

Local Performance Indicator Self-Reflection

Local Educational Agency (LEA)	Contact Name and Title	Email and Phone
Sacramento County Office of Education (SCOE)	David W. Gordon Superintendent	dgordon@scoe.net (916) 228-2410

Introduction

The State Board of Education (SBE) approved standards for the local indicators that support a local educational agency (LEA) in measuring and reporting progress within the appropriate priority area. The approved performance standards require an LEA to:

- Annually measure its progress in meeting the requirements of the specific Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) priority.
- Report the results as part of a non-consent item at a regularly scheduled public meeting of the local governing board/body in conjunction with the adoption of the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP).
- Report results to the public through the Dashboard utilizing the SBE-adopted self-reflection tools for each local indicator.

This Quick Guide identifies the approved standards and self-reflection tools that an LEA will use to report its progress on the local indicators.

Self-Reflection Tools

An LEA uses the self-reflection tools included within the Dashboard to report its progress on the local performance indicator to educational partners and the public.

The self-reflection tools are embedded in the web-based Dashboard system and are also available in Word document format. In addition to using the self-reflection tools to report its progress on the local performance indicators to educational partners and the public, an LEA may use the self-reflection tools as a resource when reporting results to its local governing board. The approved self-reflection tools are provided below.

Appropriately Assigned Teachers, Access to Curriculum-Aligned Instructional Materials, and Safe, Clean and Functional School Facilities (LCFF Priority 1)

LEAs will provide the information below:

- Number/percentage of misassignments of teachers of ELs, total teacher misassignments, and vacant teacher positions
- Number/percentage of students without access to their own copies of standards-aligned instructional materials for use at school and at home
- Number of identified instances where facilities do not meet the "good repair" standard (including deficiencies and extreme deficiencies)

Teachers	Number	Percent
Misassignments of Teachers of English Learners	0	0.0%
Total Teacher Misassignments	0	0.0%
Vacant Teacher Positions	0	0.0%

Access to Instructional Materials	Number	Percent
Students Without Access to Own Copies of Standards-Aligned Instructional Materials for Use at School and at Home	0	0.0%

Facility Conditions	Number
Identified Instances Where Facilities Do Not Meet The "Good Repair" Standard (Including Deficiencies and Extreme Deficiencies)	0

Implementation of State Academic Standards (LCFF Priority 2)

LEAs may provide a narrative summary of their progress in the implementation of state academic standards based on locally selected measures or tools (Option 1). Alternatively, LEAs may complete the optional reflection tool (Option 2).

OPTION 1: Narrative Summary (Limited to 3,000 characters)

In the narrative box provided on the Dashboard, identify the locally selected measures or tools that the LEA is using to track its progress in implementing the state academic standards adopted by the state board and briefly describe why the LEA chose the selected measures or tools.

Additionally, summarize the LEA's progress in implementing the academic standards adopted by the SBE, based on the locally selected measures or tools. The adopted academic standards are:

- English Language Arts (ELA) - Common Core State Standards for ELA
- English Language Development (ELD) (Aligned to Common Core State Standards for ELA)
- Mathematics - Common Core State Standards for Mathematics
- Next Generation Science Standards
- History-Social Science
- Career Technical Education
- Health Education Content Standards
- Physical Education Model Content Standards
- Visual and Performing Arts
- World Language

OPTION 2: Reflection Tool

Recently Adopted Academic Standards and/or Curriculum Frameworks

1. Rate the LEA's progress in providing professional learning for teaching to the recently adopted academic standards and/or curriculum frameworks identified below.

Rating Scale (lowest to highest) -

- 1 - Exploration and Research Phase
- 2 - Beginning Development
- 3 - Initial Implementation
- 4 - Full Implementation
- 5 - Full Implementation and Sustainability

Academic Standards	1	2	3	4	5
ELA – Common Core State Standards for ELA				4	
ELD (Aligned to ELA Standards)			3		
Mathematics – Common Core State Standards for Mathematics				4	
Next Generation Science Standards		2			
History-Social Science				4	

2. Rate the LEA's progress in making instructional materials that are aligned to the recently adopted academic standards and/or curriculum frameworks identified below available in all classrooms where the subject is taught.

Rating Scale (lowest to highest) -

- 1 - Exploration and Research Phase
- 2 - Beginning Development
- 3 - Initial Implementation
- 4 - Full Implementation
- 5 - Full Implementation and Sustainability

Academic Standards	1	2	3	4	5
ELA – Common Core State Standards for ELA					5

Academic Standards	1	2	3	4	5
ELD (Aligned to ELA Standards)					5
Mathematics – Common Core State Standards for Mathematics					5
Next Generation Science Standards		2			
History-Social Science					5

3. Rate the LEA's progress in implementing policies or programs to support staff in identifying areas where they can improve in delivering instruction aligned to the recently adopted academic standards and/or curriculum frameworks identified below (e.g., collaborative time, focused classroom walkthroughs, teacher pairing).

Rating Scale (lowest to highest) -

- 1 - Exploration and Research Phase
- 2 - Beginning Development
- 3 - Initial Implementation
- 4 - Full Implementation
- 5 - Full Implementation and Sustainability

Academic Standards	1	2	3	4	5
ELA – Common Core State Standards for ELA				4	
ELD (Aligned to ELA Standards)				4	
Mathematics – Common Core State Standards for Mathematics				4	
Next Generation Science Standards			3		
History-Social Science				4	

Other Adopted Academic Standards

4. Rate the LEA's progress implementing each of the following academic standards adopted by the state board for all students.

Rating Scale (lowest to highest) -

- 1 - Exploration and Research Phase
- 2 - Beginning Development
- 3 - Initial Implementation
- 4 - Full Implementation
- 5 - Full Implementation and Sustainability

Academic Standards	1	2	3	4	5
Career Technical Education					5
Health Education Content Standards			3		
Physical Education Model Content Standards			3		
Visual and Performing Arts			3		
World Language	1				

Support for Teachers and Administrators

5. Rate the LEA's success at engaging in the following activities with teachers and school administrators during the prior school year (including the summer preceding the prior school year).

Rating Scale (lowest to highest) -

- 1 - Exploration and Research Phase
- 2 - Beginning Development
- 3 - Initial Implementation
- 4 - Full Implementation
- 5 - Full Implementation and Sustainability

Academic Standards	1	2	3	4	5
Identifying the professional learning needs of groups of teachers or staff as a whole				4	
Identifying the professional learning needs of individual teachers				4	
Providing support for teachers on the standards they have not yet mastered				4	

Optional Narrative (Limited to 1,500 characters)

6. Provide any additional information in the text box provided in the Dashboard that the LEA believes is relevant to understanding its progress implementing the academic standards adopted by the state board.

SCOE teachers collaborate weekly, during a two-hour common planning time, to create state standards aligned lessons, plan co-teaching activities, evaluate student learning and achievement data, and prepare appropriate intervention activities designed to meet the individual learning goals for each student.

Parental Involvement and Family Engagement (LCFF Priority 3)

Introduction

Family engagement is an essential strategy for building pathways to college and career readiness for all students and is an essential component of a systems approach to improving outcomes for all students. More than 30 years of research has shown that family engagement can lead to improved student outcomes (e.g., attendance, engagement, academic outcomes, social emotional learning, etc.).

Consistent with the California Department of Education's (CDE's) Family Engagement Toolkit: ¹

- Effective and authentic family engagement has been described as an intentional partnership of educators, families and community members who share responsibility for a child from the time they are born to becoming an adult.
- To build an effective partnership, educators, families, and community members need to develop the knowledge and skills to work together, and schools must purposefully integrate family and community engagement with goals for students' learning and thriving.

The LCFF legislation recognized the importance of family engagement by requiring LEAs to address Priority 3 within their LCAP. The self-reflection tool described below enables LEAs to reflect upon their implementation of family engagement as part of their continuous improvement process and prior to updating their LCAP.

For LEAs to engage all families equitably, it is necessary to understand the cultures, languages, needs and interests of families in the local area. Furthermore, developing family engagement policies, programs, and practices needs to be done in partnership with local families, using the tools of continuous improvement.

Instructions

This self-reflection tool is organized into three sections. Each section includes research and evidence-based practices in family engagement:

1. Building Relationships between School Staff and Families
2. Building Partnerships for Student Outcomes
3. Seeking Input for Decision-Making

Based on an evaluation of data, including educational partner input, an LEA uses this self-reflection tool to report on its progress successes and area(s) of need related to family engagement policies, programs, and practices. This tool will enable an LEA to engage in continuous improvement and determine next steps to make improvements in the areas identified. The results of the process should be used to inform the LCAP and its development process, including assessing prior year goals, actions and services and in modifying future goals, actions, and services in the LCAP.

LEAs are to implement the following self-reflection process:

1. Identify the diverse educational partners that need to participate in the self-reflection process in order to ensure input from all groups of families, staff and students in the LEA, including families of unduplicated students and families of individuals with exceptional needs as well as families of underrepresented students.
2. Engage educational partners in determining what data and information will be considered to complete the self-reflection tool. LEAs should consider how the practices apply to families of all student groups, including families of unduplicated students and families of individuals with exceptional needs as well as families of underrepresented students.
3. Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, identify the number which best indicates the LEA's current stage of implementation for each of the 12 practices using the following rating scale (lowest to highest):
 - 1 – Exploration and Research
 - 2 – Beginning Development
 - 3 – Initial Implementation
 - 4 – Full Implementation
 - 5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability
4. Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, respond to each of the prompts pertaining to each section of the tool.
5. Use the findings from the self-reflection process to inform the annual update to the LCAP and the LCAP development process, as well as the development of other school and district plans.

Sections of the Self-Reflection Tool

Section 1: Building Relationships Between School Staff and Families

Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, identify the number which best indicates the LEA's current stage of implementation for each practice in this section using the following rating scale (lowest to highest):

Rating Scale (lowest to highest) -

- 1 - Exploration and Research Phase
- 2 - Beginning Development
- 3 - Initial Implementation
- 4 - Full Implementation
- 5 - Full Implementation and Sustainability

Building Relationships	1	2	3	4	5
1. Rate the LEA's progress in developing the capacity of staff (i.e., administrators, teachers, and classified staff) to build trusting and respectful relationships with families.				4	
2. Rate the LEA's progress in creating welcoming environments for all families in the community.				4	
3. Rate the LEA's progress in supporting staff to learn about each family's strengths, cultures, languages, and goals for their children.				4	
4. Rate the LEA's progress in developing multiple opportunities for the LEA and school sites to engage in 2-way communication between families and educators using language that is understandable and accessible to families.			3		

Building Relationships Dashboard Narrative Boxes (Limited to 3,000 characters)

1. Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, briefly describe the LEA's current strengths and progress in Building Relationships Between School Staff and Families.

The SCOE student programs have continuously invested in hiring employees who excel in building relationships with students and families and in on-going family and community engagement professional development for those employees. Our schools and programs are welcoming places for all parents. Each student and family participate in an enrollment meeting, where strengths, goals and the family culture are discussed and understood by our team. The detailed enrollment process ensures appropriate wrap-around services are assigned prior to the first day of attendance. Families are also connected with community resources to further support their needs and parents are actively engaged in the decision-making process through IEP meetings, student study team meetings, student-led conferences, and site council meetings. Students in our court school participate in a new student interview and families are invited to call or visit with school staff in the visitor center on any school day and on our formal visitation evenings once per month. During the academic year, SCOE invites families to campus to view exhibition projects, and for cultural celebrations.

2. Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, briefly describe the LEA's focus area(s) for improvement in Building Relationships Between School Staff and Families.

SCOE's transition specialists (two per campus) engage in frequent outreach to families. Based on need, the initial outreach is often related to attendance, but these staff continue to build strong relationships as the year progresses.

The enrollment of English learners, including some refugee students whose first language is other than English, is increasing for SCOE schools. While SCOE has a contracted translation agency and a master list of interpreters that work across our organization, we strive to recognize and understand the cultures and languages of our students.

3. Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, briefly describe how the LEA will improve engagement of underrepresented families identified during the self-reflection process in relation to Building Relationships Between School Staff and Families.

Developing multiple opportunities for authentic two-way communication between families and school staff is ongoing. To improve engagement of underrepresented families, it is important that communication is systematic so that it includes everyone.

Section 2: Building Partnerships for Student Outcomes

Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, identify the number which best indicates the LEA's current stage of implementation for each practice in this section using the following rating scale (lowest to highest):

Rating Scale (lowest to highest) -

- 1 - Exploration and Research Phase
- 2 - Beginning Development
- 3 - Initial Implementation
- 4 - Full Implementation
- 5 - Full Implementation and Sustainability

Building Partnerships	1	2	3	4	5
5. Rate the LEA's progress in providing professional learning and support to teachers and principals to improve a school's capacity to partner with families.				4	
6. Rate the LEA's progress in providing families with information and resources to support student learning and development in the home.			3		
7. Rate the LEA's progress in implementing policies or programs for teachers to meet with families and students to discuss student progress and ways to work together to support improved student outcomes.					5
8. Rate the LEA's progress in supporting families to understand and exercise their legal rights and advocate for their own students and all students.				4	

Building Partnerships Dashboard Narrative Boxes (Limited to 3,000 characters)

1. Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, briefly describe the LEA's current strengths and progress in Building Partnerships for Student Outcomes.

SCOE provides a Family and Community Engagement professional development program, which our administrators and staff participate in and we support all staff participation in additional outside professional development sequences. In 2021-22, a new position of Vice Principal for Family and Community Engagement was initiated. This administrator, along with other key staff, received coaching from Michele P. Brooks, a nationally-recognized leader in family engagement.

SCOE is in contract with multiple non-profit agencies that partner with our administration and staff to engage families with resources to support student learning and development in the home. Our teams consistently participate in student study team meetings with families and set goals and expectations for continued student success. Each family receives transition support and information for their student's transition back to mainstream, high quality school district programs and we ensure all families understand their right for legal representation, as we provide information on free legal services. Our teams are committed to advocating for our students and helping families develop advocacy skills as well.

2. Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, briefly describe the LEA's focus area(s) for improvement in Building Partnerships for Student Outcomes.

To build partnerships with families of underrepresented students, when many families are disengaged and unhappy with the student's placement, consistency in communication is important. Every family and student should be informed about SCOE's academic programs, career preparation, credit recovery options, and the student's transition plan.

- Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, briefly describe how the LEA will improve engagement of underrepresented families identified during the self-reflection process in relation to Building Partnerships for Student Outcomes.

The Family and Community Engagement team will continue to make connections with families at enrollment and throughout the student's term. SCOE leaders are researching the options for app-based communication to simplify engagement in a non-intrusive way.

Section 3: Seeking Input for Decision-Making

Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, identify the number which best indicates the LEA's current stage of implementation for each practice in this section using the following rating scale (lowest to highest):

Rating Scale (lowest to highest) -

- 1 - Exploration and Research Phase
- 2 - Beginning Development
- 3 - Initial Implementation
- 4 - Full Implementation
- 5 - Full Implementation and Sustainability

Seeking Input	1	2	3	4	5
9. Rate the LEA's progress in building the capacity of and supporting principals and staff to effectively engage families in advisory groups and with decision-making.			3		
10. Rate the LEA's progress in building the capacity of and supporting family members to effectively engage in advisory groups and decision-making.			3		
11. Rate the LEA's progress in providing all families with opportunities to provide input on policies and programs, and implementing strategies to reach and seek input from any underrepresented groups in the school community.				4	
12. Rate the LEA's progress in providing opportunities to have families, teachers, principals, and district administrators work together to plan, design, implement and evaluate family engagement activities at school and district levels.			3		

Seeking Input for Decision-Making Dashboard Narrative Boxes (Limited to 3,000 characters)

- Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, briefly describe the LEA's current strengths and progress in Seeking Input for Decision-Making.

Leadership is invested in developing parent capacity. Relationships are strong, and SCOE leadership is seeing growing participation in advisory committees. SCOE's progress towards seeking input from parents/guardians in decision making and efforts to promote parental participation in programs is measured through a consistent annual survey that is translated for our non-English speaking families and administered electronically. The survey is designed to be accessible and specific to the issues that are most relevant to our non-traditional student populations. The survey included an assessment of whether parents feel their child's school offers activities to bring families onto campus, and whether parents would recommend SCOE's programs.

- Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, briefly describe the LEA's focus area(s) for improvement in Seeking Input for Decision-Making.

A focus area is to sustain and grow participation in advisory committees.

3. Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, briefly describe how the LEA will improve engagement of underrepresented families identified during the self-reflection process in relation to Seeking Input for Decision-Making.

Key to improving engagement of underrepresented families is systematic outreach and reflection of the needs communicated.

School Climate (LCFF Priority 6)

LEAs will provide a narrative summary of the local administration and analysis of a local climate survey that captures a valid measure of student perceptions of school safety and connectedness in at least one grade within the grade span (e.g., K–5, 6–8, 9–12) in a text box provided in the California School Dashboard (response limited to 3,000 characters). LEAs will have an opportunity to include differences among student groups, and for surveys that provide an overall score, such as the California Healthy Kids Survey, report the overall score for all students and student groups. This summary may also include an analysis of a subset of specific items on a local survey and additional data collection tools that are particularly relevant to school conditions and climate.

1. **DATA:** Reflect on the key learnings from the survey results and share what the LEA learned.
2. **MEANING:** What do the disaggregated results (if applicable) of the survey and other data collection methods reveal about schools in the LEA, such as areas of strength or growth, challenges, and barriers?
3. **USE:** What revisions, decisions, or actions has, or will, the LEA implement in response to the results for continuous improvement purposes? Why? If you have already implemented actions, did you see the results you were seeking?

The 2022 SCOE LCAP Survey assessed school climate and was completed by 246 students in the court and community schools, Palmiter school, and intervention programs. Measures of school safety show that 88% of students felt safe while at school, up 6 percentage points from the prior year. Nine percent indicated they felt somewhat safe and 3% indicated that they did not feel safe while at school. Reasons for feeling somewhat safe or unsafe mainly focused on the behaviors of other students. Similar to last year, results disaggregated by grade span and program type revealed that high school students felt safer than middle school or elementary students. Analyses by program type revealed that programs which catered to students that were not enrolled due to discipline or behavior issues (such as Senior Extension) had the largest percentages of students who felt safe at school (97%) as compared to the CARE program for middle school students (88%) or the community (87%) and court (81%) schools. Although the survey was not appropriate for students in the Special Education Foundations programs, 86% of their parents (N=8 survey respondents) believed that their child was safe at school.

Measures of school connectedness included items most relevant to our goals for students. Overall, 79% of students indicated that they felt connected to their school with students in higher grade levels reporting more connectedness than students in lower grade levels. More than half (51%) of respondents noted that they were given counseling and support services and 58% of students reported that they felt supported by their teachers. Just over 39% reported that they have open communication with teachers and staff. Analyses disaggregated by program type revealed differences in connectedness. More students in Palmiter and the Community Schools reported connectedness, 100% and 85% respectively, whereas fewer did at El Centro. Senior Extension, and the CARE programs, 73%, 77%, and 77% respectively.

Some barriers to improving safety and relationships between students and staff are related to student program placement and time in program. Sometimes students are placed in programs due to court or district mandates or delinquency issues, and building trust and relationships is challenging. This becomes more difficult when students have short enrollments. Because many students transition among our programs, having continuity and consistency among practices across our programs could be beneficial as well as staff training to support students' distinctive needs. Areas for growth include a better understanding of the mental health needs of the younger students and expanding program and behavioral supports, and learning more about how the community schools and Palmiter staff

engage with students and adapt this model to inform how we might employ the same strategies for students in the lower grade spans and other programs.

Access to a Broad Course of Study (LCFF Priority 7)

LEAs provide a narrative summary of the extent to which all students have access to and are enrolled in a broad course of study by addressing, at a minimum, the following four prompts:

1. Briefly identify the locally selected measures or tools that the LEA is using to track the extent to which all students have access to, and are enrolled in, a broad course of study, based on grade spans, unduplicated student groups, and individuals with exceptional needs served. (response limited to 1,500 characters)
2. Using the locally selected measures or tools, summarize the extent to which all students have access to, and are enrolled in, a broad course of study. The summary should identify any differences across school sites and student groups in access to, and enrollment in, a broad course of study, and may describe progress over time in the extent to which all students have access to, and are enrolled in, a broad course of study. (response limited to 1,500 characters)
3. Given the results of the tool or locally selected measures, identify the barriers preventing the LEA from providing access to a broad course of study for all students. (response limited to 1,500 characters)
4. In response to the results of the tool or locally selected measures, what revisions, decisions, or new actions will the LEA implement, or has the LEA implemented, to ensure access to a broad course of study for all students? (response limited to 1,500 characters)

1. Local Measures

It is important to note that our students have differing course needs across programs and schools and not all need to be enrolled in the full complement of courses to achieve their academic goals. For example, a senior extension program student may only be enrolled in one math course and one history course because that is all they need to complete their graduation requirements. That said, all students have access to the courses they need for their educational plans. Local measures used to assess whether students have access to the following areas of study include staff and student surveys and course and program enrollment information for Math, Reading/Language Arts, History/Social Science, Science, Fine Arts, Health/PE, Computers/Technology, and CTE related courses. Data is disaggregated by program type, grade span, and students with special needs where possible and staff regularly review students' individual education plans. Data regarding course enrollment is published annually on the SARC.

2. Student Access to, or Enrollment in, a Broad Course of Study

A total of 48 certificated staff provided data for this measure. The survey results showed that by areas of instruction, nearly all teachers believed that students had enrollment in, or access to, all of the core content areas. Analyses by content areas showed that 95% of Reading/Language Arts teachers indicated that students have enrollment in/access to English Language/Language Arts. In the areas of Math, History/Social Science, and Science, 100% of the teachers indicated that students have enrollment in/access to courses in these areas. Percentages of teachers indicating that students have enrollment in or access to the non-core classes were Fine Arts 78%, Health/PE 94%, Computers/Technology 81%, and CTE 86%.

Analyses by school and program type showed that fewer teachers at the special education Foundations program indicated that their students had access to, or enrollment in, a broad course of study. This is not surprising as many of these students' non-core class time might be spent on further development of independent living skills, engagement with their environment, and communication progression, some of which may include arts, technology, and related CTE activities.

Student survey results (N = 246) showed that when asked what other courses or subjects students wanted, the responses included mostly support areas such as clubs, support classes (e.g., anger management), and supplemental courses such as drivers' education.

3. Barriers to a Broad Course of Study

Important to note is that although access to a course may be possible, it may not always occur due to the type of program that students are in or the specific areas in which they need to obtain credits to graduate. Although few teachers identified barriers to course access, a number identified areas in which course implementation and instruction could be enhanced to enable accessibility of course content for students. Special education teachers indicated that some of the barriers included the lack of supplemental materials or the time it takes to further adapt materials for their specialized populations of students. Teachers from both regular and special education classrooms emphasized the need for technology support, training in CTE related courses and course options, materials that can be sent home to enhance learning, the addition of life-skills courses, more English learner support materials, and greater independent study course options and supplemental materials to accompany this option.

4. Changes Implemented

Based on feedback received throughout the year and further validated by the surveys, changes planned for the following year include expanded professional learning opportunities, expansion of UC/CSU approved a-g course offerings, addition of an English language development specialist, and access to classes offered by both Folsom Lake College and the Los Rios Community Colleges.

Coordination of Services for Expelled Students – COE Only (LCFF Priority 9)

Assess the degree of implementation of the progress in coordinating instruction for expelled students in your county.

Rating Scale (lowest to highest) -

- 1 - Exploration and Research Phase
- 2 - Beginning Development
- 3 - Initial Implementation
- 4 - Full Implementation
- 5 - Full Implementation and Sustainability

Coordinating Instruction	1	2	3	4	5
1. Assessing status of triennial plan for providing educational services to all expelled students in the county, including:	[No response required]	[No response required]	[No response required]	[No response required]	[No response required]
a. Review of required outcome data.					5
b. Identifying existing educational alternatives for expelled pupils, gaps in educational services to expelled pupils, and strategies for filling those service gaps.					5
c. Identifying alternative placements for pupils who are expelled and placed in district community day school programs, but who fail to meet the terms and conditions of their rehabilitation plan or who pose a danger to other district pupils.					5
2. Coordinating on development and implementation of triennial plan					5

Coordinating Instruction	1	2	3	4	5
with all LEAs within the county.					
3. Establishing ongoing collaboration and policy development for transparent referral process for LEAs within the county to the county office of education or other program options, including dissemination to all LEAs within the county a menu of available continuum of services for expelled students.					5
4. Developing memorandum of understanding regarding the coordination of partial credit policies between district of residence and county office of education.					5

Coordination of Services for Foster Youth – COE Only (LCFF Priority 10)

Assess the degree of implementation of coordinated service program components for foster youth in your county.

Rating Scale (lowest to highest) -

- 1 - Exploration and Research Phase
- 2 - Beginning Development
- 3 - Initial Implementation
- 4 - Full Implementation
- 5 - Full Implementation and Sustainability

Coordinating Services	1	2	3	4	5
1. Establishing ongoing collaboration and supporting policy development, including establishing formalized information sharing agreements with child welfare, probation, Local Education Agency (LEAs), the courts, and other organizations to support determining the proper educational placement of foster youth (e.g., school of origin versus current residence, comprehensive versus alternative school, and regular versus special education).					5

Coordinating Services	1	2	3	4	5
2. Building capacity with LEA, probation, child welfare, and other organizations for purposes of implementing school-based support infrastructure for foster youth intended to improve educational outcomes (e.g., provide regular professional development with the Foster Youth Liaisons to facilitate adequate transportation services for foster youth).					5
3. Providing information and assistance to LEAs regarding the educational needs of foster youth in order to improve educational outcomes.					5
4. Providing direct educational services for foster youth in LEA or county-operated programs provided the school district has certified that specified services cannot be provided or funded using other sources, including, but not limited to, Local Control Funding Formula, federal, state or local funding.					5
5. Establishing ongoing collaboration and supporting development of policies and procedures that facilitate expeditious transfer of records, transcripts, and other relevant educational information.					5
6. Facilitating the coordination of post-secondary opportunities for youth by engaging with systems partners, including, but not limited to, child welfare transition planning and independent living services, community colleges or universities, career technical education, and workforce development providers.					5
7. Developing strategies to prioritize the needs of foster youth in the community, using community-wide assessments that consider age group, geographical area, and identification of highest needs students based on academic needs and placement type.					5

Coordinating Services	1	2	3	4	5
8. Engaging in the process of reviewing plan deliverables and of collecting and analyzing LEA and COE level outcome data for purposes of evaluating effectiveness of support services for foster youth and whether the investment in services contributes to improved educational outcomes for foster youth.					5