

Overview of the *Williams* Settlement

On September 29, 2004, *Williams v. California*, a lawsuit filed on behalf of thousands of California public school students who argued they were denied an equal educational opportunity, resulted in a settlement agreement with the state. The settlement was quickly implemented through five bills.

County superintendents must monitor schools ranked in deciles 1, 2, and 3 under the Base Academic Performance Index (API) for the following elements of the *Williams* settlement: (1) sufficiency of instructional materials; (2) facilities deficiencies; (3) accuracy of data reported on the School Accountability Record Card related to sufficiency of materials and facilities deficiencies; and (4) teacher misassignments and teacher vacancies. The most current was determined using the 2012 Base API. If a school did not receive a 2012 Base API, the 2011 Base API was used. Superintendents report the results of their annual reviews to each school district's governing board on a quarterly basis, followed by an annual report.

California's Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) was enacted in 2013. The State Board of Education was tasked with developing a new statewide accountability system, which resulted in the suspension of the API calculation in 2013, and the launch of a new accountability system in 2017 based on multiple measures. This system is housed within the online "California School Dashboard" (Dashboard). As mentioned above, the most recent list of schools meeting Williams criteria was determined using the 2012 Base API.

In addition to the current API-based Williams criteria being nearly a decade out-of-date, we must consider whether legislation to amend those criteria should be based on newer accountability measures. California has the Dashboard and differentiated assistance. The federal Every Student Succeeds Act has the Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI), Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), and Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) criteria (**see Attachment 1**). We must also consider whether, as a matter of public policy, it is necessary for the new criteria to result in a substantially similar number of schools identified for Williams purposes.

Using the [2012 Base API dataset](#), **2,184** traditional public schools are subject to Williams monitoring and **200** charter schools eligible to opt into Williams monitoring (charter schools are exempt from monitoring).

- Input on prospective legislation. CCSESA was a co-sponsor of AB 2472 (Jones-Sawyer, 2020), relating to the *Williams* selection criteria for monitoring schools. Other co-sponsored included the Los Angeles County Office of Education, Public Advocates, and the ACLU. Efforts around AB 2472 were paused before committee hearings could begin due to the sudden onset of the COVID-19 pandemic. Now, Assembly Member Jones-Sawyer wishes to proceed with new legislation in the 2021 legislative session. CCSESA staff is therefore seeking direction from our membership on potential revisions to the *Williams* criteria, along with other potential changes to the law. Our meeting today will inform a discussion with the bill author's staff and other stakeholders on Wednesday as we determine next steps for the prospective bill.



Discussion on Public Advocates memo and options for revising school selection criteria

Please review the memo written by Public Advocates ([linked here](#))

Discussion questions:

1. Are the federal CSI, TSI, and ATSI appropriate criteria for *Williams* monitoring?
2. What is your view on using CalSAAS misassignment data where 15% or more of the teachers are not fully credentialed *and* the school is not already captured by CSI/ATSI?
3. Having replaced the API with our current Dashboard, are there ways to integrate the Dashboard's multiple measures into *Williams* monitoring criteria?
4. How important is maintaining the current *number* of monitored schools under a revised formula? Base API deciles 1-3 covered approximately 2,300 traditional and charter schools.
5. What other aspects of the *Williams* statutory framework, especially provisions relating to county offices of education, would be helpful to reexamine?