



**California County Superintendents
Educational Services Association**

**Guide for County Superintendents
– Support, Review, and Approval
of Local Control and Accountability
Plans**

June 2017 Edition

Table of Contents

Foreword	1
Introduction - Role of the County Superintendent.....	3
Guidance on Emerging Topics	5
Alignment of Information	5
Guidance on How to Organize and Deploy Your Support and Review Teams...	6
Addressing the Eight State Priorities.....	10
Sending the District LCAP Back to the Board.....	11
LCFF Fiscal Topics	12
Unspent Funds.....	12
Including LCFF Funds in the LCAP and Use of Object and Resource Codes	12
Third-Party Letters to Superintendent	14
Supporting Meaningful Stakeholder Engagement.....	15
Acknowledgments.....	20
Acronym Key	21

Foreword

This is a guidance document that complements the CCSESA Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) Approval Manual and is designed for county superintendents.

California's 58 county superintendents and their offices will continue to be the first line of support for school districts and will play an integral role in the state's ability to deliver on the promise of LCFF/LCAP to help all California students achieve college and career readiness. The LCFF/LCAP model will continue to evolve in future years. However, the impact of the county superintendents will continue as they provide their districts with LCAP oversight, review, approval, support, and technical assistance.

Every county superintendent in California must be knowledgeable and directly involved in the oversight and implementation of the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) and the Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP).

Recognizing that each county office of education has its own unique culture and methods of operation, it is important to balance local prerogatives within a consistent statewide approach to the support, review, and approval of school district LCAPs.

CCSESA has convened an LCAP Coordinating Committee to help establish guidance and recommendations to assist county superintendents and their staffs with LCAP support, review, and approval. A key component of this committee's continuing work will be to identify emerging issues that affect most counties and to coordinate guidance for county superintendents as they make local decisions. As with many things, the "Art of LCAP" will continue to evolve and with that, this guide will be a living document that will continue to be updated as emerging topics are identified.

Introduction - Role of the County Superintendent

The LCFF has brought fundamental changes to California's education funding system, including expanding the authority and oversight responsibilities of county superintendents.

Education Code Section 1240 grants county superintendents general oversight of districts in their county. This authority and oversight expanded under AB1200, significantly increasing and refining that role. In the past, the focus was on ensuring school districts' fiscal solvency; however, this oversight has evolved into a multidimensional practice, often referred to as the art and science of AB1200.

The role of providing support and oversight to districts has continued to expand with the Williams Settlement oversight and program improvement under the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). With the implementation of LCFF and specifically Education Code Section 52070, et seq., county superintendents are explicitly responsible for approving and overseeing district LCAPs.

Just as their AB 1200 fiscal management responsibilities have evolved and expanded over time, county superintendents can expect a similar experience with LCAP support, review, and approval. Learning from these other oversight experiences will help county superintendents and their staffs as they develop their LCAP support and approval practices.

Overview of the Role

Education Code Section 52070 grants county superintendents the legal authority to approve district LCAPs based on three statutory criteria: Adherence to the SBE template, sufficient expenditures in the budget to implement LCAP and adherence to SBE expenditure regulations. However, county superintendents should make a concerted effort to provide support and technical assistance that goes beyond the minimum statutory requirements (for more detail on the three criteria please reference CCSESA's LCAP Approval Manual).

As county superintendents move forward with LCAP support, the main focus will be on high-quality design and coherent implementation of LCAPs. Efforts must focus on clarity as well as the mandatory compliance aspects of the template.

Regarding criteria that require sufficiency of resources to help support LCAP goals and objectives, the local needs assessment should be regarded as the foundation upon which the LCAP is built. This means identifying the needs of students who generate supplemental and concentration grant dollars as well as the needs of all students regardless of their subgroup. The focus should remain on results as opposed to expenditures since this approach will indicate whether a plan is truly effective in meeting the needs of students.

Because of current and future expectations, every county superintendent in the state should be knowledgeable and involved in this critical work.

When approving district LCAPs, county superintendents should carefully review any descriptions of districtwide or school services that are intended to increase or improve services for low-income students, English learners and foster youth. Because each district and community is unique,

county offices will need to determine individually whether an LCAP demonstrates increased or improved services for the targeted student population.

With regard to proportionality and the use of targeted funds, it is important to first know the services provided to all students in order to measure additional services for unduplicated pupils. This knowledge will help determine whether the LCAP demonstrates a proportionate increase or improvement of services for targeted students. County superintendents must determine if increased or improved services for targeted students are specifically in support of the goals and actions of the district's LCAP.

The development and release of the CA School Dashboard will serve as the focal point of our new state accountability system. The connection between the Dashboard and the revised LCAP template within the LCAP Summary section is a key change and it is important for county offices to communicate early and frequently with client districts to ensure LCAP goals and actions include the most significant areas of need and that plans are implemented with appropriate coherence, fidelity and rigor.

For the LCAP process to be productive and benefit students across the state, it should not become a mere compliance exercise that simply follows the funds, but a coherent document.

Because of current and future expectations, every county superintendent in the state should be knowledgeable and involved in this critical work.

LCAP accountability ultimately rests with local stakeholders, elected board of education trustees, and district administration.

However, the county superintendent of schools, as the intermediate agent between the state and the LEAs, is responsible for overseeing the process in his or her county. Through the combined statutes of AB1200 and the LCFF, the county superintendent is responsible for providing fiscal and academic assistance that includes progressive and necessary interventions to school districts.

Michael Fullan's recent paper, "California's Golden Opportunity: Local Control Accountability Plan's Theory of Action" stated that "External judgmental accountability does not produce the desired outcomes it seeks; nor does elaborate bureaucratic compliance result in actions that cause measurable improvement." For the LCAP process to be productive and benefit students across the state, it should not become a mere compliance exercise that simply follows the funds, but a coherent document. The involvement of the county superintendent and his or her senior staff in this process will communicate to the field that this process should be a primary focus for districts. The main goal for everyone must be ensuring quality implementation that leads to increased student achievement.

Guidance on Emerging Topics

Alignment of Information

County office of education development, support, review, and approval of LCAPs can be a complicated if not complex process. This is also true when it comes to the likelihood of disparate interpretations of what the statutes provide and mean, and it is important to attain a balance between strict interpretations and local flexibility. Nonetheless, to preserve continuity across California county offices, a valuable strategy would be to agree on a “common message” for this work. This common message could be similar to what is articulated for the governor’s budget each year for CCSESA by the Business and Administration Steering Committee (BASC). That document has proven to be invaluable in providing guidance, direction and understanding of budget proposals and other complex financial information. At the same time, it should be recognized that disparate regional COE cultures and relationships with client school districts may necessitate modifications to the message in order to more effectively address local issues.

CCSESA has also established the LCAP Director/Lead Network to help all counties provide high quality and consistent support across the state. In addition to county offices communicating with one another for common understanding, it is also critical that CCSESA engage in a two-pronged strategy with other organizational entities and professional associations. One strategy would be to engage the other groups that are a part of the state structure such as the State Board of Education, the California Department of Education (CDE), the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence (CCEE) and the Fiscal Crisis and Management Assistance Team (FCMAT). One example of close collaboration is the work of the Standards Implementation Steering Committee, which has representatives from SBE, CCSESA, and CDE working together to create practice and policy levers for high-quality standards implementation, recognize overlaps and time constraints and address curriculum, instruction and assessment issues. Another ongoing effort is the work being done between CCSESA and the CCEE in the development of regional and statewide trainings and development and maintenance of a “library” of LCAP informational and technical resources.

Just as important is the second component of interacting with professional organizations and advocacy groups that are engaged in this work. It is hoped that ongoing transparent and open communication between these groups can help avoid misunderstanding, confusion, and potentially costly litigation. Working with professional associations such as ACSA, CASBO and CSBA will also be a key to ensuring that the practitioner point of view is at the forefront of this work.

Guidance on How to Organize and Deploy Your Support and Review Teams

As county offices of education venture into year three of LCFF, the process of reviewing, approving and supporting LCAPs continues to evolve.

While review and approval of a district's LCAP is distinct from year-round support to help districts implement their LCAPs and achieve the desired student outcomes, those efforts are inherently connected at the county office.

Focusing on capacity-building for districts will help guide county offices as they develop and deliver timely and customized support throughout the year. County offices should generally consider the information (such as the goals, actions and services, etc.) included in district LCAPs as an indicator of the probable need for support. County offices could then use this information to align their programs and services in ongoing efforts to meet their statutory charge to “superintend” the districts. The LCAP process will help all school districts and county offices build the capacity to focus on systems alignment and change to ensure that every child in the state receives the education he or she needs to be college and career ready.

Guiding Principles

- The county superintendent shall be engaged in the LCAP process.
- LCAP communication, support and training are to be ongoing throughout the year.
- County office staff leading the LCAP support and review efforts should include cabinet-level staff, ensuring feedback, and emerging issues can be highlighted immediately.
- Cross-collaboration between curriculum and instruction, fiscal, technology/IT, student services and all related divisions is vital and essential to a comprehensive review.
- County office review teams will be composed of staff from various COE departments, with the core members from curriculum and instruction and finance. Other staff members can be added to the team as reviewers consider the details of plan activities, necessitating the support of additional county office expertise.
- Calibration of review teams across county offices and regions shall be designed to provide consistency of reviewing principles and strategies with the acknowledgment that these are not to become “compliance activities.”
- COE coaching for district-level teams will be focused on building local capacity to implement their LCAP with the desired outcomes of students reaching college and career readiness.

Components of support and review should be consistently offered across the state. These components will generally fall into four categories:

- **Internal to the county office of education**
 - Regular communication and interaction for LCAP reviewers will help with collaboration and calibration.
 - The CCSESA LCAP approval manual will guide consistency of the review process for all districts.
 - County office teams will establish a schedule to review plan priorities, enabling consistency of communication and feedback loops between the county office and districts.

- A consistent process for requesting district clarifications will be used with all districts in a county office’s jurisdiction throughout the review process. The review process will be conducted neutrally when asking for clarification (for example, “on page x, it was stated that What was your intent related to . . .?”).
- County offices should be consistent in communicating approval or requests for clarification of plans with their districts.
- The use of an Internet software program such as SharePoint as part of the internal review process can be helpful for the purposes of sharing documents and tracking the review process.
- To reinforce openness, County Superintendents should urge districts to consider placing the county superintendent approval letters on their board agendas, sharing the correspondence and reviewing clarifications and modifications to reinforce the rigor of the process.
- **External efforts between the county office and client districts**
 - County offices should involve districts in ongoing yearlong professional development.
 - Guidance and training should be provided and combined with the elements of the CCSESA LCAP Approval Manual. Specific elements of the manual should be used as examples to inform and guide the districts and point out elements that will be addressed in annual reviews.
 - Support must be systemic
 - It should start early in the year
 - County office coaching must be differentiated and customized to fit each district’s needs (considering size, grade-level configurations, demographics, rural/urban, etc.)
 - The feedback loop to districts from county office staff should include regularly checking with districts on the status of their LCAP implementation as well as offering assistance and coaching.
 - Providing districts with technical assistance.
 - Assisting districts in communicating their plans and activities to their stakeholders.
 - County offices should be a “critical friend” as the districts implement plan activities.
 - There should be a multitiered system of support for districts
 - Group meetings with districts from across the county
 - Consider providing a monthly calendar of support work for district teams.
 - Monthly meetings can be held to share information, ideas and update on the data collection work.
 - Consider LCAP Implementation as a standing item for job-alike meetings (e.g., business, curriculum, etc.)
 - Professional learning opportunities should be provided for districts to learn and collaborate with each other and county office staff. Topics could include:

- Evaluation rubrics
- Technical assistance that will be provided to achieve targeted outcomes for each of the eight state priorities.
- Tying the new state and federal accountability systems to the LCFF metrics
- CALPADs training focused on review and use of the information as it relates to LCAP data and work
- Connecting the LCAP to the classroom
- Using data to clarify and address all students' needs
- LCAP implementation
- Metrics to watch all year and what to do with the data
- One-on-one technical assistance and support to LEAs will be offered throughout the entire year.
 - One-on-one consultation before school board approval of an LEA's LCAP is important to a smooth review and approval process.
 - When meeting with districts, fiscal and educational services should attend together with prepared notes and questions to share. Sending the notes to the districts in advance facilitates the meeting.
 - Allow districts to submit their draft LCAP for an initial review to provide feedback early in the review process
 - Tools such as Google Docs could be a medium for additional communication and support from the county office to the district.
 - The county office should have office hours that allow districts to have a dedicated time for support questions and activities.
 - Provide opportunities for cohort support and individual, targeted discussions on the district's leadership goals, student achievement and instructional practices.
- **Regional external efforts from county office to county office**
 - The efforts of working across county lines will help benefit all county offices by allowing for time for calibration of review, approval, and support as well as building capacity to offer high-quality support.
 - Regionally
 - Collecting best practices and samples to guide LCAP teams.
 - Sharing innovative actions and services that focus on student outcomes and state priorities.
 - Discussing consistent ways to review student progress toward identified outcomes/metrics.
- **Statewide external efforts county office to county office**
 - The Curriculum and Instruction Steering Committee (CISC)
 - The Business and Administration Steering Committee (BASC)

- The LCAP Coordinating Committee
- Calibration efforts
 - Identify statewide and regional trends that need calibration across COEs.
- Give county offices an opportunity to collaborate to clarify the LCAP and its impact on the classroom and student learning. Topics for discussion might include calibration on the review of the LCAP; impact on student achievement as it relates to leadership in the districts; how different size districts approach the LCAP; best practices for guiding districts in their implementation; an evaluation (data) of their goals; revisiting their goals for the following year.
- Calibration sessions for county office teams, reviewing actual district LCAPs for consistency and clarity to promote discussion and agreement on what was successfully demonstrated for each of the elements and to promote discussion and agreement on what was successfully demonstrated to each of the elements.
- Consider developing cross county teams to help county offices and districts with the LCAP process.

Example of year-round LCAP support that many counties are providing

- In August/September, the county office will meet with district superintendents to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of LCAPs. Ideas for improvement to the LCAP development process will be discussed. Different ways for collecting and analyzing data will be shared. In addition, districts will be encouraged to begin the process of implementing their LCAP immediately, and share with stakeholders the progress made on actions/services.
- In November, the county office will hold trainings/workshops to help districts desiring assistance with the LCAP.
- In November/December, the county office will meet with districts to determine their progress on goals, data collection, and information sharing.
- In January, the county office will hold trainings/workshops to help districts desiring assistance with the LCAP.
- In the February/March, the county office will meet again with districts for a status report on annual update and community engagement processes.
- In April/May, the county office will be available to review draft LCAPs.

Supporting Basic Aid Districts

Relationships between the county superintendents and district superintendents are clearly a key component of the successful implementation of LCFF and the support, review and approval process for LCAPs.

All districts, including basic aid districts, receive an entitlement for LCFF base grants. In addition, all districts receive an entitlement for LCFF supplemental grants and possibly concentration grants depending on the district's unduplicated pupil counts. The LCFF entitlement, excluding minimum state aid for basic aid districts is entirely funded by local property taxes, while the entitlement for nonbasic aid districts is funded by a combination of state aid and local property taxes. All districts are required to use the LCAP to demonstrate how they meet the needs of all pupils relative to state and local priorities, and how they use their supplemental and concentration grant funds to improve or increase services for low income, English language learner, and foster youth pupils.

Addressing the Eight State Priorities

The statute is clear that districts must address all eight state priorities each year in their LCAPs. However, addressing each of the eight state priorities does not mean that a district must equally weight each priority by way of actions and services, funds, depth, or goals. Districts should definitely integrate multiple priorities into a single goal (wherever appropriate). Many districts are becoming more sophisticated with developing goals, and many county office are seeing districts with three to five goals. This will allow districts to be more strategic with their planning as well as help make implementation more realistic.

The CA Dashboard will clearly play a role in this by way of the state indicators and local performance indicators.

Sending the District LCAP Back to the Board

As county offices have gained more experience in assisting districts with all things LCAP, particular attention is now focused on supporting districts as they develop their LCAPs. By working together during LCAP development, the hope is the LCAP will be approvable by the county office before it is submitted to the local school board. This saves many hours of extra work on the part of everyone involved and avoids potential embarrassment for the district.

Based on the experiences of county superintendents after the past round of review and approval, the LCAP should be resubmitted to the school board for a public hearing only if “material or substantive” changes are necessary. “Material or substantive changes” should be defined as a significant variation of funds in the LCAP, something that may alter a goal within the LCAP, or make a LCAP unapprovable.

Most county superintendents are now providing LCAP support year-round and are actively engaging their districts early on in development, providing significant support and formative feedback. This results in recommendations and necessary changes being made before the district’s public hearing.

Being proactive with districts helps build relationships as well as in avoid potentially embarrassing situations for local districts. As the support, review, and approval of LCAPs enters its third year, the work of county superintendents and their staffs will continue to evolve as more comprehensive support systems are developed.

In some situations, a county superintendent may send an LCAP back to the district for changes and an additional public hearing.

LCFF Fiscal Topics

Unspent Funds

It is not uncommon for districts to have budgeted yet unspent funds at the end of a given fiscal year. This situation could easily happen when a planned action/service either cannot be completed or is completed earlier in the year at a lower than projected cost. An example of this could be that the LEA is planning to spend funds to hire six counselors for the high schools to help increase college and career readiness and student engagement. However, if the district can hire only four qualified counselors, “unspent funds” will be left over.

In these situations, it would be appropriate for the district to describe and address this variance in the Annual Update section of the LCAP if the amount is considered material. In these cases it is advisable to follow the same logic that independent auditors use in making this determination, i.e., that which is considered fiscally significant in a small district with limited resources will not mirror that of a large district with revenues in the tens or hundreds of millions of dollars.

Many advocacy groups have expressed concern when these scenarios occur with the use of supplemental and/or concentration grant funds. This is because when supplemental and concentration grant funds are unspent at year end, they technically become unrestricted “one-time funds” in the succeeding budget year and as such are not legally categorical in nature.

As outlined in the example above regarding the planned hiring of counselors, it is reasonable for this to occur in the ebb and flow of district operations. While it is not optimal for funds that are generated by unduplicated students to be unspent and become unrestricted funds in the following year, it nonetheless happens sometimes. However, it is important to remember that these dollars are intended to support current as opposed to future student needs.

However, if there is reason to believe that the district is deliberately and purposefully under-spending its supplemental and concentration grant funds to roll over these monies to the unrestricted general fund, the county superintendent is advised to consult with the district superintendent and governing board and determine the rationale supporting these actions. Also, in order to better ensure both consistency and transparency, these interactions are best accompanied by written documentation.

Including LCFF Funds in the LCAP and the Use of Object and Resource Codes

While it is not required to include all of your LCFF funds in the LCAP, LEAs should include all LCFF funds and other fund sources (e.g. Title I, II, III, etc.) when they are being used to accomplish a goal or action and service in the LCAP. This aligns with the idea of transparency and telling a comprehensive story to the community.

The practice of county superintendents recommending that LEAs use object and resource codes in the LCAP varies. It is most appropriate to use descriptive language as opposed to object codes solely because it will allow for transparency within the community and with stakeholders. This recommendation would not preclude a LEA to use object codes. Resource codes should be used for clarity and transparency (e.g. LCFF-base, LCFF supplemental/concentration, Title I, Educator Effectiveness \$, etc.). This recommendation would also align with the discussion on including LCFF funds in the LCAP highlighted above.

The LCAP regulations require that LEAs “list and describe budgeted expenditures” needed to implement LCAP actions, “including where those expenditures can be found in the LEA’s budget.” Furthermore, the funding source for each listed expenditure must be identified, and

expenditures must be “classified using the California School Accounting Manual” (CSAM). The reference to CSAM has led some LEA’s to believe that expenditures must be listed using SACS codes for the resource (i.e. funding source) and object or major object range (i.e. the type of expenditure and location in the budget). However, CSAM classifies resources and object by both SACS codes and descriptive titles. The use of either the descriptive titles or the SACS codes likely meets the regulatory requirements, but while SACS codes may be useful for technically knowledgeable staff preparing an LCAP and for county office staff who review LCAPs, these codes are often not meaningful to parents, students, line staff and other constituents. Therefore if an LCAP is to be a useful tool for engaging with lay constituents, it should at a minimum contain descriptive titles for both the funding source and the type of expenditure. Resource and object codes (or major object range) could be added for additional clarity and utility. For example, “\$100,000 LCFF funds, certificated salaries” would be much more useful to most constituents than “\$100,000, 0000, 1000” or even “\$100,000, resource 0000, object range 1000.” However, the two could be combined to provide SACS information to technical staff and reviewers as in “\$100,000, LCFF funds (0000), certificated salaries (1000s).”

Third-Party Letters to County Superintendents

The LCAP is intended to be a comprehensive document specifying a district's planned goals, supporting actions, and services for achieving educational progress for all students. LCAPs will draw considerable interest from external entities such as advocacy groups, researchers, state agencies and policy makers. Districts and county offices may receive a wide range of inquiries about the LCAP development process, content, the level of statutory compliance, and the county office LCAP approval process.

Local control is the central tenet of the LCFF and the LCAP. Districts develop their LCAPs in consultation with their local communities. Therefore, the most appropriate way for interested parties to become involved in a district's LCAP is to work directly with the district.

County offices across the state have received many letters from parties ranging from advocacy groups citing concerns with district LCAPs to government agencies asking to review a county office's support and approval process.

Therefore, the most appropriate way for interested parties to become involved in a district's LCAP is to work directly with the district.

In responding to third-party inquiries county superintendents are well positioned to represent their community's commitment to the principles of transparency and local engagement central to the LCFF and LCAP. Because local context will determine the appropriate response for each inquiry, each response is best developed using those two principles. Beyond this, the foundation of each response begins with the statutory role of the county superintendent.

The following key elements may be worthy of considering with all responses:

LCAP Approval Criteria: Education Code 52070 delineates three specific criteria for county superintendents to use in determining whether or not to approve an LCAP. Those criteria are also further elaborated in CCSESA's LCAP Approval Manual. If a county superintendent determines that a district's LCAP meets the three criteria, EC 52070 dictates that the county superintendent "shall approve" the LCAP.

If the request does not seek documents but only information, an accurate but concise response is advisable. Consistency of response to requests made to multiple COEs avoids confusing or misinforming the requester.

As a last resort, complaints that a district has not complied with the LCAP requirements should be filed using the Uniform Complaint Procedure (UCP), as specified in Education Code 52075. County superintendents may choose to direct and/or assist in facilitating discussions between individuals or outside entities and districts to address any concerns. If all else fails, county superintendents should direct those with concerns to the district's UCP policy.

CCSESA's LCAP Coordinating Committee has suggested the following protocols to help support county superintendents across the state.

- County superintendents who receive a third-party letter are asked to forward the letter to CCSESA.
- COE response letters will be posted on the members-only section of the CCSESA website to help inform the work of all COEs.

- County superintendents should consult with their cabinet and the COE LCAP support and review team.
- County superintendents should consult with other county superintendents.
- County superintendents should consult with legal counsel prior to sending a response.

County superintendents have important and evolving dual roles in helping districts develop and implement high-quality LCAPs. The first is providing support and assistance to districts in the stakeholder engagement, development, monitoring and implementation of LCAPs and the actions and services delineated in the plan. The second, and distinct, role of county superintendents is to review and approve district LCAPs pursuant to their statutory obligations.

Supporting Meaningful Stakeholder Engagement

One area that will continue to require significant support from county superintendents is districts connecting with their communities in meaningful stakeholder engagement. The involvement of the community is a key component of local accountability and should be seen as a welcome shift for our educational system. This involvement will be key as the K-12 education system continues to move away from a compliance mindset. The LCAP template and regulations simply require a basic level of involvement, but practices used across the state can help districts achieve meaningful stakeholder engagement that results in higher quality plans.

Ultimately, this engagement will vary from district to district based on local needs, communities, and context; what is effective at one district may not be applicable or effective at another. Many of the following principles and practices will help to communicate the district's LCAP but it is still important to heed Fullan's advice: "Students and parents will not identify with or otherwise be engaged by 50-100 plus page plans. Elaborate plans on paper give no assurance that action will follow."

Overarching principles of effective and meaningful stakeholder engagement

- **Stakeholders are communicated with in a variety of ways to ensure awareness of their opportunities for engagement. Some examples of this could include:**
 - Web pages on district/school website are dedicated to LCAP and LCFF.
 - Automated calls promote LCAP meetings and activities.
 - Flyers, email, and LCAP/LCFF brochure are developed.
 - The superintendent develops a formal letter describing LCAP and LCFF.
 - Upcoming LCAP/LCFF activities/meetings are announced at SSC, DELAC, ELAC, PTC, and district board meetings.
 - Marquee announcements are made.
 - Videos/pictures are posted on district Web page sharing engagement activities.
 - The district Web page includes a survey, notes from meetings, comments and suggestions.
 - Social media (e.g. Twitter, Facebook, etc.) is utilized.
 - Each communication is made in languages appropriate to the community.
- **Stakeholders are provided with a variety of engagement opportunities. Some examples of this could include:**
 - Parent Engagement Advisory Committee – Lead parents represent their perspective school sites and communicate information between district and home (LCAP updates, meeting dates).
 - A convenient schedule

- A neighborhood location
- Child care
- Unique strategies that generate attendance (e.g. student art shows, student performances, parent math nights, etc.). Combine with district/school events such as academic nights and PTA meetings.
- Online surveys
- Incentives for attending stakeholder meetings
 - Door prizes, food served
- LCAP/LCFF is a permanent agenda item for SSC, DELAC, ELAC, PTC, district board meetings
- Use of the district Web page to post survey, comments and suggestions, notes from prior meetings
- **Concerted efforts are made to appropriately engage with stakeholders during these meetings. Some examples of this could include:**
 - Materials and support are available in the appropriate languages.
 - Stakeholders work in pairs or small groups
 - Round table discussions are held.
 - Perspective mapping is used.
 - LCAP success – What are the role and responsibilities of stakeholders? (Power Point presentation)
 - A glossary of terms and programs to provide clarity for stakeholders.
- **Stakeholders receive comprehensible data on which to base their input and decisions. Some examples of this could include:**
 - A meeting time is scheduled to explain data in a language that stakeholders understand.
 - Documents are translated into the stakeholders' language.
 - Data is displayed in a format that stakeholders understand.
 - Stakeholders have the opportunity to ask questions about data in a safe and supportive environment.
 - Stakeholders are not asked to make a decision until they comfortably understand the shared data
- **Identify key stakeholder groups (based on community needs and statute). Some examples of this could include:**
 - For example - Students, parents (a wide group of parents from a variety of backgrounds), Communities and staff (from all classifications)
 - Representatives of targeted students and significant subgroups

- **Stakeholder Engagement in the Context of the LCAP and Annual Update**
- **Stakeholders are provided with accurate and detailed information in the Annual Update**
 - In the “actual actions/services” a difference in plans and results is clear and well-detailed for all readers.
 - In the “estimated actual annual expenditures” a difference between budgeted and expended amounts is clear and well-detailed for all readers.
- **Stakeholder input is reflected in Section 1 of the LCAP**
 - In addition to the information required in statute (parent and English learner advisory committees, written responses to the advisory committees, public hearing, board meeting approval, to consultation with teachers, principals, administrators, other school personnel, local bargaining units, parents and pupils) details regarding stakeholder meetings is evident
 - Meeting occurrence
 - Impact of stakeholder input at the meeting on the LCAP
 - Details of where in the LCAP (3-year goal or annual update) the results of stakeholder input can be found
- **Stakeholder input is reflected in the Annual Update**
 - Changes in actions and services and expenditures, along with the stakeholder input on the changes, are included in the box asking “What changes in actions, services and expenditures will be made as a result of reviewing past progress and/or changes to goals?”
 - Stakeholder input from Section 1, the impact of the “annual update” can be found in the annual update, “What changes in actions, services and expenditures will be made as a result of reviewing past progress and/or changes to goals” box.
- **Stakeholder input is reflected in the three-year LCAP Goal section**
 - Stakeholder decisions detailed in Section 1 of the LCAP are reflected in the 3-year LCAP goal section.
 - Changes to be made that were detailed in the annual update are reflected in the 3-year LCAP goal section.

Following are some sample resources for effectively reaching out to stakeholder groups:

The community partners list on the single plan for student achievement can help identify organizations that can serve multiple campuses <http://www.childrennow.org/issue-areas/education/school-finance-reform/lcap/>

The PTA School Smarts Parent Engagement Program model educates parents on the K-12 school system and focuses on parent involvement. Materials are available in a variety of languages, <http://capta.org/programs-events/school-smarts/>

Different forms of communication can be used to help parents understand how they can get involved. Approaches that work include holding meetings at convenient times, providing child care and food at meetings, and forming partnerships with community organizations. The California Endowment has a variety of resources and suggestions: http://www.healthhappenshere.com/lcff_parent_involvement

Existing networks can be accessed throughout the community to build trust. To reach a broader array of parents, multiple communication efforts can be made outside of regular meetings such as surveys, or other outreach tools in a variety of languages to supplement the community conversation and be inclusive of all groups. A coalition of parent groups prepared a best practices document on LCFF: http://d3n8a8pro7vhm.cloudfront.net/schoolmeals/pages/56/attachments/original/1397150992/Final_BestPractices_PI_coalition.pdf?1397150992

Acknowledgments

The California County Superintendents Educational Services Association (CCSESA) developed and released the first version of this document in October 2015, and it was revised in December 2016. This document is designed for county superintendents and their senior staff to use as guidance in their approach to support the development, review, approval and implementation of LCAPs in their counties and local context. It represents the work of the CCSESA LCAP Coordinating Committee, which is a collaboration led by county superintendents with support from CCSESA's Business and Administration Steering Committee (BASC), the Curriculum and Instruction Steering Committee (CISC) and the Student Programs and Services Steering Committee (SPSSC). The Fiscal Crisis and Management Assistance Team (FCMAT) has provided additional assistance in this effort.

LCAP Coordinating Committee Members

Chair: Stan Mantooth (Ventura)	
Subcommittee #1 - Chair: Anne Campbell (San Mateo)	
County Superintendents	Cecilia Massetti (Madera), Mike Martin (Modoc)
BASC	Robbie Montalbano (El Dorado) and Misty Key (Ventura)
CISC	Lisa Gilbert (Kern), Charlene Stringham (Tulare)
SPSSC	Jane Steinkamp (San Joaquin)
Subcommittee #2 - Chair: Stacey Adler (Mono)	
County Superintendents	Mary Jane Burke (Marin)
BASC	Gary Bousum (Monterey), Joshua Schultz (Napa), Denise Porterfield (San Mateo)
CISC	Kathryn Catania (Fresno)
SPSSC	Misti Norby (Modoc)
Subcommittee #3 - Chair: Dave Gordon (Sacramento)	
County Superintendents	Debra Duardo (Los Angeles), Jim Yovino (Fresno)
BASC	Terena Mares (Marin), Tommy Welch (Solano), Gail Atwood (Sutter)
CISC	Judy Flores (Shasta), Christine Olmstead (Orange)
SPSSC	Rick Martin (Orange)

Acronym Key

BASC – Business and Administration Steering Committee

CALPADS – California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System

CCSESA – California County Superintendents Educational Services Association

CISC – Curriculum and Instruction Steering Committee

COE – County Office of Education

DELAC – District English Learner Advisory Committee

ELAC – English Learner Advisory Committee

FCMAT – Fiscal Crisis and Management Assistance Team

LCAP – Local Control and Accountability Plan

LCFF – Local Control Funding Formula

LEA – Local Educational Agency

NCLB – No Child Left Behind

PTC –Parent Teacher Committee

SBE – State Board of Education

SSC – School Services of California, Inc.

SPSCC – Student Programs and Services Steering Committee

UCP – Uniform Complaint Procedures