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# Major Features of the Public Schools Accountability Act

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Performance Index (API)</strong></td>
<td>Ranks schools in deciles 1 through 10 based on results from student assessments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governor’s Performance Awards</strong></td>
<td>Provides rewards to schools that improve their API scores annually (if funded in the budget).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Intervention Programs**     | Immediate Intervention for Underperforming Schools Program (II/USP) for schools in deciles 1 through 5 not meeting API targets.  
                                 | High Priority Schools Grant Program (HPSGP) for lowest-performing schools starting with API decile 1 (added to Public Schools Accountability Act in 2001). |
| **Sanctions**                 | Sanctions schools in II/USP and HPSGP that do not make their API growth targets.  
                                 | Sanctions range from assigning an intervention team to closing the school. |

- State system focuses on growth in overall student achievement from year to year.
- Interventions targeted at school level.
- School districts have limited formal role.
Major Features of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Accountability Requirements

### One Integrated State and Federal Accountability System

#### Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)
- Requires schools to meet annual objectives so all students reach proficiency by 2013-14.

#### Rewards
- Requires states to provide monetary and/or nonmonetary awards for making AYP.

### Program Improvement—Intervention and Sanction Programs

- **Level 1—School Choice**
  - Develop a two-year improvement plan.
  - Use 10 percent of Title I funds for professional development focused on school improvement.
  - Provide students with the option to transfer to any other school in the school district and pay the transportation costs.

- **Level 2—Supplemental Services**
  - Level 1 interventions.
  - Use Title I funds to obtain tutoring/after school program from State Department of Education (SDE) approved public or private provider.

- **Level 3—Corrective Action.** Level 1 and 2 interventions, plus school district must do one of the following:
  - Replace responsible staff.
  - Implement new curriculum.
  - Significantly decrease management authority at school level.
  - Appoint an external expert to advise school.
  - Extend school day or school year.
  - Restructure internal organization of school.

- **Level 4—Restructuring.** Level 1, 2, and 3 interventions, plus prepare a plan that must be implemented within one year. Options include:
  - Reopen school as charter school.
  - Replace most of the school staff.
  - Hire private management company to operate school.
  - Turn the operation over to SDE.
  - Other major restructuring.
## Comparison of State and Federal Accountability Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>Program Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of schools</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>562 approved 86 pending</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility</td>
<td>Bottom 5 deciles</td>
<td>Bottom 5 deciles—only decile 1 funded to date</td>
<td>Competitive grant process primarily for Title I Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry criteria</td>
<td>Fail API for one year</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning funds</td>
<td>$50,000 grant</td>
<td>Optional $50,000 grant</td>
<td>No grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan requirements</td>
<td>22 specific requirements</td>
<td>All II/USP requirements plus four additional requirements</td>
<td>11 specific components. Must use research-based model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention year 1</td>
<td>Implement action plan—$200 per pupil</td>
<td>Implement action plan—$400 per pupil</td>
<td>Implement action plan—$200 per pupil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention year 2</td>
<td>Implement action plan—$200 per pupil</td>
<td>Implement action plan—$400 per pupil</td>
<td>Implement action plan—$200 per pupil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention year 3</td>
<td>Exit, sanctions, or significant growth and $200 per pupil</td>
<td>Implement action plan—$400 per pupil</td>
<td>Implement action plan—$200 per pupil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention year 4</td>
<td>Continue sanctions</td>
<td>Exit, sanctions, or significant growth at $400 per pupil.</td>
<td>If part of II/USP or HPSGP, exit, sanctions, or significant growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention year 5</td>
<td>Continue sanctions</td>
<td>Continue sanctions</td>
<td>Continue sanctions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit criteria</td>
<td>Meet growth targets two years in a row</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>II/USP or HPSGP exit criteria apply if under those programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctions funding</td>
<td>$150 per pupil, $75,000 to $125,000 for School Assistance and Intervention Teams</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>II/USP or HPSGP sanctions apply if under those programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Universe of Low-Performing Schools
In State and Federal Programs

As of April 2003, there are 1,970 low-performing schools in state and federal programs, including 86 potential schools for High Priority Schools Grant Program (HPSGP) cohort 2.

734 schools are in more than one intervention program.

Integrating accountability programs would reduce duplication of effort and contain costs and create a more consistent and coherent accountability system.
Problems With Existing Two Accountability Systems

- The Academic Performance Index (API) and the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) measure different goals. Using them together creates confusion.

- Multiple intervention programs create mixed messages.

- Cost of continuing duplicative programs high.
  - Multiple interventions will be at the same schools.
  - Large number of schools will enter Program Improvement (PI) in the next few years.
  - Number of schools sanctioned by the Immediate Intervention for Underperforming Schools Program (II/USP) estimated to increase from 24 in 2002-03 to 100 in 2003-04 and 230 in 2004-05.

- NCLB creates unrealistic standards.
  - Large number of schools will be identified as low-performing.
  - State definition of proficiency too stringent.
Framework for an Integrated Accountability System

Focus state interventions at the school district level.

- State does not have sufficient capacity to intervene at school level at a large number of schools.
- NCLB makes school districts responsible for school interventions.
- State can help school districts build capacity with direct support and interventions through the Statewide System of School Support.
- NCLB makes the state responsible for interventions at school districts.

Target state interventions at the neediest schools.

- Many schools will fall under PI in the next few years.
- It is important to target state-level interventions at only the neediest schools because of capacity constraints.
- State should intervene in both Title 1 and non-Title 1 schools.
- We recommend intervention in decile 1 of the API while the State Department of Education suggests basing the level of interventions on a school classification matrix.

Provide less intensive interventions at higher-performing schools.

- Many schools above API decile 1 will fall under PI.
- Interventions for these schools should be handled at the district level and should be less intensive than interventions for decile 1 schools.
- State can provide assistance to these schools through the Statewide System of School Support.
Redesign HPSGP to serve both state and federal purposes.

- Phase out II/USP and align HPSGP with NCLB.
- Provide funding for decile 1 schools—both Title 1 and non-Title 1.
- Make planning requirements uniform.
- Provide funding for a specific number of years and end use of significant growth as a trigger for additional funding.
- Modify timing and types of sanctions to coincide with those required by NCLB for corrective action and restructuring.
- Assign HPSGP schools in corrective action a school support team, which is similar to state School Assistance and Intervention Teams.

Transition schools in state intervention programs to new system expeditiously.

- Align the timing and types of sanctions for II/USP and HPSGP with NCLB as soon as possible.
- Be careful to follow through with original sanction commitments to maintain credibility.
- End use of significant growth as a criterion for additional funding.
- Unresolved issue—should the state use API or AYP for schools already in state intervention programs?
Change definition of proficiency to reflect being on track to pass the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE).

- The state has defined passage of CAHSEE as a goal for all students.
- State Board of Education has defined proficiency for NCLB purposes as scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on California Standards Tests.
- These performance levels were designed for students on track to go to the University of California or the California State University—only one-third of students score at these levels.
- Changing the definition of proficiency as being on track to pass the high school exit exam will set a more reasonable expectation for students and will slow the rate schools enter program improvement.
Funding for Restructured Accountability System

We recommend setting aside $50 million in Proposition 98 funds for a restructured accountability system in 2003-04.

State accountability programs underfunded.

- II/USP is underfunded by approximately $27 million.
- HPSGP is underfunded by $31.1 million, assuming 86 new schools begin funding in 2003-04.
- If no new HPSGP schools are funded, HPSGP is underfunded by $6.4 million.

State could save approximately $32 million if it does not fund significant growth for schools in II/USP cohort 2.

Federal funds supporting intervention and sanction programs.

- Federal funds from Title I set-aside for PI.
  - $29.1 million in 2003-04.
  - $15 million carryover from 2002-03.
- $40 million in federal CSRD funds for school-level interventions.