

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1

Agenda

Senator John Laird, Chair
Senator Dave Min
Senator Rosilicie Ochoa Bogh



Monday, February 22, 2021
9:00 a.m. State Capitol - Room 3191

Consultants: Elisa Wynne and Nora Brackbill

AGENDA

<u>Item</u>	<u>Department</u>	<u>Page</u>
6100 Issue 1	Department of Education School Accountability Update	2
6360 Issue 2	Commission on Teacher Credentialing Budget and Trailer Bill Proposals	8
6100 6360 Issue 3	Department of Education Commission on Teacher Credentialing Teacher Recruitment and Retention	11
6100 6980 Issue 4	Department of Education California Student Aid Commission Golden State Teacher Program	16
6100 Issue 5	Department of Education Professional Development Proposals	18
Issue 6	Community Schools Grant Program	22
Issue 7	Other Budget Proposals and Trailer Bill Language	27
	Public Comment	

Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals who, because of a disability, need special assistance to attend or participate in a Senate Committee hearing, or in connection with other Senate services, may request assistance at the Senate Rules Committee, 1020 N Street, Suite 255 or by calling (916) 651-1505. Requests should be made one week in advance whenever possible.

6100 DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**Issue 1: School Accountability Update**

Panel:

- Sara Pietrowski, State Board of Education
- Elly Garner, Department of Education
- Michelle Valdivia, Department of Finance
- Sujie Shin, Deputy Executive Director, California Collaborative for Educational Excellence
- Karla Estrada, Deputy Executive Director Systems Improvement and Innovation, California Collaborative for Educational Excellence

Background

Local Control and Accountability Plans (LCAP). To ensure accountability for LCFF funds, the state requires that all LEAs annually adopt and update a LCAP. The LCAP must include locally-determined goals, actions, services, and expenditures of LCFF funds for each school year in support of the state educational priorities that are specified in statute, as well as any additional local priorities. In adopting the LCAP, LEAs must consult with parents, students, teachers, and other school employees.

The eight state priorities that must be addressed in the LCAP, for all students and significant student subgroups in a school district and at each school, are:

- *Williams* settlement issues (adequacy of credentialed teachers, instructional materials, and school facilities).
- Implementation of academic content standards.
- Parental involvement.
- Pupil achievement (measured in part by statewide assessments, Academic Performance Index, and progress of English-language learners toward English proficiency).
- Pupil engagement (measured by attendance, graduation, and dropout data).
- School climate (measured in part by suspension and expulsion rates).
- The extent to which students have access to a broad course of study.
- Pupil outcomes for non-state-assessed courses of study.

COEs must address the following two priorities, in addition:

- Coordination of services for foster youth.
- Coordination of education for expelled students.

School district LCAPs are subject to review and approval by COEs, while COE LCAPs are subject to review and approval by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI). Statute also established a process for districts to receive technical assistance related to their LCAPs. The SPI is authorized to intervene in a district that is failing to improve outcomes for students after receiving technical assistance.

In addition, under changes made as part of the 2017 Budget Act, COEs are also required to provide a summary of the plan for supporting schools and school districts within their county, including a description of goals for LCAP review, and provision of technical assistance and support. COEs must measure progress towards meeting these goals by identifying and assessing metrics, as well as specifying the actions and expenditures to meet these goals. Finally, COEs must identify how they are collaborating with the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence, the CDE, and other COEs.

Finally, the 2018-19 budget agreement specified updates to the LCAP including: 1) a summary table of planned expenditures for all actions for each goal included in the LCAP, broken out by fund source; 2) a summary of the actions and planned expenditures to increase or improve services for English learners, low-income and foster youth students; 3) specified that LEAs can prioritize their goals, actions and related expenditures within the eight state priorities; and 4) required the LCAP and Annual Update template adopted by SBE to use language that is understandable and accessible to parents and required school districts and county offices of education to post prominently on the homepage of their website their approved LCAP. These changes will be reflected in the next LCAP template cycle.

California School Dashboard. Pursuant to LCFF statute, the SBE developed an online tool and interface for an evaluation rubric, called the California School Dashboard (Dashboard), which was launched at the end of 2017. This tool includes the state and local performance indicators that reflect performance on the LCFF priorities, such as test scores, graduation rates, and school climate surveys. The data in the dashboard relies on the CDE data system, CALPADS, as well as locally reported indicators.

The Dashboard also includes performance standards for each indicator allowing LEAs and schools to identify both progress and needed improvements. The Dashboard uses a color-coded indicator to show how an LEA scores on a particular indicator. For example, blue means that the LEA is in the highest performance category, while red means that an LEA is in the lowest performance category. Additional functionality allows for the user to look at school and student group data and understand if an LEA is improving in any indicator area. The LCAP template was updated in 2017 to include a description of those indicators for which the LEA scored orange or red and the actions and services an LEA is undertaking in these areas.

Technical Assistance and Support of LEAs. Along with the release of the Dashboard, beginning in December 2017, the SBE identified LEAs in need of assistance based on LEA scores on the dashboard indicators and created a tiered structure, based on statute, to provide this assistance. The tiers of support are described below in more detail.

Overview of Statewide System of Support

Level of Support	Description of Supports Available
Support for All LEAs and Schools (Level 1)	Various state and local agencies provide an array of resources, tools, and voluntary assistance that all LEAs may use to improve student performance at the LEA and school level and narrow disparities among student groups across the LCFF priorities, including recognition for success and the ability to share promising practices.
Differentiated Assistance (Level 2)	County superintendents, the CDE, charter authorizers, and the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence (CCEE) provide differentiated assistance for LEAs and schools, in the form of individually designed assistance, to address identified performance issues, including significant disparities in performance among student groups.
Intensive Intervention (Level 3)	The State Superintendent of Public Instruction or, for charter schools, the charter authorizer may require more intensive interventions for LEAs or schools with persistent performance issues over a specified time period.

Source: State Board of Education: January 18, 2018 Agenda, Item 3

In the first few cohorts of LEAs identified for differentiated assistance or intervention, the majority were identified related to their students with disabilities, with the other significant student groups being homeless student and foster youth students where LEAs need additional support.

As part of the 2018-19 budget agreement, a structure for providing support for LEAs identified for differentiated assistance or intervention was refined in statute, specifying the process for COEs to support school districts in need of technical assistance and the ability of a school district to seek assistance from the COE and other providers. Similar adjustments were made to the process for the SPI to assist struggling COEs.

Statute also established a formula for providing funding for COEs to support school districts. Under this formula, COEs would receive base funding plus additional funding determined by the number of school districts identified as in need of differentiated assistance on the dashboard.

Additional Support Structures. In 2018-19, statute also established various lead agencies to provide support and spur capacity building across the state as well as to provide a resource for specific issue areas. These lead agencies are described below:

- **Geographic Lead Agencies.** The 2018-19 budget provided \$4 million in ongoing Proposition 98 funding to establish COEs as geographic lead agencies in their region. There are now 9 geographic leads across the state. The responsibilities of the lead COEs include building the capacity of other COEs in the region, coordinating and collaborating technical assistance across the region, providing technical assistance to a school district if a COE is unable to, and identifying existing resources and developing new resources upon request of the CCEE or the SPI. As of Mar, seven geographic lead agencies have been established.

- **Special Education Local Plan Areas (SELPAs) Lead Agencies.** The 2018-19 budget also included \$10 million in ongoing Proposition 98 funding to establish (SELPAs) to serve as special education resource leads to work with COEs to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. There are three SELPA Improvement Leads and four SELPA Content Leads that focus particular areas of need, such as universal design for learning, or autism support.
- **Expert Lead Agencies.** The 2018-19 budget also included funding from a variety of sources for lead agencies with different expertise.

California Collaborative for Educational Excellence (CCEE). The CCEE was created as part of the new LCFF accountability framework, with its goal to advise and assist school districts charter schools, and COEs to achieve identified outcomes in their LCAPs under the LCFF. Statute allows the CCEE to accept requests or referrals for technical assistance after consulting with the SPI. The CCEE may contract with individuals, LEAs, or organizations with expertise in the LCAP state priority areas and experience in improving the quality of teaching, improving school and district leadership, and addressing the needs of student populations (such as unduplicated students or students with exceptional needs.)

The CCEE has played a key role in transitioning LEAs statewide to the new accountability system, initially conducting statewide training for LEAs and education stakeholders on the LCAP and the school dashboard, with a focus on improving student outcomes and closing the achievement gap. Statewide trainings and webinars focusing on different components of the accountability system are continuing, as well as training for individual LEAs by request, or groups of stakeholders. In addition, the CCEE has facilitated the development of Professional Learning Networks (PLNs) made up of COEs, statewide organizations, and non-profits led by facilitators to support collaborative efforts to build capacity, some of these activities have been ongoing. The CCEE also initially conducted a pilot program to develop and design their ongoing work in providing technical assistance and intervention to LEAs. The ongoing work of the CCEE has been focused to a greater extent on capacity building through the regional leads and providing support for LEAs in differentiated assistance or intervention, as needed.

CCEE Pandemic Response. At the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, CCEE consulted with all 58 county offices of education (COE) to determine the most urgent support for the high-need LEAs identified in the Dashboard. The collective goal was to collaborate on the rapid response necessary to address student engagement, assess learning progress, expand professional learning, and transition to the safe return for in-person instruction. From March 2020 through January 2021, CCEE developed professional learning resources in collaboration with LEAs and System of Support partners (e.g., geographic leads, statewide agencies, and stakeholder groups). For example, the CCEE provided free professional learning resources such as the Continuity of Learning Playbooks, Distance Learning Consortium, Accelerated Learning Series, and Field Guide for Accelerating Learning, Equity, and Well-being support LEAs with maximizing equity, strengthening systems and structures, and leveraging high-quality instruction. In addition, CCEE launched the Leading Forward Initiative on January 25th. This CCEE virtual professional learning initiative provides tools for educators, leaders, and school community stakeholders to re-engage students and accelerate learning while advancing equity for vulnerable student groups and ensuring that we are addressing the whole child.

Accountability System Changes Related to the COVID – 19 Pandemic

The closure of schools across the state in March of 2020, prevented LEAs from completing their regular spring assessments of students. California applied, and the U.S. Department of Education approved, a request to waive statewide accountability and reporting requirements for the 2019–2020 school year.

In June 2020, Governor Newsom approved SB 98 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review) Chapter 24, Statutes of 2020, which prohibits the California CDE from publishing state and local indicators in the 2020 Dashboard. Therefore, the 2020 Dashboard will reports only:

- LEA and school details (e.g., LEA/school address)
- Student population data (e.g., enrollment data)
- A link to DataQuest or a CDE web page that reports the 2019–2020 data collected in the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) (e.g., graduation data)

In addition, SB 98 specified that the CDE shall not identify LEAs, which includes charter schools, during the 2020–21 school year for differentiated assistance. As a result, LEAs identified for support in 2019–20 will continue to receive differentiated assistance in 2020–21. In addition, schools identified for federal support and intervention measures in 2019–20 remain eligible through the 2020–21 school year. 365 LEAs were identified for differentiated assistance prior to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Finally, SB 98 specified that the CDE shall identify LEAs for differentiated in December 2021, by using performance data on the state and local indicators from the December 2019 Dashboard and the December 2021 Dashboard.

The SBE and CDE are aware that there are discussions within the U.S. Department of Education (ED) and with stakeholders about possible flexibilities that may be made available to states in order to satisfy the federal assessment, accountability, school identification and federal funding requirements in Fiscal Year (FY) 2020–2021, and will provide updates when more information is made available.

Governor’s Budget Proposal:

The Governor’s Budget proposes the following:

An increase of \$183,000 ongoing Proposition 98 General Fund for the CCEE responsibilities, bringing the total budget for the CCEE to \$12.5 million.

Maintains funding for county offices of education to support LEAs at \$72.4 million Proposition 98 General fund to support the existing LEAs identified for targeted assistance

Suggested Questions:

- What specific needs/trends has CCEE noticed among LEAs reaching out for assistance?
- How has the work or LEAs in differentiated assistance changed during the pandemic?
- How is CCEE working with lead COEs in the statewide system of support to adapt resources during the pandemic?

- Have CDE and SBE discussed how LEAs will be identified for technical assistance in December 2021? What are the challenges / decisions that will need to be made in order to make these identifications and ensure struggling LEAs are supported with limited state data?

Staff Recommendation: Hold Open.

6360 COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING**Issue 2: Budget Adjustments and Trailer Bill Proposals**

Panel:

- Dr. Mary Sandy, Executive Director, Commission on Teacher Credentialing
- Kim Leahy, Department of Finance

Background:

Major Responsibilities. The CTC is responsible for the following major state operations activities, which are supported by special funds:

- Issuing credentials, permits, certificates, and waivers to qualified educators.
- Enforcing standards of practice and conduct for licensed educators.
- Developing standards and procedures for the preparation and licensure of school teachers and school service providers.
- Evaluating and approving teacher and school service provider preparation programs.
- Developing and administering competency exams and performance assessments.

Major Activities. In 2018-19, the CTC processed approximately 23,109 new teaching credentials (including preliminary and intern credentials), a 3.1 percent increase over the prior year. The CTC also processes other types of teacher authorizations including short term teaching permits, internship permits, and teaching waivers. In addition, the CTC currently administers, largely through contract, a total of six different educator exams annually. The CTC also monitors the assignments of educators and reports the findings to the Legislature.

The CTC is also responsible for misconduct cases involving credential holders and applicants resulting from criminal charges, reports of misconduct by local educational agencies, and misconduct disclosed on applications.

Lastly, the CTC is responsible for accrediting approved sponsors of educator preparation programs, including public and private institutions of higher education and, local educational agencies in California.

State Operations. The CTC is a “special fund” agency whose state operations are largely supported by two special funds – the Test Development and Administration Account and the Teacher Credentials Fund. Of the CTC’s \$31.1 million state operations budget proposed for 2019-20, about \$23.1 million is from credential and accreditation fees, which are revenue sources for the Teacher Credentials Fund; \$6.4 million is from educator exam fees, which fund the Test Development and Administration Account and \$1.6 million in reimbursements. Accreditation fees have been suspended through the 2021-22 to mitigate cost impacts to teacher preparation programs. The chart on the next page outlines the CTC's expenditures in 2019-20, 2020-21 and the Governor's proposed expenditures for 2020-21.-

Commission on Teacher Credentialing Expenditures and Positions
(Dollars in Thousands)

3-YEAR EXPENDITURES AND POSITIONS

		Positions			Expenditures		
		2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2019-20*	2020-21*	2021-22*
5381	Preparation & Licensing of Teachers	109.4	109.4	110.4	\$17,180	\$18,179	\$19,326
5382	Attorney General Legal Services	-	-	-	2,757	3,389	3,389
5383	Accreditation Streamline Project	-	-	-	237	310	310
5384	Educator Performance Assessments	-	-	-	1,235	710	2,000
5388	Classified School Employee Teacher Credentialing Program	-	-	-	-	25,000	-
5397	Educator Preparation	-	-	-	-	100,000	-
5399	Administration	40.7	37.7	37.7	5,504	5,518	6,034
TOTALS, POSITIONS AND EXPENDITURES (All Programs)		150.1	147.1	148.1	\$26,913	\$153,106	\$31,059
FUNDING					2019-20*	2020-21*	2021-22*
0001	General Fund				\$100	\$-	\$-
0001	General Fund, Proposition 98				-	125,000	-
0407	Teacher Credentials Fund				20,931	21,895	23,123
0408	Test Development and Administration Account, Teacher Credentials Fund				5,474	4,653	6,378
0995	Reimbursements				408	1,558	1,558
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES, ALL FUNDS					\$26,913	\$153,106	\$31,059

Source: Department of Finance

Teacher Credentials Fund (Credential Fees). The Teacher Credentials Fund is generated by fees for issuance of new and renewed credentials and other documents. Current law requires, as a part of the annual budget review process, the DOF to recommend to the Legislature an appropriate credential fee sufficient to generate revenues necessary to support the operating budget of the Commission plus a prudent reserve of not more than 10 percent.

In 2012-13, the CTC increased the credential fee from \$55 to \$70 due to fund instability primarily due to a decrease in credential applications. This action restored the fee to the statutory maximum. In the 2015-16 budget trailer bill, AB 104 (Committee on Budget, Chapter 13, Statutes of 2015), the credential fee was further increased to \$100 per applicant, with the additional revenue generated intended to support processing of teacher misconduct caseload.

Test Development and Administration Account (Exam Fees). The Test Development Administration Account is generated by various fees for exams administered by the CTC such as the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST), the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA), and the California Subject Examination for Teachers (CSET), the California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL), and the California Preliminary Administrative Credential Examination (CPACE). The CTC has the authority to review and approve the examination fee structure to ensure that the examination program is self-supporting. To determine fees for these testing programs, the CTC staff projects the number of exams, based upon their most recent figures, and compares these figures with projected examination program costs.

Governor's Budget Proposal:

The Governor's January proposal includes the following adjustments to the CTC's operations:

- An increase of \$2 million one-time Test Development and Administration Account to support updates to educator testing.
- An increase of \$1.3 million one-time reimbursement authority to support activities outlined in the federal Preschool Development Grant Renewal award including development of a teaching performance assessment for candidates seeking a teacher level child development permit.
- Other workload adjustments, including revenue adjustments to decreased credential and examination revenues due to COVID-19 Impacts.

The Governor's January proposal includes the following trailer bill proposals related to the work of the CTC:

- **Demonstrations of Competence for Teacher Basic Skills and Subject Matter Knowledge.** This language would expand the list of allowable exemptions from the basic skills proficiency test to include applicants that earn at least a specified grade in qualifying coursework to demonstrate subject matter proficiency or are designated proficient by a credential program. This language would also specify that the minimum requirements for a preliminary single or multiple subject teaching credential include verification of subject matter competence, though through specified means.

Suggested Questions:

- Does the CTC need additional resources to support implementation of the proposed trailer bill language? If so, has this been built in to the Governor's Budget? Or is the Administration considering for the May Revision?
- Does the Administration or the CTC have concerns about reductions in revenues due to the pandemic? Will the CTC be able to absorb any reductions, or will other solutions be needed?
- Can the CTC comment on some of the potential barriers to entry for teacher candidates that the trailer bill language appears to address? Were some of these changes considered in the past?
- Can the CTC comment on the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic that they are seeing in their various programs?

Staff Recommendation:

Hold Open

6100 DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
6360 COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING**Issue 3: Teacher Recruitment and Retention****Panel:**

- Kimberly Leahy, Department of Finance
- Dr. Mary Sandy, Executive Director, Commission on Teacher Credentialing
- Elly Garner, Department of Education
- Amy Li, Legislative Analyst's Office

Background:

Teacher shortages. In 2018-2019, California's public school system had about 295,000 full-time equivalent teachers, with a statewide student-to-teacher ratio of 21:1. However, roughly three percent of the teacher workforce (around 8,700 teachers) had an emergency credential, suggesting that school districts have trouble finding credentialed teachers. This is more common for certain subject areas, including special education, science, and math, and for certain types of schools, including low-income urban schools and rural schools.

Early retirement of teachers. The California State Teachers' Retirement System (CalSTRS) recently noted that teacher retirements have increased 26 percent during the second half of 2020 as compared to the same period in 2019¹. Of retirees surveyed by CalSTRS, 62 percent had retired earlier than planned, and 56 percent cited the challenges of teaching during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Previous state efforts to address teacher shortages. Since 2016-17, the state has spent \$190 million to address teacher shortages, outlined in the table below from the LAO. The Governor's proposal includes additional funding for three of these programs: the Teacher Residency Program, the Classified School Employees Credentialing Program, and the Golden State Teacher Grant Program (which will be discussed separately). The first two are described below:

- **Teacher Residency Program.** The Teacher Residency Grant Program funded the development, implementation, and expansion of residency programs in special education, bilingual education, and science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) fields which provided teacher candidates more support and classroom experience by teaching alongside an experienced mentor teacher. Up to \$20,000 per teacher candidate was allocated through a competitive application process to LEAs, who worked in partnership with institutions of higher learning that had teacher preparation programs. In return, the candidates supported by these grants committed to teach for the grant recipient district for at least four years after the program. The program was funded with \$75 million in 2018-19, including \$25 million for STEM and bilingual education, which was exhausted, and \$50 million for special education, of which only \$27 million was spent. The remaining \$23 million was swept in spring 2020 before a second round of funding could be allocated, although 17 LEAs had already applied. In the

¹ <https://www.calstrs.com/blog-entry/understanding-increase-teacher-retirements>

2019-20 year, 309 teachers enrolled in these programs², and 38 programs in 32 LEAs were funded. Current funding will support approved programs through June 2023.

- **Classified School Employees Credentialing Program.** This program provided financial support (up to \$4,000 per year for five years) for classified staff, such as instructional aides, to pursue their teaching credential. Classified staff at grantee LEAs who are selected to participate in the program received financial assistance for expenses such as tuition, fees, books, and examination costs; academic guidance; and other forms of individualized support to help them complete the undergraduate education, teacher preparation program, and transition to becoming credentialed teachers for the public schools.

This program was funded with \$20 million in 2016-17 and an additional \$25 million in 2017-18. The initial two rounds of funding provided enough financial assistance to support 2,260 classified employees. A total of 770 credentials have been issued to classified staff, the most common being Education Specialist (369 credentials) followed by Multiple Subject (253 credentials). 367 participants have earned a teaching credential and are now serving as a teacher. These numbers will increase as participants, who are now in the third or fourth years, complete the five-year program. The program was oversubscribed, as an additional 6,000 classified employees requested to participate, and applications from 27 school districts and COEs remain unfunded.

² https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/commission/agendas/2020-12/2020-12-2d.pdf?sfvrsn=a23028b1_2

Figure 2**State Has Provided \$190 Million Since 2016-17 to Address Teacher Shortages***General Fund Unless Otherwise Indicated (In Millions)*

Program	Year	Description	Funding Allocation	Amount
Teacher Residency Grant Program	2018-19	Supports establishing and expanding teacher residency programs in special education, STEM, and bilingual education.	CTC competitively awards grants to districts, COEs, and school-university partnerships. There are two grant types: (1) planning grants of up to \$50,000 and (2) residency grants of up to \$20,000 per resident in the new or expanded program.	\$51 ^a
Local Solution Grants	2018-19	Provided funding to local efforts to recruit and retain special education teachers.	CTC competitively awarded grants of up to \$20,000 per participant to districts, COEs, and schools. Grantees required to provide a dollar-for-dollar match.	50
Classified School Employee Teacher Credentialing Program	2016-17 and 2017-18	Provides financial assistance to classified school employees, such as instructional aides, to pursue teaching credentials.	CTC competitively awarded grants of \$4,000 per participant per year for up to five years to districts, COEs, and schools.	45
Golden State Teacher Grant Program	2020-21	Provides financial assistance to students enrolled in teacher preparation programs who commit to working in special education at a school with a high share of teachers on emergency credentials.	CSAC awards funds to participating teachers. This program was federally funded.	15 ^b
Integrated Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Grants	2016-17	Supported expanding integrated programs that allow participants to earn a bachelor's degree and a teaching credential within four years. Programs focused on special education, STEM, and bilingual education received funding priority.	CTC competitively awarded planning grants of up to \$250,000 to universities.	10
California Educator Development Program	2017-18	Assisted districts with recruiting and preparing teachers, principals, and other schools leaders.	California Center on Teaching Careers competitively awarded grants to 26 districts, COEs, and schools. This program was federally funded.	9
California Center on Teaching Careers	2016-17	Established a statewide teacher recruitment center to recruit qualified and capable individuals into the teaching field, particularly to low-income schools in special education, STEM, and bilingual education.	CTC competitively awarded grant to Tulare COE to operate center.	5
Bilingual Teacher Professional Development Program	2017-18	Supported teachers pursuing authorization to teach bilingual and multilingual classes.	CDE competitively awarded grants to eight districts and COEs.	5
			Total	\$190

^a Program initially received \$75 million. The 2020-21 Budget Act swept \$23 million in unused funds.

^b Program initially received \$90 million in 2019-20 budget, but funds were swept as part of 2020-21 budget.

STEM = science, technology, engineering, and math; CTC = Commission on Teacher Credentialing; COE = county office of education; CSAC = California Student Aid Commission; and CDE = California Department of Education.

Source: Legislative Analyst's Office

Federal relief. The March CARES Act allocated \$1.5 billion to California public schools based on numbers of low-income and disadvantaged children, which are available until September 30, 2022. The December federal aid package allocated an additional \$6 billion using the same formula, available until September 30, 2023. These funds have a broad range of allowable uses.

Governor’s Budget Proposal:

The Governor’s proposal includes the following programs and funds to recruit, retain, and support educators:

- **Teacher Residency Program.** The proposed budget includes \$100 million one-time Proposition 98 General Fund to expand the Teacher Residency Program, including establishing new programs and expanded existing programs. The proposal expands the eligible subject areas beyond special education, bilingual education, and STEM to include any other shortage area identified by CTC. Unlike previous funding, the Governor’s proposal does not allocate a specific amount of funding for each shortage area. Schools where the majority of students qualify for free or reduced lunch or schools located in either rural or densely populated regions would have priority. The proposed \$100 million allocation would support 1,000 residents each year for five years at a rate of \$20,000 per resident. Funding would be available until June 2025.
- **Classified School Employees Credentialing Program.** The proposed budget includes \$25 million one-time Proposition 98 General Fund to expand the Classified School Employees Credentialing Program, which provides grants to local educational agencies to recruit non-certificated school employees to become certificated classroom teachers. Funding would support at least an additional 1,041 participants with grants of up to \$24,000 over five years. Priority would go to LEAs that did not previously receive grants through this program.

Legislative Analyst’s Office Analysis:

Teacher Residency Programs May Improve Preparation but Are Challenging to Initiate and Sustain. Research suggests that teachers prepared through residency programs tend to feel more prepared than other beginning teachers and typically remain teaching in the same district for a longer period of time. Despite these potential benefits, however, residency programs can be difficult to develop and financially sustain. For example, the districts we spoke to mentioned they had challenges establishing a reliable partnership with the university, attracting residents due to the appeal of other preparation pathways (such as internship programs) that allow teacher candidates to earn a teaching salary while completing their program, and sustaining funding for the program after the residency grant ends. We recommend the Legislature provide \$50 million (half the amount proposed by the Governor) for new residency programs in 2021-22—roughly equivalent to the amount of funds awarded thus far. Given the challenges in building and sustaining these programs, we believe this amount is sufficient to address additional demand for new residency programs. We also believe the current program rules are more appropriately targeted than the Governor’s proposed change in addressing long-standing shortage areas. As such, we recommend the Legislature reject the proposed change to broaden the funding to other subject areas as identified by CTC.

Classified Program Is in High Demand but Is Not Targeted to Statewide Shortage Areas. The Classified Program is oversubscribed. Administrators we spoke to viewed the program as a long-term recruitment and “grow-your-own” retention strategy. Administrators also noted that, compared to the current teacher workforce, the participants in the Classified Program are more likely to be from the local community and share the same racial and ethnic backgrounds as the students they serve. However, although applicants were required to demonstrate a need for credentialed teachers in their applications, those with greater need did not receive priority in the application process. As a result, several districts participating in the program have relatively low shares of underprepared teachers. Of the 23 districts that applied individually (not part of a larger consortium), 14 had a lower percentage of teachers on emergency credentials than the statewide average. Seven districts have both lower shares of teachers on emergency credentials and lower shares of low-income students than the statewide averages. This differs from most other teacher-related state programs, which target resources to subject areas and school districts where teacher shortages are most pronounced. An evaluation of this program is expected by July 1, 2021, and CTC shared with us their intent to incorporate any notable evaluation findings into the next application process. Given the substantial demand for the Classified Program, we recommend the Legislature approve the Governor’s proposal to provide \$25 million for this program. In addition, we recommend several modifications to ensure the program is more directly targeted toward addressing teacher shortage areas. Specifically, we recommend giving priority to districts with higher shares of teachers on emergency credentials and higher shares of low-income students. After reviewing the findings of the forthcoming evaluation, the Legislature also may want to revisit program rules in subsequent years.

Recent Federal Funds Could Also Support These Activities. With a total of \$7.5 billion in flexible and locally-controlled funding available across the two federal emergency relief packages, California public schools will have significant one-time resources available to spend in 2021-22. These funds could be used to attract and retain qualified teachers through awards and bonuses, and/or support a wide variety of professional development activities, similar to the ones proposed here. The Legislature should consider whether federal funding should be used to cover these areas, and/or how the Governor’s proposals could complement these federal funds.

Suggested Questions:

- Given the one-time nature of most of these funds, can the Administration elaborate on a long-term and sustainable strategy for teacher recruitment and training?
- What is the estimated demand for the Teacher Residency program, given that the previous round was not fully exhausted? Do you expect more demand for STEM and bilingual subject areas? For the shortage area extension, does CTC have any areas in mind? Do these programs need ongoing funding, or are one-time infusions sufficient?

Staff Recommendation: Hold Open

6100 DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
6980 CALIFORNIA STUDENT AID COMMISSION

Issue 4: Golden State Teacher Program
--

Panel:

- Gabriela Chavez, Department of Finance
- Jake Brymner, California Student Aid Commission
- Elly Garner, California Department of Education
- Amy Li, Legislative Analyst's Office

Background:

Teacher shortages. In 2018-2019, California's public school system had about 295,000 full-time equivalent teachers, with a statewide student-to-teacher ratio of 21:1. However, roughly three percent of the teacher workforce (around 8,700 teachers) had an emergency credential, suggesting that school districts have trouble finding credentialed teachers. This is more common for certain subject areas, including special education, science, and math, and for certain types of schools, including low-income urban schools and rural schools.

Early retirement of teachers. The California State Teachers' Retirement System (CalSTRS) recently noted that teacher retirements have increased 26 percent during the second half of 2020 as compared to the same period in 2019³. Of retirees surveyed by CalSTRS, 62 percent had retired earlier than planned, and 56 percent cited the challenges of teaching during the COVID-19 pandemic. Grant programs like this have been shown to be effective at recruiting teachers into high-need schools⁴.

Golden State Teacher Grant Program. This program was funded with \$15 million in federal funding, after the planned allocation of \$90 million in the 2019-20 budget was swept in spring 2020. Grants of \$20,000 were provided to students in teacher preparation programs who committed to working for at least four years in special education at a school with a high share of teachers with emergency credentials. CSAC reported receiving approximately 380 applications from students indicating they will pursue a credential in special education. They will be accepting applications through the rest of the year, but they are unlikely to use all \$15 million. These grants have not yet been disbursed.

Governor's Budget Proposal:

The Governor's proposal includes \$100 million one-time non-Proposition 98 General Fund for continued investment in the Golden State Teacher Grant Program. There are two main changes compared to the previous version of this program. First, this proposal expands the definition of high-

³ <https://www.calstrs.com/blog-entry/understanding-increase-teacher-retirements>

⁴ <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/how-effective-are-loan-forgiveness-and-service-scholarships-recruiting-teachers>

needs field from just special education to include bilingual education, STEM, and multiple subject instruction. Second, a priority school would now be defined as one that has at least 55 percent unduplicated pupil rate as defined through the Local Control Funding Formula, which includes students who are English language learners, qualify for free or reduced lunch, and/or are foster youth, as the previous definition (based on emergency credentialed teachers) was unstable. After accounting for funding that can be used for administration and outreach, the proposed funding would support up to 4,925 grants.

Legislative Analyst's Office Analysis:

Impact of Golden State Teacher Grant Remains Unknown, Could Be Limited. At the time of this analysis, the first round of Golden State Teacher Grants had not been awarded. As such, the state cannot yet measure the effect of the program on teacher supply. Several programmatic elements of the grants, however, could limit their effects. Although teacher candidates agree to teach in a low-income school to receive funding, there is no guarantee they will ultimately teach at a low-income school. For instance, the teacher candidate may not be able to secure employment at a low-income school due to reasons beyond their control. Furthermore, there is no guarantee the teacher candidates would repay grant funding if they are unable to meet the program requirements. Moreover, the effectiveness of this grant as a recruitment incentive is limited. For example, it is possible that the program might provide grants to some teachers who would have taught at a low-income school even without the grant.

The LAO further recommends:

Reject Golden State Teacher Grant Proposal. We recommend the Legislature reject the Governor's proposal to augment the Golden State Teacher Grant Program. Given that the first round of grant funding has not yet been allocated in the current year, the effect of the program on teacher supply remains uncertain. Moreover, by mainly focusing on teacher candidates still in preparation programs prior to securing a teaching job, the proposal cannot guarantee that grant funds will effectively address recruitment challenges in low-income schools. Furthermore, the low-income schools intended to benefit from this program have access to significant one-time federal funding that provides broader flexibility to address these long-standing recruitment challenges. Should the Legislature be interested in incentive funding for teachers, we suggest focusing efforts on expanding the total supply of teachers in shortage areas. For instance, the Legislature could instead consider targeting funding to expand enrollment in the integrated teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate level. Many other states currently offer this route into teaching. Under this approach, the state could increase the total supply of teachers by encouraging more undergraduate students to pursue teaching in a high-need subject when they might have otherwise pursued another profession.

Suggested Questions:

- How much of the original \$15 million is expected to be left over?
- Does the Administration anticipate higher demand in the expanded target areas? How much overall demand does the Administration anticipate?
- How will the teaching requirement work, in terms of ensuring grantees do teach at target schools and tracking their progress? What is the anticipated proportion of grantees that will not complete the four year teaching requirement?

Staff Recommendation: Hold Open.

6100 DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Issue 5: Professional Development Proposals

Panel:

- Kimberly Leahy, Department of Finance
- Elly Garner, Department of Education
- Amy Li, Legislative Analyst's Office

Background:

Professional development for teachers. Professional development is typically controlled and funded at the local level, using general purpose funding. The federal government also provides California with \$210 million annually to support teacher professional development. The state also provides some funding for specific trainings and curriculum development for teacher training, including:

- *Educator Effectiveness Block Grants.* In 2015, \$490 million in one-time Prop 98 funding was provided for Educator Effectiveness Block Grants. The funding was allocated to LEAs in an equal amount per full-time equivalent certified staff. LEAs had flexibility to use these grants on a number of professional development activities, such as mentoring, coaching, and trainings. CDE allocated funds for nearly 294,000 full time equivalent educators, while LEAs reported providing professional development for nearly 1.1 million educators. LEAs were able to spend this money through July 2018.
- *Subject Matter Projects at the University of California.* The University of California receives \$7.6 million ongoing (state and federal funds) to support professional development in core subject areas through the Subject Matter Projects. There are currently nine projects: arts, global education, history-social science, mathematics, physical education-health, reading & literature, science, world languages, and writing. For each project, there is a statewide office, and regional sites that host professional learning programs in their areas. In 2018-19, approximately 25,000 educators from more than 1,200 school districts attended California Subject Matter Project programming.
- *California Early Math Initiative.* The 2018 Budget Act included funds available through 2020-21 to develop resources and implement professional development for pre-K through grade 3 educators. These funds have been used to build educator knowledge, enthusiasm, and comfort in teaching math, as well as to provide coaching on math strategies. Through 30 different organizations, over 1,400 educators participated in the initiative.

Learning loss and student re-engagement after distance learning. Although it is difficult to measure, students have likely not learned as much during the past year as they would have in a normal year. This “learning loss” has disproportionately affected students in earlier grades and students who are low-income or English language learners⁵. Ensuring that these students do not fall behind permanently poses a significant challenge to educators as schools move towards reopening.

⁵ <https://edpolicyinca.org/newsroom/covid-19-and-educational-equity-crisis>

MTSS and SUMS. Multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS) refers to integrated support for social-emotional, academic, and behavioral needs of all students at the school and district level. In April 2016, Orange County Department of Education, in partnership with Butte County Office of Education and other partner organizations, was awarded a large grant to implement MTSS statewide, an effort called Scale Up MTSS Statewide (SUMS). This provides a process for Local Education Agencies (LEA) to assess their strengths, coordinate supports to their Local Control Accountability Plans (LCAP), and align their MTSS efforts with the state priority areas⁶. Since 2015, the state has provided \$45 million for the SUMS initiative.

Governor's Budget Proposal:

- **Educator Effectiveness Block Grants.** The proposed budget includes \$250 million one-time Proposition 98 General Fund for a new Educator Effectiveness Block Grant to provide LEAs with flexible resources to expedite professional development for teachers, administrators, and other in-person staff. This would be similar to the 2015-16 program, but with a new focus on areas that are immediately relevant given COVID-19, distance learning, student and staff stress and anxiety, and social equity issues. These high-need areas including accelerated learning, re-engaging students, restorative practices, and implicit bias training. Funds could be used through the 23-24 school year. DOF estimates a funding allocation for approximately 300,000 certificated staff, which would provide around \$833 per full time equivalent educator.
- **Professional Development in Social-Emotional Learning.** The proposed budget includes \$50 million one-time Proposition 98 General Fund to create statewide resources and provide targeted professional development on social-emotional learning and trauma-informed practices. This includes:
 - \$30 million for grants to LEAs to implement services or practices aligned with the MTSS framework developed under the SUMS project, with a focus on addressing the mental health and social and emotional needs of students who have been adversely impacted by the pandemic response. These funds could be used for a variety of purposes related to training and implementing the MTSS framework and practices at the school and district level. Priority would go to LEAs with a high number of unduplicated pupils, as defined through the Local Control Funding Formula.
 - \$20 million to build the state's capacity to support LEAs in several key areas, including social emotional learning, by creating a centralized set of resources, providing ongoing training and coaching, etc. This would be managed by the Orange County Department of Education, the Butte County Office of Education, and contracted partners.
- **California Early Math Initiative.** The Governor's proposed budget includes \$8.3 million one-time Proposition 98 General Fund for the California Early Math Initiative to provide teachers with professional development in mathematics teaching strategies for young children pre-K through third grade through the statewide system of support. The funding would be available over three years. Additional funding could also support state-level capacity to broaden the

⁶ <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/statepriorityresources.asp>

reach of the Early Math Initiative among California State Preschool and other programs across the state.

- **UC Subject Matter Project on Learning Loss.** The proposed budget includes \$7 million one-time non-Proposition 98 General Fund to the University of California Subject Matter Projects to create high-quality professional development. \$5 million would go to a project on learning loss in core subject matter content areas like reading and math and \$2 million would go to a project on ethnic studies.
- **Ethnic Studies Professional Development.** The proposed budget includes \$5 million one-time Proposition 98 General Fund to fund professional development and instructional materials for local educational agencies who are offering, or would like to offer, courses on ethnic studies.

Legislative Analyst's Office Analysis:

Recent Federal Funds Could Also Support These Activities. With a total of \$7.5 billion in flexible and locally controlled funding available across the two federal emergency relief packages, California public schools will have significant one-time resources available to spend in 2021-22. These funds could be used to attract and retain qualified teachers through awards and bonuses, and/or support a wide variety of professional development activities, similar to the ones proposed here. The Legislature should consider whether federal funding should be used to cover these areas, and/or how the Governor's proposals could complement these federal funds.

Most Targeted Proposals Are Addressing Specific Gaps in Training. Given most decisions about professional development are made locally, we think directing most professional development funding to districts makes sense. To the extent the Legislature wants to dedicate state-level funding to develop additional training resources, we think it should consider whether the additional resources are addressing existing gaps in training. Most of the targeted proposals in the Governor's budget address existing gaps. The Early Math Initiative, for example, provides training resources in an area where relatively few training resources exist. Providing training on the forthcoming ethnic studies model curriculum is reasonable, given elements of the guidance will be new to schools. We are less clear, however, on how the funding for Subject Matter Projects would address existing gaps. The proposal includes \$5 million for learning recovery in core subject areas, but it is unclear how this would differ from other training currently provided through the program. Furthermore, the \$2 million provided to the Subject Matter Projects for ethnic studies appears duplicative of the Governor's other proposal on ethnic studies.

Consider Requiring Clear Deliverables and Expectations Tied With Funding for Targeted Proposals. The Governor's budget includes very few details on the deliverables and expected activities to be funded under the subject-specific proposals. For instance, the Early Math Initiative proposal does not specify the types of activities to be supported with additional funding. The Subject Matter Projects proposal does not clarify how the proposed one-time augmentation would be used differently than ongoing funding currently provided to the program. The proposed funding for social-emotional learning also lacks detail regarding the level of support this funding would provide for schools. The Legislature may want to establish a clear set of deliverables and expectations for each proposal that is approved to ensure funds are spent as intended and achieve the desired outcomes.

Suggested Questions:

- What is the relationship between the Subject Matter Projects and the related professional development funding? For example, the \$5 million for ethnic studies PD and the \$2 million for a Subject Matter Project in ethnic studies?
- Can you elaborate on what the Early Math Initiative funding would be used for? Does the program need ongoing, instead of one-time, funding?
- How does the Administration intend to use federal funds to complement these programs?

Staff Recommendation:

Hold Open

Issue 6: Community Schools Grant Program

Panel:

- Liz Mai, Department of Finance
- Elly Garner, Department of Education
- Michael Alferes, Legislative Analyst Office

Background:

The final 2020-21 Budget Act authorized the California Community Schools Partnership Program grants and appropriated \$45 million in one-time federal relief aid from the Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief Fund, with the intent to support existing Community School models during the COVID-19 pandemic. School districts, county offices of education, and charter schools, excluding non-classroom-based charter schools, are eligible to apply for the Program, and awards are expected in February 2021. According to CDE and the Budget Act, grant funding may be used for any of the following purposes:

- Expanding and sustaining existing community schools
- Coordinating and providing health, mental health, and pupil support services to pupils and families at community schools
- Providing training and support to local educational agencies (LEAs) personnel to help develop best practices for integrating pupil supports.

Applicants are also required to include four key pillars in their community school model, which are aligned and integrated into high-quality, rigorous teaching and learning practices and environments:

- Integrated support services;
- Family and community engagement;
- Collaborative leadership and practices for educators and administrators; and
- Extended learning time and opportunities.

In addition, CDE recommends that an LEA application should also include strategies to address learning loss and support student-centered learning, based on research findings outlined as ‘the science of learning and development.’ These include, but are not limited to, the following: student engagement, social-emotional learning, trauma-informed approaches, peer-to-peer support, positive school climate, and ‘just-in-time’ academic and social-emotional supports. According to CDE, 102 LEAs have applied for this program, for a total of \$167.5 million in funding.

Trailer legislation adopted as part of the 2020-21 budget package allows the State Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI) to set aside one percent of the funding (\$450,000) to provide technical assistance to potential applicants, as well as provide program oversight and technical assistance to grantees. As part of the oversight, this funding can also be used toward the comprehensive report that the SPI must provide to the Governor and the Legislature by 2025.

Prior Community School Investments. The Healthy Start Support Services for Children Act (Healthy Start Initiative) was established in 1991 through SB 620, and provided comprehensive, school-community integrated services and activities to improve the lives of children, youth, and

families. The services included health, dental, and vision care; mental health counseling; family support and parenting education; academic support; health education; safety education and violence prevention; youth development; employment preparation; and others—serving as the seed funding for most existing Community School models in California. The Healthy Start Initiative provided grants to local education agency partnerships for program development and implementation. Schools with 50 percent of the students eligible for free and reduced meals in the lower grades, and 35 percent eligible in middle through high schools were eligible for the competitive grant. In addition, English learners were a targeted population. Planning, operational, and combined grants that included planning and implementation activities were awarded to local educational agencies and their collaborative partners for locally coordinated, school-linked services. The Healthy Start Initiative was designed to do the following:

- Ensure that each child receives the physical, emotional, and intellectual support that he or she needs—in school, at home, and in the community—to learn well.
- Build the capacity of students and parents to be participants, leaders, and decision-makers in their communities.
- Help schools and other child and family-serving agencies to recognize, streamline and integrate their programs to provide more effective support to children and their families.

The CDE administered Healthy Start and awarded two-year planning, five year operational, and seven-year combined planning and operational grants to LEAs. Healthy Start developed community partnerships with public and private partners to deliver coordinated physical and mental health services to children and their families. These services were provided to students at the school site or at other district locations. After the Healthy Start grants expired, LEAs were expected to sustain the partnerships, programs, and services through other funding sources. State funding for the Healthy Start Initiative funding was eliminated in 2007. Some community school models found other funding sources to maintain services, including MediCal LEA billing (MAA), local First 5 funding, and other local health and community partnership funding. A total of 823 Healthy Start planning grants, 651 operational grants, and 19 combined grants were awarded during the Initiative's existence, impacting over 1,500 school sites.

Governor's Budget Proposal:

The January Budget provides an additional \$265.2 million in one-time Proposition 98 General Fund to provide additional grants through the Community Schools Grant program, as authorized in the 2020-21 Budget Act, and would expand the program to support the establishment of new community schools in addition to expanding and enhancing existing community school models.

Applicants would be prioritized using the same criteria as in the first round. Under the Governor's proposal, the new round of grants would be available until June 30, 2026—providing grantees about four years to spend the funding. In contrast, grantees receiving awards in the current year have about a year and a half to spend the funds. As with the first round of funding, the SPI can set aside up to one percent of the total funding proposed (\$2.7 million) to provide technical assistance to potential applicants and oversight and technical assistance to grantees. Grantees awarded funding under this second round of grants would also be evaluated as part of the SPI's comprehensive report required in the first round of grants.

Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) Analysis:

Community Schools Are Associated With Improved Outcomes... Formal evaluations of community schools tend to find positive results for student and school outcomes, such as higher attendance and graduation rates, narrower academic achievement gaps as measured by standardized tests, and decreases in instances of disciplinary incidents. By prioritizing grants for high-poverty schools, the proposal prioritizes the grants for LEAs that would most benefit from implementing such a model. In turn, these LEAs would be able to provide comprehensive services and supports for their high-needs students.

...But Implementation Can Be Challenging. Although adopting a community schools model can lead to improved outcomes, particularly for disadvantaged students with the greatest needs, successful adoption requires fundamental changes that can be a complicated for LEAs to implement. Experts say the following elements are critical for successful implementation:

- ***Community Partnerships.*** The lead educational agency behind the implementation of a successful community school may spend a year or more developing its implementation strategy before putting it into action, as well as establishing strong relationships with potential service providers and community partners.
- ***Funding.*** Community schools typically require a variety of long-term funding streams. This can include public funding sources, such as reimbursement for health care services from Medi-Cal, as well as private philanthropic support. Because community schools frequently rely on philanthropic support, establishing a sustainable community school in a region where relatively few nonprofits or private foundations operate may be more difficult.
- ***Support.*** Researchers emphasize that successfully implementing the community school model requires a substantial amount of technical assistance—sometimes over the course of several years. LEAs without prior experience operating community schools may need help learning how to develop external partnerships, collaborate with other public agencies, identify ongoing funding streams, and rebuild existing governance structures to align with the community schools model.

Technical Assistance for First Round Still Being Developed. With the exception of hosting webinars to inform potential applicants about the grant, CDE has not yet provided technical assistance to applicants or grantees. Rather, CDE has indicated they are in conversation with one of their existing technical assistance contractors to begin providing assistance to the first round of community school grantees, as well as to complete the required report to the Legislature. As part of these conversations, CDE expects to come to an agreement on the specific technical assistance the partner will conduct.

Second Round of Grantees Will Likely Need Greater Support. Given CDE does not yet have a plan for providing technical assistance to the first round of grantees, it is not possible to determine whether the level of technical assistance is sufficient to help grantees successfully expand their community schools programs. The first round of grantees, however, were LEAs with existing community schools that were likely to have already conducted some of the more challenging aspects of implementing a community schools model, such as developing partnerships and conducting a community needs assessment. By contrast, the second round of grantees will include LEAs that are new to the community schools model. They are likely to need more support during the application process and

after receiving a grant award. Since existing community schools already provide some level of services and supports to their students, we think the proposed grant program would have the greatest statewide benefit if it provided sufficient support to address the needs of LEAs that do not currently have a community schools model.

Prioritization Favors Applicants With Existing Community Schools. The Governor’s proposal would create one application process that would include LEAs interested in establishing new community schools, as well as those interested in expanding their existing community schools. In addition, the proposal requires the SPI to prioritize applicants that have taken initial steps to implement a community schools model, such as partnering with other agencies and creating a long-term plan for financially sustaining their community schools when grant funds expire. This prioritization criteria would likely work against new programs and result in existing programs receiving the bulk of new grant funds. This would limit the effectiveness of the grant program in expanding the community schools model to benefit a greater number of students across state

The LAO recommends the following:

Set Specific Expectations for Technical Assistance. Given the need for technical assistance in developing a successful community schools model—particularly for those establishing new community schools—we recommend the Legislature modify the proposal to set clear and specific expectations for the type of technical assistance that prospective applicants and grantees will receive. At a minimum, we recommend the state technical assistance be available to assist schools with (1) conducting a community needs assessment, (2) improving community engagement, (3) creating community partnerships, and (4) developing sustainable funding sources. We recommend the assistance be available for prospective applicants and grant recipients. CDE could contract with one or more entities with expertise in these areas to ensure sufficient capacity to support all interested LEAs. Clear expectations for technical assistance would particularly be beneficial for interested applicants that have less experience with implementing the community schools model.

Consider Increasing Set-Aside for Technical Assistance. To the extent the specific technical assistance requirements listed above would require spending more than 1 percent of the total grant, the Legislature could consider increasing the amount that can be set aside for technical assistance. The proposed new grant would provide about \$2.7 million for technical assistance that could be spent over four years—\$662,000 per year. This is somewhat higher than the \$450,000 available over one year under the first round of grants. To assess whether that amount is sufficient, the Legislature could ask CDE to report in the spring on whether the amount of technical assistance available in the current year has been sufficient to address the needs of the first round of grantees.

Modify Grant Process to Benefit New Programs. To ensure grants are awarded to applicants interested in establishing new community schools, we recommend the Legislature modify the proposal to split funding into two separate grants—one for those seeking to expand existing community schools and one for applicants seeking to establish new community schools. This approach would expand the model more equitably across the state and ensure funding can benefit communities that do not currently have the capacity to provide more comprehensive services to their students. To provide additional support for LEAs interested in establishing new community schools, the Legislature also could consider pushing back the application deadline for those seeking to establish new programs to later in the fiscal year. This would give LEAs more time to seek technical assistance and develop partnerships prior to the applications deadline.

Suggested Questions:

- How did the Administration determine the amount of funding for this grant program?
- How are successful community school models sustained over time and are any lessons from these built in to the current grant program?
- Who are the partners that CDE is working with to provide technical assistance to grantees from the first round of funding? Was their input used in developing this grant proposal?

Staff Recommendation: Hold Open

Issue 7: Other Budget and Trailer Bill Proposals

Panel:

- Melissa Ng, Department of Finance
- Michael Alferes, Legislative Analyst's Office
- Elly Garner, Department of Education

Governor's Budget Proposals:

The Governor's January proposal also includes the following funding proposals:

- \$3.1 million in one-time federal funds for the Standardized Account Code Structure System. This funds the next phase of a multi-year project to replace and update this system for tracking and reporting of funds.
- \$4 million in one-time General Fund for the Special Olympics of Northern and Southern California. These funds support various programs and would be available for expenditure through 2023-24.

Governor's Budget Trailer Bill Proposals:

The Governor's January proposal also includes the following trailer bill proposals:

- **AB 1200 Clean-up for County Offices of Education.** This language would make technical clarifying changes to process by which county office of education budgets are certified and overseen by the Superintendent of Public Instruction.
- **Revising Repayment Terms for Funds Owed to the School Facilities Program.** This language would change the maximum repayment period for funds owed by districts to the School Facilities Program from 5 years to 20 years, aligning with the repayment period for repaying emergency apportionments. In addition, this language updates the requirements to repayment of funds not expended in accordance with the terms of the School Facilities Program to include funds from the 2006 and 2016 State School Facilities Funds
- **School District Lapsation Process.** This language provides for additional control over the lapsation process at the local level, allowing lapsation to occur upon resolution of the local governing board of the school district with written concurrence of the county superintendent.
- **Adult Students in Charter Schools Program.** This language would narrow the eligibility for charter schools to enroll adult students in their programs and receive state funding. Additional reporting would also be required of charter schools operating these models. Schools previously serving adult students in 2019-20 would be grandfathered in at their 2019-20 funding level. Staff notes that a related proposal was made by the Governor in the past budget cycle, and was withdrawn by the Administration for future discussion.

- **Alignment of Distance Learning Attendance and Record-Keeping Penalties.** This language would revise the calculation of penalties associated with distance learning attendance to reflect penalties only for the specific number of days out of compliance with requirements.
- **School District Hold Harmless Language.** Adjustments to funding calculations for Pioneer Union School District and Paradise Unified School District to provide funding relief related to natural disasters.
- **Net Charter Shift Proposal.** This language suspends the calculation of allocating charter school average daily attendance (ADA) to a sponsoring school district in the 2021-22 fiscal year, to conform to other ADA changes made during the pandemic.
- **Charter Mid-Year Closure.** This language would allow the Superintendent of Public Instruction to reduce funding apportioned for charter schools that close during the 2020-21 school year if the school operated for 175 days or less.
- Other technical language changes.

Suggested Questions:

- Can the Administration share the process for determining which LEAs need additional support related to natural disasters or other extenuating circumstances? Will the Administration be considering assistance for other LEAs?
- How does the Administration's proposal for adults in charter schools differ from previous proposals? How does this proposal interact with the adult education program?

Staff Recommendation:

Hold Open