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**California Department of Education**

**Report to the Legislature, Department of Finance, State Board of Education, and Legislative Analyst’s Office**

**The Developing, Aligning, and Improving Systems of Academic and Behavioral Supports Grant** **2023 Annual Report to the Legislature**

## Executive Summary

This report summarizes the key content of two annual reports submitted by the Orange County Department of Education (OCDE) in 2023. The first report is titled *Developing, Aligning, and Improving Systems of Academic and Behavioral Supports: Fostering a Positive School Climate.* This report details the impact of the project activity on the implementation of the California Multi-Tiered System of Support (CA MTSS) Framework in year five (2022–23). The second report is titled *Developing, Aligning, and Improving Systems of Academic and Behavioral Supports: Enhancing the Social–Emotional Well-Being of Youth.* This report focuses on the impact of the CA MTSS Framework; specifically, the integration of an MTSS in various learning practices at the school level in year two (2022–23).

This report covers the following information, as summarized from the original reports:

1. A summary of activities conducted and resources developed.
2. The number of local educational agencies (LEAs), educators, and pupils served.
3. A description of effective, evidence-based strategies identified to help LEAs statewide to create a positive school climate.
4. A summary of any data available on outcomes resulting from the activities conducted, including data reported by LEAs.
5. Recommendations for improving state-level policy or activity in support of improving school climate.

For full details and comprehensive descriptions, please see the original reports as submitted to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction on the OCDE California Scale-Up MTSS Initiative Annual Reports web page at <https://ocde.us/MTSS/Pages/California_SUMS_Initiative.aspx>.

If you have any questions regarding this report or would like to request a hard copy, please contact Alison Pettit, Education Programs Consultant, Professional Learning Support Division, at 916-323-3927 or [apettit@cde.ca.gov](mailto:apettit@cde.ca.gov).

## Background and Legislative Reporting Requirements

The Developing, Aligning, and Improving Systems of Academic and Behavioral Supports (ISABS) grant was established by Assembly Bill (AB) 104 (Chapter 13, Statutes of 2015) and later amended by Senate Bill 828 (Ch. 29, Stats. 2016). The 2015 Budget Act appropriated $10 million to the ISABS grant, and the 2016 Budget Act augmented the original appropriation with an additional $20 million. The legislation required that the grantee provide technical assistance and develop and disseminate statewide resources.

In 2016, the California Department of Education (CDE) selected the Orange County Department of Education (OCDE) as the recipient of the ISABS grant through a competitive grant process for the Scaling Up Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Statewide Initiative, also known as the CA SUMS Initiative. The OCDE subcontracted with (1) the Butte County Office of Education (BCOE) for rural representation and partnership in planning and conducting grant activities and (2) the Schoolwide Integrated Framework for Transformation Technical Assistance Center at the University of Kansas to provide technical assistance and professional learning opportunities to participating local educational agencies (LEAs).

In 2018, AB 1808 (Chap. 32, Stats. 2018) established an additional component of the ISABS grant that required the OCDE to subcontract with a California postsecondary educational institution. The OCDE and BCOE partnered with the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) Center for the Transformation of Schools (CTS) to expand the CA MTSS Framework with an emphasis on promoting a positive school climate statewide.

In 2021, AB 130 (Chap. 44, Stats. 2021) appropriated $50 million to the OCDE with the instruction to partner with an LEA to expand the state’s capacity to support LEAs in implementing social–emotional learning (SEL), trauma-informed practices, and culturally relevant, affirming, and sustaining practices. The Placer County Office of Education (PCOE) was identified as a partner LEA through a competitive application process, and OCDE awarded $12.5 million to PCOE as their partner LEA.

The CDE has an administrative role in this grant program, including conducting the award process, distributing funding, and providing technical oversight of the items contained within the original Request for Applications document. The CDE does not receive funding for the administration of this grant program.

AB 1808 (Chap. 32, Stats. 2018) requires that the grantee provide the following information on an annual basis:

1. a summary of the activities conducted and resources developed;
2. the number of LEAs, educators, and pupils served by the activities and resources;
3. a description of effective evidence-based strategies identified for implementing the practices described in subdivision (c);
4. a summary of any data that is available on outcomes resulting from the activities conducted, including any data reported by LEAs; and
5. recommendations for improving state-level activities or policies.

## Summary of How Legislative Requirements Were Met

The OCDE provided the 2022–23 *Developing, Aligning, and Improving Systems of Academic and Behavioral Supports: Fostering a Positive School Climate* (*School Climate*) Report and the *Developing, Aligning, and Improving Systems of Academic and Behavioral Supports: Enhancing the Social–Emotional Well-Being of Youth* (*Social–Emotional Well-Being*) Report to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction (SSPI) by the legislatively mandated date. These documents are posted on the OCDE CA SUMS Initiative Annual Reports web page at <https://ocde.us/MTSS/Pages/California_SUMS_Initiative.aspx>.

Included in this legislative report is the grantee’s high-level summary obtained from both grantee’s annual reports provided to the SSPI, which describes the use of grant funds during fiscal year 2022–23.

## Activities Conducted and Resources Developed

### The Executive Leadership Team

The Executive Leadership Team met weekly via phone conference calls and video conference calls. The executive leadership team includes:

* OCDE, Director of Integrated Supports, Jami Parsons, Ed.D
* BCOE, Director of Rural CA MTSS, Rindy DeVoll
* UCLA-CTS, Director, Joseph Bishop, Ph.D.

### Plan of Action

The UCLA-CTS, the OCDE, and the BCOE co-designed the plan of action, which is based upon a theory of action connecting evidence-based, positive approaches to school discipline to ongoing efforts to address the educational needs of students. A summary of the plan of action is as follows: (1) engagement with key statewide professional organizations, agencies and community stakeholders; (2) development of an evidence-based curriculum for schools; (3) preparation for educators on how to apply the curriculum to the daily practices; (4) pilot the program at selected sites and use data from pilot sites to guide broader implementation; (5) connect MTSS to response to intervention and continuous improvement frameworks; and (6) determine impact using qualitative, quantitative and cost-benefit analysis to develop a final summary report.

### The State Support Team

The State Support Team is made up of representatives from the OCDE, BCOE, CDE, and the State Board of Education. They conduct the following activities: (1) lead and support a sustainable technical assistance process for Region Lead COEs and Region Site Coaches working with schools to implement the CA MTSS Framework with fidelity; (2) assist in scaling up and sustaining CA MTSS implementation across the state (including contributing to state and local meetings) and network development with other key agencies and educational partners; (3) provide CA MTSS professional learning opportunities; (4) facilitate Communities of Practice (COPs) across the state; and (5) oversees the Request for Applications (sub-grant) development and selection process.

### Region Lead County Offices of Education

The Region Lead COEs serve as liaisons for information, technical assistance, and coaching expertise for sub-grant awardees in their local California County Superintendents Educational Services Association (CCSESA) Region. The Region Leads meet with the State Support Team for one hour per month to receive coaching resources and support. In turn, they meet once per month for one hour with lead coaches in their area to provide ongoing support and continue to build capacity for CA MTSS. There are 11 Region Lead Coaches based on the CCSESA Regions.

### Regional School Site Coaches

Local COE staff with knowledge of CA MTSS serve as coaches to LEAs in their area who were awarded the school or consortium grant. All coaches will complete the CA MTSS Pathway Certification for Schools courses and complete the Coaching pathway, which builds capacity for this approach to enhancing school climate using the CA MTSS Framework. Assigned coaches meet weekly or bi-weekly with site leadership to discuss progress on the course, implementation of CA MTSS, data around school climate, and goal headway.

### School Climate Pilot

To ensure that a broad yet representative sample was chosen for the pilot, disciplinary and demographic data was organized for 1,026 California school districts. Data was then structured into seven geographic areas, identified through the Statewide System of Support. Priority for voluntary participation in the pilot was given to districts from each geographic area with a demonstrated need to improve school climate, as measured through the California School Dashboard. The pilot program was initiated in Phase 2 of the CA MTSS Development Timeline, consisting of two sub-phases of the pilot program. These sub-phases are identified in the OCDE *School Climate* Report and in this legislative report as Phase 2A and Phase 2B. Additional information about each sub-phase is provided later in this report and is also posted on the OCDE CA SUMS Initiative Annual Reports web page at <https://ocde.us/MTSS/Pages/California_SUMS_Initiative.aspx>.

### Sub-Grants to Enhance the Social–Emotional Well-Being of Youth

Three types of sub-grants were made available as part of Phase 3 of the CA MTSS Development Timeline. These sub-grants were intended to provide funding for schools, consortia, and COEs to help enable staff to implement the CA MTSS Framework with fidelity at the school level, focusing on building or enhancing the social–emotional well-being of youth using Universal Design Learning, trauma-informed practices, and culturally and linguistically relevant and responsive teaching practices. Priority was given to schools that had been exposed to the CA MTSS foundations training, schools that could commit to having at least 90 percent of eligible staff complete the CA MTSS Pathway Certification for Schools courses, obtain representation from both certificated and classified staff with both groups (indicating an awareness of the plan to train and scale up MTSS), and schools that demonstrated exemplary responses to the open-ended questions within the grant application. Grantees were divided into three cohorts, based on when they wanted to begin their coursework, and are identified in the OCDE *Social–Emotional Well-Being* Report and in this legislative report as Cohort A, Cohort B, and Cohort C. Additional information about each cohort is provided later in this report and is also posted on the OCDE CA SUMS Initiative Annual Reports web page.

### California Multi-Tiered System of Support Pathway Certification for Schools

The OCDE continued to utilize online certification courses to provide professional learning for pilot LEAs. The OCDE’s intention for the CA MTSS Pathway Certification for Schools is to build participant knowledge of the CA MTSS by making explicit and meaningful connections to the participant’s work as an educator. A score-tracking tool was implemented to support school leaders to easily interpret and extract information to make more effective data-driven decisions.

### Communities of Practice

Each region or COE formed a COP to provide ongoing technical assistance and support for LEAs with their implementation of CA MTSS. The COPs are hosted in person, online (e.g., via Zoom), or in a combination of the two. Each COP identifies one of the CA MTSS domains or features to further explore and then shares practices.

### California Multi-Tiered System of Support Professional Learning Institute

The OCDE hosted the CA MTSS Professional Learning Institute (PLI) on  
July 18−20, 2023. The conference theme “Equity in Action: Every Student, Every Day" aimed to inspire and enlighten educators focused on best practices to support all students in academics, behavior, and SEL. The PLI had more than 250 presenters who covered knowledge and best practices, equity and access, and school climate. The next PLI is scheduled for July 16–18, 2024.

### California Rural Education Network

The California Rural Education Network serves to amplify the voices of rural educators. There is an executive team, steering committee, advisory council, a team of researchers, and over three hundred members. In school year 2022–23 the California Rural Education Network held several events to gather and share information about promising practices in rural education.

### Guide to Implementing California Multi-Tiered System of Support

This guide serves as a useful tool for district and school leadership teams and provides practical guidance and resources for educators implementing the CA MTSS Framework. The guide is comprised of resources, strategies, and evidence-based practices that will assist district and school leaders in implementing the framework with fidelity.

### California Integrated Supports Project

The OCDE partnered with the California Integrated Supports Project to expand the state’s capacity to support LEAs in implementing SEL, trauma screening, trauma-informed practices, and culturally relevant, affirming, and sustaining practices. Team members included representatives from PCOE, Kern County Superintendent of Schools, Santa Clara COE, and WestEd. Core features of the California Integrated Supports Project are: (1) Schoolwide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports Implementation; (2) Teaming; (3) Quality Professional Development; (4) Family and Youth Engagement; (5) Intervention Selection, Implementation and Progress; and (6) Data for Equity.

## Number of Local Educational Agencies, Educators, and Pupils Served

### School Climate Pilot Program Participation Phase 2A

The OCDE selected one school district from each California Geographic Lead Area. Each school district identified two schools to participate in the pilot program, for a total of 14 schools. In school year 2022–23 two schools withdrew from participation, and the number of students being served has changed since initial implementation. The table below was provided in the OCDE *School Climate* Report.

Table 1. Pilot Program Participants for Phase 2A

| **Geographic Lead Agency** | **School District** | **Schools** | **Number of Educators** | **Number of Pupils (2022–23**  **enrollment)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Shasta COE | Oroville City Elementary District | Oakdale Heights Elementary | \* | 311 |
| Shasta COE | Oroville City Elementary District | Ishi Hills Middle School | \* | 302 |
| Sonoma COE | Fort Bragg Unified School District | Dana Gray Elementary | \* | 365 |
| Sonoma COE | Fort Bragg Unified School District | Fort Bragg Middle | \* | 392 |
| Placer and Sacramento COEs | Center Joint Unified School District | Center High School | \* | 1,312 |
| Placer and Sacramento COEs | Center Joint Unified School District | Oak Hill Elementary School | \* | 727 |
| Alameda COE | Pittsburg Unified School District | Rancho Medanos Jr. High | \* | 791 |
| Alameda COE | Pittsburg Unified School District | Martin Luther King Jr. Jr. High | \* | 738 |
| Kern County Superintendent of Schools | Pomona Unified School District | Decker Elementary | \* | 446 |
| Kern County Superintendent of Schools | Pomona Unified School District | Lorbeer Middle | \* | 623 |
| Riverside and San Diego COEs | Morongo Unified School District | Palm Vista | \* | 383 |
| Riverside and San Diego COEs | Morongo Unified School District | Twentynine Palms Jr. High | \* | 413 |
| **Total** | **-** | **-** | \* | **6,803** |

*\*Staffing data for 2022–23 was not available at the time of this report.*

### School Climate Pilot Participation Phase 2B

The OCDE selected a second group of LEAs to receive sub-grants to participate in the CA MTSS Pathway Certifications for Schools. Twenty-two LEAs representing all grade levels (elementary, middle, and high school) were selected. In the school year 2022–23 seven schools withdrew from the pilot for various reasons. The table below was provided in the OCDE *School Climate* Report.

Table 2. Pilot Program Participants for Phase 2B

| **Geographic Lead Agency** | **School District** | **Schools** | **Number of Educators** | **Number of Pupils (2022–23**  **enrollment)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Shasta COE | Johnstonville  Elementary  School District | Johnstonville Elementary School | 20 | 396 |
| Sonoma COE | Forestville  Union School  District | Forestville Elementary | 27 | 54 |
| Sonoma COE | Forestville  Union School  District | Forestville Academy | 27 | 170 |
| Placer and Sacramento COEs | Natomas  Charter School | Natomas Charter School | 168 | 1,869 |
| Placer and Sacramento COEs | Linden Unified  School District | Glenwood Elementary | 41 | 397 |
| Alameda COE | Liberty Union  High School  District | Freedom High School | 0 | 2,527 |
| Alameda COE | Bayshore  Elementary  School District | The Bayshore School | 11 | 322 |
| Alameda COE | Campbell  Union School  District | Monroe Middle School | 74 | 729 |
| Tulare COE | North Monterey  County Unified  School District | North Monterey County High  School | 114 | 1,286 |
| Tulare COE | Hollister School  District | Rancho San Justo Middle School | 34 | 556 |
| Tulare COE | Alta Vista  Elementary  School District | Alta Vista Elementary School | 42 | 495 |
| Kern County Superintendent of Schools | Tehachapi  Unified School  District | Tehachapi High School | 4 | 1,254 |
| Kern County Superintendent of Schools | Los Angeles  Unified School  District | Purche Avenue Elementary | 0 | 370 |
| Riverside and San Diego COEs | Saddleback  Valley Unified  School District | La Paz Intermediate School | 39 | 706 |
| Riverside and San Diego COEs | Rialto Unified  School District | Kordyak Elementary | 1 | 608 |
| Riverside and San Diego COEs | Rialto Unified  School District | Eisenhower High School | 5 | 2,207 |
| **Total** | **-** | **-** | **580** | **13,946** |

### Social–Emotional Sub-Grant Cohorts

Below is a summary of LEAs that were awarded sub-grants and agreed to participate on a voluntary basis. Grantees were divided into three cohorts with different start dates, including COE representation.

Table 3. Number of Schools by Sub-Grant Cohorts

| **Geographic Lead Areas** | **Cohort A** | **Cohort B** | **Cohort C** | **Number of COEs** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Shasta COE | 9 | 25 | 44 | 7 |
| Sonoma COE | 1 | 16 | 9 | 3 |
| Placer and Sacramento COEs | 0 | 34 | 10 | 8 |
| Alameda COE | 5 | 4 | 14 | 5 |
| Tulare COE | 9 | 30 | 17 | 9 |
| Kern County Superintendent of Schools | 9 | 30 | 17 | 9 |
| Riverside and San Diego COEs | 14 | 34 | 26 | 5 |
| **Totals** | **47** | **173** | **137** | **46** |

## Description of Strategies Identified

Through coaching support and the CA MTSS Pathway Certification for Schools courses, learning opportunities are provided to enable the enhancement of school conditions and climate. Role-specific pathways allow educators to make connections to their work that guide them in providing a continuum of support to meet students’ academic, behavioral, social–emotional, and mental health needs. Specific evidence-based practices include:

* Continuous Improvement—Implementation Science and Improvement Science
* SEL to Support Social–Emotional Competencies
* Restorative Practices
* Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports
* Universal Design for Learning
* Culturally and Linguistically Relevant and Responsive Teaching
* Trauma-Informed Practices

Annual reports from school sites include descriptions of how these strategies were implemented.

## Outcome Data

The OCDE uses the following measures to assess the sites’ ability to implement a school culture/climate training based on the CA MTSS Framework and show positive student outcomes over time. Detailed results of the assessments can be found in the OCDE’s 2022–23 *School Climate* Report and *Social–Emotional Well-Being* Report.

### The Schoolwide Integrated Framework for Transformation—Fidelity Integrity Assessment

The Fidelity Integrity Assessment (FIA) is a self-assessment for school leadership teams with the purpose of examining the current status of schoolwide practices that have been demonstrated through research to provide a basis for successfully including all students who live in the school community. There were 22 FIA items associated with the CA MTSS Framework that were assessed, and teams reviewed descriptive statements and determined their current implementation on the following four-point scale: (1) Laying the Foundation, (2) Installing, (3) Implementing, or (4) Sustaining Schoolwide Implementation.

The OCDE *School Climate* Report provided results showing that LEAs in phase 2A made progress towards Implementing or Sustaining Implementation on practices within each of the CA MTSS Framework domains. LEAs in Phase 2B also made progress towards Implementing or Sustaining Implementation but remained in the Laying the Foundation or Installing levels on most items. The OCDE *Social–Emotional Well-Being* Report provided results showing that LEAs in Cohort A made progress towards Implementing or Sustaining Implementation of practices, and also made progress within some CA MTSS Framework domains. Results showed that LEAs in Cohort B and Cohort C are already Implementing or Sustaining Implementation on some of the practices and CA MTSS Framework domains.

### Schoolwide Implementation Tool

The Schoolwide Implementation Tool (SIT) is a self-assessment used by school leadership teams to examine the current status in addressing the four domains necessary for schools to improve their climate and culture: (1) developing a shared vision for readiness, (2) developing a school identity, (3) adopting approaches to learning, and (4) adopting schoolwide structures that support all students to succeed. The SIT employs the same four-point scale as the FIA to assess the site status in each domain.

For the 2022–23 participation year 17 LEAs completed the SIT self-assessment. The OCDE *Social–Emotional Well-Being* Report provided results showing that LEAs in Cohort A made progress towards Implementing or Sustaining Implementation of the practices described in the SIT and also made progress within some SIT components. Results showed that LEAs in Cohort B and Cohort C are already Implementing or Sustaining Implementation on some of the practices and SIT components.

### Local Educational Agency Self-Assessment

The Local Educational Agency Self-Assessment (LEASA) is a self-assessment for district leadership teams to examine the current status of systemic practices consistently demonstrated through research to be the components of effective district systems. There are six components of an effective district system assessed through the LEASA: (1) Shared Beliefs, Visions, and Mission; (2) Teaching, Learning, and Assessment; (3) Leadership and Governance; (4) Professional Learning for All; (5) Infrastructure Alignment, and (6) Clear and Collaborative Relationships. The same four-point scale as the FIA is used to assess the site status in each domain.

The OCDE *School Climate* Report provided results that LEAs in Phase 2A remain in the Installing stage, as indicated by their most frequently selected descriptors. LEAs in Phase 2B started at the Installing or Implementing level on most items. The OCDE *Social–Emotional Well-Being* Report provided results showing the LEAs supporting Cohort A sites only made progress in one of the LEASA component areas. However, LEAs supporting Cohort B sites made progress towards Implementing or Sustaining Implementation overall and within each of the LEASA components. LEAs supporting Cohort C sites started Installing or Implementing some practices described in the LEASA.

### Annual End-of-Year Reports

School leaders reported on their progress towards fostering a positive school climate and conditions, improving pupil-teacher relationships, increasing pupil engagement, and prompting alternative discipline practices.

The OCDE *Social–Emotional Well-Being* Report provided data from 143 LEAs across all three cohorts. These participants reported making progress toward achieving their project’s goals.

### Completion of the California Multi-Tiered System of Support Pathway Certification for Schools Courses

At the time of the OCDE *Social–Emotional Well-Being* Report submission to the CDE, 400 LEAs across three cohorts (and 43 COEs) were participating in the CA MTSS Pathway Certification for Schools courses. Across the 400 LEAs, 625 educators were enrolled in courses, with 632 courses completed.

### Coaching Feedback Survey

Feedback was gathered from the administrators via a survey on the quality, relevance, usefulness, and impact of coaching they received.

The OCDE *School Climate* Report provided results from two LEAs in Phase 2A and three in Phase 2B, as these were the only LEAs that provided feedback throughout the year. School leaders considered the coaching relevant and useful, and reported increased confidence or efficacy to implement their envisioned changes, access needed resources, and build their capacity to transform and sustain. The OCDE *Social–Emotional Well-Being* Report also provided coaching feedback data, with results similar, if not identical, to the results found in the *School Climate* Report.

### Professional Learning Institute Participant Feedback

Participant feedback was collected from the annual PLI that took place on   
July 18−20, 2023. Feedback was overwhelmingly positive, with most respondents reporting being pleased with the topics and content of the material presented, and feeling the information provided would enhance or be relevant to their work. The live interactive sessions, keynote speakers, wellness space, and wellness moments were considered the most valuable parts of the conference.

## Recommendations for Improving State-Level Activities or Policies

### From the Social–Emotional Well-Being Report

Preliminary findings highlight the importance of the CA MTSS to enable school staff to support the implementation of high-quality integrated academic, behavioral, and SEL practices in integrated MTSS at all school levels. It is recommended that educators throughout the state continue to strengthen their understanding and implementation of the CA MTSS Framework through the CA MTSS Pathway Certification for Schools courses to organize schools around the academic, behavioral, and social–emotional needs of students. Recommendations for additional state-level activities or policies will be included in subsequent annual OCDE progress reports.

### From the *School Climate* Report

Similar to the findings in the *Social–Emotional Well-Being* Report, findings from the *School Climate* Report highlight the importance of establishing the CA MTSS as a framework, and change strategy for school sites, districts, and COEs must be central to the Statewide System of Support. A commitment to the CA MTSS Framework can help build a more coherent common strategy for state partners working alongside LEAs to improve school climate and student outcomes. The OCDE noted the following activities or policies to organize LEAs around the academic, behavioral, and social–emotional needs of students:

1. **Prioritize providing more resources to geographically isolated school districts.**

Rural educators continue to shoulder the extra burden of “doing more with less” regarding access to resources to support their students. While issues affecting these schools were similar to other regions, the interaction of community and geographic context made them unique compared to their urban counterparts. The state should prioritize delivering resources to these areas to combat this disproportionality of resources in these regions.

1. **Coherence is foundational to systems change.**

Feedback from administrators and coaches indicated that other overlapping or similar initiatives and other fiscal and educational program accountability reporting compete for staff time. Even though the goals and aspirations of the initiatives are similar, their requirements and deliverables make efforts feel duplicative or ineffective. It is recommended that the State Board of Education, the CDE, the Legislature, and other key educational partners work together to provide guidance on how to implement multiple models simultaneously and with fidelity, as well as how to align, streamline, or minimize documenting and reporting into one statewide system so that the connections between current and future initiatives are clear and apparent.