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## Subject

State Annual Performance Report for Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 covering program year 2020–21.

## Type of Action

Action, Information

## Summary of the Issue(s)

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 2004, Part B, requires each state to develop a State Performance Plan (SPP) using the instructions published by the US Department of Education (ED), Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). The OSEP requires states to work with educational partners to develop targets for specified indicators for a six-year period covering Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2020–21 through FFY 2025–26. The process of setting targets is known as re-benching and ensures that states set rigorous, yet attainable targets to improve outcomes for students with disabilities (SWDs). The State Board of Education (SBE) approved the SPP performance targets at the November 2021 board meeting.

Additionally, each year, states must report on progress toward meeting the indicator targets outlined in the SPP in an Annual Performance Report (APR). The APR is developed pursuant to instructions from the OSEP detailing how states must measure, calculate, and report on each of the seventeen SPP indicators. The APR outlines the collective progress of local educational agencies (LEAs) in the state toward meeting yearly targets identified in the SPP for sixteen of the indicators. Indicator 17 of the SPP/APR requires states to develop a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), which is a targeted plan to improve outcomes for SWDs. The APR is presented to the SBE for review and approval annually at the January SBE meeting.

The APR describes California’s progress on five compliance indicators, eleven performance indicators, and one indicator with both compliance and performance components. The attached report is for program year 2020–21.

## Recommendation

The CDE recommends the SBE review and approve the Executive Summary of the FFY 2020 APR for Part B of the IDEA covering program year 2020–21 as prepared by the SED.

## Brief History of Key Issues

The APR is presented to the SBE annually for review and approval as part of the CDE’s annual report to the public on the performance of its local educational agencies (LEAs) in serving SWDs. The APR is developed pursuant to instructions from the OSEP detailing how states must measure, calculate, and report on each of the 17 SPP indicators. The APR outlines the collective progress of LEAs in the state toward meeting yearly targets identified in the SPP.

Indicator 17, known as the SSIP, is a three-phase plan to address systemic improvement for SWDs in California. Beginning with the 2022 year, the SSIP will also be presented to the SBE for review and approval at the January SBE meeting, in accordance with the new direction from OSEP. Previous years, the CDE presented Indicator 17 to the SBE at the March SBE meeting. The SSIP requirement reflects the OSEP’s shift in focus from ensuring state and local compliance with special education law, towards improved outcomes for SWDs.

The SSIP describes California’s plan for improving outcomes for SWDs. The Theory of Action posits that when accountability efforts and resources are aligned to ensure that evidence-based improvement strategies are included in comprehensive improvement plans to meaningfully address SWDs along with their peers, SWDs performance outcomes will improve.

California’s SSIP continues to be a critical driver of change, resulting in special education and SWDs being meaningfully represented and addressed in the overall SSOS. Developed in 2013, prior to the launch of the California School Dashboard and Statewide System of Support (SSOS), the SSIP hypothesized that by drawing connections between the intersectionality of SWDs and the new Local Control Funding Formula weighted student groups, all students would benefit. Aligning and integrating special education activities and technical assistance to the larger SSOS for LEAs, would lead to coherence among services and improved outcomes for SWDs.

The SSIP was to be developed in three phases, with specific sections required to be completed in each phase. The Phase I report included an overview and analysis of current state conditions and a description of the state’s general plan for improving academic performance for SWDs. The SBE approved Phase I of the SSIP in March of 2015. The Phase II report established the structure and details of California’s SSIP. The SBE approved Phase II in March 2016. Phase III, focuses on evaluation and refinement of the SSIP, is submitted with updates to the OSEP each year. In this report the CDE will be presenting only an update on Phase III of the SSIP, which represents the sixth year of implementing Phase III. The SED has developed the SSIP Phase III report based on instructions provided by the OSEP and with input from a variety of educational partners. California’s SSIP addresses plans for increasing academic performance of SWDs.

**The Federal Fiscal Year 2020-2025 State Performance Plan Approval Process**

In February 2020, the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) announced that it would be revising the calculation methodologies for SPP/APR indicators, effective beginning with the 2020–21 program year. This revision would inform the development of states’ next six-year SPP. OSERS engaged in two rounds of public comment on revisions to the indicators’ measurements, commencing with a 60-day public comment period from February 19, 2020 through April 20, 2020. Following the response to the initial public comment period, OSERS published a revised indicator measurement table for a 30-day public comment period from July 7, 2020 through August 10, 2020. Several states provided input to OSERS encouraging a shift in the calculation methodologies for several indicators to better align with state accountability systems and OSERS ultimately published a final indicator measurement table in October 2020.

In anticipation of the new six year SPP, the CDE commenced a series of community engagement meetings to review and develop recommended targets for the new six-year cycle of the revised SPP. Beginning in August 2019, these meetings were held over a two-year period and were designed to engage community partners from various backgrounds – educators, parents, school administrators, policy advisors, school psychologists, Family Empowerment Centers, early education, advocacy groups, and state advisory board members. The CDE leveraged these educational partners, with their breadth and depth of knowledge, to help inform the development of a new set of rigorous state targets for the next six-year SPP cycle.

During the community engagement meetings, CDE staff thoroughly reviewed the twelve performance indicators. (The remaining indicators under the SPP are compliance indicators, with targets set at zero or one hundred percent by OSEP). The review included detailed presentations to inform the community members of the history and data trends, and assist them in making informed recommendations. The presentations included an explanation of how each indicator is defined, measured, and calculated; an in-depth history of statewide performance trends over the last five years; and a comparison of how California’s results compare to other states of similar size and demographics, along with data forecasting. These meetings provided time for community members to discuss statewide data, target setting, and how the CDE can provide supports for LEAs to meet more rigorous targets.

The SED presented the new SPP targets for review in September 2021 and the SBE voted to approve the targets in November 2021.

## Summary of Previous State Board of Education Discussion and Action

In January 2021, the SBE approved the FFY 2019 APR Executive Summary which reported on the progress of the 2019–21 compliance and performance indicators as required by the IDEA.

In March 2021, the SBE approved California’s SSIP Phase 3 report 5.

In September 2021, the SED presented the proposed new targets covering program years 2020–21 through 2025–26, to the SBE for review and feedback.

In November 2021, the SBE approved the new SPP targets covering program years 2020–21 through 2025–26.

## Fiscal Analysis (as appropriate)

Absent approval, California’s approximately $1.4 billion federal IDEA funding could be jeopardized.

## Attachment(s)

Attachment 1: California Department of Education Special Education Division State Annual Performance Report Executive Summary Federal Fiscal Year 2020 (Program Year 2020–21) (58 pages).
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## Special Education in California

The California Department of Education (CDE) provides state leadership and policy guidance to local educational agencies (LEAs) for special education programs and services for students with disabilities, birth to twenty-two years. Special education is defined as specially designed instruction and services, at no cost to parents, to meet the unique needs of students with disabilities. Special education services are available in a variety of settings, including early learning and care, preschool, regular classrooms, classrooms that emphasize specially designed instruction, the community, and the work environment.

The CDE also provides families with information on the education of students with disabilities and works cooperatively with other state agencies to provide a range of services from family-centered services for infant and preschool children with disabilities to planned steps for transition from high school to employment and quality adult life. The CDE responds to consumer complaints and administers programs related to the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 (IDEA) and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) for students with disabilities in California.

## Accountability and Data Collection

In accordance with the IDEA, California is required to report annually to the U.S. Department of Education (ED) on California’s performance and progress meeting targets defined in the State Performance Plan (SPP). This report is the State’s Annual Performance Report (APR). The APR requires the CDE to report on 17 indicators (Table 1) that examine a comprehensive array of compliance and performance requirements relating to the provision of special education and related services. The California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) is the data reporting and retrieval systems used by the CDE for students with disabilities. CALPADS provides LEAs a statewide standard for maintaining a core of special education data at the local level that is used for accountability reporting and to meet statutory and programmatic needs in special education.

The CDE is required to publish the APR for public review. The current APR reflects data collected during Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2020, which is equivalent to California’s school year 2020–21. Indicators 1, 2, and 4 are reported in lag years using data from school year 2019–20. The 17 federal indicators include 11 performance indicators, 5 compliance indicators, and 1 indicator with both performance and compliance components (Indicator 4). All compliance indicator targets are set by the ED at either 0 or 100 percent. Performance indicator targets were established based on recommendations of a stakeholder group, and approved by the State Board of Education (SBE) in November 2021 (Table 4).

### Table 1: California State Indicators

| **Indicator Type** | **No.** | **Description** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Performance | 1 | Graduation Rates |
| Performance | 2 | Dropout Rates |
| Performance | 3 | Statewide Assessments |
| Performance | 3A | Participation for Students with Disabilities |
| Performance | 3B | Proficiency for Students with Disabilities against grade level academic standards |
| Performance | 3C | Proficiency for Students with Disabilities against alternate academic standards |
| Performance | 3D | Proficiency Gap Rates |
| Combined | 4 | Suspension and Expulsion |
| Performance | 4A | Rates of Suspension and Expulsion |
| Compliance | 4B | Rates of Suspension and Expulsion by Race or Ethnicity |
| Performance | 5 | Education Environments |
| Performance | 5A | Education Environments: In Regular Class ≥ 80% of day |
| Performance | 5B | Education Environments: In Regular Class < 40% of day |
| Performance | 5C | Education Environments: Served in separate school or other placement |
| Performance | 6 | Preschool Environments |
| Performance | 6A | Preschool Environments: Services in the regular childhood program |
| Performance | 6B | Preschool Environments: Separate special education class, school, or facility |
| Performance | 6C | Preschool Environments: Home Setting |
| Performance | 7 | Preschool Outcomes |
| Performance | 7A | Preschool Outcomes: Positive social-emotional skills |
| Performance | 7B | Preschool Outcomes: Acquisition/use of knowledge and skills |
| Performance | 7C | Preschool Outcomes: Use of Appropriate Behaviors |
| Performance | 8 | Parent Involvement |
| Compliance | 9 | Disproportionate Representation |
| Compliance | 10 | Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories |
| Compliance | 11 | Child Find |
| Compliance | 12 | Early Childhood Transition |
| Compliance | 13 | Secondary Transition |
| Performance | 14 | Post-school Outcomes |
| Performance | 14A | Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high  school |
| Performance | 14B | Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school |
| Performance | 14C | Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school |
| Performance | 15 | Resolution Sessions |
| Performance | 16 | Mediation |
| Performance | 17 | State Systemic Improvement Plan |

## Overview of Population and Services

During FFY 2020 a total of 794,788 students from birth to twenty-two years received special education from LEAs. There are 6,002,523 kindergarten through grade twelve students enrolled in California; students with disabilities comprise 12.5 percent of that population. Almost half of students with disabilities in California (48 percent) are between six and twelve years of age; over two-thirds of students with disabilities are male (67 percent); and a quarter are English-language learners (25 percent). Of all students with disabilities, Hispanic/Latino students represent the greatest numbers of students in need of special education and related services (58 percent) followed by white students (21 percent). All tables and figures are based on students with disabilities birth to twenty-two years.

California students identified as having at least one disability are eligible for individualized services to meet their unique needs. There are 14 disability categories, as displayed in Table 2. The most common primary disability category designation for students is Specific Learning Disability (36.34 percent), followed by Speech or Language Impairment (21.21 percent).

### Table 2: Enrollment of Students with Disabilities by Disability Type

| **Disability** | **Number of Students** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Specific Learning Disability (SLD) | 288,791 | 36.34 |
| Speech or Language Impairment (SLI) | 168,553 | 21.21 |
| Autism (AUT) | 127,889 | 16.09 |
| Other Health Impairment (OHI) | 110,117 | 13.85 |
| Intellectual Disability (ID) | 41,521 | 5.22 |
| Emotional Disturbance (ED) | 24,206 | 3.05 |
| Hard of Hearing (HH) | 9,966 | 1.25 |
| Orthopedic Impairment (OI) | 8,188 | 1.03 |
| Multiple Disability (MD) | 7,741 | 0.97 |
| Deafness (DEAF) | 2,956 | 0.37 |
| Visual Impairment (VI) | 2,884 | 0.36 |
| Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) | 1,394 | 0.18 |
| Established Medical Disability (EMD) | 504 | 0.06 |
| Deaf Blindness (DB) | 78 | 0.01 |
| Totals | 794,788 | 100.0 |

Source: CALPADS, Fall 2020

Students with disabilities in California receive a variety of services to address their unique needs. During FFY 2020–21, there were 2,614,861 services provided to California’s students with disabilities, many receiving multiple services. Table 3 lists the most commonly provided services to students. The most common service provided was Specialized Academic Instruction (35.67 percent) followed by Language and Speech (20.60 percent).

### Table 3: Services Provided to Students with Disabilities

| **Services** | **Number of Students** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Specialized Academic Instruction | 932,756 | 35.67 |
| Language and Speech | 538,723 | 20.60 |
| Vocational/Career | 510,420 | 19.51 |
| Mental Health Services | 264,036 | 10.09 |
| All Other Services | 368,926 | 14.13 |
| Total | 2,614,861 | 100.0 |

Source: CALPADS, EOY 2020

## 2020–21 Annual Performance Report Indicators

During FFY 2020, California met 50 percent of the 17 indicators. Table 4 identifies each indicator, its target, the FFY 2020 state results, and whether or not the target was met. The pages following Table 4 provide an overview of each individual indicator, including a description of the indicator, the target, the data collected, the results, and whether there was an increase or decrease in the results from prior year.

### Table 4: Federal Fiscal Year 2020 Indicators, Target, Results, and Change

| **Indicators** | **Targets** | **Results** | **Met Target** | **Change from Prior Year** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 Graduation | 75% | 77.02% | Yes | \* |
| 2 Drop Out | 11% | 10.38% | Yes | -5.03% |
| 3 Statewide Assessment | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 3A Participation | 95% ELA/Math | Various | No | \* |
| 3B Grade Level Assessments Proficiency | Various | Various | Yes/No | \* |
| 3C Alternate Assessment Proficiency | Various | Various | Yes/No | \* |
| 3D Achievement Gap | Various | Various | Yes/No | N/A |
| 4 Suspension/Expulsion | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 4A Suspension and Expulsion Rate Overall | 3% | 0.51% | Yes | -2.0% |
| 4B Suspension and Expulsion Rate by Race/Ethnicity | 0% | 1.47% | No | -2.6% |
| 5 Education Environments | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 5A Regular Class 80 Percent or More | 58% | 57.82% | No | -0.56% |
| 5B Regular Class Less than 40 Percent | 19.5% | 17.73% | Yes | -0.48% |
| 5C Separate Schools, Residential Facilitates, or Homebound/Hospital Placements | 3.4% | 2.90% | Yes | -0.29% |
| 6 Preschool Least Restrictive Environments | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 6A Regular Preschool | 39% | 29.16% | No | -5.30% |
| 6B Separate Schools or Classes | 33% | 37.02% | No | +1.26% |
| 6C Home | 3.5% | 5.64% | No | \* |
| 7 Preschool Assessment | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 7A Positive Social-Emotional Skills | 76%/76% | 71%/68% | No | -8.5%/-8.8% |
| 7B Use of Knowledge and Skills | 76%/76% | 69.5%/65.7% | No | -8.6%/-10.7% |
| 7C Use of Appropriate Behaviors | 76%/76% | 73.7%/69.3% | No | -5.7%/-8.5% |
| 8 Parent Involvement | 95.0% | 99.64% | Yes | +0.04% |
| 9 Disproportionate Representation | 0% | 0.27% | No | -1.78% |
| 10 Disproportional Representation by Disability Category | 0% | 6.0% | No | -8.11% |
| 11 Child Find | 100% | 97.62% | No | +1.40% |
| 12 Early Childhood Transition | 100% | 72.59% | No | -15.04% |
| 13 Secondary Transition | 100% | 95.33% | No | -1.02% |
| 14 Post-school Outcomes | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 14A Enrolled in Higher Education | 55% | 46.6% | No | -10.1% |
| 14B Enrolled in Higher Education or Competitively Employed within a Year | 75% | 70.3% | No | -5.6% |
| 14C Enrolled in Higher Education, Postsecondary Education or Training or Competitively Employed | 87% | 88.9% | Yes | -5.2% |
| 15 Resolution Sessions | 40% | 9.86% | No | -16.07% |
| 16 Mediation | 65% | 18.79% | No | -34.4% |
| 17 State Systemic Improvement Plan | Various | Various |  | \* |

\* Denotes a change in calculation or new indicator category and therefore there is no comparative data.

## Indicator 1: Graduation Rate

### Description

Indicator 1 is a performance indicator that measures the percent of youth with individualized education programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma.

### Measurement

Data are reported in lag years using data from the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS).

Percent = [the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma] divided by [the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21)] times 100.

### Target Met: Yes

### Graduation Rate Targets and Results for FFYs 2019–25

| **Indicator 1** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 90% | 75% | 75.5% | 76% | 77% | 78% | 79% |
| Result | 67.7% | 77.02% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Target Met | No | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |

## Indicator 2: Dropout Rate

### Description

Indicator 2 is a performance indicator that measures the percent of students with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out.

### Measurement

Data are reported in lag years using data from CALPADS.

Percent = [the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out] divided by [the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator] times 100.

### Target Met: Yes

### Dropout Rate Targets and Results for FFYs 2019–25

| **Indicator 2** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 9.72% | 11% | 10% | 9% | 8% | 7% | 6% |
| Result | 15.41% | 10.38% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Target Met | No | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |

## Indicator 3: Statewide Assessment

### Description

Indicator 3 is a performance indicator that measures the participation and performance of students with disabilities on statewide assessments including:

1. Participation rate for children with IEPs
2. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
3. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
4. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

### Measurement

1. Participation rate percent = [(number of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total number of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.
2. Proficiency rate percent = [(number of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total number of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.
3. Proficiency rate percent = [(number of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total number of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.
4. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020–2021 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020–2021 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

### Target Met:

1. No
2. Yes/No
3. Yes/No
4. Yes/No

### Assessment Targets and Results for FFYs 2019–25

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator 3a ELA** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Grade 4 Target | N/a | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% |
| Grade 4 Result | N/a | 19% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 4 Target Met | N/a | No |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 8 Target | N/a | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% |
| Grade 8 Result | N/a | 20% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 8 Target Met | N/a | No |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 Target | N/a | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% |
| Grade 11 Result | N/a | 33% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 Target Met | N/a | No |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator 3a Math** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Grade 4 Target | N/a | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% |
| Grade 4 Result | N/a | 20% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 4 Target Met | N/a | No |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 8 Target | N/a | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% |
| Grade 8 Result | N/a | 20% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 8 Target Met | N/a | No |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 Target | N/a | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% |
| Grade 11 Result | N/a | 33% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 Target Met | N/a | No |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator 3b ELA** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Grade 4 Target | N/a | 15% | 15% | 15% | 16% | 17% | 18% |
| Grade 4 Result | N/a | 18% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 4 Target Met | N/a | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 8 Target | N/a | 12% | 12% | 12% | 13% | 14% | 15% |
| Grade 8 Result | N/a | 11% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 8 Target Met | N/a | No |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 Target | N/a | 14% | 14% | 14% | 15% | 16% | 17% |
| Grade 11 Result | N/a | 17% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 Target Met | N/a | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator 3b Math** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Grade 4 Target | N/a | 15% | 15% | 15% | 16% | 17% | 18% |
| Grade 4 Result | N/a | 17% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 4 Target Met | N/a | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 8 Target | N/a | 8% | 8% | 8% | 9% | 10% | 11% |
| Grade 8 Result | N/a | 6% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 8 Target Met | N/a | No |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 Target | N/a | 8% | 8% | 8% | 9% | 10% | 11% |
| Grade 11 Result | N/a | 6% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 Target Met | N/a | No |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator 3c ELA** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Grade 4 Target | N/a | 15% | 15% | 15% | 16% | 17% | 18% |
| Grade 4 Result | N/a | 13% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 4 Target Met | N/a | No |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 8 Target | N/a | 10% | 10% | 10% | 11% | 12% | 13% |
| Grade 8 Result | N/a | 11% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 8 Target Met | N/a | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 Target | N/a | 14% | 14% | 14% | 15% | 16% | 17% |
| Grade 11 Result | N/a | 16% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 Target Met | N/a | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator 3c Math** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Grade 4 Target | N/a | 7% | 7% | 7% | 8% | 9% | 10% |
| Grade 4 Result | N/a | 6% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 4 Target Met | N/a | No |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 8 Target | N/a | 8% | 8% | 8% | 9% | 10% | 11% |
| Grade 8 Result | N/a | 14% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 8 Target Met | N/a | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 Target | N/a | 6% | 6% | 6% | 7% | 8% | 9% |
| Grade 11 Result | N/a | 11% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 Target Met | N/a | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |

| **Indicator 3d ELA** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade 4 Target | N/a | 31% | 31% | 31% | 30% | 29% | 28% |
| Grade 4 Result | N/a | 24% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 4 Target Met | N/a | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 8 Target | N/a | 37% | 37% | 37% | 36% | 35% | 34% |
| Grade 8 Result | N/a | 36% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 8 Target Met | N/a | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 Target | N/a | 42% | 42% | 42% | 41% | 40% | 39% |
| Grade 11 Result | N/a | 42% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 Target Met | N/a | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator 3d Math** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Grade 4 Target | N/a | 25% | 25% | 25% | 24% | 23% | 22% |
| Grade 4 Result | N/a | 19% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 4 Target Met | N/a | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 8 Target | N/a | 29% | 29% | 29% | 28% | 27% | 26% |
| Grade 8 Result | N/a | 25% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 8 Target Met | N/a | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 Target | N/a | 27% | 27% | 27% | 26% | 25% | 24% |
| Grade 11 Result | N/a | 29% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 Target Met | N/a | No |  |  |  |  |  |

Statewide assessments were waived for FFY 2019, therefore there was no data.

## Indicator 4A: Suspension and Expulsion Overall

### Description

Indicator 4A is a performance indicator that measures the percent of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for students with IEPs. The data are reported using the CALPADS data from the prior year

### Measurement

Percent = [(number of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (number of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

### Target Met: Yes

### Suspension and Expulsion Targets and Results for FFYs 2019–25

| **Indicator 4a** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 10% | 3% | 2.8% | 2.6% | 2.4% | 2.2% | 2% |
| Results | 2.52% | 0.51% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Target Met | Yes | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |

## Indicator 4B: Suspension and Expulsion Rate by Race or Ethnicity

### Description

Indicator 4B is a compliance indicator that measures the percent of LEAs that have:

(1) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for students with disabilities; and (2) policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. The data are reported using the CALPADS data from the prior year.

### Measurement

Percent = [(number of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (number of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

### Target Met: No

### Suspension and Expulsion by Race or Ethnicity Targets and Results for FFYs 2019–25

| **Indicator 4b** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Result | 4.08% | 1.47% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Target Met | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |

## Indicator 5: Education Environments

### Description

Indicator 5 is a performance indicator that measures the percent of students with disabilities, aged five who are enrolled in kindergarten, including five-year old’s who are enrolled in transitional kindergarten, and aged six to twenty-two, served:

1. inside the regular class 80 percent or more of the day;
2. inside the regular class less than 40 percent of the day, and
3. served in public or private separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placement.

### Measurement

1. Percent = [(number of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total number of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
2. Percent = [(number of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total number of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
3. Percent = [(number of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total number of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

### Target Met

1. No
2. Yes
3. Yes

### Education Environment Targets and Results for FFYs 2019–25

| **Indicator 5** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5a Target | 53.2% | 58% | 60% | 62% | 64% | 67% | 70% |
| 5a Result | 58.38% | 57.82% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5a Target Met | Yes | No |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5b Target | 20.6% | 19.5% | 18% | 16.5% | 15% | 13.5% | 12% |
| 5b Result | 18.21% | 17.73% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5b Target Met | Yes | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5c Target | 3.6% | 3.4% | 3.2% | 3.0% | 2.8% | 2.6% | 2.4% |
| 5c Result | 3.19% | 2.90% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5c Target Met | Yes | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |

## Indicator 6: Preschool Least Restrictive Environments

### Description

Indicator 6 is a performance indicator that measures the percent of children with disabilities ages three through five years, enrolled in a preschool program attending a:

1. regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related service in the regular early childhood program; and
2. separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility; and
3. receiving special education and related services in the home.

### Measurement

1. Percent = [(number of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total number of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
2. Percent = [(number of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total number of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
3. Percent = [(number of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total number of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

### Target Met

1. No
2. No
3. No

### Preschool Environments Targets and Results for FFYs 2019–25

| **Indicator 6** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6a Target | 38.9% | 39% | 41% | 43% | 45% | 47% | 49% |
| 6a Result | 34.46% | 29.16% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6a Target Met | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6b Target | 30.4% | 33% | 31% | 29% | 27% | 25% | 23% |
| 6b Result | 35.76% | 37.02% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6b Target Met | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6c Target | N/a | 3.5% | 3.5% | 3.5% | 3.5% | 3.5% | 3.4% |
| 6c Result | N/a | 5.64% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6c Target Met | N/a | No |  |  |  |  |  |

## Indicator 7A: Preschool Assessment–Positive Social-Emotional Skills

### Description

Indicator 7A is a performance indicator that measures the percent of children aged three through five with IEPs who demonstrate improvement in Positive Social-Emotional Skills, including social relationships.

These are the following progress categories:

* Number of preschool children who did not improve functioning divided by the number of preschool children with IEPs assessed, multiplied by 100.
* Number of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers divided by the number of preschool children with IEPs assessed, multiplied by 100.
* Number of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it divided by the number of preschool children with IEPs assessed, multiplied by 100.
* Number of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by the number of preschool children with IEPs assessed, multiplied by 100.
* Number of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by the number of preschool children with IEPs assessed, multiplied by 100.

### Measurement

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

### Target Met: No

### Preschool Outcomes–Positive Social-Emotional Skills Targets and Results for FFYs 2019–25

| **Indicator 7a** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 85.2%/  81.5% | 76%/76% | 77%/77% | 78%/78% | 79%/79% | 80%/80% | 81%/81% |
| Result | 79.46%/  76.8% | 71%/68% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Target Met | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |

## Indicator 7B: Preschool Assessment–Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills

### Description

Indicator 7B is a performance indicator that measures the percent of children aged three through five with IEPs who demonstrate improvement in acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, including early language/communication and early literacy.

These are the following progress categories:

* Number of preschool children who did not improve functioning divided by the number of preschool children with disabilities assessed, multiplied by 100.
* Number of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers divided by the number of preschool children with disabilities assessed, multiplied by 100.
* Number of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it divided by the number of preschool children with disabilities assessed, multiplied by 100.
* Number of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by the number of preschool children with disabilities assessed, multiplied by 100.
* Number of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by the number of preschool children with disabilities assessed, multiplied by 100.

### Measurement

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

### Target Met: No

### Preschool Outcomes–Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills Targets and Results for FFYs 2019–25

| **Indicator 7b** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 82.7%/  80.5% | 76%/76% | 77%/77% | 78%/78% | 79%/79% | 80%/80% | 81%/81% |
| Result | 78.12%/  76.38% | 69.5%/65.7% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Target Met | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |

## Indicator 7C: Preschool Assessment–Use of Appropriate Behaviors

### Description

Indicator 7C is a performance indicator that measures the percent of children aged three through five with IEPs who demonstrate improvement in Use of Appropriate Behaviors to meet their needs.

These are the following progress categories:

* Number of preschool children who did not improve functioning divided by the number of preschool children with disabilities assessed, multiplied by 100.
* Number of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers divided by the number of preschool children with disabilities assessed, multiplied by 100.
* Number of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it divided by the number of preschool children with disabilities assessed, multiplied by 100.
* Number of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by the number of preschool children with disabilities assessed, multiplied by 100.
* Number of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by the number of preschool children with disabilities assessed, multiplied by 100.

### Measurement

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

### Target Met: No

### Preschool Outcomes–Use of Appropriate Behaviors Targets and Results for FFYs 2019–25

| **Indicator 7c** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 76.7%/  79.45% | 76%/76% | 77%/77% | 78%/78% | 79%/79% | 80%/80% | 81%/81% |
| Result | 79.41%/  77.79% | 73.7%/69.3% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Target Met | Yes/No | No |  |  |  |  |  |

## Indicator 8: Percent of Parents Reporting the Schools Facilitated Parental Involvement

### Description

Indicator 8 is a performance indicator that measures the percent of parents with a student receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for students with disabilities.

The data is one question in a survey distributed, collected, and reported by the Special Education Local Plan Areas (SELPAs). The measure is the percentage of parents responding “yes” to the following question: “Did the school district facilitate parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for your child?”

### Measurement

Percent = [(number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

### Target Met: Yes

### Parent Involvement/Input Targets and Results for FFYs 2019–25

| **Indicator 8** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 94% | 95% | 95.5% | 96% | 96.5% | 97% | 97.5% |
| Result | 99.6% | 99.64% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Target Met | Yes | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |

## Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

### Description

Indicator 9 is a compliance indicator that measures the percent of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. Effective FFY 2016, the CDE uses the risk ratio (or the alternate risk ratio when appropriate) to make identification of disproportionate representation. LEAs selected are required to go through a review of policies, practices, and procedures.

### Measurement

Percent = [(number of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (number of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

### Target Met: No

### Disproportionate Representation Targets and Results for FFYs 2019–25

| **Indicator 9** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Result | 2.06% | 0.27% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Target Met | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |

## Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation by Disability Categories

### Description

Indicator 10 is a compliance indicator that measures the percent of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. The calculation for Indicator 10 (Ethnicity by Disability) has been changed to match the new federal regulations in 34 CFR 300.647. Effective FFY 2016, the CDE uses the risk ratio (or the alternate risk ratio when appropriate) to make identification of disproportionate representation. LEAs selected are required to go through a review of policies, practices, and procedures. LEAs identified below had non-compliance in those reviews.

### Measurement

Percent = [(number of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (number of districts in the State that meet a State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

### Target Met: No

### Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories Targets and Results for FFYs 2019–25

| **Indicator 10** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Results | 14.11% | 6.0% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Target Met | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |

## Indicator 11: Child Find

### Description

Indicator 11 is a compliance indicator that measures the percent of students who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the state establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe. If the parent of a student repeatedly failed or refused to bring the student for the evaluation, or a student enrolled in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations had begun, and prior to a determination by the student's previous public agency as to whether the student is a student with a disability, then the student was eliminated from both the numerator and the denominator.

These data were calculated using CALPADS data fields related to parental consent date and initial evaluation date.

### Measurement

Percent = [number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline) divided by the number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received] times 100.

### Target Met: No

### Child Find Targets and Results for FFYs 2019–25

| **Indicator 11** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Result | 96.22% | 97.62% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Target Met | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |

## Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

### Description

Indicator 12 is a compliance indicator that measures the percent of children referred by the infant program (IDEA Part C) prior to age three, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday. These data were collected through CALPADS and data from the Department of Developmental Services.

### Measurement

The indicator is calculated as follows:

1. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B (LEA notified pursuant to the IDEA section 637[a][9][A] for Part B eligibility determination).
2. Number of children referred determined to **not** be eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthday.
3. Number of children found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday.
4. Number of children for whom parental refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.
5. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.

Percent of children referred equals (c) divided by (a-b-d-e) times 100.

### Target Met: No

### Early Childhood Transition Targets and Results for FFYs 2019–25

| **Indicator 12** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Result | 87.63% | 72.59% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Target Met | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |

## Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

### Description

Indicator 13 is a compliance indicator that measures the percent of students with disabilities ages sixteen and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals annually updated and based upon an age-appropriate transition assessment and transition services, including courses of study that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition service needs. There must also be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

### Measurement

Percent = [(number of youths with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age-appropriate transition assessment) divided by the (number of youths with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

### Target Met: No

### Secondary Transition Targets and Results for FFYs 2019–25

| **Indicator 13** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Results | 96.35% | 95.33% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Target Met | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |

## Indicator 14: Post-school Outcomes

### Description

Indicator 14 is a performance indicator that measures the percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school but had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

1. enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school; or
3. enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

### Measurement

1. Percent = [The number of youths who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect when they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school divided by the number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school] times 100.
2. Percent = [Number of youths who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect when they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school divided by the number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school] times 100.
3. Percent = [Number of youths who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect when they left school, and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment divided by the number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school] times 100.

### Target Met:

1. No
2. No
3. Yes

### Post-school Outcomes Targets and Results for FFYs 2019–25

| **Indicator 14** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 14a Target | 55.3% | 55% | 56% | 57% | 58% | 59% | 60% |
| 14a Result | 56.67% | 46.6% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14a Target Met | Yes | No |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14b Target | 75.4% | 75% | 76.5% | 78% | 79.5% | 81% | 82.5 |
| 14b Result | 75.94% | 70.3% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14b Target Met | Yes | No |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14c Target | 84% | 87% | 87.5% | 88% | 88.5% | 89% | 89.5% |
| 14c Result | 94.11% | 88.9% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14c Target Met | Yes | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |

## Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

### Description

Indicator 15 is a performance indicator that measures the percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

### Measurement

Percent equals the number of resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements divided by the number of resolution sessions multiplied by 100.

### Target Met: No

### Resolution Sessions Targets and Results for FFYs 2019–25

| **Indicator 15** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 61% | 40% | 41% | 42% | 43% | 44% | 45% |
| Result | 25.93% | 9.86% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Target Met | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |

## Indicator 16: Mediation

### Description

Indicator 16 is a performance indicator that measures the percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

### Measurement

The indicator is calculated by mediation agreements related to due process complaints plus mediation agreements not related to due process complaints divided by number of mediations held, multiplied by 100.

### Target Met: No

### Mediation Targets and Results for FFYs 2019–25

| **Indicator 16** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 61% | 65% | 66% | 67% | 68% | 69% | 70% |
| Result | 53.19% | 18.79% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Target Met | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |

## Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

### Section A: Data Analysis

**The State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?**

California’s State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) addresses plans for improving outcomes for students with disabilities (SWD). California’s State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR) is the performance of all SWD who took the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress in both English Language Arts and Mathematics. California’s SSIP is focused on creating systemic and sustainable changes, including necessary alignment in statewide accountability and improvement structures like the State System of Support (SSOS) to improve outcomes for SWD.

The link to the current theory of action.

<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/mar17item01.doc>, attachment 4.

California’s SSIP continues to be a critical driver of change, resulting in special education and SWD being meaningfully represented and addressed in the overall statewide system of accountability and support. Developed in 2013, prior to the launch of California’s new accountability system, the California Department of Education (CDE) hypothesized in the SSIP that by leveraging the intersectionality of SWD with the new Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) weighted student groups (students who are Foster Youth, English Language Learners, and/or socio-economically disadvantaged), all students would benefit. By aligning and integrating special education activities and technical assistance (TA) to the larger system of support for local educational agency (LEAs), it would lead to coherence among services for SWD and improve outcomes.

The comprehensive improvement efforts initiated by LEAs are outlined in their local control and accountability plans (LCAPs). The TOA for California’s SSIP hypothesized that if California required each LEA to establish a comprehensive improvement plan and developed instructions to ensure that the plan included appropriate improvement activities for SWD, then each LEA would create an improvement plan that included evidence-based strategies and goals targeting high-needs students, including SWD, which would result in increased access to instruction for SWD and improved academic outcomes accordingly. Since phase III, California progressed toward ensuring that LCAPs include and address performance of SWD, including the passage of legislation (Assembly Bill 1808, Chapter 32, Statutes of 2018) to ensure the integration of LEA efforts to improve outcomes for SWD and the LCAP specifically.

California has made significant progress in building a SSOS that effectively assists LEAs to design and implement effective improvement strategies for SWD. A robust LCAP that meaningfully includes supports for SWD is a critical component of improving student outcomes. The comprehensive system of technical assistance available through the SSOS includes access to evidence-based practices to effectively serve SWD.

The SSOS seeks to support LEA efforts to implement the improvement strategies outlined in their LCAPs and monitor intended improvement. California is now in year six of creating a coordinated and coherent state structure to ensure that LEAs receive the assistance necessary to address disparities in student outcomes. California’s SSIP is focused on creating systemic and sustainable changes, including necessary alignment in statewide accountability and improvement structures like the SSOS to improve outcomes for SWD.

### Progress toward the SiMR

| **Indicator 17** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 15.6% | 14% | 14% | 15% | 16% | 17% | 18% |
| Result | N/a | 12.2% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Target Met | N/a | No |  |  |  |  |  |

**The Impact of COVID-19 on the progress of the SSIP**

The 2019–2020 and 2020–2021 school years presented unprecedented challenges for communities, educators, students, and parents. The schooling experience was disrupted and different than any other year due to the impacts of the novel coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic. The collection of evidence regarding student academic performance was no exception in this disruption. Although the federal testing requirement was waived for the 2019–2020 school year, for the 2020–2021 school year, the U.S. Department of Education (ED) informed states that they were required to administer statewide academic assessments in English language arts literacy (ELA), mathematics, and science as well as the English language proficiency assessments. Furthermore, states were required to report the assessment results to parents, educators, and the public about student performance. With these requirements, however, the ED provided states several flexibilities to support the administration of assessments:

* Administering a shortened version of statewide assessments,
* Offering remote administration, where feasible, and
* Extending the testing window to the greatest extent practicable.

The California State Board of Education (SBE) and California Department of Education (CDE) took full advantage of all the flexibilities offered, recognizing the challenges local education agencies (LEAs) faced in administering the state assessment during the pandemic. While the CDE made available all assessments within California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) and supported LEAs in the administration of these assessments, the SBE and CDE recognized that for some LEAs, administration of the designated state assessments could prove an insurmountable challenge. This was true because most districts were in remote learning until well into the spring; many students lacked computers with secure browsers that would allow remote administration of the test, and many more experienced problems with bandwidth that made testing remotely infeasible.  Therefore, to maximize the collection of evidence of student performance, LEAs that could not viably administer the CAASPP were required to administer local assessments that met specific criteria approved by the SBE during the March 2021 meeting. The SBE required that local assessments must meet the following criteria:

* Aligned with California Common Core State Standards for ELA and mathematics.
* Available to assess students in grades three through eight and grade eleven.
* Uniformly administered across a grade level, grade span, school, or district.
* LEAs must provide results that can be reported to parents/guardians and educators about individual students, and to the public by school and by district, disaggregated by student subgroup.
* LEAs are required to report their local assessment results on the School Accountability Report Card.

### Section B: Implementation, Analysis, and Evaluation

**Please provide a link to the State’s current evaluation plan.**

<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr16/agenda201603.asp>, Item 20. Attachment 1 and 2.

**Equity, Disproportionality and Design: Preventing Disproportionality in Our Schools**

As a Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) content lead within the SSOS, San Diego South County SELPA through the “Equity, Disproportionality and Design: Preventing Disproportionality in Our Schools” (ED&D) program is focused on building capacity in other SELPAs to lead a movement towards effective solutions for improving equity and decreasing disproportionality. As highlighted in the FFY 2018 SSIP, ED&D developed a disproportionality tool, and with continued testing, it has become operational. By putting this tool in the hands of SELPA leads and LEAs, ED&D has continued to build a collaborative knowledge base while assisting SELPA leads and LEAs be proactive around their disproportionality data and how it impacts SWD outcomes. Since the last report, ED&D has expanded the data tool to include training for SELPA leadership about student-centered data use. These trainings are offered monthly and are now available not only to SELPA leaders, but also LEA directors. The trainings have three focuses: interpreting risk ratio scores using person-to-person language, sharing data efficiently and regularly, and identifying data ethics. The ED&D team is committed to using appropriate techniques to measure the impact of their work on California school systems. Their measurement approach includes the use of surveys, collection of personal stories, process metrics, and interviews with training participants by the external evaluator about their use of ED&D tools.

**Open Access Project**

The Placer County SELPA Open Access project serves as a SELPA content lead within the SSOS focused on improving outcomes for SWD by providing students with access to quality curriculum and participation and active engagement with learning in inclusive settings by eliminating barriers to learning. The Open Access Project supports integrated planning and learning for all students while promoting equity and inclusion. The project focuses on optimizing teaching to ensure all students have access to rigorous standards using an equity lens to support teaching and learning where the students are at through intentional instructional planning.

**California Autism Professional Training and Information Network**

Marin County SELPA, in partnership with the California Autism Professional Training and Information Network (CAPTAIN), serves as the SELPA content lead within the SSOS to build SELPA capacity across the state to support the implementation of Evidence-Based Practices for Autism.

**SELPA System Improvement Leads**

The SELPA System Improvement Leads (SILs) are charged with building the foundational knowledge and capacity in systems improvement processes for SELPA across the state. The SIL project continues to develop its hub for continuous improvement resources. The improvement data center (IDC) is one key aspect of the hub and provides: data visualizations for six years of SPP indicator data, access to annual performance reports, and analytic tools. As each year’s annual performance report data is released, the SIL project updates the IDC, enabling SELPAs, LEAs and County Office of Education (COE) administrators to identify patterns, trends, and trajectories in their special education data.

**Imperial County SELPA**

The Imperial County SELPA strives to continuously directly impact systems and indirectly improve student outcomes, by assisting SELPAs, their COEs & LEAs, as related to needs associated with their English Learner (EL) and SWD populations. The website has received upwards of 6,000 unique visits and views. These views have resulted in positive outcomes, whereby use of the various resources have been reported by SELPAs, COEs, LEAs, California regional EL specialists, as well as institutes of higher education. The Imperial County SELPA content-lead team has continued to be capacity builders, facilitators and connectors within the SSOS to improve outcomes for ELs. To further support SELPAs, COEs and their LEAs need for resources during 2020–21 school year, the Imperial County SELPA expanded their website, to include an array of Infographics and Padlets, amongst other resources. For further information related to these [resources](https://www.icoe.org/selpa/el-swd/resources), please visit the Imperial County SELPA Content Lead website at <https://www.icoe.org/selpa/el-swd>. For more information regarding their ‘Statewide Impact’, please refer to their website to identify where capacity has been built at <https://www.icoe.org/selpa/el-swd/statewide-impact>.

**The short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy, including the measures or rationale used to assess and communicate achievement.**

**Equity, Disproportionality and Design: Preventing Disproportionality in Our Schools**

The ED&D team is discussing different ways to meet the challenge of measuring student level outcomes, while also focusing on building capacity for good data use and the implementation of Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) to prevent disproportionality. Since the last report, ED&D has collected comprehensive survey data from LEAs all over California about disproportionality awareness, practices that contribute to disproportionality, and practices that reduce disproportionality. ED&D will use data in two ways. First, they will use the data to inform and develop more services for promoting equity in schools. Second, ED&D will share the results with CDE and the SELPAs as a way to improve collective awareness and inspire collective action.

**Open Access Project**

The Open Access Project spent 60 hours in 16 SELPAs building capacity through the Support of Implementation practices of Universal Design Learning (UDL), Assistive Technology (AT) and Augmentative or Alternate Communication (AAC). The project dedicated 282 hours in implementation training sequences for 16 SELPAs including UDL Immersion, UDL-AT Immersion, Digital Tools and Assistive Technologies, Student Planning & Quality AT Practices, Deep Dive with Student Access Planning, AAC Foundations and AAC Implementation. The Open Access Team dedicated another 119 hours of dedicated coaching to build the capacity of the regional SELPA Lead teams in each of the training sequences.

The Open Access Project produced a plethora of best practice guides and classroom resources and tools that are universally available to implementers around the state as each region continues to build capacity. In the last 12 months, the Open Access Website has had 4,439 unique users and 11,112 sessions. The Access to Distance Learning site saw more than 3000 unique users over 4700 sessions. Open Access hosted 352.5 hours of training with 806 participants. In these sessions, Open Access presents material with the Lead SELPAs supporting the presentation and receiving coaching in a model which will have the SELPAs participate first as participants, then as supported presenters with targeted coaching and support and finally as the lead presenters with additional coaching and support. The process allows the lead agencies to develop confidence in the content while demonstrating the required skills to become regional experts who will continue to build capacity independently after the third year.

The Lead SELPAs may continue to participate in a Professional Learning Network with the leads around the state after the third year. The implementation of AT, AAC and UDL to promote access for ALL students is a fundamental element of equity for all students. The guiding principle for the Open Access Project is access for all learners, with the learner identified as the focal point. In effect, the educator meets the learner exactly where they are and scaffolds the educational process based on the strengths and needs of the student.

**California Autism Professional Training and Information Network**

Marin County SELPA and CAPTAIN have continued to work in the 17 regions throughout the state, each having a SELPA Director, Regional Implementation Lead and now the new addition of an appointed interdisciplinary implementation team who are knowledgeable in autism and the science of implementation to build sustainable and scalable capacity systems for Evidence-based Practices (EBPs) for autism. The CAPTAIN Cadre members continue to implement trainings on EBPs using fidelity measures for effective adult education/training practices. Each training is accompanied by an established pre- and post-assessment of knowledge to determine the effectiveness of the trainer at conveying the core components to the training participants. Marin County SELPA and CAPTAIN is in the process of developing the remaining 18 out of 28 trainings on EBPs for autism, which include pre- and post- training knowledge assessments. All 10 of the previous EBP trainings are posted on the CAPTAIN website and the remaining 18 trainings (and the previous 10 trainings) will be available through a newly designed data system that will be available to the public at no cost in the Spring of 2022. From July 1, 2020 through June 30, 2021, the website has recorded 13,000 Users in 23,000 sessions. Especially useful were the resources to support students with autism and their return to in-person school with 4,733 access points.

**SELPA System Improvement Leads**

The SIL project continues to grow their direct technical assistance to the field. Their statewide team of 12 improvement facilitators build the improvement capacity of SELPAs and LEAs by providing coaching on self-identified problems of practice. Current LEA improvement projects include: increasing the use of data to inform special education program decisions, decreasing the rate of student placement in non-public schools, increasing the use of universal reading screeners, and improving the IEP meeting supports to families. Teams can request technical assistance by emailing the SIL team at [info@systemimprovement.org](mailto:info@systemimprovement.org)

The SIL project utilized a series of knowledge, skill, and satisfaction surveys which assessed satisfaction, quality, and relevance of services, trainings, and other opportunities for educators. Participants reported high levels of satisfaction with both the facilitator and the content presented in the training modules. Over 90 percent of respondents indicated they agreed or strongly agreed that trainers demonstrated expertise in the subject matter, were responsive to participants’ questions, were sensitive to the diversity of participants and used appropriate training strategies. Over 90 percent of respondents indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed that the training was well organized, included a good mix of learning activities and that the amount of time for the training was appropriate for the content provided.

Lastly, over 95 percent of respondents indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed that their understanding of topics covered in training increased and that their training experience was highly valuable. Based on this feedback SIL continues to move forward with the virtual meetings and training sessions. Participant feedback consistently highlights the value of coaching support both during and after training sessions. For example, “The team time in between the introduction of each new tool/concept was so powerful. It really helped to solidify my knowledge and comfort with everything presented.” and “Having a coach was HUGELY beneficial.” As a result, the SIL project has integrated facilitated breakout sessions, office hours, and follow up coaching sessions into the overall training model. Follow surveys from teams receiving coaching indicate that this additional level of training allows educators to think more deeply about system problems and to continue to develop their skills after training sessions.

**Imperial County SELPA**

Imperial County SELPA continues to provide support to SELPAs through targeted and detailed workshops and modules as well as collaborative conversations and connections. Imperial County SELPA will continue to develop statewide and professional learning communities (PLC). The Imperial County SELPA is in a position to provide targeted support and detailed resources to meet the unique needs of each PLC. During the 2020–21 school year to date, there are a total of 9 SELPAs, COEs and their respective LEAs working together in distinct PLCs to further their regional initiatives to produce improved outcomes for ELs with disabilities. During the pandemic the ability to use virtual conferencing methods has enable the Imperial County SELPA to continue to connect and facilitate conversations related to various topics surrounding the needs of English learners with disabilities. Technical assistance has been provided to SELPAs, COEs, and staff from LEAs across the state of California. In relation to professional development opportunities, the Imperial County SELPA has provided training and support to just over 7,200 practitioners in the field with topics ranging from pre-referral, referral, assessment, tiers of support & interventions, IEP development, instructional design, planning and alignment of ELD standards and CA Common Core state standards, as well as addressing hot-topics such as language vs. disability, exit of students from special education due to mis-identification as a student with a disability and reclassification from English leaner status of students with disabilities.

**New infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved*.***

**Equity, Disproportionality and Design: Preventing Disproportionality in Our Schools**

The ED&D team is working on three infrastructure improvements. First, they hired an Executive Consultant whose primary responsibility is to design services for SELPAs that focus on instructional improvement to reduce disproportionality. Second, ED&D is formatting training content about preventing disproportionality into new fifteen-minute lessons. They are testing these lessons with SELPAs and LEAs during monthly meetings. Once fully developed, ED&D will scale the impact of their services by providing the materials to SELPAs and LEAs.  And third, ED&D is identifying three levels of technical assistance, provisionally called Level 1 (universal), Level 2 (structured), and Level 3 (targeted). Each level will have supports and services for promoting equity that meets the needs of their audience, ranging from receiving regular emails and resources to active participation in designing future services.

**SELPA System Improvement Leads**

In the past year, the SIL has worked collaboratively within California’s SSOS to build the capacity of SELPAs, COEs, and LEAs with a common goal to improve outcomes for SWD. The SIL team provided 90 high quality in-person and virtual trainings from July 2020 through June 2021 for 4,549 educators. Participants came from 131 LEAs/SELPAs and more than 90% of respondents rated the trainers as highly knowledgeable. We took great effort to ensure the virtual learning opportunities met the needs of participants during these unprecedented times and participants agreed with over 95% stating their online learning needs were met. These trainings focused on the following topics: continuous improvement, root cause analysis, data quality, data use, high leverage and evidence-based practices. New resources include: Root Cause Analysis Inquiry Guide, High Leverage Practices Guide, Improvement Science in a Minute web modules, and the annual release of the State Performance Plan Indicator Guide. These resources are all available at systemimprovement.org.

As California’s special education monitoring processes continue to shift from a compliance focus to a continuous improvement approach, SELPA and LEA leaders have the opportunity to leverage monitoring processes to reveal inequities in their systems and affect real sustainable improvement. To do so, leadership teams must engage in deep, thoughtful, and multi-faceted root cause analysis. In FFY 2020, The SIL team developed a root cause analysis training series to equip leadership teams with tools, resources, and protocols to engage in meaningful root cause analysis. The three-part training series was run three times and SIL provided follow up office hours and consultation to teams as needed.

**Imperial County SELPA**

The Imperial County SELPA conducted virtual training around the CDE published California Practitioners’ Guide for Educating English Learners with Disabilities throughout the 2020–21 school year. To include professional development sessions available to practitioners statewide, as well as professional development tailored to meet the needs of county offices, SELPAs and their respective LEAs. These tailor-made series of professional development were based on the unique needs of the COE/SELPA/LEA as derived from staff surveys and/or consultative collaborative dialogue session with the Imperial County SELPA Improving Outcomes for ELs with Disabilities content-lead team. To date, there are 21 archived, pre-recorded training modules which can be found on the Imperial County SELPA website at [https://www.icoe.org/selpa/el-swd/training-module](https://www.icoe.org/selpa/el-swd/training-modules)s ranging from topics related to UDL for ELs with Disabilities during remote and in-person learning, pre-referral strategies, culturally & linguistically appropriate assessment of ELs who may be eligible as a student with a disability, and development of the IEP for ELs with disabilities. To date, these archived training events have received 3,491 views. Based on survey data, 98% of participants who attended the professional development events have indicated it met and/or exceeded their expectations; 80% of participants agreed/strongly agreed that they learned skills they could immediately use.

**A summary of each of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategies and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

**Equity, Disproportionality and Design: Preventing Disproportionality in Our Schools**

Moving forward ED&D will continue to use the three guiding tenets of the project: awareness, action, and scale. At the heart of the ED&D project is the community-based design model. By taking this collaborative approach, ED&D continues to establish cross-functional teams that approach Disproportionality and SWD outcomes through the three guiding tenets. ED&D looks to further strengthen the relationship between SELPA leads, COEs, industry partners and stakeholders to help build and define its community-based design model. Recognizing the impact COVID-19 has had on SELPAs and LEAs and the unique challenges they face, ED&D utilized a virtual platform and continued their support for SELPAs and LEAs through online networking, professional development collaboration, and created a toolkit checklist for inclusive distance learning planning. Since the last report, ED&D is increasingly focused on scaling deliverables to reach more SELPAs and LEAs in California by developing and implementing intentional outreach and marketing procedures (introductions, regular follow-up, resource sharing, developing relationships). They are refining their technical assistance by segmenting their audience into three levels of service: universal, structured, and targeted. Further, ED&D are producing multimedia content to expand options for their audience to receive information. These options include in-person trainings, virtual trainings, blog posts, social media posts, and podcasts.

**Open Access Project**

Open Access is currently developing 30 regional hubs around the state. When each SELPA Lead completes their 3-year cycle, they will be in a position to serve the SELPAs, COEs, and LEAs in their region to build their capacity in UDL, AT or AAC. The regional leads will be connected to the base materials and resources, the Open Access website and a professional learning network of their peers as they continue to build on the work of the project.

**California Autism Professional Training and Information Network**

CAPTAIN will continue to provide implementation coaching to build the capacity of the SELPA Director, Regional Implementation Lead and their SELPA Autism Implementation Team for each of the 17 CAPTAIN regions in California to develop the necessary system to sustain the work of this grant. CAPTAIN will base the technical assistance on the Active Implementation Frameworks using resources and tools developed by the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN) and State Implementation and Scaling-up of Evidence-based Practices (SISEP) Center to ensure sufficient attention is given to stabilization, sustainability, scaling, and efficiency. CAPTAIN will incorporate the following principles:

* Systems are the central focus of support for effective use of practices
* Practices selected are based on local need and fit
* Aligns initiative and leverages resources to meet coherent goals
* Iterative cycles of data to guide improvement
* Uses of bi-directional feedback loops
* Follows a stage-based approach to change

Conduct activities in each of the 17 CAPTAIN regions in California that lead to the development of an autism program demonstration site using the principles of Implementation Science focusing especially on the initial stages of Exploration and Installation and possible initial implementation for some regions.

Continue to develop the CAPTAIN data system to support the fidelity of high-quality training and implementation coaching of evidence-based practices for autism that supports data driven decision-making.

**SELPA System Improvement Leads**

Looking toward the next reporting cycle, the SIL project will continue its direct support to SELPAs, COEs, and LEAs. In addition to providing support to individual improvement efforts, SIL will serve as a hub for a Networked Improvement Community in FFY 2021. This network will bring together teams across the state with a common aim of improving the quality of IEPs for students with disabilities. SIL will provide advanced data analysis, coaching support, and access to research-based change ideas to all teams participating in the network. Key learnings will be shared out with the field to allow for spread of these strategies. SIL will also continue to develop the IDC and provide access to data tools that allow for analysis of current special education data including disaggregating to the student level. These reports will be a powerful complement to the existing historical data displays on the IDC, empowering leaders to engage in ongoing analysis of their special education data. The SIL team is committed to walking alongside teams as they tackle their most pressing challenges and will continue to scale up support across the state in service of improving outcomes for students with disabilities.

**Imperial County SELPA**

Moving forward the Imperial County SELPAs ***Improving Outcomes for English Learners with Disabilities*** content-lead project will continue to be focused on assisting CDE with dissemination of the California Practitioners’ Guide for Educating English Learners with Disabilities. Our primary charge will to further build the capacity of SELPAs statewide and that of their respective COEs & LEAs in the implementation of best practices related to serving ELs with disabilities. Through this project, the Imperial County SELPA provides professional development and technical assistance to further the implementation of equitable and inclusive services in establishing a pathway to success for ELs with disabilities while facilitating connections between the systems improvement work. The project will continue to support a multidisciplinary team approach as an instrumental feature in the appropriate identification of services that address the unique language and learning needs of ELs with disabilities. Throughout the project the Imperial County SELPA team has encouraged the cross-collaboration of multidisciplinary teams to participate in both professional development offerings, and PLC development to ensure that expertise from both English learner division staff and special educators leverage each other’s knowledge and skills in addressing the varied needs of English learners with disabilities and collectively commit to improving outcomes for all English learners with disabilities. For more information visit our website at <https://www.icoe.org/selpa/el-swd>.

**The evidence-based practices implemented in the reporting period:**

The Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Pathway Certification for Schools

The Supporting Inclusive Practices (SIP) Project

**A summary of each of the evidence-based practices.**

**California Multi-Tiered System of Support**

California Multi-Tiered System of Support (CA MTSS) is a systemic, continuous-improvement framework designed to provide effective technical assistance for districts and schools to address every student’s academic, behavioral, and socio-emotional needs in the most inclusive and equitable learning environment. Driven by policies and practice, strong leadership, family and community engagement, staff collaboration, and data-driven decision-making, CA MTSS helps districts and schools increase attendance, prevent dropouts, lower disciplinary rates, improve school climate, and boost academic performance.

CA MTSS aligns with numerous state, regional, county, district, school, family, and community resources to provide a unified educational framework that is universally designed and differentiated to meet individual needs. The framework contains three levels or tiers: 1) universal support for all students, 2) supplemental services for students who require more academic or behavioral assistance and 3) individualized help for those with the most significant needs.

Co-leading this effort is the Orange County Department of Education (OCDE), Butte County Office of Education and the University of California, Los Angeles Center for the Transformation of Schools (UCLA-CTS). This collaborative effort involving a state design and advisory team has created a pilot program to implement a school culture/climate training based on the CA MTSS framework. This work hopes to expand upon restorative approaches, positive behavior intervention, as well as support social and emotional learning, and minimize the use of emergency interventions. The OCDE created an online certification course, the CA MTSS Pathway Certification for Schools, to build knowledge of the CA MTSS and make explicit and meaningful connections to the participant’s work as an educator in order to provide more inclusive and equitable learning environments for ALL students and families.

**Supporting Inclusive Practices**

The Supporting Inclusive Practices (SIP) Project is an existing TA provider that works within the SSOS, working with the special education resource leads to build capacity across the state to assist LEAs. The SIP project supports LEAs to increase access to general education settings with research and evidence-based practices, targeted training, and TA related to supporting SWD in the least restrictive environment (LRE). The project is administered by two COEs, one in northern and one in southern California to ensure statewide coverage. The SIP project outcomes include shifting attitudes toward inclusion, equity, and access, implementation of inclusive practices, utilizing UDL as a curricular framework, using evidence-based inclusive teaching practices, and moving key statewide SPP indicators associated with student classroom inclusion and achievement.

The El Dorado County Superintendent of Schools (EDCSS), in partnership with the Riverside County Superintendent of Schools (RCSS), has been contracted to support grantee LEAs identified by the CDE - Special Education Division (SED) in increasing inclusion and performance indicators outlined in the SPP, specifically indicators 3, 5, 6, and 7 for students ages three through 21.

Support during the 2020–21 school year was provided to grantees in a three-tiered system. Tier I includes provision of no cost professional development offered in-person and virtually open to any school community across the state. Tier II includes direct technical assistance to grantees provided at the county, SELPA, district, and individual site levels. Tier III consists of technical assistance to school communities and partner organizations beyond those entities identified as grantees and based on CDE-SED referrals for support. Technical assistance for inclusion and achievement for 2020–21 was impacted by the global pandemic and significantly limited in-person meetings and events. As such, the majority of technical assistance was provided virtually and tailored to the unique needs of each grantee. This included:

* Support with implementation of grantee-selected, district- and site- based initiatives and focus areas (e.g., UDL, co-teaching, LRE)
* Webinars and conferences
* Access to virtual resources via the SIP website and social media
* SIP Spring Institute
* Direct, individualized support in moving through the phases of the SIP Blueprint

**A summary of how each of the evidence-based practices and activities or strategies that support its use.**

**California Multi-Tiered System of Support**

The OCDE created an online certification course, the CA MTSS Pathway Certification for Schools, to build knowledge of the CA MTSS and make explicit and meaningful connections to the participant’s work as an educator in order to provide more inclusive and equitable learning environments for ALL students and families.

Course Learning Objectives:

* Deepen understanding of the What, Why, and How of CA MTSS
* Discover resources to support implementation of CA MTSS in the work as educators, support inclusive and equitable learning environments, and engage students and families in the community
* Collaborate with other educators to share practices that support the academic, behavioral, and social-emotional success of all students
* Determine CA MTSS/LCAP alignment to support working with students in order to enhance and implement LCAP and school site goals and services

This is a self-paced, asynchronous course designed to be completed individually, with a colleague, or school team. The course is recommended to complete in a 12-18-month period.

To obtain the CA MTSS Pathway Certification:

* Section 1: Get Started CA MTSS
* Sections 2 - 4: Foundations of CA MTSS - What, Why, and How
* Sections 5 - 10: Role-Specific Pathways (Teacher, Administrator, School Counselor, School Psychologist, Paraeducator, and Coach)
* Section 11: Reflection and Call to Action

Within each module, learners engage in lessons, discussions, and activities related to the above-mentioned topics. Each level builds upon the previous level and each section has a series of Reflections and BADGE Activities. Reflections are optional while all BADGE Activities are required in order to advance to the next activity. Some BADGE Activities provide a choice on how to complete the activity. Even though there is a choice, the submission of the activity is required.

Via coaching and the CA MTSS Pathway Certification for Schools course, learning opportunities to support the enhancement of school conditions and climate are provided. Each role-specific pathway of the course allows educators to make connections to their role in order to provide a continuum of support to meet the academic, behavioral, social-emotional, and mental health needs of students and create a positive school climate. Specific evidence-based practices include:

* Continuous improvement via Implementation Science and Improvement Science
* Social-emotional learning to support social-emotional competencies
* Restorative Practices
* Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports
* Universal Design for Learning
* Culturally Linguistically Relevant and Responsive Teaching
* Trauma informed practices

In addition, School Leadership Teams (SLTs) develop short-term plans (approximately 9-weeks in length) aimed at addressing issues surrounding their schools’ identity and/or vision for readiness. The 14 school sites in Phase 2A engaged in their third and fourth PDSA (Plan, Do, Study, Act) cycles in 2020–21 and are working toward addressing their problem of practice. Coaches meet virtually with the principal every week to do a check in and provide leadership assistance in implementing their plan.

Lastly, each Region or COE has formed a Community of Practice (COP) for the purpose of providing ongoing technical assistance and support for LEAs who have completed the CA MTSS training series as they continue to scale up and sustain their work with CA MTSS implementation. Members engage in joint activities and discussions, help each other, learn from each other and share information. COPs are hosted in person or online (e.g., via Zoom) or combination option. Each COP identifies one of the CA MTSS Domains or Features to further explore and share practices around.

**Supporting Inclusive Practices**

The EDCSS and RCSS continues to assist and support LEAs to successfully align programs to the SPP and APR indicators by identifying evidence-based practice programs, supporting LEAs at on-site (when permissible due to the pandemic) and virtual meetings with improvement processes, supporting with networking, and arranging site visits with LEAs to tour and learn about best practices and programs. The EDCSS and RCSS has worked to stay abreast of the latest research and evidence-based practices that support students in inclusive settings via readings of peer-reviewed research, membership/participation in professional organizations (e.g., American Speech-Language Hearing Association, Association of California School Administrators), conference attendance and participation in other professional development opportunities to obtain the most current information on inclusive practices.

The EDCSS and RCSS, created materials for use in presentations, webinars, and professional development activities (see www.sipinclusion.org for a list of events for 2020–21). The subcontractors are chosen, based on demonstrated outcomes and expertise in building, implementing, sustaining, and scaling up inclusive practices. Training topics vary based on the needs of participating LEAs. Materials are available to LEAs in the form of electronic PDF format, depending upon the objectives and content of each presentation or training activity (e.g., webinars are recorded and archived). The EDCSS and RCSS has engaged subcontractors to assist LEAs in improvement process activities and provide training and technical assistance. The EDCSS and RCSS coordinated, prepared, facilitated and created the following webinars and events:

* Epoch Training Courses
* Paraeducator Series
* Equity by Design: Conference in a Box
* Equity by Design (Part 2)
* From Surviving to Thriving
* Antiracism and UDL

A hallmark of the SIP project is the team’s ability to address a range of technical assistance needs related to inclusion, equity, and achievement, as well as to pivot and prioritize based on the CDE’s needs in support of its varied school communities. These skills were tapped during the pandemic more than ever.

The CDE reached out to the SIP team at the start of the 2020–21 school year with a request for statewide support in the area of family engagement. Not wanting to make assumptions about the needs of our diverse families throughout the state, the SIP team convened the first ever Family Engagement Network meetings on October 5, 2020, December 17, 2020, and February 23, 2021. The purpose of the meetings was to gather together stakeholders already engaged in the work to support families, share resources, and gain a better understanding of current perspectives and needs in order to then support them in response. Participants have included individuals from the CDE, Family Empowerment Centers, Parent Training and Information Centers, SELPAs, LEAs, Seeds of Partnership, and other community partners. The participants were unanimous in their desire to continue and scale the Network to also include representation from Community Advisory Committees, CDE partners in Educational Services, and parents going into the 2021–22 contract year.

In addition to establishing the Network, the SIP team partnered with RCSS’s Leadership, Innovation, and Outreach unit to host (2) four-part series “From Surviving to Thriving” with Dr. Michele Borba. The series was the highest attended of all offerings and included free books for the first 1,000 registrants. The series focused on the top qualities of a thriver and offered applicable tips for families and educators to apply immediately in their own homes and classrooms.

**Data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.**

**California Multi-Tiered System of Support**

Multiple measures assess the sites’ ability to improve their school culture/climate based on the California Multi-Tiered System of Support framework and show positive student outcomes over time.

* Schoolwide Implementation Tool (SIT) – 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 cultures.
* SWIFT-Fidelity Integrity Assessment (FIA) – self-assessment used by School Leadership Teams to examine the current status of school-wide practices that have been demonstrated through research to provide a basis for successfully including all students who live in the school community.
* A survey that gathers sites’ feedback on coaching/technical assistance quality, relevance and usefulness and how much the technical assistance they received impacted their confidence or efficacy to implement the envisioned changes, access resources needed to make the changes envisioned and build capacity to transform and sustain.
* LEA Self-Assessment (LEASA) – a self-assessment for LEA/District Leadership Teams to examine the current status of systemic practices that have been consistently demonstrated through research to be the components of effective district systems.
* Reports of school sites’ progress in fostering positive school climate and conditions, improving pupil-teacher relationships, increasing pupil engagement, and promoting alternative discipline practices.

**Supporting Inclusive Practices**

Quantitative methods involved gathering key indicator data from the CDE for the 44 grantees that have been involved in the SIP project over the past five years. The SIP team keeps data received from the CDE each project year, adding new data to a master data file.

The first analysis examined key indicator measures 5a, 5b, and 5c over the past five years for the grantees that have participated in the project each year. For each year the participating grantees in the dataset are unique (different) based upon two factors; first, the grantee LEAs that participated in the project for a given year, and second, the grantee LEAs for which we have state indicator data for that year. Trend analysis indicates that data related to LRE trended on average in the desired direction for all SIP grantees. This is a remarkable finding, especially when considering the porous nature of state collected indicator data and that we are not in this analysis comparing the same grantee LEAs over time, but rather a unique set of participating grantee LEAs for each year. We see that indicator 5a increases from 53.85% to 55.15% for grantees. For 5b we see a desired decline from 19.71% to 15.24%. For 5c we see a desired decline from 4.78% to 1.97%.

Our analysis at this point has examined different SIP participating grantees for which we have data over time and in comparison, to state target and performance. Now we examine the same SIP participating grantees over time to see the nature and magnitude of change on key indicators.

First, we look at indicator 5a and change based upon time an LEA has spent in the project. For the 5 grantees for which we have data that have also been part of the project for 5 years, we observe a 18.92% increase in measure 5a. This is a dramatic and positive result for the grantees that have been in the project for 5 years. It should be highlighted that between 2015 and 2020, these grantees have increased their 5a measure *nearly 20%*. For those grantees in the project 3 or 4 years for which we have data (total N=20 LEAs) we see just over a 2% increase in measure 5a.

Next, we examine indicator 5b and look at change based upon time a grantee has spent in the project. For the 5 grantees for which we have data that have also been part of the project for 5 years, we observe a 10.84% decrease in measure 5b. This is a dramatic and positive result for the grantees that have been in the project for 5 years. Between 2015 and 2020, these grantees have decreased their 5b measure just *over 10%.* For those grantees in the project 3 or 4 years for which we have data (total N=20 LEAs) we see between a 6.6 and 7.4% decrease in measure 5b.

Technical assistance is provided to SIP grantees based on their unique school communities and contexts. As such, support is offered in a variety of ways and via a tiered system. Tier I level support is accessible to anyone throughout the state (and more broadly when provided virtually/online). Tier I level support includes access to synchronous and asynchronous professional learning events, access to resources posted on the SIP website, and social media postings and interactions. Tier II level supports are specific to SIP grantees and individualized to take school communities from their current state to their desired state. This support includes professional learning tailored to grantee needs, meeting with leadership teams to move through the stages of the SIP Blueprint for Inclusion, collaboration to develop or refine strategic plans, and support with creating infrastructure to ensure equitable and inclusive environments and systems for learners to grow and succeed.

**Next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

**California Multi-Tiered System of Support**

Next steps will follow the project timeline set by the Executive Leadership Team:

* OCDE, Interim Chief Academic Officer and Associate Superintendent, Christine Olmstead, Ed.D.
* Butte COE, Director of CA Rural CA MTSS, Rindy Devoll
* UCLA-CTS, Director, Joseph Bishop, Ph.D.

**Table 5: MTSS Timeline**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Years** | **Tasks/Deliverables** |
| 2018–2019; 2019–2020 | * Co-develop theory of action & five-year plan to be submitted * Co-develop curriculum framework, website, and training modules * Conduct an analysis of the statewide discipline, school climate, and chronic absenteeism data patterns * Identify districts in need of support |
| 2019–2020; 2020–2021 | * Select and help train lead educators on curriculum |
| 2019–2020; 2020–2021 | * Provide technical support as needed to regional training cohorts |
| 2020–2023 | * Identify pilot sites for testing out curriculum * Provide technical assistance to educators and districts as needed |
| 2018–2023 | * Lead case studies research * Partner with evaluation research entity * Partner on cost-benefit analysis * Co-author final report and recommendations * Support awareness with state policy audiences |

The CA MTSS Pathway Certification course will be evaluated using the completion data and the artifacts submitted by the 14 schools in Phase 2A and the 22 schools in Phase 2B. All sites are expected to completed the course by June 2023.

Coaching and technical assistance will continue to be provided to the Phase 2A and 2B schools as needed through June 2023.

Communities of Practice (COPs) will also continue to meet in order to provide ongoing technical assistance and support for LEAs who have completed the CA MTSS training series as they continue to scale up and sustain their work with CA MTSS implementation.

Implementation data that will be collected in 2021-22 from the Phase 2A and 2B schools is anticipated to show:

* Progress at the school level towards addressing the four domains necessary for schools to improve their climate and cultures as measured by the Schoolwide Implementation Tool (SIT)
* Progress at the school level towards implementing school-wide practices that have been demonstrated through research to provide a basis for successfully including all students who live in the school community as measured by the SWIFT-Fidelity Integrity Assessment (FIA)
* Site Leadership Teams will report to have the confidence or efficacy to implement the envisioned changes, access resources needed to make the changes envisioned and build capacity to transform and sustain
* Progress at the LEA level towards sustainable systemic practices that have been consistently demonstrated through research to be the components of effective district systems as measured by the LEA Self-Assessment (LEASA)
* Reports of school sites’ progress in fostering positive school climate and conditions, improving pupil-teacher relationships, increasing pupil engagement, and promoting alternative discipline practices along with how efforts will be sustained after the grant period ends

Growth in the above areas are expected to lead to positive student outcomes over time which includes, rates of suspension or expulsion, incidents of bullying or harassment, discipline referrals, referrals to Special Education, chronic absenteeism, graduation rates, dropout rates, measures of pupil academic achievement in ELA and Math, as well as positive school climate/ perceptions of school climate.

**Supporting Inclusive Practices**

The SIP project, as a collaborative effort between RCSS and EDCSS, has demonstrated a significant impact on school communities’ abilities to move from their current to their desired states with the most progress noted when participating for more than two years. This is reflective of the research on improvement science and diffusion of innovations that reveals real change begins to occur in three to five years and when provided with ongoing support.

In June 2021 AB 130 was passed that includes $15 million from the General Fund to scale up the SIP project through June 2026. This additional, state-supported funding will allow for inclusion of more LEAs as grantees, increased Tier II support with increased team capacity, and reflects the Education Committee’s investment in inclusion and equity for all students.

The following is a list of recommendations for the project going forward:

* Allow for SIP participation in cohorts of no fewer than five years
* Continue to provide opportunities for virtual and in-person event participation
* Focus efforts specifically at the preschool level through all tiered levels of support
* Examine data collection systems with respect to data quality and allow for access to current versus lag data
* Continue to build and scale collective teacher efficacy with respect to educating and including students with disabilities and their families

### Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

In anticipation of the fact that California’s prior SPP/APR would conclude with the 2019–20 program year, the CDE commenced a series of stakeholder meetings to begin discussions and develop recommended targets for the new six-year cycle of the revised SPP. Beginning in August 2019, these meetings were held over a two-year period and were designed to engage stakeholders from various backgrounds - educators, parents, school administrators, policy advisors, school psychologists, Family Empowerment Centers, early education, advocacy groups, and state advisory board members. The CDE leveraged these stakeholders, with their breadth and depth of knowledge, to help inform the development of a new set of rigorous state targets for the next six-year SPP cycle.

During stakeholder meetings, CDE staff thoroughly reviewed the twelve performance indicators. The remaining indicators under the SPP are compliance indicators, with targets set at zero or one hundred percent by OSEP. The twelve performance indicators were partnered with detailed presentations to inform the stakeholders of the history and data trends, and assist them in making informed recommendations. The presentations included an explanation of how each indicator is defined, measured, and calculated; an in-depth history of statewide performance trends over the last five years; and a comparison of how California’s results compare to other states of similar size and demographics, along with data forecasting. These meetings provided time for stakeholders to discuss statewide data, target setting, and how the CDE can provide supports for LEAs to meet more rigorous targets. Following the publication of the revised measurement table, the CDE reconvened the stakeholder group to discuss the changes to key indicators, including assessment, school age least restrictive environment, preschool least restrictive environment, parent involvement, post school outcomes, and graduation rate, and provided stakeholders with the opportunity to refine their recommendations for these targets in light of the new calculations.

**Specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.**

The CDE engaged with a diverse set of stakeholders over the course of the last fiscal year. CDE staff presented the SSIP and the SSOS to stakeholders and informed and updated them on the various implementation strategies and the evidence-based practices used in the SSOS to achieve better outcomes for SWD. The CDE collected feedback from all stakeholders which included proposed new targets, and responses on all aspects of the SSIP. Moving forward the CDE plans to meet with this stakeholder group biannually to be transparent with stakeholders about the work supporting the SSIP and the SSOS as well as to continuously collect feedback to improve efforts.

This targeted engagement with stakeholders was in addition to standard stakeholder engagement opportunities around SSIP implementation, the SSOS, and any other emerging area of critical need. As in prior years, those opportunities included monthly meetings and conference calls with the Statewide SELPA organization, bi-monthly meetings with the Special Education Administrators of County Offices, regular meetings (generally every other month) with the California Advisory Commission on Special Education, and bi-monthly State Board of Education meetings.