TITLE I

- States required to submit a plan prior to 2017-18 school year
- Plan must include state plan to identify 5% of school in need of intervention
- State allowed to use 7% of allocation for Intervention additional 3% for direct services to students
- No further federal AYP
- Bill encourages use of Title I in schoolwide plan – waivers for schools below 40% to implement a schoolwide can be waived by states
- For Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 and 2016 – Formula grant funds will be awarded and administered in accordance with the ESEA on the day before the date of enactment of the ESSA – Funds will follow the NCLB formula
- This also means that with exceptions described, Title I recipients will continue to operate in the 2016-17 school year under the plans, procedures, and requirements that are in place for the 2015-16 school year
- California is not an ‘ESEA Flexibility’ State
- ESSA section 5(e)(2)(i) requires that a school identified by the state as in need of improvement, corrective action or restructuring under ESEA as it existed under NCLB to continue to implement the same interventions through the 2016-17 school year. (Continue existing status for 1 more year)
During the 2016-17 school year, States may but are not required to, ensure that LEAs are providing supplemental educational services, public school choice and the related notice to parents for the 2016-2017 school year.

If States do not require SES and public school choice in 2016-2017 they must develop and implement a 1 year transition plan to insure that the LEAs provide alternative supports for the students eligible for SES and school with greatest need, schools with large numbers or percentages of students eligible for SES. (Additional clarifying letter is forthcoming)

**TITLE III - Supports for English Learners in 2016-2017**

- States will not be required to hold LEAs accountable for their performance against Annual Measurable Objectives (AMAOs) 1, 2, and 3 under Title III of the ESEA for the 2014-15 and 2015-16 school years.

- States must freeze district accountability under Title III based on status as of December 15, 2015 – based on the most recent calculations.

- Continue to provide corresponding supports and interventions for 2015-16 and 2016-17 based on current Title III status. In California this includes sending out Title III letters.

**Additional Transitions**

- States are not required to implement for 2016-2017: section 1119 & 2141, “highly qualified teachers” LEAs no longer required all core teachers are highly qualified and develop/implement an improvement plan (Title II highly qualified teacher report no longer required)
Equitable Access to Excellent Educators – must continue to insure that poor and minority children are not taught at higher rates than other children by inexperienced, unqualified, or out of field teachers remain in effect for the 2015-16 and 2016-17 school years. (Comparability Report – still required)

FOR CALIFORNIA –
- The plan California is developing will likely include the LCAP as the single comprehensive plan and accountability measure,
- Accountability will be based on multiple measures based on the 8 state priorities
- Academic achievement weighted in the accountability formula

An Example of a possible system:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>ELA</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>3rd Grade Rdg.</th>
<th>Reclass Rate</th>
<th>Grad Rate</th>
<th>Dropout Rate</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>A-G / CTE Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bottom 5% may be identified by an aggregate score of the measures or through a mechanism to pull 5% from each of the identified measures among the 8 State Priorities to identify the correct number of schools to total 5%