Workshops in classroom management • Budget for quality workshops and common core curriculum courses

Root Cause Category	Possible Strategies Suggested by Stakeholders
	• Evidence based practices • Develop and train teachers to become engaged in parent/teacher groups to promote school health • Cultural Competency with school demographic population • More information for parents to help teachers

Strategies for Eliminating Equity Gaps

Following these stakeholder conversations, CDE staff revisited and refined the analysis of the root causes and identified priority strategies. It is important to note that these strategies are embedded in a California context of strong local control. Stakeholders repeatedly expressed the belief that the role of the state is to provide guidance, exemplars, and support but that many decisions regarding educators and teaching are most appropriately made at the local level.

The following six root causes that were revisited and refined are:

- Root Cause 1: Uneven teacher preparation and induction
- Root Cause 2: Uneven administrator preparation and induction
- Root Cause 3: Inadequate support for educator professional learning
- Root Cause 4: Challenging working conditions in high-need schools
- Root Cause 5: Need to enhance parent and community engagement in high-need schools
- Root Cause 6: Diverse local root causes.

Root Cause 1: Uneven Teacher Preparation and Induction

California is home to some excellent preparation programs for both teachers and principals that serve as models for others in the nation. These are drawn from the ranks of both innovative pre-service and internship programs. However, the range of program quality is wide, and some educators are permitted to enter the profession with little training and without having met meaningful standards for knowledge of content and pedagogy. Given the challenges facing today's educators as they seek to teach ever

more challenging content to an increasingly diverse set of students, there are areas of preparation that must be deepened, and the variability in quality among preparation programs must be narrowed. Programs preparing educators to serve English learners, early childhood-age students and students with disabilities need particular attention. (*GbD* p. 15)

Studies have long shown that high-quality teacher induction programs lead to teachers who stay in the profession at higher rates, accelerated professional growth among new teachers and improved student learning. In a review of 15 empirical studies regarding the impact of induction programs, Ingersoll and Strong (2011) describe having a mentor teacher, common planning time with teachers in the same subject and regularly scheduled collaboration with other teachers as some of the most important features of successful induction. (*GbD* p. 40)

In each of the three California meetings, stakeholders stated that teachers need to be better prepared to succeed in high-minority and SED schools and expressed concern regarding the supports new teachers receive when they enter the profession.

Theory of Action: If California teachers, including early childhood educators, receive strong preparation and support from pre-service through their first two years in the profession, then they will be better able to succeed in high-need schools, lessening teacher turnover and inequitable access to excellent educators.

To that end, California is implementing the following strategies to increase the rigor and effectiveness of the State's preparation and induction process to better prepare and induct teachers into the profession:

Strategy 1A: Implement Teaching Performance Assessments (TPA)

Since 2008, to ensure prospective teachers are as prepared as possible, California requires credential program candidates to pass a teaching performance assessment (TPA) prior to earning a teaching credential. Now that TPAs have been required for a number of years, the CTC is requiring the TPAs to be reviewed and updated to ensure that the assessment remains an appropriate bar that prospective teachers must meet prior to earning the Preliminary Teaching Credential.

The TPA incorporates four performance tasks that increase in complexity but not necessarily in difficulty. These tasks are intended to be completed as the teacher progresses through his or her teacher preparation program. Each teacher preparation program decides how and where each task is embedded in the program coursework and/or related program activities.

Taken as a whole, the four performance tasks ask teachers to demonstrate that they know how to:

- Find out information about a given class and about specific focus students within the class such as an English learner or a student with identified special needs

- Plan appropriate subject-specific instruction for all students in alignment with state-adopted K–12 student academic content standards and/or frameworks

- Implement the instruction according to the lesson plans the teacher has developed and reflect upon the outcomes of that instruction, including evidence of student learning

- Design and implement assessment activities appropriate to the lesson and to the learners and use the assessment results to inform the next round of lesson planning

- Reflect upon the teachers own professional growth as a member of the teaching profession

The CTC adopted revised Assessment Design Standards (ADS) require all CTC-approved TPAs to be centrally scored to assure reliability and validity of the scoring process. In addition, the ADS require all TPA models to assess that teachers are prepared to teach California's most current academic content standards. Each prospective teacher also needs to demonstrate that he or she can effectively teach students who are English learners and students with disabilities as part of the TPA. The 2015–16 state budget provides funds to update California's state TPA model and it is expected that the revised TPAs will be in place beginning with the 2017–18 school year.

Strategy 1B: Strengthen and Streamline Accreditation

The stakeholders also identified a lack of uniformity in teacher preparation programs leading to uneven preparation of teachers. In June 2014, the CTC directed that work should take place to strengthen and streamline the CTC's accountability and accreditation system (http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2014-06/2014-06-2E.pdf). How teachers are initially prepared will be reviewed and updated as needed, based on data collected from the performance assessments individuals must pass prior to earning a Preliminary Teaching Credential and surveys completed by program completers, master teachers, and employers. The work will also look at how teachers are inducted in the first two years of teaching and include a data warehouse and data dashboard system for California. This will also help the CTC identify which preparation programs are producing teachers who are well-prepared for the classroom.

An overview of the work to date in this area is provided in the June 2015 CTC agenda item: http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2015-06/2015-06-5B.pdf.

Strategy 1C: Increase Support for Teacher Induction

Teachers' induction across the state is also an area that appears to be uneven depending on the LEA providing the induction program. This uneveness impacts the number of prepared teachers in classrooms. The CTC, as part of its work to review and revise its accreditation system, charged a task group to propose revised Induction standards and requirements. The group has developed revised program standards and other recommendations for new teacher induction in California (http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2015-06/2015-06-5F.pdf).

The focus for new teacher induction is proposed to be job-embedded mentoring for first and second year teachers. The task group has recommended that induction be provided in the first and second year of teaching to support the new teacher to be effective with all students. The task group also recommends that an individual holding a Preliminary Teaching Credential needs to have a fully credentialed teacher assigned to the new teacher to support participation in induction.

The focus for the induction programs will be to support the new teacher in his or her current assignment, support the new teacher in joining the learning community at the school and district, and to use cycles of inquiry to reflect on and improve practice.

Strategy 1D: Include Cultural Awareness and Responsive Teaching Principles and Practices within Teacher Preparation Programs and Local Induction

In all of the stakeholder meetings, it was clearly stated that placing new teachers in situations where they may have little understanding of the culture of the students was a problem that needs to be addressed. The Preliminary Standards Task Group that is working within the Accreditation Advisory Panel has discussed the need for new teachers to be well prepared to teach all students. The proposed Beginning Teacher Performance Expectations (BTPEs) place enhanced focus on inclusive practices, restorative justice, and cultural competency during the preliminary preparation program and will require each prospective teacher to pass a performance assessment that includes the enhanced focus on these topics.

The proposed program standards focus on the prospective teacher having the opportunity to learn, practice, and be assessed on the BTPEs. In addition, the program standards raise the requirements for clinical practice, or student teaching, in the preliminary preparation program. The quality, duration and depth of the clinical experience is key to the preparation of new teachers.

The CTC discussed the proposed revised performance expectations and program standards (http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2015-06/2015-06-5D.pdf) at its June 2015 meeting. It is expected that the revised expectations and program standards will be adopted before the end of 2015. It will take the preparation programs up to two years to be redesigned to meet the revised program standards.

Root Cause 2: Uneven Administrator Preparation and Induction

There are 61 institutional sponsors of Preliminary Administrative Services programs in California. Some of the programs are very effective and others less so. The CTC adopted revised program standards for Preliminary Administrative Services programs in December 2013 and programs are required to transition to the revised standards as of July 1, 2015. CTC staff has provided technical assistance, including regional meetings, to support the programs to meet the CTC's revised requirements.

Once an administrator has earned a Preliminary Administrative Services Credential and has a position as a school administrator, the individual will be required to complete an Administrative Services induction program. The standards for Administrative Services induction programs were adopted by the CTC in February 2014. There are 46 CTC-approved Administrative Services induction programs. Technical assistance is being provided to the programs to ensure that the programs meet the CTC's revised requirements.

Stakeholders cited a need for strong leadership at both the school and district levels. They stated that strong leaders at the site level are better able to support and retain strong teachers and that those entrusted with hiring new teachers at the district level must be adequately prepared and supported to make good decisions.

Theories of Action: If California administrators receive strong preparation and support from pre-service through their first two years in the profession, then they will be better able to succeed in high-need schools, lessening administrator turnover and inequitable access to excellent educators. If administrators are better prepared and supported, then they will be better able to support teachers at their sites, thus improving teacher retention.

To that end, California is implementing the following strategies to better prepare and induct administrators into the profession:

Strategy 2A: Refresh the California Professional Standards for Education Leaders (CPSEL) and Descriptions of Practice (DOP)

The work of teachers in schools and their ability to be successful in helping all students meet their potential is greatly dependent on the quality of the site administrator or principal. The CTC adopted the revised CPSEL at its February 2014 meeting (http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2014-02/2014-02-6B.pdf). The CPSEL identify what an administrator must know and be able to do in order to move into sustainable, effective practice. They are a set of broad policy standards that are the foundation for administrator preparation, induction, development, professional learning, and evaluation in California. Taken together, the CPSEL describe critical areas of leadership for administrators and offer a structure for developing and supporting education leaders throughout their careers. Following the adoption, CTC staff has been

working with the CDE and the research, development, and services agency WestEd to update the current "Descriptions of Practice" exemplifying candidate performance at different levels along a continuum of professional practice relating to each of the CPSEL. The status of this work is described below.

The 2014 CPSEL have three levels—the standard, the elements, and the indicators. The standards, although recently updated, address the same six broad categories that the previous version addressed. The elements have been substantially updated and reflect a more current view of an education administrator's responsibilities. The indicators, a new component, further delineate leader action. The indicators serve primarily as examples of how an education leader might demonstrate the element or standard within his or her practice; they are not intended to be a comprehensive or required list of administrator behaviors.

Most, if not all, of California's approved Administrative Services credentialing programs use WestEd's publication *Moving Standards into Everyday Work: Descriptions of Practice* (initially published in 2003) as a tool to document the level of candidate competence in each of the CPSEL. With the revision of the CPSEL, this tool needed revision as well.

In a joint effort, the CTC, the CDE, and WestEd facilitated the revision of this document during the 2014–15 year. A panel with representation from a broad spectrum of stakeholders was assembled to examine the new CPSEL, review the existing rubric, and identify places where changes were needed. Once edits were identified, the group crafted new structures and new language to reflect the 2014 CPSEL revisions. The editing work of this document is in its final stages.

Strategy 2B: Develop Modules to Support Administrator Induction

The implementation of a coaching-based, job-embedded induction model for administrative programs represents a significant departure from the prior traditional IHE coursework and fieldwork model. To support institutions in transitioning to this new paradigm, the CTC, the CDE, and WestEd are overseeing the development of several implementation and training modules on topics that include the content of the new standards, current research on best practices, the revised CPSEL, and the accompanying new descriptions of practice (DOP) tool. These modules will be available to programs and the programs will make decisions regarding which of the modules to use locally. A panel of experts with representation from a broad spectrum of stakeholder groups met throughout the 2014–15 year to complete this work.

The modules are being organized into three groupings: *Briefings, Best Practice Examples*, and *Future Views*. *Briefings* will address the new content found in the program and performance standards and highlight key concepts to address. *Best Practice Examples* will cover key points of the induction program (e.g., the first meeting between coach and candidate), offering approaches that existing programs with strong

coaching components have found to be beneficial. *Future Views* is similar to *Best Practice Examples* but focuses on new components of the program, projecting what research tells us will be profitable approaches.

The modules will be available through the CTC's Web site in 2015. Because the panel is working to provide information to a variety of interested parties (e.g., program sponsors, coaches, employers), the members are planning to design a Web page that offers multiple pathways to using the modules and materials. Current thinking includes approaches by viewer's role, by key program documents, and by various program components.

Strategy 2C: Develop an Administrator Performance Assessment

To ensure administrators have the abilities needed to lead a school, the Governor's budget for 2015–16 includes $4 million from the General Fund to the CTC to develop and revise educator preparation assessments. Of that amount, $1 million will be allocated to the development of an Administrator Performance Assessment (APA) for program route candidates. It is anticipated that this assessment would be a single statewide APA model taken by all program route candidates. Reliable and consistent scoring would be managed by a contracted entity whose work would be overseen by the CTC. The quality and appropriateness of the assessment for California Preliminary Administrative Services credential candidates would be assured by requiring the assessment developer to meet the CTC's adopted Assessment Design Standards for Administrator Performance Assessment. The content and focus of the assessment would be to assess each candidate's performance relative to the CTC's adopted Content and Performance Expectations for Preliminary Administrative Services Credential candidates. This work will be informed by the CA Education Leadership Professional Learning Initiative (CELPLI) grant awarded to the University of San Diego by the CDE.

The CDE has awarded $997,894 in Federal Title II Part A Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Program funds for professional learning activities related to the future development of an APA for candidates completing the program route to the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential. A Request for Applications process was conducted to select a grantee for this work. The federal requirements for these funds specified that eligible grantees had to be a partnership comprised of a minimum of three specific types of entities: a high-need LEA, a school of Arts and Sciences, and a school of Education (these latter two could be, but were not required to be, from the same institution).

The grantee for this work was a partnership of San Diego Unified School District and the University of San Diego. The scope of work for this grant includes professional learning activities focusing on prospective school administrators and the development of a self-assessment tool based on the CTC's adopted administrator content and performance expectations to help prospective school administrators determine their level of knowledge, skills, ability, and interest in school administration as a next step in

their career. It is intended that the foundational work done on the self-assessment tool can form the basis for the future development of an actual APA for candidates who have completed or are on the verge of completing a Preliminary Administrative Services Credential program and who should already possess the requisite knowledge, skills, and abilities to begin competent beginning practice as a school administrator.

Root Cause 3: Inadequate Support for Educator Professional Learning

Funding for professional learning has been severely reduced in California, in part as a result of recent budget cuts, and in part because of categorical flexibility provisions that allowed districts to use those dollars to fill other budget gaps. More than half of districts report that they have eliminated, or significantly reduced, professional development offered to teachers and principals, and one-third of districts have reduced paid professional development days (*GbD*, p. 50). It is important to note that the CDE, like the Educator Excellence Task Force, has drawn the same distinction between professional development (PD) and professional learning. *GbD* states, "Old-style PD that follows a 'one size fits all' approach, conducted in the 'drive-by, spray-and-pray' workshops educators have often grown to dread, does not generally improve teaching practices or student achievement" (*GbD,* p. 50).

During the recent recession from 2007 through 2011, California districts and schools experienced over $20 billion in cumulative cuts. Districts responded by increasing class size, laying off teaching and administrative staff, scaling back support and professional development for teachers, and reducing instructional days.[6] California K–12 public education is only now recovering from the State's financial challenges.

Information regarding professional learning opportunities for educators is not collected at the state level. Therefore, for the purpose of this plan, the relevant metrics are based on national research conducted by the Boston Consulting Group in 2014 for the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. The report, *Teachers Know Best: Teachers' Views on Professional Development*, indicates that the professional learning delivered by schools and districts "is highly fragmented and characterized by key disconnects between what decision-makers intend and the professional learning teachers actually experience."[7] Specifically, the research found:

- Few teachers (29 percent) are highly satisfied with current professional development offerings

- Few teachers (34 percent) think professional development has improved

---

[6] Bland, J., Sherer, D., Guha, R., Woodworth, K., Shields, P., Tiffany-Morales, J., & Campbell, A. (2011). *The status of the teaching profession 2011*. Sacramento, CA: The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning at WestEd.

[7] Boston Consulting Group. *Teachers Know Best: Teachers' Views on Professional Development*. 2014. http://collegeready.gatesfoundation.org/sites/default/files/Gates-PDMarketResearch-Dec5.pdf

- Large majorities of teachers do not believe that professional development is helping them prepare for the changing nature of their jobs, including using technology and digital learning tools, analyzing student data to differentiate instruction, and implementing academic content standards

- Professional development formats strongly supported by district leadership and principals, such as professional learning communities and coaching, are currently not meeting teachers' needs

- Principals largely share teachers' concerns about the efficacy of professional learning

GbD states:

> Research suggests that district and school professional learning systems should be standards-focused, engage practitioners in sustained inquiry related to problems of practice and foster collaboration and sharing of promising practices. These systems should differentiate for educators' professional stages and build coherent learning cultures from induction to expert practice. (*GbD,* p. 53)

An emerging body of research illustrates that the contexts in which teachers' work shape teachers' effectiveness and decisions to move to another school site or leave the profession. Teachers who work in supportive professional learning cultures stay in the classroom longer, and improve more rapidly, than their peers in less-supportive environments. [8]

The California Subject Matter Project (CSMP), established in 1988, is an essential component within the California professional learning infrastructure. With more than 90 regional sites statewide, it is a network of nine discipline-based communities of practice that promote high-quality teaching and leadership. The CSMP sites operate on fundamental beliefs that include rigorous professional learning, designed collaboratively by K–12 and university educators, to enhance learning for all students. More importantly, the CSMPs advance a "teachers teaching teachers" principle that is central to its sustainability, as it is what fuels the passion for each institution of higher education faculty and their teacher leader colleagues to keep the CSMP operational and effective.

Due to overall budget cuts, funding for the CSMP decreased significantly in the past ten years. Despite these cuts, the CSMP has maintained an impressive reputation among K–12 educators for the variety and quality of professional learning opportunities they offer. These opportunities include workshops, leadership institutes, and in-service programs designed to:

---

[8] Johnson, S., Kraft, M., Papy, J. *How context matters in high-need schools: The effects of teachers' working conditions on their professional satisfaction and their students' achievement*. 2011.http://scholar.harvard.edu/files/mkraft/files/johnson_kraft_papay_teacher_working_conditions_final.pdf

- Revise and develop new programs aligned with California's academic content standards based on school/district needs

- Rebuild teacher leadership development through intensive year-round professional learning institutes in a variety of formats to accommodate teacher availability. Teachers may participate in the CSMPs through release time, time compensated by stipend, or unpaid time. The CSMP support can include providing school day coaching opportunities and support. These opportunities may occur onsite or off-site

- Identify and foster the development of a greater number of mentor teachers from shortage areas to support new teachers in induction

- Revise and develop new programs for site administrators that refresh or reinforce the necessary leadership and pedagogical skills to assess, coach, and mentor their staff and create and sustain the essential conditions for encouraging professional growth and improving instructional practice

- Expand the delivery models and uses of technology to provide high-quality professional learning opportunities for teachers and administrators to help them better understand California's academic content standards; and

- Assist teachers in understanding how literacy is addressed not only in English language arts, but in all subject areas

LEAs need a professional learning system built on the premise that it is for the professional growth of all teachers and leaders. While educator evaluation alone is an ineffective approach to significantly improving the quality of all teachers and leaders, it is an important component of a high-quality professional learning system.

California *Education Code* sections 44660–44665, often referred to as the Stull Act, provide California's primary guidance regarding educator evaluation. The provisions are relatively broad and there have been several legislative efforts to change or enhance the law regarding how educators are evaluated in California. According to a 2010 report released by the National Board Resource Center at Stanford University, "While evaluation processes across the state vary widely, many of them look very much the same as they did in 1971…" Comments from Accomplished California Teachers, a Web-based state teacher leadership network, indicate that current approaches to teacher evaluation result in a system that teachers do not trust, that rarely offers clear direction for improving practice, and often charges school leaders to implement without preparation or resources.

Stakeholders at each of the three meetings expressed the need for teachers and administrators, particularly those in SED and high-minority schools, to participate in a high quality system of professional learning designed to support their success, improve educator retention, and improve educational outcomes for students.

Theory of Action: If California educators, including early childhood educators, are supported by a high quality, integrated professional learning system that supports continuous professional growth throughout their careers, as described in *GbD*, then they will be better able to succeed in high-need schools, lessening turnover and inequitable access to excellent educators.

To that end, California is implementing the following strategies to better support the implementation of a high-quality, statewide professional learning system.

Strategy 3A: Disseminate and Promote the *Superintendent's Quality Professional Learning Standards* (QPLS)

When *GbD* was written, California did not have state standards for professional learning. The Educator Excellence Task Force identified the need for a common language and set of expectations to help those that prepare educators and those who teach and lead to improve system coherence.

LEAs, educator preparation programs, professional development providers, and policymakers and policy implementers, with professional learning standards establishing the attributes of best practices, now have a framework for discussion within the state, regional, and local context. Adopted by the SBE on May 7, 2015, the Quality Professional Learning Standards (QPLS) present the elements of a quality professional learning system that, if well implemented, will benefit educators focused on increasing their professional capacity and performance. The standards are not meant to be used to evaluate any educator in any aspect of his or her work. Rather, the QPLS are intended to help educators, LEAs, and the state develop and contextualize professional learning system goals and plans. The QPLS identify a clear outcome for professional learning—to continuously develop educators' capacity to teach and lead so that all students learn and thrive—and seven interdependent professional learning standards focused on:

- **Data:** Quality professional learning uses varied sources and kinds of information to guide priorities, design, and assessments.
- **Content and Pedagogy:** Quality professional learning enhances educators' expertise to increase students' capacity to learn and thrive.
- **Equity:** Quality professional learning focuses on equitable access, opportunities, and outcomes for all students, with an emphasis on addressing achievement and opportunity disparities between student groups.
- **Design and Structure:** Quality professional learning reflects evidence-based approaches, recognizing that focused, sustained learning enables educators to acquire, implement, and assess improved practices.

- **Collaboration and Shared Accountability:** Quality professional learning facilitates the development of a shared purpose for student learning and collective responsibility for achieving it.

- **Resources:** Quality professional learning dedicates resources that are adequate, accessible, and allocated appropriately toward established priorities and outcomes.

- **Alignment and Coherence:** Quality professional learning contributes to a coherent system of educator learning and support that connects district and school priorities and needs with state and federal requirements and resources.

Since the SSPI's approval in 2013, professional learning providers have started incorporating the QPLS into their collaborative discussions and planning with teacher leaders when developing priorities for professional learning. The seven QPLS represent essential components of a comprehensive, research-based, quality professional learning system that is appropriate for California. By adapting or adopting the QPLS, educators, policymakers, education officials, and other stakeholders will have a shared expectation of what professional learning is and how it should be supported.

The CDE is in the early stages of planning for the dissemination of the QPLS. Within the next few months a letter will be sent throughout the system from CDE leadership regarding the adoption of the QPLS closely followed by a news release. The California Comprehensive Center at WestEd, instrumental in the development of the QPLS, will work with the CDE to produce supporting materials and a webinar describing how educators can use the standards. A rubric to measure the effectiveness of professional learning at all education levels to inform system improvement activities is also being developed.

Strategy 3B: Disseminate and Promote Integrated Professional Learning System Work

The CDE, with the *GbD* report as the chief resource, is focusing on the development and vetting of "promising practices and processes" that will serve as models to inform LEAs as they adopt or adapt professional learning system components that will build system alignment and coherence. This work is based, in part, on the Instructional Capacity Building (ICB) Framework, based on the research by Ann Jaquith (2009; 2012), which identifies the conditions and resources necessary to support effective teaching as:

- **Instructional knowledge** (knowledge of content, pedagogy, and students)

- **Instructional tools or materials** (curriculum, teaching materials, and assessments)

- **Instructional relationships** characterized by trust and mutual respect

- **Organizational structures** that promote the use of various instructional resources, such as common learning time for teachers and formal instructional leadership roles.

In an Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) article entitled "Instructional Capacity: How To Build It Right," Jaquith states, "School leaders need to know where these four types of instructional resources reside within their schools and how they interact. They also need to know how to create opportunities for teachers to use these resources to improve teaching and learning."[9]

The CDE is currently overseeing promising grant projects designed to create prototypes for the implementation of the recommendations of the Educator Excellence Task Force. The Teacher-Based Reform Grant Pilot Projects (T-BARs) are designed to inform state, regional, and local policymakers about effective strategies to help each education level focus on specific problems of practice and identify existing, new, or repurposed resources to solve those problems. Funded until September 30, 2015, the grants are supporting district and school prototypes that focus on their own problems of practice related to educator evaluation, the peer assistance and review program (PAR), induction, leadership, improving instructional practice, and a substantive number of other professional learning system components identified in the *GbD* report that place professional growth at the center.

This work is funded by the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Program, a federal program, established under Title II, Part A of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. The purpose of these projects is to build a working knowledge of the processes and practices through which instructional capacity is developed while demonstrating that it is possible to support a teacher-developed, teacher-led professional learning model with the potential to improve teacher quality within California.

Resourcing Professional Learning Systems (RPLS) T-BAR project, led by the UC Davis Resourcing Excellence in Education (REEd) Center, is funded through September 30, 2016. In addition to the ICB work, it has been focusing on developing a generative process to help LEAs build their own instructional capacity to resource professional growth. The RPLS project is facilitating a process with over thirty LEA teams comprised of labor and management, including county offices of education, to plan, develop, and test prototypes for their continuous improvement. A key principle for this work is to develop and/or repurpose existing resources for the professional growth of all teachers and administrators, not just the few that have been singled-out for intervention. The creation and testing of prototypes by the LEA teams include the necessary components of a comprehensive evaluation system.

---

[9] Jaquith, A. 2013. *Instructional Capacity: How To Build It Right.* Available from ACSD: Educational Leadership. October 2013/Volume 71/Number 2. *Leveraging Teacher Leadership.*

For district teams to choose the appropriate strategies and action plans based on their local context, by often reestablishing instructional relationships (i.e., trust and mutual respect), the RPLS project is supporting labor-management collaboration by providing expertise, space, and opportunities to collaborate. Regardless of where the district teams begin, the desired end result is the development of an integrated professional learning system and the site-based conditions needed to support, sustain, and continuously improve that system. Using the original T-BAR Model and the ICB Framework, the RPLS project will provide tools, materials, and processes for:

- Intensive coaching/mentoring support that results in district and site use of the locally contextualized evaluation tool as part of an emerging comprehensive teacher evaluation system, including the use of observation protocols, feedback cycles, calibration and training sessions, and peer professional learning sessions.

- Administrator professional learning opportunities focused on a LEA's ability to access and use calibration, observation protocols, and collegial conversations as resources to support implementation of an integrated professional learning system aligned to the QPLS.

- An Articulated Interventions and Mentoring (AIM) model and pilot testing of the model using a structured cycle of inquiry process as articulated in the Network Improvement Community materials. This will include analytic protocols and approaches to measure and inform instructional change and shifts in instructional capacity over time.

- A suite of online tools and materials to resource implementation of integrated professional learning materials including: documentation and suggested curriculum for all academies, video demonstrations of ambitious teaching and learning, observation protocols, calibration materials, and effective feedback protocols that are aligned to the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and the California Professional Standards for Education Leaders

- Models and promising practices that showcase how districts collaborate and learn when provided with structured support around a set of common objectives.

- Dissemination of new knowledge and resources generated as a result of the activities outlined above.

The CDE will make available on its Web pages and promote the successful prototypes generated by the Integrated Professional Learning System work via news releases and other communications to LEAs, institutions of higher education, and other education stakeholders. The promising practices exhibited by the successful prototypes will include:

- Evaluation system components and processes that may be used by school districts to implement the best practices teacher evaluation system.

- Processes for implementing observations of instructional and other professional practices.

- Processes for defining calibration for purposes of training evaluators.

- Processes for developing the observation tool that may be used for observations of instructional and other professional practices.

- Processes for determining and defining the performance levels for the evaluation of teacher performance.

Root Cause 4: Challenging Working Conditions in High-Need Schools

Schools serving large numbers of poor and minority students present challenging workplace conditions for teachers, including social factors, lack of authentic and sufficient community engagement, and inequitable salaries. Research has shown that high teacher turnover in high-need schools has much to do with working conditions related to social factors, such as school leadership, collegial relationships, and elements of school culture.[10] Related to this, parents of students in high poverty communities are less likely to be involved in the school, to hold teachers accountable, and to be able to provide financial or other support.[11]

During all three stakeholder meetings, challenging working conditions were cited as a root cause of the California's equity gap. Stakeholders postulated that students attending high-minority and SED schools bring with them greater social, emotional, and academic needs, placing more stress on educators in these schools and resulting in more attrition. To address this challenge, stakeholders suggested that high-need schools receive additional funds to employ counselors, nurses, and additional support staff.

Theory of Action: If California's high-need schools receive additional fiscal resources and are required to address conditions of learning through expenditure and accountability plans developed in collaboration with the entire school community, they will be better able to improve working conditions to attract and retain high quality educators, lessening educator turnover and inequitable access to excellent educators.

To that end, California is implementing the following strategy to provide more resources to high-need schools:

---

[10] Simon and Moore Johnson, "Teacher Turnover in High-Poverty Schools: What we Know and Can Do," 2015

[11] EdSource report "The Power of Parents: Research underscores the impact of parent involvement in schools," February 2014

Strategy 4A: Implement the Local Control Funding Formula

California's 2013–14 Budget Act enacted landmark legislation that greatly simplifies the school finance system and provides additional resources to LEAs serving students with greater educational needs. The changes introduced by the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) represent a major shift in how the state funds LEAs, eliminating revenue limits and most state categorical programs. LEAs receive funding based on the demographic profile of the students they serve and gain greater flexibility to use these funds to improve student outcomes. More information regarding the LCFF is available on the CDE LCFF Overview Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/lcffoverview.asp.

LEAs receive a base grant based upon average daily attendance with additional funds for students in certain grade spans. In addition, they receive a supplemental grant equal to 20 percent of the base grant based on the number of students eligible to receive free or reduced-price meals, English learners (ELs), and foster youth students and a concentration grant equal to 50 percent of the adjusted base grant for these same students when exceeding 55 percent of an LEA's enrollment. LEAs have broad discretion regarding use of the base grants but are required to develop, adopt, and annually update a three-year Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) which describes how they intend to meet annual goals for all pupils, with specific activities to address state and local priorities identified in LCFF statute. The law requires LEAs to increase or improve services for high-need students in proportion to the additional funding apportioned on the basis of the target student enrollment in the district.

The LCAP must describe goals and specific actions and services to achieve those goals for all pupils for each of the state priorities and any locally identified priorities. LEAs must annually review the progress toward the expected annual outcomes based on, at a minimum, the required metrics identified in the LCFF statute. LEAs are required to consult with teachers, principals, administrators, local-bargaining units, and other school personnel, in addition to parents and students, in developing the LCAP. The state priorities include student achievement; implementation of state academic content standards; measurement of English learner pupils making progress toward English proficiency; student engagement as measured by graduation rates, dropout rates, absenteeism and attendance; school climate as measured by suspension and expulsion rates. In addition, the state priorities include parent involvement as measured by the extent to which parents participate in key school decisions and ensuring facilities are maintained in good repair. Within these priorities, LEAs have the opportunity to develop, at the local level, specific, measurable goals that address the challenging workplace conditions characteristic of high minority/poverty schools. By prioritizing these issues statewide, and maintaining local control and accountability, LEAs and school communities with high numbers of the identified targeted students have the autonomy and additional funding to invest in better facilities, more professional learning

opportunities for staff, better engagement with parents and families, and stronger support for teachers.

Root Cause 5: Need to Enhance Parent and Community Engagement in High-Need Schools

Research has shown that parent and community engagement has a measurable impact on student outcomes, but traditionally, schools serving large numbers of poor and minority students have been particularly challenged in engaging parents and communities.[12] Families from all backgrounds desire to be involved, want their children to do well in school, and hope their children will achieve a better life than their parents.[13] However, parents of students in high poverty communities are less likely to be involved in the school, to hold teachers accountable, and to be able to provide financial or other support.[14] Research has revealed a range of barriers to parent involvement in their child's education: "lack of time among working parents; negative prior experiences with schools; an inability of parents to help children with their homework; limited funding to support parent engagement activities; teachers and administrators connecting to parents primarily when their children misbehave; and a lack of staff training in different strategies to engage parents."[14]

During each of its three stakeholder meetings, the CDE heard from stakeholders that schools, particularly those serving large numbers of SED and minority students, needed to more effectively engage their parent communities. Stakeholders expressed the concern that educators did not receive sufficient support and training to communicate with parents effectively.

Theories of Action: If California's high-need schools genuinely and respectfully encourage and receive additional support and input from parent and community stakeholders, and build the capacity of both parents and educators to work as partners, they will be better able to improve working conditions to attract and retain high quality educators, lessening turnover and inequitable access to excellent educators. If schools have additional guidance and resources to support effective parent engagement, then they will improve their ability to engage parents in schools.

To these ends, California is implementing the following strategies to better engage parents and community members in high-need schools:

---

[12] EdSource report "The Power of Parents: Research underscores the impact of parent involvement in schools," February 2014

[13] Gandara. *Bridging Language and Culture* (2011); Redding, Murphy, Sheley, *Handbook on Family and Community Engagement*; and Weiss, Bouffard, Bridglall, Gordon, *Reframing Family Involvement in Education: Supporting families to Support Educational Equity* (2009)

[14] EdSource report "The Power of Parents: Research underscores the impact of parent involvement in schools," February 2014

Strategy 5A: Implement the Local Control Funding Formula

As described in Strategy 4A, the LCFF requires LEAs to regularly engage parents and community members in the process of using data to establish goals and define the measures that will be used to monitor and evaluate progress toward these goals.

Strategy 5B: Promote Resources Designed to Assist Schools to Effectively Engage Parents

The CDE home Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ has been redesigned in order to provide direct access to a parent portal, at http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/di/po/parents.asp, which links site visitors directly to resources that are most relevant to and most sought after by parents and families.

The *Family Engagement Framework: A Tool for California School Districts* (*Framework*) has been revised, in collaboration with WestEd, to provide comprehensive guidance to educators, districts, schools, families, and communities as they plan, implement, and evaluate strategies across multiple educational programs for effective family engagement to support student achievement. Specifically, the *Framework* is organized around five principles that address essential actions at the district level: build capacity; demonstrate leadership; resources: fiscal and other; monitor progress; and access and equity. The guidance in the *Framework* provides federal and state requirements for family engagement and rubrics to describe basic, progressive, and innovative implementation of those requirements. Guidance that supports the engagement of families in high minority/poverty communities includes capacity building for educators and families in effective partnerships, integrating resources and services from the community, establishing multiple and diverse opportunities for involvement, and policies that support and respect the variety of parenting traditions and practices within the community's cultural and religious diversity.

Hard copies of the *Framework* were mailed to all LEAs, and the SSPI announced its availability in a news release. The CDE's Title I Policy and Program Guidance Office provides training for LEAs in the use of the Framework for planning, implementing, and evaluating family engagement programs and activities. Since the implementation of LCFF, there has been a much higher demand for the *Framework*. The 2014 *Framework*, available in English and Spanish, can be viewed on the CDE Web site at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/pf/pf/documents/famengageframeenglish.pdf.

The CDE Parent/Family Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/pf/pf/ includes an abundance of resources about academic content standards, advisory committees and councils, multilingual documents, parents' rights, policies, and federal requirements. Communication to parents, families, and educators regarding statewide family engagement resources, activities, legislation, and more, is provided through the California Family Engagement (CAFE) listserv, which is open to all members of the public. The wide use of the *Family Engagement Framework* and the resources available

on these Web pages is evident by participant feedback in trainings, Web site traffic, and email requests for the *Framework* and training.

The CDE continues to meet with statewide parent stakeholder groups and collect feedback on efforts to improve parent involvement and engagement. This work, in addition to LEAs working to meet the requirements of the LCFF, will continue to foster school to home partnerships.

Root Cause 6: Diverse Local Root Causes

It can be challenging to identify root causes to educational inequity that affect every LEA. For instance, in the Educator Equity Profile provided by ED, educator absenteeism in high poverty/high minority schools was less than two percentage points higher than low poverty/low minority schools, and this margin is narrower when compared to the statewide average. If we look at the highest poverty/minority districts, we can see that absenteeism is a major issue for some, but not all of these districts. This is not to say that absenteeism should not be addressed at the state level, but that in order to support local agencies in addressing these issues, the State must support a system where expertise of the local context can be leveraged.

Stakeholders at each of the three meetings made clear that the State role in providing equitable access to excellent educators needed to go beyond providing guidance and sharing best practices. Even in the context of strong local control, the CDE must monitor and support LEAs to ensure that students have equitable access to excellent educators within their local contexts.

Theory of Action: If the State provides technical assistance and intervenes when LEAs do not provide equitable access to educators, then LEAs will more equitably distribute these educators.

Strategy 6A: Implement the Compliance Monitoring, Intervention and Sanctions Program

It should be noted that all California LEAs receiving funds under the ESEA are required to develop and implement an LEA Plan, the purpose of which is to develop an integrated, coordinated set of actions that LEAs will take to ensure that they meet certain programmatic requirements.

Included in the LEA plan is an assurance document regarding a number of educational issues including Item 24 which indicates that LEAs will comply with the following:

> Ensure, through incentives for voluntary transfers, the provision of professional development, recruitment programs, or other effective strategies, that low-income students and minority students are not taught at higher rates than other students by

unqualified, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers consistent with Sections 1111(b)(8)(C) and 1112(C)(1)(L).

In addition, California's current EEP, which is known as the Teacher Equity Plan requires LEAs to develop and implement a detailed and coherent plan to ensure that poor and minority students are not taught at higher rates than other students by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers. To facilitate implementation of the State Plan, the Legislature authorized the CMIS program in 2007. The CMIS program has been included in the California State Budget since 2009.

The two primary roles of CMIS are to monitor LEAs for compliance with federal laws regarding highly qualified teachers (HQTs) and to provide technical assistance to LEAs to ensure they are successful in the development and implementation of a comprehensive plan consistent with federal law.

LEAs must report annually, via the CALPADS, the number of ESEA core courses per site, including the number of those courses that are taught by HQTs. This reporting process provides the basis for validating the professional qualifications and certifications of teachers and their assignments, as well as the distribution of teachers. Based on this data, LEAs that are identified as being non-compliant are monitored and provided technical assistance via the CMIS program.

In the initial year of CMIS placement (Level A), LEAs with less than 100 percent HQT in core academic subjects are provided with technical assistance and encouraged to develop a Non-Compliant Teacher Action Plan outlining steps they will take to ensure that they are meeting HQT requirements.

To meet the requirements of ESEA Section 2141(a) and (b), California LEAs that have not met annual measureable objectives reporting less than 100 percent HQT in ESEA core academic subjects for two consecutive years are assigned to Level B of the CMIS program. Each LEA in Level B is required to create an Equitable Distribution Plan (EDP). The creation of the EDP is a collaborative and intensive process during which LEAs are required to complete all of the following activities:

- Convene a local equitable distribution team comprised of:
    - Human Resources Director
    - Curriculum and Instruction Director
    - State and Federal Programs Director
    - California Basic Educational Data System (CBEDS)/California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) Coordinator
    - Cabinet-level decision makers

    - Site-level representatives
    - Collective bargaining unit members
    - Beginning teacher support staff
- Conduct, as a team, analyses of school data
- Create a Non-Compliant Teacher Action Plan
- Create an LEA professional development needs assessment which must include:
    - Teacher data such as certification types and areas, professional development history, academic degrees, language fluency, and professional development requests
    - Data relating to student achievement, curriculum and instruction, professional development, and school governance and organization
    - Student data, including disaggregated achievement data analysis, classroom work, attendance data, discipline records, and student transfer data, dropout data, language and ethnicity data, and gender data
    - Student data including student access to books, supplies, extended learning opportunities and other support systems
    - School-level data including total instructional full-time employees, class size, instructional dollars per pupil, special grants and funding, support staff, technology available in the school, and staff professional development type and frequency
- Create an LEA professional development plan
- Conduct an analysis of the placement of PIPs, STSPs, and Interns
- Conduct an analysis of teacher experience rates and levels of support for new teachers
- Submit Board-approved policy or contract language ensuring that PIPs and STSPs are not assigned to schools with 40 percent or higher poverty, or that are in program improvement
- Submit Board-approved policy or contract language ensuring that interns are not placed in high-poverty or program improvement schools in greater numbers than in schools with low-poverty or higher academic achievement

- Provide documentation of a district-wide new teacher support system
- Conduct an analysis of retention rates and recruitment policies
- Submit a teacher retention plan and teacher recruitment plan
- Conduct an analysis of the experience rates of site administrators
- Conduct an analysis of opportunities for administrator training
- Submit documentation of principal support systems

The local EDP must include immediate solutions for ensuring that poor, minority, and underperforming students have access to experienced and effective administrators. Once an LEA has an approved EDP, it submits monitoring data annually to demonstrate progress toward meeting equitable distribution requirements for teachers and principals. The LEA enters the monitoring phase automatically to ensure that the EDP is implemented effectively and the LEA is demonstrating progress toward meeting equitable distribution provisions for three consecutive years.

To fulfill the requirements of ESEA Section 2141(c), LEAs that report less than 100 percent HQT in ESEA core academic subjects for three consecutive years and fail Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for three consecutive years move into Level C of the CMIS program. These LEAs enter into an agreement with the CDE consisting of: 1) a Non-Compliant Teacher Action Plan; 2) a Memorandum of Understanding that outlines agreed-upon activities regarding the use of funds to ensure all teachers become highly qualified; and 3) a Budget Agreement that reserves sufficient funds to pay for these activities. All three documents must be submitted to the CDE.

The CDE submits a report on the CMIS program to the appropriate budget and policy committees of the California Legislature, the Legislative Analyst's Office, and the Department of Finance annually. The report identifies the number of school districts that received CMIS support in the current fiscal year and the major components of the plans that those districts developed to respond to the federal HQT requirements. For each participating district, the report provides longitudinal data on the number and percent of teachers who are and are not highly qualified.

Through the collaborative development of the Equitable Distribution Plan, Non-Compliant Teacher Action Plan, Budget Agreement, and MOU, many districts successfully move out of Level C. In 2012–13, 152 districts were in Level C of the CMIS program. By 2014–15, only 100 districts were in Level C.

The CDE received commendations for the early warning and proactive technical assistance elements of the CMIS program from ED staff during a September 2014 Title

II Part A monitoring visit. More information regarding the program is available on the CDE CMIS Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/nclb/sr/tq/tiicmis.asp.

The CDE has considered making revisions to the CMIS program to shift the emphasis from HQTs for all students toward more strategic, targeted support for LEAs who have equitable distribution issues that may require different types of support or interventions. However, it would be an inappropriate use of resources to make significant adjustments to the program before the reauthorization of ESEA. In 2015–16, the CDE will explore the possibility of refining the EDP documents included in Level B of the CMIS program to include specific provisions regarding inexperienced, unqualified, and out-of-field teachers consistent with ESEA Title I requirements.

Section 5: Ongoing Monitoring and Public Report of Progress

California is committed to ensuring the long-term success of its Educator Equity Plan by providing the necessary mechanisms for ongoing technical assistance, monitoring, and feedback. The State has clearly defined its commitments to ensuring educational equity, and improving teaching quality and instructional leadership. With expanded implementation of the LCFF, the CMIS program, and the recommendations made in *GbD,* as described in the plan, the CDE anticipates LEAs will continue to make progress in their efforts to recruit and retain experienced, qualified teachers and administrators to high-need schools, lessening the issue of inequitable access to excellent educators.

To measure the success of these efforts, the CDE will develop an annual data profile that provides information regarding the rates at which poor children are taught by inexperienced, unqualified, out-of-field, and intern teachers compared to the rates at which other children are taught by these teachers and the rates at which minority children are taught by inexperienced, unqualified, out-of-field, or intern teachers compared to the rates at which other children are taught by these teachers.

The CDE will convene stakeholders annually to review this data, examine equity gaps, and identify opportunities to improve upon strategies. Using this information, the CDE will prepare a report on the progress of the California State Plan to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators, present it to the SBE on an annual basis, and post the plan on its Web pages.

Table 13 provides a timeline outlining the implementation of the strategies proposed in this plan.

California shares ED's goal of ensuring that every student has equitable access to excellent educators. We appreciate having had the opportunity to re-examine and evaluate our work to date and look forward to continued collaborative conversations as we proceed with the implementation of this plan.

Table 13: Educator Equity Plan Implementation Timeline

Strategy		Responsible Parties	2014–15	2015–16	2016–17
1A	Implement updated Teaching Performance Assessments (TPAs)	CTC	Adopt revised Assessment Design Standards and secure funding	Begin updating the state TPA model	Prepare to implement revised TPAs in 2017-18
1B	Strengthen and Streamline Accreditation System	CTC/Accreditation Advisory Panel members	Convene workgroups of experts to examine and streamline accreditation processes	Integrate work group recommendations into policies	Implement streamlined policies
1C	Increase Support for Teacher Induction	CTC/Induction task group	Convene workgroup to propose revised induction standards and requirements	Integrate work group recommendations into policies	Full implementation of new policies re: new teacher induction
1D	Include Cultural Awareness and Responsive Teaching Principles and Practices within Teacher Preparation Programs and Local Induction	CTC/ Preliminary Standards Task Group	Convene workgroup to propose revised performance expectations and program standards, including enhanced focus on inclusive practices,	Adopt revised program standards by end of 2015. Begin supporting transition of preparation programs to new standards	Transition to new program standards

Strategy		Responsible Parties	2014–15	2015–16	2016–17
			restorative justice and cultural competency		
2A	Update the California Professional Standards for Education Leaders (CPSEL) Descriptions of Practice (DOP)	CTC/WestEd/CDE/expert panel	Convene expert panel to craft new structures and language for the DOP to reflect the refreshed CPSEL	Publication and dissemination of the refreshed CPSEL DOP	
2B	Develop and disseminate modules to support administrator induction	CTC/WestEd/CDE/expert panel	Convene expert panel to design modules	Administrator induction modules available on CTC Web site, statewide training of trainers	Support statewide transition
2C	Develop an Administrator Performance Assessment (APA)	CDE /CTC	Conduct RFA process for CA Education Leadership Professional Learning Initiative (CELPLI) grant	Monitor implementation of CELPLI grant	CTC contracts with assessment developer to develop APA using products of CELPLI grant
3A	Disseminate and promote The Superintendent's Quality Professional Learning Standards (QPLS)	CDE/WestEd	SBE adoption of the QPLS	Develop dissemination strategy and begin promotion	Assess effectiveness of strategy and adapt and expand as necessary
3B	Promote and disseminate Integrated Professional Learning	CDE	Monitor implementation of grants	Promote T-BAR prototypes and products on Web	Promote online tools and materials including

Strategy		Responsible Parties	2014–15	2015–16	2016–17
	System work products			pages	observation protocols, calibration materials, and effective feedback materials
4A	Provide additional resources to schools serving SED and minority students	California	Continued implementation of the LCFF	Continued implementation of the LCFF	Continued implementation of the LCFF
5B	Promote and disseminate parent resources	CDE	Continue to build collection of resources to support parent engagement	Explore creation of dissemination strategy	Assess effectiveness of strategy and adapt and expand as necessary
6A	Implement and potentially expand the Compliance Monitoring, Intervention, and Sanctions (CMIS) program	CDE/LEAs	Implement the CMIS program to support LEAs to equitably distribute HQTs, consistent with ESEA Title II Part A requirements. Ongoing (since 2007)	Explore the possibility of refining the EDP documents included in Level B of the CMIS program to include specific provisions regarding inexperienced, unqualified, and out-of-field teachers consistent with ESEA Title I requirements	Implement refined CMIS program if appropriate

Strategy		Responsible Parties	2014–15	2015–16	2016–17
	Monitor State-level data regarding equitable distribution of inexperienced, unqualified, and out-of-field teachers	CDE/CTC	Prepare data profile spring 2015	Prepare data profile spring 2016	Prepare data profile spring 2017
	Convene Annual Educator Equity Plan Stakeholder Meeting	CDE/SBE/CTC/LEAs/ parents/teachers/ administrators/ pupil services personnel/ community groups	Convene stakeholder meetings to inform development of EEP	Convene stakeholders to share new data, explore equity gaps, and inform update of EEP strategies as appropriate	Convene stakeholders to share new data, explore equity gaps, and inform update of EEP strategies as appropriate
	Prepare and present to the SBE an annual report of implementation progress regarding the California State Plan to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators	CDE	2015 California State Plan to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators presented to SBE at its July 2015 meeting	2016 California State Plan to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators presented to SBE at its July 2016 meeting	2017 California State Plan to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators presented to SBE at its July 2017 meeting

Appendix A: Stakeholder Meeting Agendas and Participant Lists

California Educator Equity Roundtable: Excellence for All

Clark Kerr Conference Center
University of California, Berkeley
2601 Warring Street, Garden Room, Berkeley, CA
May 13, 2015, 9:30 AM–3:00 PM

Meeting Goals

- *To facilitate thoughtful and honest dialogue about what addressing educator equity in California will require, and what's already underway to address it.*
- *To provide feedback and support on California's Educator Equity plan; and share data and analyses to inform how to look at educator equity gaps and their root causes.*
- *To explore and share district strategies for educator equity underway around the state.*
- *To discuss on-going stakeholder engagement around educator equity.*

9:30 am–10:00 am Registration and Light Breakfast

10:00 am–10:30 am Welcome

- **The goals and process for this meeting**
  Christopher Edley, Jr., Partners for Each and Every Child
- **The importance and urgency of addressing educator equity at this moment in California and the opportunity provided by the Educator Equity Plans**
  Ryan Smith, Education Trust–West
- **The policy context surrounding efforts to address Educator Equity; both short (current Teaching Bills and Surplus) and longer term.**
  Linda Darling-Hammond, Stanford Center of Policy in Education (SCOPE)
- **Update on the development of California's Education Equity plan**
  Barbara, Murchison, California Department of Education

10:30 am–11:30 am Discussion 1: Identifying the Educator Equity Gaps and Key Opportunities for Strengthening the Plan for Educator Equity

- **Inequities and growing educator shortages in California**
  Linda Darling-Hammond and Team
- **Examining current data sources and monitoring programs**
  Teri Clark, California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
  Carrie Roberts, California Department of Education
- **Discussion/Brainstorm in Whole Group**
  - **Does the data presented lead to a common understanding of root causes?**
  - **What other analyses would be useful?**

11:30 am–12:15 pm Discussion 2: Top Strategies for Addressing Educator Equity

- **Providing Food for Thought**
  Linda Darling-Hammond and Team
  - **What are the Key Strategies for addressing the well-**

known causes of educator inequity?

- **Discussion/Brainstorm in Whole Group**
  - **What should our priorities for Recruitment, Preparation, Induction, Development, and Evaluation of teaching/teachers?**
  - **What needs strengthening?**

12:15 pm–12:30 pm **Buffet Lunch**

12:30 pm–1:30 pm **Discussion 3: District Strategies and Data Systems that Promote Transparency and Continuous Improvement of Educator Equity**

- **Providing Food for Thought**
  Ginger Adams, CORE Districts
  Jeannette LaFors, Education Trust–West
  - **What innovative ways are districts tracking and addressing issues of educator equity and effectiveness?**
- **Discussion/Task**
  - **What is the role of the state in supporting districts to develop and use these systems?**

1:30 pm–2:30 pm **Discussion 4: Strengthening Stakeholder Engagement**

- **Providing Food for Thought**
  Ryan Smith, Education Trust–West
  - **What's the purpose and importance of stakeholder engagement?**
- **Discussion/Task**
  - **What should stakeholder engagement on educator equity look like?**
  - **Are there ways to begin pushing for educator equity and analysis of the gaps in the context of LCFF?**

2:30 pm–3:00 pm **Next Steps**

Christopher Edley, Jr., Partners for Each and Every Child

- **Recap outcomes from four discussions**
- **Identify next steps**

California Educator Equity Roundtable: Excellence for All May 13, 2015, 9:30 AM–3:00 PM Attendance List		
Last Name	**First Name**	**Organization**
Adams	Ginger	CORE Districts
Affeldt	John	Public Advocates Inc.
Bezoza	Jennifer	Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights
Bishop	Joseph	Institute for Education Policy
Canaveral	Christina	Coleman Advocates
Clark	Teri	California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Darling-Hammond	Linda	Stanford Center of Policy in Education (SCOPE) Stanford University
Edley, Jr.	Christopher	Partners for Each and Every Child
Franklin	Melia	Bay Area Parent Leadership Action Network (PLAN)
Fuller	Bruce	UC Berkeley, Graduate School of Education
Furger	Roberta	PICO California
Green	Sophie	Partners for Each and Every Child
Gustafson-Corea	Jan	California Association for Bilingual Education
Hahnel	Carrie	Education Trust–West
Isheda	Taryn	Californians for Justice
Kim	Hayin	Independent Consultant
Kini	Tara	Educator
Koon	Danfeng	Partners for Each and Every Child
LaFors	Jeannette	Education Trust–West
Mauer	Molly	Partners for Each and Every Child
Mui	Elaine	Partners for Each and Every Child
Murchison	Barbara	California Department of Education
Ochoa	Tina	Families in Schools
Pfister	Carolyn	California State Board of Education
Plank	David	Policy Analysis for California Education, Stanford University
Pleitez-Howell	Karla	Advancement Project
Roberts	Carrie	California Department of Education
Ross	Peter	Institute for Education Policy
Saenz	Tom	Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF)
Sandy	Mary	California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Saunders	Janine	California School-Based Health Alliance
Smith	Ryan	Education Trust–West
Snyder	Jon	Stanford Center of Policy in Education (SCOPE) Stanford University
Strong	Brad	Children Now
Tinubu Ali	Titilayo	Institute for Education Policy
Warnken	Heather	Partners for Each and Every Child
Watkins	Debra	California Alliance of African American Educators (CAAAE)

California Educator Equity Plan Stakeholder Meeting

West Ed, 1000 G Street, Sacramento, CA 95814
June 9, 2015, 1:00 PM – 5:00 PM

Agenda

- Welcome and Introductions
- Findings from Research on Equitable Access
- Historical Background on Equitable Access
- Overview of Excellent Educators for All Initiative
- Data Review: Equitable Access in California
- Root Cause Analysis Session
- Break
- Strategy Session
- Next Steps

California Educator Equity Plan Stakeholder Meeting June 9, 2015, 1:00 PM–5:00 PM Attendance List		
Last Name	**First Name**	**Organization**
Anderson	Nicole	Association of California School Administrators
Bachez	Sara	Association of California School Administrators
Bishop	Joseph	Education Startup
Brown	Shannan	San Juan Teachers Association
Buenrostro	Manuel	California School Boards Association
Burt	Ken	California Federation of Teachers
Coppage	Keith	California Department of Education
Cruz	Oscar	Families in Schools
Easterling	Lori	California Teachers Association
Ennis	Judy	American Institutes of Research
Enriquez	Marcela	California Department of Education
Fajardo	Elena	California Department of Education
Graybill	Beth	Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Jaffe	Celia	California State Parent Teacher Association
Lacy	Paul	California Department of Education
Marcellus	Christina	California County Superintendents Educational Services Association
Murchison	Barbara	California Department of Education
Ochoa	Tina	Families in Schools
Pfister	Carolyn	State Board of Education
Preston	Laura	Association of California School Administrators
Purdue	Roxann	Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Robb	Jane	California Teachers Association
Roberts	Carrie	California Department of Education
Sanchez	Norma	California Teachers Association
Sherratt	Ellen	American Institutes of Research
Sinclair	Judy	California Department of Education
Speck	Jay	California County Superintendents Educational Services Association
Strong	Brad	Children Now
Sun	Ting	State Board of Education
Tamayo	Rico	California Federation of Teachers

California Educator Equity Plan Stakeholder Meeting

California Department of Education, 1430 N Street, Sacramento, CA 95814
June 10, 2015, 1:00 PM – 5:00 PM

Agenda

- Welcome and Introductions
- Findings from Research on Equitable Access
- Historical Background on Equitable Access
- Overview of Excellent Educators for All Initiative
- Data Review: Equitable Access in California
- Root Cause Analysis Session
- Break
- Strategy Session
- Next Steps

California Educator Equity Plan Stakeholder Meeting June 10, 2015, 1:00 PM–5:00 PM Attendance List		
Last Name	**First Name**	**Organization**
Aleman	Brenda	Council of Mexican Federations
Alvarez	Rafael	Community Service Employment Training
Avita	Angel	Community Service Employment Training
Chambers	Niki	Congregations Organized for Prophetic Engagement
Contreras	Lizbeth	Council of Mexican Federations
Cortez-Alcala	Lupita	California Department of Education
D'Souza	Lestan	Families in Schools
Ennis	Judy	American Institutes of Research
Gallardo	Sofia	Community Service Employment Training
Gomez	Raquel	Community Service Employment Training
Guadron	Stephanie	Families in Schools
Murchison	Barbara	California Department of Education
Navarro	Martha	Community Service Employment Training
Ochoa	Araceli	Proteus
Ochoa	Tina	Families in Schools
Roberts	Carrie	California Department of Education
Rodgers	Gwen	Congregations Organized for Prophetic Engagement
Sinclair	Judy	California Department of Education