

Implementation Guide

Reco. No.	Major recommendation	Action	Specific implementation operations	Timeline (select)
Strengthen Teaching and Leadership				
1.1 and 1.2	Implement Teacher and Administrator Professional Practice Models	Legislation + Budget or Initiative	<p>Legislation would establish parameters a district would have to meet to participate and receive state funds: local teacher buy-in, rigorous evaluation, positions/roles within a career ladder, professional compensation, etc. Minnesota legislation implementing a similar program provides a starting place for drafting this legislation.</p> <p>Budget augmentations (optimally over a five-year period) would allow districts to enter the program in cohorts as funding is available to support professional compensation and minimize planning.</p>	2008/09 legislation with progressive funding in 2010–15
1.3	Narrow the Teacher and Administrator Quality Gap			
1.3.1	Provide incentive pay	Legislation integrated in Recommendation 1.1 and 1.2 above	This recommendation would be included within the professional practice model legislation discussed above. It would provide additional incentive compensation for effective teachers and administrators who are educators in hard-to-staff schools.	
1.3.2	Identify and plan to mitigate the disparity in educator quality	Legislation	Legislation would create reporting and planning requirements for districts to identify hard-to-staff schools and to develop plans to address the identified needs.	
1.3.3	Use targeted student-centered funds for promising practices	Operational practice integrated with Recommendation 2.1	Districts would be expected to use some of the additional targeted funding provided through Recommendation 2.1 (student-centered funding) to address needs identified in the educator quality plans, school working conditions, and the needs of paraprofessionals attempting to become teachers.	
1.3.4	Expand alternative teacher and administrator training programs to provide high-quality candidates	Legislation integrated with Recommendation 1.4 and 1.5, discussed below	Legislation to provide alternative routes into the teaching profession should concentrate on recruiting teachers to schools with the greatest needs.	

Reco. No.	Major recommendation	Action	Specific implementation operations	Timeline (select)
1.3.5	Create a Teach for California Program	Legislation + Budget + Seek private support	Seek seed funding from philanthropic foundations to establish this program.. State funds would support the advertising and training costs for these new candidates through an intense summer training program. Candidates would be required to have subject-matter competency.	2008/09
1.4	Improve the Quality and Expand the Supply of New Teacher Candidates			
1.4.1	Create an Integrated Teacher Training Program that incorporates the best traits of teacher internships and traditional teacher training	Legislation + Budget	<p>Legislation would create a grant program administered by the California Department of Education (CDE) to which districts, counties, unions, community colleges, or charter schools would apply. It would establish initial criteria that programs would be required to meet in order to participate. Over time, the new outcome-driven accreditation process would be used. (See Recommendation 1.4.5.)</p> <p>The budget would provide operations funding for this program. Grant levels would be roughly equivalent to the level of support the state currently provides to California State University (CSU) for a teacher credential program student.</p>	Pilot 2008/09
1.4.2	Create a teacher apprenticeship program in targeted schools	Legislation + Budget	<p>Legislation would establish a program that provides stipends to teacher candidates in the integrated teacher training program. The legislation would set the targeting mechanism for this program and would require a commitment to teach in a hard-to-staff school or subject area for a specified number of years.</p> <p>The budget would provide operations funding for this program.</p>	
1.4.3	Empower county superintendents to grant exceptional candidates an exemplary credential	Legislation	<p>Legislation would authorize county superintendents to grant this credential for exemplary candidates. Districts would sponsor the candidate, and the county superintendent would review and approve or decline. Candidates would need to demonstrate subject-matter competency. Legislation would lay out the broad criteria for county superintendents to use to evaluate a candidate.</p> <p>The budget would provide minimal funding to the counties for the additional workload associated with this proposal.</p>	2008/09

Reco. No.	Major recommendation	Action	Specific implementation operations	Timeline (select)
1.4.4	Support an EnCorps program for math and science teachers	Legislation + Budget	<p>The Sherry Lansing Foundation has established the base program on which the state could build. The foundation already has obtained commitments from a dozen corporations to participate in the program.</p> <p>Legislation would establish the state structure to support the program. The budget would support the expansion of this model and help train individuals.</p>	Begun 2007
1.4.5	Reform accreditation and credentialing processes and eliminate the Commission on Teaching Credentialing	Legislation + State Board +Budget	<p>Legislation would direct the State Board of Education (SBE) to develop a new, largely outcome-based accreditation process. Teacher training programs would be evaluated based on the effectiveness of recent graduates to improve student performance, instead of the current input-based regulatory process. This would be more effective after the implementation of high-quality student and teacher databases. (See Recommendations 4.1.1 and 4.2.1.) The State Board also would revise and strengthen requirements for educators to become public school teachers and administrators.</p> <p>Legislation would eliminate the Commission on Teaching Credentialing (CTC) and transfer revised iterations of its current functions to other agencies. The legislation would charge SBE to streamline the credentialing process and create an outcome-based accreditation process for teacher training programs.</p> <p>The budget would make conforming changes.</p>	
1.5	Expand and Strengthen Administrator Training			Pilot 2008/09
1.5.1	Authorize county-district integrated training	Legislation + Budget	<p>Mirroring the Integrated Teacher Training program (Recommendation 1.4.1), legislation would empower districts or county superintendents to apply to operate an administrator training program, pursuant to statewide standards.</p> <p>The budget would provide a funding rate to training providers that mirrors CSU's state funding for administrator courses.</p>	

Reco. No.	Major recommendation	Action	Specific implementation operations	Timeline (select)
1.5.2	Create administrator “induction” support	Legislation + Budget	<p>Legislation would require districts to offer administrators an induction process that includes a mentor for each new administrator and additional training and support.</p> <p>The budget would provide grants to districts to pay for release time for principals and other education leaders to participate in this training for both inductees and mentors. Grants also would cover other support costs.</p>	
1.5.3	Develop a school turnaround training program	Legislation + Budget	<p>Legislation developed in conjunction with the University of California (UC) would authorize the development of a partnership program involving a school of education and school of business at one UC campus. The proposal would be based on a University of Virginia model, applying to the improvement of failing schools management techniques used to turn around failing businesses.</p> <p>The budget would provide funding to UC to develop this program.</p>	
1.6	Promote Efficiency in Recruitment and Training Efforts			
1.6.1	Create a college tutoring program to support struggling K–12 students	Legislation + Budget	<p>Legislation would establish this tutoring program and define the eligible regions of the state and criteria for selection. These programs would be established primarily in areas with teacher shortages in core subject areas and would attempt to recruit tutors who are representative of the communities where these schools are located.</p> <p>Legislation would require that each participating college enter into a partnership with an elementary or middle school and would establish that the tutor training curriculum would be developed by the college in partnership with the school district.</p> <p>The budget would provide funding to the California Community Colleges (CCC) to pay costs of teacher training programs and to fund tutor stipends; it also would provide grant funding for which other colleges and universities could apply.</p>	

Reco. No.	Major recommendation	Action	Specific implementation operations	Timeline (select)
1.6.2	Evaluate all teacher training programs	Legislation + Budget	The budget would provide funding to CDE to establish this program. (That portion of CDE would transition to the Superintendent of Public Instruction [SPI] under the post-2011 governance reform.) This program will become cost-effective after the student and teacher databases (see Recommendation 4.1) are in place; therefore, implementation should be delayed at least one to two years.	Phase out concurrent with Reco. 1.1 phase-in
1.6.3	Transition the Peer Assistance and Review program into the new teacher professional practice model	Legislation + Budget	Legislation and budget changes would consolidate this program and its funding into the new professional practice model.	
Ensure Fair Funding that Rewards Results				
2.1	Transition to a Student-Centered Funding System	Legislation + Budget	Legislation would develop a new finance system that provides a base funding level and new targeted augmentations based on the enrollment of economically disadvantaged students and English learners. (Details are described in the following sub-recommendations within the 2.1 series.) The budget would support targeted augmentations, at minimum.	2008/09 legislation with progressive funding in 2010–15
2.1.1	Establish a new base funding level for every student	Legislation + Budget	Legislation would create a new base funding allocation for school districts that would replace the current revenue limits and revenue limit add-ons. The new base would be differentiated by grade span instead of the current system, which is differentiated by the size and type of school district. The budget would make conforming changes and provide additional funding over time to equalize the new base funding levels.	
2.1.2	Consolidate revenue limits and revenue limit add-ons into new funding base	Legislation + Budget	Legislation would consolidate the current base revenue limits and various revenue limit add-ons to establish the base funding level. Over time, base funding would be equalized across districts. The budget would make conforming changes in base funding distribution.	

Reco. No.	Major recommendation	Action	Specific implementation operations	Timeline (select)
2.1.3	Differentiate base funding by grade span	Legislation + Budget	<p>Legislation would require that the new base funding level be differentiated. Student attendance in grades 4–8 would drive the base funding level. Because of higher costs, the base funding rate for high school students would be higher, irrespective of the type of district.</p> <p>The budget would make conforming adjustments.</p>	
2.1.4	Provide additional resources for disadvantaged students	Legislation + Budget	<p>Legislation would establish a goal for targeted student funding that would provide an augmentation of 40 percent of the new base funding level for economically disadvantaged students and a 20 percent augmentation for English learner students. Legislation also would create a process for periodically reviewing and updating these targets.</p> <p>The budget would annually provide funding to districts based on these two factors, progressively increasing until the goal is reached.</p>	
2.1.5	Consolidate existing categorical programs into the new base augmentation and targeted student grant	Legislation + Budget	<p>Student-centered funding legislation would eliminate most of the current categorical programs and their accompanying statutory requirements.</p> <p>The budget would transfer funding from the existing categorical programs to either the new base grant or the new targeted student grants, on a district-by-district basis, dependent on the purposes of the categorical.</p>	
2.1.6	Ensure that targeted funding gets to schools whose students generate it	Legislation	<p>Legislation would require district superintendents to annually report to their local boards how the district is ensuring that the targeted student grant funding is reaching the students who generated it. For “failed schools,” the superintendent must ensure that the targeted funds reach the school with the student who generated the additional targeted funding.</p>	
2.1.7	Mitigate skewed incentives to overclassify English learners	Legislation + Budget	<p>Legislation would allow a district to receive full funding for an English learner only for that student’s first three years in a California school. In year 4, year 5, and year 6, the district would receive 75 percent, 50 percent, and 25 percent funding, respectively, for that student. In the budget, funding formulas would conform to this recommendation.</p>	

Reco. No.	Major recommendation	Action	Specific implementation operations	Timeline (select)
2.1.8	Make school budgets more understandable	Legislation + Budget	<p>Legislation would require districts to begin to report accounting information on a school-site basis. CDE would develop standards for the accounting system in consultation with districts and would field test them before imposing the new requirements.</p> <p>The budget would provide operations funding to CDE to administer this transition; districts would be required to meet the new reporting requirements as a condition of receiving targeted student funding.</p>	
2.1.9	Ensure equitable funding for charter schools	Legislation + Budget	Legislation would require that charter schools receive the same funding as non-charter schools through the new student-centered funding system. The budget would provide the equivalent funding over time.	
2.2	Provide Financial Incentives To Reward Districts and Schools That Succeed			Priority as education budget grows
2.2.1	Create positive incentives to reward success	Legislation + Budget	<p>Legislation would develop specific criteria that a school must achieve to earn an award based on multiple years of student achievement data. The details of the criteria would be delegated to SBE.</p> <p>Budget would provide funding for rewards with a multiyear commitment; incentives must be in place before the school year starts to have an impact of teacher and administrator actions, so budgets will lag legislation by one year.</p>	Concurrent with Reco. 2.1 rollout
2.2.2	Eliminate disincentives that undermine success	Legislation + Budget	Legislation would phase out all programs that provide additional funding to schools or districts with low performance. The budget would consolidate funding for these programs into the new student-centered funding model's targeted grant.	
2.2.3	Promote school site budget authority to reward success	Legislative Intent Language	Legislation implementing the new student-centered funding model and the new school inspection system (Recommendation 3.5) would include intent language to encourage districts to delegate budgetary and administrative decision-making authority to the school site for schools that have improved student outcomes.	
2.3	Create Greater Funding Stability			2008/09 with Test 1 trigger

Reco. No.	Major recommendation	Action	Specific implementation operations	Timeline (select)
2.3.1	Improve the accuracy of the Proposition 98 calculation	Legislation + Budget	Legislation can be pursued immediately, but the change in timing would not take place until Proposition 98 hits Test 1, to avoid any adverse effects to Proposition 98 funding due to the transition year of the proposal.	
2.3.2	Create a Proposition 98 reserve using Proposition 98 Reversion Account funds	Legislation + Budget	Legislation would require the state to set aside half of the reversion account funding annually into a new Proposition 98 reserve, once the facility obligations for the <i>Williams</i> settlement have ended. It also would establish criteria by which these funds could be accessed, particularly any year in which Proposition 98 growth is insufficient to pay growth and cost of living adjustments (COLA).	Concurrent with <i>Williams</i> Completion
2.4	Improve Special Education Funding		Omnibus legislation would incorporate specifics of the sub-recommendations.	
2.4.1	Equalize funding across SELPAs	Legislation + Budget	<p>Legislation would establish the goal that special education funding will be equalized so that no Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) receives less than the 90th percentile SELPA, as well as the mechanism for achieving the goal over time.</p> <p>Budgets over multiple years will provide the additional funding necessary to achieve the target (approximately \$310 million).</p>	
2.4.2	Expand the pool of funding for extreme high-cost students	Legislation + Budget	Legislation would gradually expand the number of extreme-high-cost special education students for whom the state pays a share of the cost. The mechanism would freeze the cost threshold (providing no COLA), above which the state shares in the cost of educating the student, until the targeted number of students are above the threshold.	
2.4.3	Address shortfalls in federal funding that create inequities	Legislation + Budget	Legislation would adjust the special education funding formula so that shortfalls in federal funding impact all districts and SELPAs proportionally. A federal deficit factor would be created and adjusted annually as part of the budget to equalize the impact of federal shortfalls.	2008/09
2.4.4	Collaboratively address additional key issues	Administrative Action	Administration staff, led by the Secretary of Education, would begin an ongoing dialogue with stakeholders to address the following: (1) special education accountability, (2) method for updating the special disabilities adjustment to the special education funding model, and (3) the impact of students with autism on school districts.	

Reco. No.	Major recommendation	Action	Specific implementation operations	Timeline (select)
2.5	Additional School Finance Reforms			Priority as Education Budget Grows
2.5.1	Create an ongoing innovation and research fund	Legislation + Budget	<p>Legislation would establish a program to conduct random assignment or matched school evaluations of various promising practices, and set parameters for conducting evaluations. The SPI would be responsible for evaluating each experiment.</p> <p>The budget would provide the funding to support this effort. The state likely would find philanthropic foundation interest in supporting specific research and planning efforts.</p>	2008/09
2.5.2	Address cost obligations of retiree health benefits	Legislation	Legislation would require all districts offering post-retirement benefits to develop a plan to address unfunded liabilities. Legislation would require SBE to amend the criteria used for the county's fiscal reviews of school districts to incorporate the plans used for addressing these benefits.	
2.5.3	Allow school districts greater autonomy to contract for services	Legislation	Legislation would change the burden of proof for districts to contract out: Districts would be allowed to contract out for particular services if they determine it would cost less than performing the service with district staff.	
2.5.4	Fully fund state mandates	Budget	The budget would begin funding the annual costs of state reimbursable mandates, of approximately \$200 million annually, as soon as feasible.	
Streamline Governance and Strengthen Accountability				
3.1	Promote Greater Local Autonomy	Legislation	Legislation would streamline the Education Code and the finance system to empower school districts with decision-making authority. It would support improved leadership training to improve the abilities of administrators to make effective local decisions. It would provide the appropriate interventions and supports for schools and districts that are not able to achieve without greater state involvement.	
3.2	Streamline and Deregulate the Education System			Begin review in 2008/09

Reco. No.	Major recommendation	Action	Specific implementation operations	Timeline (select)
3.2.1	Deregulate the Education Code	Executive Order + Future Legislation	<p>The Governor would appoint an external committee responsible for reviewing the Education Code in total. Based on this review, the committee would recommend code revisions for the Governor to pursue as legislation in the future.</p> <p>The state likely would find philanthropic foundation interest in supporting this effort.</p>	
3.2.2	Sunset the Education Code	Legislation	Legislation would create a sunset/reauthorization process for the entire Education Code. Similar to the federal reauthorization process, the state would conduct sunset reviews of different chapters of the Education Code, with each section being subject to a sunset review every five to seven years.	
3.3	Reform the Convoluted State Governance System	Legislation or Statutory Initiative	Legislation or a ballot initiative would alter state governance, subsequent to 2010, so that the Secretary of Education would manage CDE and so that the SPI would be responsible for all accountability. While this recommendation could be implemented statutorily, placing it before the electorate would garner the type of support that could promote stability of operation. Final implementing legislation would specifically define how the department should be reconfigured.	2011 or later
3.3.1	Redefine state-level responsibilities in a manner similar to the model of the 2002 Master Plan for Education		See 3.3	
3.3.2	Reconfigure the role of CDE	CDE administrative action + Legislation	<p>CDE would take action to modify its operations in ways that support schools' instructional efforts.</p> <p>Change would occur in conjunction with legislation that modifies categoricals and other compliance-driven functions.</p>	

Reco. No.	Major recommendation	Action	Specific implementation operations	Timeline (select)
3.4	Create a Regional Support System To Provide Oversight for All Districts and Interventions for Struggling Districts	State Board action + Budget	<p>SBE must take action to intervene in districts that are not making adequate yearly progress, as required by federal law. Legislation would create the regional support system. The first priority for each region would be to support the districts for which SBE requires interventions.</p> <p>The budget would provide a mixture of federal and state funding to the county regions to support this work. As the existing High Priority school cohort ends, the funding would be folded into this program.</p>	2008/09
3.4.1	Invest in the regional structure of county offices of education to build capacity for district support and interventions	Legislation + Budget	<p>Legislation would require county offices of education to develop regional support teams for each region in the state, charged with creating support mechanisms for struggling districts and schools. Teams also would be involved in the intervention process for districts identified through the accountability system. The budget would provide resources to county offices to conduct this work.</p>	2008/09
3.4.2	Create an Academic Crisis Management and Assistance Team (ACMAT)	Legislation + Budget	<p>Legislation would authorize the creation of ACMAT to develop standards for the school inspection, establish best practices, and assist the regions and most troubled districts.</p> <p>The budget would provide ongoing funding for ACMAT through a lead county office or partnership.</p>	2008/09
3.4.3	Impose regional interventions for consistently failing districts	Legislation + Budget	<p>Legislation would establish the criteria that would be used to identify failing schools (achievement level, growth, and school inspections). Schools and districts would be subject to this higher level of accountability as a requirement for receiving student-centered funding augmentations or professional practice funding.</p> <p>The budget would provide funding to develop counties' capacity and to hire multiple trustees to oversee schools, support charter school capacity to develop grassroots solutions in these schools, and help build CDE capacity to oversee these interventions.</p>	Concurrent with Reco. 2.1 rollout

Reco. No.	Major recommendation	Action	Specific implementation operations	Timeline (select)
3.4.4	Overhaul categorical program monitoring	Legislation	Legislation would require CDE to develop a new program-monitoring process for funds provided through the student-centered funding model. This monitoring would focus largely on program effectiveness, rather than compliance with processes.	Priority as Education Budget allows
3.5	Institute a School Inspection System	Legislation + Budget	<p>Legislation would authorize the creation of a school inspection system; outline the broad criteria that would be used in such a system; and establish a process for ACMAT and an advisory committee to develop the specific inspection criteria.</p> <p>The budget would support SBE contracting for an external vendor with experience to conduct first inspections, phasing in a program over a three-year period.</p>	
3.5.1	Develop a California-specific inspection framework	Legislation	Legislation would create an advisory committee that, in collaboration with ACMAT, would develop the school inspection framework.	
3.5.2	Build capacity to conduct school inspections	Legislation + Budget	<p>Legislation would outline the phasing of implementation and the training of future inspectors.</p> <p>The budget would provide funds to contract for external inspectors and train county employees to eventually become inspectors.</p>	
3.5.3	Ensure consistent, reliable inspections	Legislation	Legislation would outline the quality review process to ensure that inspectors are consistent.	
3.5.4	Create a system of support		During implementation, inspections will provide each school with specific action steps the school can take to develop a culture of continuous improvement.	
3.5.5	Report findings	Legislation	Legislation would require inspection reports to be made public once the inspection process has been piloted and once the reports were determined to be reliable across inspectors and over time.	
3.5.6	Use inspections to ensure accountability and promote autonomy	Legislation	Legislation would encourage districts to delegate decision-making authority to school sites that demonstrate their capacity to be effective decision makers.	
3.6	Institute Clear Intervention Rules	Legislation	Legislation would require CDE to use multiple measures to identify school districts or schools that need assistance and require that these districts receive the needed assistance.	2008/09

Reco. No.	Major recommendation	Action	Specific implementation operations	Timeline (select)
3.7	Develop Pre/Post Testing for Alternative Education Schools	Legislation + Budget	Legislation would require CDE to develop an assessment to be used in alternative education programs to reliably measure the progress of students during the short time they are in these programs. The budget would provide funding to CDE to contract for the development of a standards-aligned pre/post assessment.	
3.8	Promote Choice for Families			2008/09
3.8.1	Provide equitable resources for charter schools	Legislation + Budget	Same as Recommendation 2.1.9.	2008/09
3.8.2	Examine alternative authorization mechanisms for charter schools	Administrative leadership	SBE, or the Secretary of Education after the governance restructuring of Recommendation 3.3, would develop options to provide alternative authorizers of charters and/or to oversee charter schools.	2008/09
3.8.3	Inform parents of their education options	Legislation	Legislation would require districts to notify parents of their choice options regarding the various schools their children could attend.	
Use Data Wisely				
4.1	Build and Manage Effective Data Systems To Meet Local and State Information Needs			2008
4.1.1	Implement and financially support student and teacher information systems	Legislation + Budget	Additional investments would be part of the 2008 budget, building on the failed efforts in 2007. The statute would be clarified that the student and teacher databases would facilitate the analysis of student-level longitudinal data, effectively linked to teacher data.	2008
4.1.2	Appoint a data commission to oversee data system implementation and develop a long-term strategic plan for data	Legislation	Legislation would create a data commission to establish a long-term plan for the state's data systems. This commission also would address near-term issues such as developing policies and procedures on Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) (protections for access to individual student information) and parameters of access to information by researchers and others. The state likely would find philanthropic foundation interest in supporting this effort.	2008/09

Reco. No.	Major recommendation	Action	Specific implementation operations	Timeline (select)
4.1.3	Build capacity of districts and schools to support improved data quality and to use data more effectively	Budget	The budget would provide funding to school districts to improve the quality of their local information systems and practices. This state investment also would (1) leverage the timely submission of data, (2) support the improvement of data quality, and (3) insulate the state against a possible reimbursable mandate claim.	2008/09
4.1.4	Explore the range of appropriate uses of information	Budget	The budget would fund a study to work with districts, county, and charter organizations to explore appropriate uses and potential benefits of new information systems that can support instructional improvement.	
4.2	Make Data More Useful and Informative, To Support Accountability			2008 — amend test contract
4.2.1	Implement a growth measure for assessment	State Board action & Budget	SBE would require the test publisher to create a vertical scale that can measure student achievement growth; this likely would require lengthening the test to provide overlapping questions across grades. The budget would provide funding augmentation to the testing contract to support additional costs.	Concurrent with Reco. 2.1 rollout
4.2.2	Require school-level accounting data	Legislation + Budget	Legislation would require accounting down to the school-site level (how much is spent at each school) as a condition of receiving funding through the new student-centered funding model, to ensure that resources generally reach the students who generate the funds. Legislation specifically would require districts to use actual teacher salaries and not district averages. A three-year implementation cycle would include the following: Year 1 — CDE staff would commission a working group to work out the policies for how to report school-level expenditures; year 2 — pilot the new system and address related issues; and year 3 — implement statewide.	
4.3	Make Data More Accessible			2008
4.3.1	Build database access for local educators and the research community	Legislation	Legislation would empower the new data commission (established per recommendation 4.1.2) to develop policies on how the state would share information from the new student and teacher data systems with schools, school districts, and researchers. The intent would be to provide maximum details allowable in compliance with FERPA.	2008

Reco. No.	Major recommendation	Action	Specific implementation operations	Timeline (select)
4.3.2	Overhaul the School Accountability Report Card (SARC) and transform it into E-SARC	Legislation + Budget	<p>Legislation would streamline the information collected for the SARC; standardize a process for reporting that information to the state so that data is comparable; require CDE to collect the data; and ensure that the data will be made public to foster easy parental and voter access.</p> <p>The budget will provide funding to CDE to facilitate this collection process.</p>	
Create a Foundation for Continuous Improvement				
5.1	Implement a Comprehensive Preschool Package			<p>2008 — legislation</p> <p>c.2010 — Use redirected kindergarten funds per Reco. 5.2 to begin program expansion</p>
5.1.1	Expand preschool using two targeting mechanisms	Legislation + Budget	<p>Legislation would clarify the criteria to be used to determine which communities (elementary school catchment areas) are eligible for grants to start new preschool centers.</p> <p>The budget would provide funding for contracts with new centers, allowing year 1 funding to be used for start-up costs.</p> <p>The budget also would provide funding for a new preschool grant available to economically disadvantaged students in areas of the state in which new preschool centers will not be added. These grants would provide funding equivalent to an alternative payment provider grant but could only be used on a high-quality preschool program.</p>	2008
5.1.2	Use a mixed delivery system with uniform, systemic standards	Legislation, State Board Regulation	<p>Legislation would require SBE to adopt preschool standards by the end of 2009, building on CDE's new preschool foundations.</p> <p>Future budgets would provide funding to conduct and report the measures publicly discussed in the next recommendation.</p>	

Reco. No.	Major recommendation	Action	Specific implementation operations	Timeline (select)
5.1.3	Make strategic investments in improving the quality of preschool	Legislation	<p>Legislation would establish a set of grant programs for school districts, county offices of education, and other potential providers that would provide training programs and stipends to preschool staff to promote their attaining additional education credits. CSU, CCC, and independent colleges would work with CDE to establish uniform course descriptions.</p> <p>The budget would fund the grants.</p>	
5.1.4	Promote preschool quality through measurement and incentives	Legislation + Budget	<p>Legislation would require CDE to establish reimbursement tiers, with specified funding rates, that vary with the quality of care provided by centers. Using the new standards and quality measurement tools, CDE would select local vendors (i.e., county offices) to monitor the quality of providers. This would create a new preschool monitoring effort that would collect additional information from those centers interested in achieving a higher rating.</p> <p>The budget would provide additional funding to support augmentations for those centers earning a higher reimbursement for their higher-quality offerings, as well as funding for monitoring costs.</p>	Test 1 year (c.2010)
5.2	Change the Qualifying Date of Birth for Kindergarten Entry	Legislation + Budget	<p>Legislation would change the birth date by which children may start kindergarten, from Dec. 2 to Sept. 1, and require that the savings from the date change be redirected to other early education programs. This process optimally would take place when the state has transitioned to Test 1 of Proposition 98 to prevent unintended consequences on the overall level of education funding. The budget would make conforming changes, redirecting funds to other early education objectives.</p>	
5.3	Target the Expansion of Full-Day Kindergarten	Legislation + Budget	<p>Legislation would establish a grant program to provide incentive funding to districts that serve economically disadvantaged students, to extend the kindergarten day. Districts also would be allowed to extend the kindergarten day at select schools without seeking an SBE waiver.</p> <p>The budget would fund the grants.</p>	