SANTA ANA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
1601 EAST CHESTNUT AVENUE
SANTA ANA, CA 92701

SPECIAL BOARD STUDY SESSION

A Special Board Study Session of the Santa Ana Unified School District Board of Education will convene at Santa Ana Unified School District, 1601 E. Chestnut Ave., Santa Ana, California, in the Board Room/Executive Conference Room, located on the First Floor at 4:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m., Tuesday, August 20, 2013.

TELECONFERENCE – CECILIA “CECI” IGLESIAS
Champions World Resort
8660 West Irlo Bronson Memorial Highway
Kissimmee, Florida 34747

AGENDA

4:30 P.M. CALL TO ORDER

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

PRESENTATION/DISCUSSION

• California Office of Reform Education (CORE) Overview

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS (Pursuant to Government Code 54954.3)

• Individuals or groups may make presentations or bring matters to the Board's attention that are within the Board's subject matter jurisdiction.

RECESS TO CLOSED SESSION (NOT OPEN TO PUBLIC)
CLOSED SESSION AGENDA

A. With respect to every item of business to be discussed, The Board of Education will meet in Closed Session as provided by California Government Code Section 54957 to consider:

1.1 Public Employment – Chief of School Police Services

1.2 Public Employee Appointment – Superintendent Selection

Pursuant to Government Code Section 54953 (3), one member will be participating by teleconference at the following address: Champions World Resort, 8660 West Irlo Bronson Memorial Highway, Kissimmee, Florida 34747.

ADJOURNMENT

FUTURE MEETING: The next Regular Meeting of the Board of Education will be held on Tuesday, August 27, 2013, at 6:00 p.m.
AGENDA ITEM BACKUP SHEET
August 20, 2013

Board Meeting

TITLE: California Office to Reform Education (CORE) Overview

ITEM: Presentation
SUBMITTED BY: Michelle Rodriguez, Ed.D., Chief Academic Officer
PREPARED BY: Michelle Rodriguez, Ed.D., Chief Academic Officer

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The purpose of this agenda item is to present to the Board an overview of the California Office to Reform Education (CORE) as administration plans to implement the waiver. The three key principles of the CORE waiver include college and career ready expectations for all students, State-developed differentiated recognition, accountability and support, and supporting effective instruction and leadership.

RATIONALE:

The CORE waiver relieves Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) from requirements of Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) to implement currently required improvement actions, allow LEA flexibility in how it uses its Title I and Title II funds, allow priority or focus schools to operate a school-wide program, even if it does not meet the 40% threshold level, and permit LEAs to serve with Title I funds a Title I eligible-priority school with a graduation rate below 60%. In addition, the collaboration of districts will work together to innovate, implement, and scale new strategies and tools that help California students succeed so that school districts are improved to meet the challenges of the 21st Century.

FUNDING:

Not Applicable

RECOMMENDATION:

Presented for information.
California Office to Reform Education (CORE) Overview

Charles E. McCully, Interim Superintendent
Michelle Rodriguez, Ed.D., Chief Academic Officer
August 20, 2013
Presentation Highlights

• Overview of the Waiver Process
• Discuss the Three Key Principles of the CORE waiver
  – College and Career Ready Expectations for All Students
  – State-Developed Differentiated Recognition, Accountability and Support
  – Supporting Effective Instruction and Leadership
• Connection of Three Key Principles to SAUSD efforts
• Discuss Next Steps
School Quality Improvement System Overview

USED offers a waiver for ESEA requirements; California is one of five states that does not have an approved ESEA Flexibility Waiver or one under review.

Source: USED

[Map of the United States showing states approved for ESEA flexibility (n=37, DC) and states with ESEA flexibility requests under review (n=8, PR, BIE).]

Superior Standards
Supportive School Climate
Successful Students

Source: USED
Why Do States Apply for a Waiver?

- Relieve Local Educational Agency (LEA) from the requirements of ESEA to implement currently required improvement actions
- Allow LEA flexibility in how it uses its Title I and Title II funds—Flexible use of 20% Title I set aside—approximately $3 Million
- Lift the limits on the amount of funds an LEA may transfer from certain ESEA programs to other ESEA programs
- Allow priority or focus schools to operate a school-wide program even if it doesn’t meet the 40% threshold level
- Permit the LEA to serve with Title I funds a Title I eligible priority school with a graduation rate below 60%
Title I Set Asides

Large Categories of Allowable Title I Expenditures
In Descending Order

1. School Interventions for:
   - Priority
   - Focus
   - Other Title I Schools
   - Low-Achieving Student Groups (SWD, ELL, low-achieving)
2. Support for school partnering teams – Priority, Focus (optional)
3. Support for communities of practice
4. Waiver implementation at the LEA level
5. Extended learning time including but not limited to before, after school and summer learning program
6. CCSS implementation and assessment transition in Title I schools
   - Extending STEM programs in Title I schools
7. Stakeholder outreach and Parent/Guardian engagement
8. Transportation to support school-choice (if district chooses)
## Principle #1: College and Career Ready Expectations for All Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Principle</th>
<th>Overview</th>
<th>Link to SAUSD Programs and Initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College-and Career-Ready Expectations for All Students</td>
<td>Districts will transition to and implement no later than the 2013-2014 school year college-and career-ready standards in at least language arts and mathematics. Use of assessments aligned with SBAC</td>
<td>Use of CLAS teachers to provide job embedded coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development of units of study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development of Assessment Transition Plan and changes to district-wide assessments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2013-14 Implementation Plan

SAUSD's 2013-2014 Common Core Implementation

K-12 Foundation

- Summer 2013: Writing teams will develop additional units of study with Spec Ed addendums and curriculum maps in identified courses
- CCSS Math Institute for Grades 4 & 8

Elementary

- Oct-Dec 2013: K-3: Train and implement revised Fall Common Core Unit of Study
- 4-5: Train and implement revised Fall Common Core Unit of Study

Secondary

- Semester One: Implement unit of study developed by summer writing teams

- Dec 2013-May 2014: Establish key strategies and elements of CCSS to use in both core and non-core classrooms. Key strategies will be determined by individual departments

- Dec 2013-June 2014: Integrate Anthology Alignment Project to implement ELA selections with text-dependent questions and development of academic language (Tier II and Tier III words)

- May-June 2014: K-3: Implement revised Spring Common Core Unit of Study
- 4-5: Implement revised Spring Common Core Unit of Study

- Semester Two: Implement revised Spring Common Core Units of Study

- Dec 2013-June 2014: All K-12 Staff will complete all six activities in Collaborative Conversations Professional Learning Module
- Sept 2013-June 2014: CLAS teachers will provide job embedded coaching and support

- Sept 2013-Jan 2014: Grade Level Leaders and Department Chairs will provide input on changes to District-wide assessments to mirror SBAC
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Assessment Transition Plan

Current Status 2012-2013
- Common assessments developed by individual schools, departments or grade levels with individually created items
- Use of progress monitoring tools to monitor student progress

Transition Phase 2013-2014
- Update current common assessments developed at each site. Develop with teacher leaders and/or obtain SBAC aligned, vetted items to be used for 2014-2015 school year
- Use of progress monitoring tools to monitor student progress

Aligned SBAC Assessments 2014-2015
- Common assessments developed by individual schools, departments or grade levels from SBAC aligned, vetted item bank
- Use of progress monitoring tools to monitor student progress

Getting to the Core
- Formative
  - Benchmarks provided at various times in the school year and intended to be aligned with the pacing guide.
  - Performance based assessments in units of study (1-2 per year)
  - Universal screening in reading grades K-5
  - District-wide writing assessments

- Interim
  - Universal screening in reading Grades K-6 (computer adaptive grades 3-6)
  - District-wide writing assessments linked to texts and tasks
  - Assessment of Language Development (Grades K-5 ELs only)

- Summative
  - State and Federally required assessments including STAR Assessments (including CST, CAHSEE, 4th and 7th grade writing etc.), and CELDT

- Interim comprehensive assessments aligned to SBAC and CCSS—2-3 per yr
- Performance based assessments in units of study (2-3 per year) with expectations of technology use such as use of navigational and productivity tools required by SBAC
- Universal screening in reading Grades K-6 (computer adaptive grades 3-6)
- District-wide writing assessments linked to texts and tasks
- Assessment of Language Development (Grades K-5 ELs only)

Superior Standards

Successful Students

Supportive School Climate
# Principle #2: State-Developed Differentiated Recognition, Accountability and Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Principle</th>
<th>Overview</th>
<th>Link to SAUSD Programs and Initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State-Developed Differentiated Recognition, Accountability and Support</td>
<td>Data will be collected to hold LEAs accountable both to themselves and others as they develop cross-LEA collaborative relationships. Schools can be classified as either schools of distinction, priority schools or focus schools. There is recognition of both the importance of academic preparedness and measures of students’ social-emotional development and the critical role of a school’s culture and climate</td>
<td>Development of District’s Key Performance Indicators highlighted in Strategic Plan Focus on school climate through the implementation of PBIS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**CORE Differentiated Accountability for 2013-14 School Year**

- **Superior Standards**
- **Supportive School Climate**
- **Successful Students**

**2013-2014**

Begin collecting social-emotional and culture/climate data for baseline

---

### Academic Domain

- **High School**
  - Performance: 33%
  - Growth: 33%
  - Grad Rate (HS): 33%

- **Intermediate**
  - Performance: 33%
  - Growth: 33%

- **Elementary**
  - Performance: 50%
  - Growth: 50%

### Social-Emotional Factors

- Absentee Rate
- Suspension/Expulsion Rate

### Culture and Climate Factors

- Student/Staff/Parent Surveys
- Special Ed Identification
- ELL Re-designation Rate

### Non-Cognitive Skills

- Persistence Rate (enrollment in 10th Grade)

---

**Factors to be collected this year, but will not be included in accountability calculation. Data collected will be used as baseline to set targets for following years**

---

**Note:** Growth will be measured as whether or not a district met their API target; CORE will either implement independently, or implement PARCC.
Differentiated Accountability

2014-2015

School Quality Improvement Index
100%

Academic Domain
60%

Social-Emotional Factors
20%

Culture and Climate Factors
20%

Performance 30%
Growth

Grad Rate (HS) 30%
Persistence Rate (enrollment in 10th Grade) 30%

Absentee Rate XX%
Suspension/Expulsion Rate XX%
Non-Cognitive Skills XX%

Student/Staff/Parent Surveys XX%
Special Ed Identification XX%
ELL Re-designation Rate XX%

Performance 30%
Growth

High
Performance 30%
Growth

Middle
Performance 60%
Growth

Elem.

2014-2015 will be a baseline year for collecting SBAC data thus growth data will not be included

Use SBAC assessments and new social-emotional and culture/climate scores. Growth excluded because Year 1 of SBAC

Note: If California delays SBAC implementation, CORE will either implement independently, or implement PARCC
Differentiated Accountability

2015-16 and Beyond

School Quality Improvement Index

Academic Domain
- Performance 20%
- Growth 20%

Social-Emotional Factors
- Absentee Rate XX%
- Suspension/Expulsion Rate XX%

Culture and Climate Factors
- Student/Staff/Parent Surveys XX%

Getting to the Core

High
- Performance 20%
- Growth 20%
- Grad Rate (HS) 20%

Middle
- Performance 20%
- Growth 20%
- Persistence Rate (enrollment in 10th Grade) 20%

Elem.
- Performance 30%
- Growth 30%

Non-Cognitive Skills XX%
ELL Re-designation Rate XX%

Superior Standards
Supportive School Climate
Successful Students

Note: If California delays SBAC implementation, CORE will either implement independently, or implement PARCC
The National Academy of Sciences has categorized essential 21\textsuperscript{st} Century skills into three categories:

- **Cognitive domain**: intellectual ability, knowledge, cognitive strategies, and creativity
- **Intrapersonal domain**: work ethic, conscientiousness, self-evaluation, mindset, perseverance, metacognition, intellectual openness, curiosity
- **Interpersonal domain**: teamwork, collaboration, leadership, communication, conflict resolution, empathy
The CORE Waiver Oversight Panel will render decisions on compliance for LEA inclusion/exclusion in the waiver based on peer and self evaluation inputs.

Criteria Reviewed by Oversight Panel

Peer review report

District self-evaluation report

Peer review process

District self-evaluation process

Compliance panel will determine:
1) Administrative discipline
2) Escalation path
3) Final decision on inclusion/exclusion from waiver

1. ACSA Appointee
2. CSBA Appointee
3. CCSEA Appointee
4. CDE Appointee
5. State Board Appointee
6. Governor’s Appointee
7. CTA Appointee
8. PTA Appointee
9. Civil Rights Representative Appointees
10. EdTrust Appointee
11. Non-Supt. California Collaborative Appointee
12. CORE Board Appointed Higher Education Researcher (non-LEA)
13. Students with Disabilities Representative Appointee
14. English Language Learners Representative Appointee
Differentiated Accountability with CORE

**Reward Schools**

**Highest Performing**
- At least 10% of Title 1 schools
- Highest-Performing Schools:
  - Top 30% of schools based on performance in 2010-2012 based on 2012 graduation rates
  - Must have the highest graduation rates
  - Must be making AYP for “all students” and all subgroups
  - Cannot have significant achievement gaps that are not closing

**High-Progress**
- At least 10% of Title 1 schools
- High-Progress Reward Schools:
  - Are among the top 10% of CORE schools in improving performance over a number of years
  - Top 30% most improved graduation rate
  - The lowest performing subgroup in each school has improved by at least 5% since 2010

**Focus Schools**
- At least 5% of Title 1 schools
- Focus Schools must include:
  - Any high schools with <60% graduation rates not designated a Priority School
  - Title 1 schools with the largest within-school achievement gaps in performance or graduation rates
  - A Title 1 school with at least 1 low performing subgroup over a number of years

**Priority Schools**
- A Priority School must be one of the following:
  - A currently-served Title 1 and non-Title 1 SIG School
  - Title 1 eligible or participating school with <60% graduation over a number of years
  - Among the lowest 5% of schools in CORE based on student achievement in the “all students” group

---

**Superior Standards**

**Supportive School Climate**

**Successful Students**

Note: CORE has defined “a number of years” as 3 years.
Source: U.S. Department of Education
# Reward, Focus, and Priority Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clovis</th>
<th>Fresno</th>
<th>Long Beach</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>Oakland</th>
<th>Santa Ana</th>
<th>Sac. City</th>
<th>San Francisco</th>
<th>Sanger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reward:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SIG</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9*</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>of Non-Sig</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title 1 Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) In both San Francisco and Fresno, 2 of their SIG schools are not Title 1

Source: Parthenon Analysis
# CORE Escalation of Interventions

## Getting to the Core

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Detailed Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Develop school improvement plan and attend communities of practice | • Create school improvement plan which addresses the reason LEA did not make target, review suggested resources  
• Attend community of practice  
• Revise and implement plan with LEA approval of plan |
| 2. Pair with high-performing school                | • Develop school improvement plan and participate in school partnership program with reward school |
| 3. Complete 7 turnaround principles                 | • Undertake turnaround principles simultaneously by the 2014-15 school year for three years  
• LEA approves the school interventions to be applied in support of the turnaround principles |
### Principle #3: Supporting Effective Instruction and Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Principle</th>
<th>Overview</th>
<th>Link to SAUSD Programs and Initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Effective Instruction and Leadership</td>
<td>LEAs will recruit, prepare, evaluate and develop effective teachers and leaders. The districts will promote continuous instructional improvement and provide teachers and leaders to 1) Ensure educator performance is assessed against multiple measures, 2) provide access to a more robust and comprehensive feedback system, 3) celebrate, leverage and accelerate the skills of most effective teachers and leaders, 4) differentiate teacher supports with targeted opportunities</td>
<td>Administration evaluation system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher and Principal Evaluation and Support Systems

**Participating LEAs Current Commitments:**

- A common set of educator effectiveness indicators agreed upon by CORE Districts with input from Participating LEAs
- At least one significant component based upon a measure of student academic achievement and growth
- Classroom observation procedures that provide teachers with quality feedback regarding instructional practice, aligned to adopted educator effectiveness standards
- Data collection with sufficient frequency to provide a basis for evaluation
- Ratings that meaningfully differentiate among teaching effectiveness using at least four categories
- Support for professional growth and capacity building; and
- Increase in teacher collaboration to inform classroom instruction for increased academic achievement
Teacher and Principal Evaluation and Support Systems

1. Student growth integrated through a “trigger” system
   - An evaluation will be conducted using multiple measures, not including student achievement.
   - Results will be compared to student achievement results.
   - Any misalignment between teacher/administrator professional practice and student performance will initiate a dialogue.
   - District action will focus on professional development for the teacher.

2. Student growth as a defined percentage
   - Student growth will represent a minimum of 20% of teacher and principal evaluation calculations.

CORE LEAs will choose between both options in order to allow LEAs flexibility to maintain current systems that already meet USED requirements, while ensuring rigorous models and consistency across all participating districts.

Superior Standards  Supportive School Climate  Successful Students
Successful Students
Superior Standards
Supportive School Climate

Teacher and Principal Evaluation and Support Systems

Professional Practice
Classroom observations, artifacts of instruction, contribution to professional culture, and student (in the case of teachers) and teacher (in the case of administrators) feedback

Impact on Student Learning
MCAS growth results, where available, and at least one other district-wide measure of achievement common across grades or subjects district-wide (e.g., student portfolios, capstone projects, performances)

Exemplary
Proficient
Needs Improvement
Unsatisfactory

High
Medium
Low

Note: To determine impact on student learning, when MCAS data not available, at least two district-determined measures will be used.
Source: Massachusetts ESEA Waiver

Expectation
One year improvement plan with goals for student learning and educator practice. Failure to improve substantially after the year can lead to dismissal

One-year improvement plan that focuses on discrepancy between two judgments and requires intervention of evaluator’s supervisor

Superior Standards
Supportive School Climate
Successful Students

E H P M

NI U

E L P

One year improvement plan that focuses on discrepancy between two judgments and requires intervention of evaluator’s supervisor
## Evaluation System of Cycle of Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By 2013-14 School Year</td>
<td>CORE Board will develop a rubric to measure development and implementation of teacher, principal and superintendent evaluation systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Starting in Fall 2013, LEAs will enter into peer review to ensure progress against the milestones outlined in the rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>August 15-September 15, all Participating LEAs will solicit feedback on common educator effectiveness guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By 2014-15 School Year</td>
<td>Rubric will be fully implemented across the Participating LEAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educator evaluation system is piloted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rubric will inform admittance into the Evaluation System Cycle of Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By 2015-16 School Year</td>
<td>Educator evaluation system is implemented across all participating districts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher and Principal Evaluation and Support Systems

Professional Practice

- Classroom observations, artifacts of instruction, contribution to professional culture, and student (in the case of teachers) and teacher (in the case of administrators) feedback

Impact on Student Learning

- MCAS growth results, where available, and at least one other district-wide measure of achievement common across grades or subjects district-wide (e.g., student portfolios, capstone projects, performances)

Getting to the Core

- Exemplary
- Proficient
- Needs Improvement
- Unsatisfactory

Supportive School Climate

- One year improvement plan with goals for student learning and educator practice. Failure to improve substantially after the year can lead to dismissal

Successful Students

- One-year improvement plan that focuses on discrepancy between two judgments and requires intervention of evaluator’s supervisor

Note: To determine impact on student learning, when MCAS data not available, at least two district-determined measures will be used

Source: Massachusetts ESEA Waiver
## Evaluation System of Cycle of Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By 2013-14 School Year</td>
<td>CORE Board will develop a rubric to measure development and implementation of teacher, principal and superintendent evaluation systems. Starting in Fall 2013, LEAs will enter into peer review to ensure progress against the milestones outlined in the rubric. August 15-September 15, all Participating LEAs will solicit feedback on common educator effectiveness guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By 2014-15 School Year</td>
<td>Rubric will be fully implemented across the Participating LEAs. Educator evaluation system is piloted. Rubric will inform admittance into the Evaluation System Cycle of Review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By 2015-16 School Year</td>
<td>Educator evaluation system is implemented across all participating districts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>