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## Subject

State Annual Performance Report for Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 2004 covering program year 2021–22.

## Type of Action

Action, Information

## Summary of the Issue(s)

The 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, including the SSIP, 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 2021–22.

## Recommendation

The California Department of Education (CDE) recommends the SBE review and approve the Executive Summary of the FFY 2021 APR for Part B of the IDEA covering program year 2021–22 as prepared by the Special Education Division (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 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. 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 Statewide System of Support (SSOS). Developed in 2013, prior to the launch of the California School Dashboard and Statewide 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 (TA) 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. The Phase III report, focused 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 seventh 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 Years 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 FFY 2020–21. 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 2022, the SBE approved the FFY 2020 APR Executive Summary which reported on the progress of the 2020–21 compliance and performance indicators as required by the IDEA. The SBE also approved California’s SSIP Phase III report 6. Please see item 4: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr22/agenda202201.asp>.

In January 2021, the SBE approved the FFY 2019 APR Executive Summary which reported on the progress of the 2019–20 compliance and performance indicators as required by the IDEA. Please see item 16: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr21/agenda202101.asp>.

In March 2021, the SBE approved California’s SSIP Phase III report 5. Please see item 3: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr21/agenda202103.asp>.

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. Please see item 4: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr21/agenda202109.asp>.

In November 2021, the SBE approved the new SPP targets covering program years 2020–21 through 2025–26. Please see item 18: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr21/agenda202111.asp>.

## 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 2021 (Program Year 2021–22) (63 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 (SWD) 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 SWDs 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. The 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) 2021, which is equivalent to California’s school year 2021–22. Indicators 1, 2, and 4 (graduation, dropout and expulsion/suspension rates, respectively) are reported in lag years using data from school year 2020–21. 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 from interested parties, 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 2021 a total of 791,998 students from birth to twenty-two years received special education services from LEAs. There are 5,892,240 kindergarten through grade twelve students enrolled in California; SWDs comprise 12.7 percent of that population. Almost half of SWDs in California (47 percent) are between six and twelve years of age; two-thirds of SWDs are male (66 percent); and almost a quarter are English-language learners (24 percent). Of all students with disabilities, Hispanic/Latino students represent the greatest numbers of students in need of special education and related services (59 percent) followed by white students (20 percent). All tables and figures are based on SWDs 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 (35.43 percent), followed by Speech or Language Impairment (21.5 percent).

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

| **Disability** | **Number of Students** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Specific Learning Disability (SLD) | 280,627 | 35.43 |
| Speech or Language Impairment (SLI) | 170,282 | 21.50 |
| Autism (AUT) | 133,641 | 16.87 |
| Other Health Impairment (OHI) | 112,118 | 14.16 |
| Intellectual Disability (ID) | 40,298 | 5.09 |
| Emotional Disturbance (ED) | 22,304 | 2.82 |
| Hard of Hearing (HH) | 9,976 | 1.26 |
| Orthopedic Impairment (OI) | 7,620 | 0.96 |
| Multiple Disability (MD) | 7,528 | 0.95 |
| Deafness (DEAF) | 2,881 | 0.36 |
| Visual Impairment (VI) | 2,807 | 0.35 |
| Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) | 1,370 | 0.17 |
| Established Medical Disability (EMD) | 452 | 0.06 |
| Deaf Blindness (DB) | 94 | 0.01 |
| Totals | 791,998 | 100.0 |

Source: CALPADS, Fall 2021

In California, SWDs receive a variety of services to address their unique needs. During FFY 2021–22, there were 1,882,381 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 singular service provided was Specialized Academic Instruction (34.00 percent) followed by Language and Speech (21.67 percent).

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

| **Services** | **Number of Students** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Specialized Academic Instruction | 639,983 | 34.00 |
| Language and Speech | 408,003 | 21.67 |
| Vocational/Career Services | 411,208 | 21.85 |
| Mental Health Services | 160,068 | 8.50 |
| All Other Services | 263,119 | 13.98 |
| Total | 1,882,381 | 100.0 |

Source: CALPADS, Fall 2021

## 2020–21 Annual Performance Report Indicators

During FFY 2021, California met 38 percent of the 17 indicators. Table 4 identifies each indicator, its target, the FFY 2021 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 2021 Indicators, Target, Results, and Change

| **Indicators** | **Targets** | **Results** | **Met Target** | **Change from Prior Year** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 Graduation | 75.5% | 77.36% | Yes | +0.34% |
| 2 Drop Out | 10% | 12.87% | No | +2.49% |
| 3 Statewide Assessment | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 3A Participation | 95% ELA/Math | Various | No | Various |
| 3B Grade Level Assessments Proficiency | Various | Various | Yes/No | Various |
| 3C Alternate Assessment Proficiency | Various | Various | Yes/No | Various |
| 3D Achievement Gap | Various | Various | Yes | Various |
| 4 Suspension/Expulsion | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 4A Suspension and Expulsion Rate Overall | 2.8% | 0% | Yes | -0.51% |
| 4B Suspension and Expulsion Rate by Race/Ethnicity | 0% | 0% | Yes | -1.47% |
| 5 Education Environments | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 5A Regular Class 80 Percent or More | 60% | 60.82% | Yes | +3.0% |
| 5B Regular Class Less than 40 Percent | 18% | 18.60% | No | +0.82% |
| 5C Separate Schools, Residential Facilitates, or Homebound/Hospital Placements | 3.2% | 2.57% | Yes | -0.33% |
| 6 Preschool Least Restrictive Environments | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 6A Regular Preschool | 41% | 18.86% | No | -10.30% |
| 6B Separate Schools or Classes | 31% | 47.87% | No | +10.85% |
| 6C Home | 3.5% | 7.97% | No | +2.33 |
| 7 Preschool Assessment | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 7A Positive Social-Emotional Skills | 77%/77% | 69.5%/67.7% | No | -1.5%/-0.3% |
| 7B Use of Knowledge and Skills | 77%/77% | 69.0%/65.2 | No | -0.5%/-0.5% |
| 7C Use of Appropriate Behaviors | 77%/77% | 71.5%/72.2 | No | -2.2%/+2.9% |
| 8 Parent Involvement | 95.5% | 99.63% | Yes | -0.01% |
| 9 Disproportionate Representation | 0% | 0.47% | No | +0.20% |
| 10 Disproportional Representation by Disability Category | 0% | 4.43% | No | -1.57% |
| 11 Child Find | 100% | 93.99% | No | -3.63% |
| 12 Early Childhood Transition | 100% | 78.15% | No | +5.56% |
| 13 Secondary Transition | 100% | 94.89% | No | -0.44% |
| 14 Post-school Outcomes | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 14A Enrolled in Higher Education | 56% | 47.93% | No | +1.3% |
| 14B Enrolled in Higher Education or Competitively Employed within a Year | 76.5% | 74.53% | No | +4.2% |
| 14C Enrolled in Higher Education, Postsecondary Education or Training or Competitively Employed | 87.5% | 91.12% | Yes | +2.2% |
| 15 Resolution Sessions | 41% | 8.18% | No | -1.68% |
| 16 Mediation | 66% | 16.92% | No | -1.87% |
| 17 State Systemic Improvement Plan | 14% | 14.07% | Yes | +0.97% |

## 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 2020–25

| **Indicator 1** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 75% | 75.5% | 76% | 77% | 78% | 79% |
| Result | 77.02% | 77.36% |  |  |  |  |
| Target Met | Yes | 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: No

### Dropout Rate Targets and Results for FFYs 2020–25

| **Indicator 2** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 11% | 10% | 9% | 8% | 7% | 6% |
| Result | 10.38% | 12.87% |  |  |  |  |
| Target Met | Yes | No |  |  |  |  |

## Indicator 3: Statewide Assessment

### Description

Indicator 3 is a performance indicator that measures the participation and performance of SWDs 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

### Assessment Targets and Results for FFYs 2020–25

| **Indicator 3a ELA** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade 4 Target | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% |
| Grade 4 Result | 19% | 94.66% |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 4 Target Met | No | No |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 8 Target | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% |
| Grade 8 Result | 20% | 91.68% |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 8 Target Met | No | No |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 Target | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% |
| Grade 11 Result | 33% | 82.36% |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 Target Met | No | No |  |  |  |  |

| **Indicator 3a Math** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade 4 Target | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% |
| Grade 4 Result | 20% | 94.48% |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 4 Target Met | No | No |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 8 Target | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% |
| Grade 8 Result | 20% | 91.18% |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 8 Target Met | No | No |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 Target | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% |
| Grade 11 Result | 33% | 81.59% |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 Target Met | No | No |  |  |  |  |

| **Indicator 3b ELA** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade 4 Target | 15% | 15% | 15% | 16% | 17% | 18% |
| Grade 4 Result | 18% | 19.26% |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 4 Target Met | Yes | Yes |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 8 Target | 12% | 12% | 12% | 13% | 14% | 15% |
| Grade 8 Result | 11% | 12.70% |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 8 Target Met | No | Yes |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 Target | 14% | 14% | 14% | 15% | 16% | 17% |
| Grade 11 Result | 17% | 15.82% |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 Target Met | Yes | Yes |  |  |  |  |

| **Indicator 3b Math** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade 4 Target | 15% | 15% | 15% | 16% | 17% | 18% |
| Grade 4 Result | 17% | 18.0% |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 4 Target Met | Yes | Yes |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 8 Target | 8% | 8% | 8% | 9% | 10% | 11% |
| Grade 8 Result | 6% | 6.52% |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 8 Target Met | No | No |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 Target | 8% | 8% | 8% | 9% | 10% | 11% |
| Grade 11 Result | 6% | 4.09% |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 Target Met | No | No |  |  |  |  |

| **Indicator 3c ELA** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade 4 Target | 15% | 15% | 15% | 16% | 17% | 18% |
| Grade 4 Result | 13% | 12.22% |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 4 Target Met | No | No |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 8 Target | 10% | 10% | 10% | 11% | 12% | 13% |
| Grade 8 Result | 11% | 9.44% |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 8 Target Met | Yes | No |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 Target | 14% | 14% | 14% | 15% | 16% | 17% |
| Grade 11 Result | 16% | 15.10% |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 Target Met | Yes | Yes |  |  |  |  |

| **Indicator 3c Math** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade 4 Target | 7% | 7% | 7% | 8% | 9% | 10% |
| Grade 4 Result | 6% | 6.04% |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 4 Target Met | No | No |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 8 Target | 8% | 8% | 8% | 9% | 10% | 14.5% |
| Grade 8 Result | 14% | 11.66% |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 8 Target Met | Yes | Yes |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 Target | 6% | 6% | 6% | 7% | 8% | 11% |
| Grade 11 Result | 11% | 10.78% |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 Target Met | Yes | Yes |  |  |  |  |

| **Indicator 3d ELA** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade 4 Target | 31% | 31% | 31% | 30% | 29% | 23% |
| Grade 4 Result | 24% | 24.96% |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 4 Target Met | Yes | Yes |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 8 Target | 37% | 37% | 37% | 36% | 35% | 34% |
| Grade 8 Result | 36% | 33.94% |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 8 Target Met | Yes | Yes |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 Target | 42% | 42% | 42% | 41% | 40% | 39% |
| Grade 11 Result | 42% | 38.98 |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 Target Met | Yes | Yes |  |  |  |  |

| **Indicator 3d Math** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade 4 Target | 25% | 25% | 25% | 24% | 23% | 18% |
| Grade 4 Result | 19% | 20.26% |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 4 Target Met | Yes | Yes |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 8 Target | 29% | 29% | 29% | 28% | 27% | 24% |
| Grade 8 Result | 25% | 22.71% |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 8 Target Met | Yes | Yes |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 Target | 27% | 27% | 27% | 26% | 25% | 24% |
| Grade 11 Result | 29% | 22.89% |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 Target Met | No | Yes |  |  |  |  |

## 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 2020–25

| **Indicator 4a** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 3% | 2.8% | 2.6% | 2.4% | 2.2% | 2% |
| Results | 0.51% | 0% |  |  |  |  |
| 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: Yes

### Suspension and Expulsion by Race or Ethnicity Targets and Results for FFYs 2020–25

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

## 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. Yes
2. No
3. Yes

### Education Environment Targets and Results for FFYs 2020–25

| **Indicator 5** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5a Target | 58% | 60% | 62% | 64% | 67% | 70% |
| 5a Result | 57.82% | 60.82% |  |  |  |  |
| 5a Target Met | No | Yes |  |  |  |  |
| 5b Target | 19.5% | 18% | 16.5% | 15% | 13.5% | 12% |
| 5b Result | 17.73% | 18.60% |  |  |  |  |
| 5b Target Met | Yes | No |  |  |  |  |
| 5c Target | 3.4% | 3.2% | 3.0% | 2.8% | 2.6% | 2.4% |
| 5c Result | 2.90% | 2.57% |  |  |  |  |
| 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 and is:

1. attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related service in the regular early childhood program; and
2. attending a 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 2020–25

| **Indicator 6** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6a Target | 39% | 41% | 43% | 45% | 47% | 49% |
| 6a Result | 29.16% | 18.86% |  |  |  |  |
| 6a Target Met | No | No |  |  |  |  |
| 6b Target | 33% | 31% | 29% | 27% | 25% | 23% |
| 6b Result | 37.02% | 47.87% |  |  |  |  |
| 6b Target Met | No | No |  |  |  |  |
| 6c Target | 3.5% | 3.5% | 3.5% | 3.5% | 3.5% | 3.4% |
| 6c Result | 5.64% | 7.97% |  |  |  |  |
| 6c Target Met | No | 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. This data is collected in CALPADS in partnership with Desired Results (DR) Access.

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 2020–25

| **Indicator 7a** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 76%/76% | 77%/77% | 78%/78% | 79%/79% | 80%/80% | 81%/81% |
| Result | 71%/68% | 69.5%/67.7% |  |  |  |  |
| 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. This data is collected in CALPADS in partnership with DR Access. 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 2020–25

| **Indicator 7b** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 76%/76% | 77%/77% | 78%/78% | 79%/79% | 80%/80% | 81%/81% |
| Result | 69.5%/65.7% | 69.0%/65.2% |  |  |  |  |
| 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. This data is collected in CALPADS in partnership with DR Access.

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 2020–25

| **Indicator 7c** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 76%/76% | 77%/77% | 78%/78% | 79%/79% | 80%/80% | 81%/81% |
| Result | 73.7%/69.3% | 71.5%/72.2% |  |  |  |  |
| Target Met | 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 2020–25

| **Indicator 8** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 95% | 95.5% | 96% | 96.5% | 97% | 97.5% |
| Result | 99.64% | 99.63% |  |  |  |  |
| 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 2020–25

| **Indicator 9** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Result | 0.27% | 0.47% |  |  |  |  |
| 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 *California Federal Regulations* 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 2020–25

| **Indicator 10** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Results | 6.0% | 4.43% |  |  |  |  |
| 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 2020–25

| **Indicator 11** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Result | 97.62% | 93.99% |  |  |  |  |
| 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, early intervention services for children birth through age 2) 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 (DDS). The DDS is the lead agency for IDEA Part C.

### 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 2020–25

| **Indicator 12** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Result | 72.59% | 78.15% |  |  |  |  |
| Target Met | No | No |  |  |  |  |

## Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

### Description

Indicator 13 is a compliance indicator that measures the percent of SWDs 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 2020–25

| **Indicator 13** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Results | 95.33% | 94.89% |  |  |  |  |
| 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

In California, LEAs are responsible for surveying and contacting youth who are no longer in secondary school. In an attempt to increase the response rate year over year, LEAs survey students in a variety of different ways, including but not limited to - traditional paper mail, e-mail, social media messages, and phone calls. LEAs use these various methods to reach as many students as possible, especially for those in underrepresented groups. These increased efforts have been successful as seen in the increased response rate.

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 2020–25

| **Indicator 14** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 14a Target | 55% | 56% | 57% | 58% | 59% | 60% |
| 14a Result | 46.6% | 47.93% |  |  |  |  |
| 14a Target Met | No | No |  |  |  |  |
| 14b Target | 75% | 76.5% | 78% | 79.5% | 81% | 82.5% |
| 14b Result | 70.3% | 74.53% |  |  |  |  |
| 14b Target Met | No | No |  |  |  |  |
| 14c Target | 87% | 87.5% | 88% | 88.5% | 89% | 89.5% |
| 14c Result | 88.9% | 91.12% |  |  |  |  |
| 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. This data is collected by the Office of Administrative Hearings and reported to the CDE.

### 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 2020–25

| **Indicator 15** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 40% | 41% | 42% | 43% | 44% | 45% |
| Result | 9.86% | 8.18% |  |  |  |  |
| 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. This data is collected by the Office of Administrative Hearings and reported to the CDE.

### 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 2020–25

| **Indicator 16** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 65% | 66% | 67% | 68% | 69% | 70% |
| Result | 18.79% | 16.92% |  |  |  |  |
| Target Met | No | No |  |  |  |  |

## Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

### *Section A: Data Analysis*

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

California’s SSIP addresses plans for improving outcomes for SWDs. California’s State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR) is the performance of all SWDs 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 SSOS to improve outcomes for SWDs.

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 SWDs 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 CDE hypothesized in the SSIP that by leveraging the intersectionality of SWDs 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 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 Theory of Action 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 SWDs, then each LEA would create an improvement plan that included evidence-based strategies and goals targeting high-needs students, including SWDs, which would result in increased access to instruction for SWDs and improved academic outcomes accordingly. Since Phase III, California progressed toward ensuring that LCAPs include and address performance of SWDs, including the passage of legislation [Assembly Bill (AB)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 SWDs. A robust LCAP that meaningfully includes supports for SWDs is a critical component of improving student outcomes. The comprehensive system of TA available through the SSOS includes access to evidence-based practices to effectively serve SWDs. In the 2022-23 state budget, California has continued to invest in the SSOS by expanding the consideration of SWDs in the LCAP. Commencing on July 1, 2025, identified LEAs will be required to create and submit an IDEA LCAP addendum. The intent of the IDEA addendum, though still in development, is to outline LEA plans and efforts to improve outcomes for SWDs.

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 SWDs.

### Progress toward the SiMR

| **Indicator 17** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 14% | 14% | 15% | 16% | 17% | 18% |
| Result | 12.2% | 14.07% |  |  |  |  |
| Target Met | No | Yes |  |  |  |  |

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

**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 2020 SSIP, ED&D developed a tiered support model called Level 1 (universal), Level 2 (structured), and Level 3 (targeted). Universal support included capacity building through blog posts, the Equity Network Project, Podcasts, professional development (PD) workshops and presentations at local and state conferences. Targeted support included PD geared toward specific LEA identified needs, use of the Equity Dispro Data System (EDDS) and providing practical routines to integrate equity and data into regular existing meetings. Intensive support included individualized coaching sessions with LEA teams regarding implementation of Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) in the areas of academics, social-emotional learning and behavior, as well as intensive data analysis with LEAs examining disproportionality data trends.

Through a human-centered approach, the ED&D team has continued to promote equity and prevent disproportionality to meet the needs of LEA’s. Since the last report, ED&D has expanded to include TA support for LEAs in Targeted Level Two Disproportionality in collaboration with the CDE. The team continues to scale awareness and action about disproportionality by providing PD, presenting at conferences, individualized coaching and TA.

**Open Access Project**

The Placer County SELPA Open Access (OA) project serves as a SELPA content lead within the SSOS focused on improving outcomes for SWDs by providing students with access to quality curriculum and participation and active engagement with learning in inclusive settings by eliminating barriers to learning. The OA 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 identifying where students are through intentional instructional planning.

The OA project improves inclusive practices through building educator’s skills (content, competence and confidence) in leveraging effective instructional practices in the areas of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and assistive technology (AT), including Augmentative Alternative Communication (AAC).

In Universal Support TA, OA developed and disseminated over 100 robust, actionable print and online resources and tools across the three content areas. In the area of Targeted Support TA, OA developed actionable tools and resources to support teams who have identified UDL and AT as potential frameworks for guiding improvement work. The aim for targeted support is to develop a needs assessment and potential understanding outcomes regarding student-access related areas; understanding the implementation journey; and to complete readiness assessment in order to make informed decisions prior to engaging in the work. Intensive Support TA is focused on building regional leadership teams with extensive resources and knowledge to support SELPAs, LEAs and County Office of Education (COEs) to build capacity in the chosen strand of practice. Intensive Supports are specifically designed to leverage the science and practices of implementation and continuous improvement to focus whole systems (leaders and educators) on understanding how UDL and AT (including AAC) can promote equity and inclusion in the educational system.

**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 (EBPs) for Autism and other developmental disabilities.

**SELPA System Improvement Leads**

The System Improvement Leads (SIL) project works collaboratively within the SSOS to build the capacity of SELPAs and LEAs with a common goal of improving outcomes for SWDs. The SIL project developed and implemented a wide range of tools, resources, and trainings that benefit educators around the state. SIL resources support the vast learning styles of educators in California (e.g., guidebooks, handouts, on-demand videos) with emphasis on the following three areas: data use and governance, continuous improvement, and high leverage practices.

The improvement data center (IDC) is one key infrastructure of the SIL project. The IDC houses the Data Quality Toolkit, which is a centralized resource to help improve data quality, and the Data Tools, which is a comprehensive suite of data tools that help LEAs to better understand and monitor their data specific to the 14 indicators in the APR. The IDC Data Tools provides: data visualizations for six years of SPP indicator data, access to annual performance reports, and analytic tools to use with data files extracted from CALPADS for more real-time analysis. The SIL project also updates the State Performance Plan Indicator (SPPI) Guide annually to coincide with the release of the annual performance reports. The SPPI guide has become a critical resource for LEA teams seeking to understand and utilize this valuable data set.

The SIL team provided a wide range of continuous improvement and system thinking trainings including: Introduction to Improvement Science, Improvement Science Basics, Root Cause Analysis, and Compassionate Systems Leadership. One core offering, Improvement Science Basics, is a four-month course designed to provide a hands-on introduction to the tools and principles of improvement science. SIL improvement facilitators guide teams through the System Improvement Journey by providing coaching support, connecting teams to tools and resources, and facilitating capacity building.

In an effort to build capacity around the implementation of High Leverage Practices, the SIL Team developed guidebooks, handouts, online on demand training modules and in-person training opportunities meant to improve outcomes for students with disabilities.

**Imperial County SELPA**

The Imperial County SELPA (IC SELPA) Improving Outcomes for English Learners (ELs) with Disabilitiescontent-lead team is a partner within the SSOS, assisting SELPAs and their respective LEAs and COEs with striving for equity & access for all students. The IC SELPA team provides in-person & virtual PD and TA statewide. In so doing, the IC SELPA team provides support within the SSOS as capacity builders, connectors, and facilitators.

The IC SELPA’s work has been built around assisting the CDE with the statewide dissemination and implementation of the *California Practitioners’ Guide for Educating English Learners with Disabilities*. The IC SELPA has created various PD, a website which hosts numerous resources, and has engaged in TA with practitioners statewide, to improve the practices of SELPA, COE & LEAs. Practitioners are provided with support to address key themes and topics within the *CA Practitioners’ Guide for Educating ELs with Disabilities* to include, but not limited to:

* MTSS and targeted interventions for multilingual learners,
* Pre-referral & referral processes,
* Culturally & linguistically appropriate assessment,
* Sound evidenced-based instructional practices & pedagogy for ELs with disabilities
* IEP development
* Reclassification of ELs with disabilities.

Through this work, practitioners have engaged in identifying gaps in practice(s), effective processes, policies, supports & services for improving outcomes for ELs with disabilities.

**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 identified 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 MTSS to prevent disproportionality. ED&D collected comprehensive survey data from LEAs all over California about disproportionality awareness, practices that contribute to disproportionality, and practices that reduce disproportionality. ED&D continues to use the data to inform and develop more services for promoting equity in schools.

The ED&D team used different techniques to measure the impact of the work on California school systems. The measurement used included the use of surveys, collection of personal stories, process metrics, and interviews with training participants by the external evaluator about the use of ED&D tools. The ED&D team is expanding services and tools focused on proactively building capacity for good data use and the implementation of MTSS to prevent disproportionality. Through extensive TA, ED&D has supported 74 LEAs with targeted professional learning focused on analyzing data, gathering feedback from the community, and creating a plan to prevent disproportionality in the future.

**Open Access Project**

The OA project measures impact at three levels of implementation: Regional (system), Regional Leads (training and coaching fidelity) and participant (fidelity with targeted skills and instructional practices).

Regional Readiness Assessments are completed at the beginning, mid-point and end of the project. The system-level assessment enables the leadership team to look at key infrastructure needs that contribute to established barriers and key leverage points for improvement (such as establishing the practice of evaluating AT or AAC effectiveness across environments during naturally occurring and structured activities).

The intensive TA projects of the resource lead grant were designed so that grantees would have the opportunity to engage in active implementation planning and continuous improvement work in order to use this experience to better refine their ability to build systems needed to create universal access to learning for all students. All of these efforts demonstrate that by employing core practices, SELPAs can build sustainable and impactful system-wide instructional changes that leaders can use across all initiatives or practices.

The overall goal of OA under the parameters of the grant was capacity building to develop regional hubs of expertise in AT, AAC and UDL that will continue to train and build implementation fidelity in that region.

**California Autism Professional Training and Information Network**

Thirteen CAPTAIN regions have developed an interdisciplinary implementation team who are knowledgeable in Autism and the science of implementation to build sustainable and scalable capacity systems for EBPs for Autism and other developmental disabilities. Each region has been assigned an implementation coach who supports the development of regional implementation capacity. The Regional Capacity Assessment (RCA) developed by the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN), State Implementation and Scaling-up of Evidence-based Practices (SISEP), is used to assist the regional education agencies in their efforts to effectively support LEAs in their use of EBPs for Autism and other developmental disabilities. Increased regional implementation capacity was noted from 2021 to 2022 as a result of this SELPA Content Lead’s support.

The CAPTAIN Cadre members continue to implement trainings on EBPs for Autism and other developmental disabilities 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. CAPTAIN has developed and posted free trainings on: *What is Autism*, *Understanding and Selecting EBPs for Autism* and 27 EBP trainings for Autism all of which include pre- and post- training knowledge assessments. CAPTAIN Cadre provide coaching using the National Professional Development Center on Autism coaching model. Coaching is a requirement of all school-based CAPTAIN Cadre because it is a key ingredient for the successful implementation of EBPs for Autism and other developmental disabilities. Coaching ensures that educators make informed decisions about instruction and program organization that will lead to intervention practices that help children and youth with Autism and other developmental disabilities learn more effectively.

The CAPTAIN website [www.captain.ca.gov](http://www.captain.ca.gov) is the repository of the tools and resources used in these efforts to implement EBPs with fidelity for individuals with Autism and other developmental disabilities to improve student outcomes. From July 1, 2021 through June 30, 2022, the website has recorded 16,000 users in 28,000 Sessions. Of the 22,503-page views, the most visited pages were those posting free materials and resources, pre-made EBP trainings and the page especially dedicated to families of individuals with Autism and family support personnel.

**SELPA System Improvement Leads**

Primary evaluation methods include the knowledge, skill, and satisfaction surveys which assess satisfaction, quality, and relevance of services, trainings, and other opportunities for educators, interviews, and focus groups with the various stakeholders that the SELPA Leads aim to impact.

The data collected throughout the project is reviewed regularly and utilized to inform SIL activities and supports. The range of data collected all indicate that SELPAs, COEs, and LEAs are utilizing the SIL resources, tools and coaching/facilitation opportunities throughout the state in a variety of ways, including but not limited to:

* Participation in Networked Improvement Communities (NICs)
* Engagement in the Compliance and Improvement Monitoring (CIM) activities required by the California Department of Education
* More than 100 improvement projects focused on improving outcomes for SWDs in a variety of areas [e.g., disproportionality, free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment (LRE), IEP development and facilitation, special education policy and procedure]

The SIL team elicits feedback on participants' understanding of topics and their ability to apply new skills. Evaluation highlights include:

* 96% strongly agree/agree that trainers demonstrated expertise in the subject matter
* 95% strongly agree/agree that trainers were responsive to participants’ questions
* 94% strongly agree/agree that their understanding of topics covered in training increased
* 93% strongly agree/agree that they would rate the training experience as highly valuable
* 97% strongly agree that the coach helped facilitate learning of improvement science methods and tools

The SIL project continues to grow their direct TA to the field. Their statewide team of 11 improvement facilitators build the improvement capacity of SELPAs and LEAs by providing coaching on self-identified problems of practice. Participant feedback consistently highlights the value of coaching support during and after training sessions. As a result, the SIL project has integrated facilitated breakout sessions, office hours, and follow up coaching sessions into the overall training model.

**Imperial County SELPA**

The IC SELPA utilizes quantitative and qualitative measures to determine impact and effectiveness of PD, TA & resources provided. SELPAs, COEs & LEAs partner with the IC SELPA team to receive various levels of support consisting of:

* Level 1 supports: statewide in-person or virtual PD, TA & access to website and resources.
* Level 2 supports: Level 1 supports, plus SELPA, COE and/or LEA team targeted consultation & TA, along with customized PD series based on SELPA, COE and/or LEA Community of Practice (CoP) data-based identified needs.
* Level 3 supports: Level 1 & 2 supports, plus additional year(s) of customized PD, TA, and consultative support to further integration of resources, best practices, and continued data analysis with CoPs multidisciplinary team members.

To date the IC SELPA has trained 5,298 practitioners across California, representing various roles including, but not limited to: general & special education teachers and site administrators, LEA & COE EL Specialists, SELPA administrators, COE & LEA Special Education administrators, School Psychologists, and Speech Pathologists. Participants represent: 136 SELPAs, 52 COEs & 548 LEAs from across California.

The IC SELPA collects data from SELPAs, COEs, and LEAs through surveys, website data, feedback gathered via zoom chats, phone calls, emails, and conversations with CoPs, along with several other measurements to determine capacity development and future development of statewide resources.

The following feedback and measurements informed the IC SELPA for the upcoming FFY 2022:

* 8,987 IC SELPA Improving Outcomes for ELs with Disabilities website visits/hits
* 7,097 views of archived website video training modules
* 1,535 subscribers to the IC SELPA Newsletter
* 1,686 website views of created Infographics
* 1,514 website views of Resources
* 5,298 participants in statewide PD Opportunities (in-person or live via Zoom),

representing: 136 SELPAs, 52 COEs & 548 LEAs from across California.

* 98% of participants report that PD & TA provided by the IC SELPA team has met or exceeded expectations.
* 89% of participants report that they agree or strongly agree that learned resources can be used immediately to improve their practice within their SELPA, COE or LEA.

***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, with the addition of an Executive Consultant with a skill set focused on instructional improvement, ED&D expanded services and partnerships. These professional learning opportunities were designed to support school and district multi-disciplinary teams with the implementation of academic and social-emotional interventions that promote increased learning with diverse learners. Second, ED&D continued to develop training content about preventing disproportionality in fifteen-minute lessons. ED&D began and will continue to scale the impact of their services by providing the materials to SELPAs and LEAs. Lastly, ED&D designed and provided TA to LEAs identified by CDE as Targeted Level 2. Based on positive feedback, ED&D continues to provide and scale their human-centered approach to TA.

**SELPA System Improvement Leads**

The CDE’s monitoring framework uses a tiered system that differentiates the level of monitoring and TA support for each LEA based on data analyses and that LEA’s need. At the core of the monitoring framework is the CIM process. This process is built to ensure that LEAs, with differentiated levels of involvement and review, examine a wide-range of both compliance and performance data and identify the root causes of areas of concern so that an effective improvement plan can be developed and implemented. For more information, please visit <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/qa/cimprocess.asp>

In spring 2022, CDE asked the SIL team to provide direct TA to 25 LEAs that have been identified for level 1 intensive monitoring as they work through the CIM process. These LEAs have been identified as the bottom 8-10 percent of LEAs for outcomes in Assessment, Placement and Student Engagement (Suspension and Attendance).

In April 2022, Intensive Level 1 LEAs were notified of their monitoring status and required to engage in the CIM process with support from the SIL team. Assistance to LEAs by the SIL team can include, but are not limited to, individual and/team coaching, data analysis, analysis of strengths and weaknesses, provision of resources to support required activities, and meeting facilitation. The SIL team established three goals for our technical support:

* Assist LEA teams in *understanding* the new CIM process and required activities
* Make required activities *meaningful* for the LEA team
* Ensure teams feel *supported* through the intensive monitoring process

**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 through June 2023, 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.

The ED&D team continues to develop and implement these project ideas to scale our practical and user-friendly brand of equity work to even more educational systems beyond 2023. ED&D’s dual focus on human-centered design and using systemic practices (including MTSS and data use) present the greatest opportunity for system and student-level change regarding inequitable school outcomes.

ED&D’s innovative approach has substantially increased awareness of disproportionality in each of these systems and continues to empower educators to act on disproportionality causes in a time when the added stressors introduced by the pandemic have the potential of compounding the problem.

**Open Access Project**

The OA project is currently developing 31 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 OA website and a professional learning network of their peers as they continue to build on the work of the project.

The project runs the course of two to three years in order to enable LEAs to develop the capacity to train and coach based on the extensive resources available through the grant, the expectation is that they will continue to use the tools and implement the practices of regional implementation planning that is introduced in the roadmaps, as capacity building is a long-term effort. If schools are truly to actualize change across these critical content areas, then it will also be important to solidify this network and as a state support the regionalized model seeded through OA and to support these regionalized teams in developing an ongoing and functioning statewide community of practice prepared to support other regions and LEAs. OA is establishing statewide CoPs in each focus area, who can continue to contribute to the work of building capacity across other LEAs and regions.

**California Autism Professional Training and Information Network**

The 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. The CAPTAIN will base the TA on the Active Implementation Frameworks using resources and tools developed by the NIRN and the SISEP Center to ensure sufficient attention is given to stabilization, sustainability, scaling, and efficiency. The 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

The CAPTAIN will conduct activities in 10 CAPTAIN regions in California that will lead to the development of demonstration sites where EBPs for Autism and other developmental disabilities can be observed in a variety of classroom settings. The CAPTAIN will continue to develop the CAPTAIN data system to support the fidelity of high-quality training and implementation coaching of evidence-based practices for autism and other developmental disabilities that supports data driven decision-making. The CAPTAIN is committed to supporting teams to develop their implementation capacity to ensure sustainability and will continue to scale up support across the state to improve outcomes for students with autism and other developmental disabilities.

**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, the SIL will serve as a hub for a NIC in FFY 2022. This network will bring together teams across the state with a common aim of improving the quality of IEPs for students with disabilities. The 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. The 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.

* Continue Improvement Science Basics Training - Cohort 7 in progress and Cohort 8 (spring 2023)
* Increase the number LEAs to load their individual CALPADS data into the IDC to support programming and data analysis
* Continue to create awareness around the importance of equity and opportunity for students with disabilities.
* Reach measurable improvement in data practices and the quality of IEP goals through the SIL Networked Improvement Community
* Provide continued monitoring support to LEAs as designated by the CDE
* Create awareness of improvement strategies and practices throughout California via both direct and indirect communication
* Continue to connect LEAs with resources and tools for their continuous improvement journey
* Model systematic improvement practices in the California Statewide System of Support
* Provide high leverage, high quality and researched based professional learning opportunities to educators throughout California

**Imperial County SELPA**

For the FFY 2022 year, four CoPs have committed to continue their partnership with IC SELPA for Level 3 supports, while four CoPs have newly emerged and have committed to receive Level 2 supports. The IC SELPA anticipates continued growth in PD & TA outreach and resources for recipients within all Levels of supports in FFY 2022.

The IC SELPA will continue to align all work to its focal resource the *California Practitioners Guide for Educating English learners with Disabilities,* LCAP Priorities, SPPIs, and the EL Roadmap Principles. Using the CDE developed PD plan as a guiding document, the IC SELPA determined it will take nine years for full implementation of the *Practitioners’ Guide* to improve supports for ELs with disabilities, due to the pandemic, additional years are necessary to truly build capacity statewide & continue to improve student outcomes for EL with disabilities. The IC SELPA *Improving Outcomes for ELs with disabilities* team, looks forward to continuing to serve LEAs across California to achieve and sustain best practices, equity, and access for all ELs with disabilities.

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

The California Multi-Tiered System of Support (CA 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**

The CA MTSS is a systemic, continuous-improvement framework designed to provide effective TA for LEAs 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 LEAs and schools increase attendance, prevent dropouts, lower disciplinary rates, improve school climate, and boost academic performance.

The 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.

CA MTSS Pathway Certification for Schools:

The OCDE continued to utilize the CA MTSS Pathway Certification for Schools online course for CA MTSS as professional learning for school sites, LEAs, and coaches. This is a self-paced, asynchronous course designed to be completed individually, with a colleague, or school team. It is recommended that the CA MTSS Pathway Certification for Schools course be completed in 12–18 months. To obtain the CA MTSS Pathway Certification the following sections are completed:

* 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, School Based Mental Health Clinician, Paraeducator, Coach, and Higher Education-Teacher Educator)
* Section 11: Reflection and Call to Action

Coaching:

Region Lead COEs serve as liaisons for information, TA, and coaching expertise for sub-grant awardees in their local California County Superintendents Educational Services Association region and facilitate regional coaching meetings. Local COE staff with knowledge of CA MTSS serve as coaches to LEAs or schools in their area. All coaches will complete the CA MTSS Pathway Certification for Schools course and complete the Coaching pathway, which builds capacity for this approach to enhancing School Climate using the CA MTSS Framework. The COE Capacity Building sub-grant is for any of our COEs in the state to build capacity to coach LEAs now and in the future.

Communities of Practice:

CoPs are groups of people who share a concern or a passion for something they do and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly. A CoP is more than a network of connections between people. It has an identity defined by a shared domain of interest. Membership implies a commitment to the domain and, therefore, a shared competence that distinguishes members from others. In pursuing their interest in their domain, members engage in joint activities and discussions, help each other, and share information. They build relationships that enable them to learn from each other; they care about their standing with each other. Members of a community of practice are practitioners. They develop a shared repertoire of resources: experiences, stories, tools, and ways of addressing recurring problems—in short, a shared practice.

**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 – 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 2021–22 school year was provided to grantees in a three-tiered system. Tier I included a provision of no cost PD offered in-person and virtually open to any school community across the state. Tier II included direct TA to grantees provided at the county, SELPA, LEA, and individual site levels. Tier III consisted of TA to school communities and partner organizations beyond those entities identified as grantees and based on CDESED referrals for support. 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**

CA MTSS Pathway Certification for Schools:

The intention of the CA MTSS Pathway Certification for Schools is to build knowledge of the CA MTSS Framework and Continuum of Support by making 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 regardless of age, race, zip code, language, physical challenge, intellectual ability, capacity, or competency.

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

Within each module, learners engage in lessons, discussions, and activities that require reading and writing related to the above-mentioned topics. Each level builds upon the previous one, and each section has a series of Reflections and BADGE Activities. Reflections are optional, while all BADGE Activities are required 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 activity submission of the is required.

Coaching:

Assigned coaches meet weekly or bi-weekly with the site administrator to discuss progress on the course, implementation of CA MTSS, data around school climate, and goal headway, which might include closing gaps in discipline, attendance, special education referrals, etc. The site administrator and the coach determine the frequency of their meetings. In the initial conversations the coach and administrator develop a timeline for school staff to complete a certification course and collaborative activities. Coaches can also facilitate the Fidelity Integrity Assessment and the Schoolwide Implementation Tool assessments and help debrief the results, identify areas of strength and determine areas for opportunity which will become the priority areas. Practice Profiles are created and aligned to the priority areas to identify the gold standard to ensure implementation fidelity.

Through coaching and the CA MTSS Pathway Certification for Schools course, learning opportunities are provided to support the enhancement of school conditions and climate. Each role-specific pathway of the course allows educators to make connections to their role to provide a continuum of support to meet students’ academic, behavioral, social-emotional and mental health needs. 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

Communities of Practice:

Each Region or COE has formed a CoP for the purpose of providing ongoing TA and support for schools and LEAs 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 or combination option. Each CoP identifies one of the CA MTSS Domains or Features to further explore and share best and/or current practices.

**Supporting Inclusive Practices**

The SIP project advances a systemic approach to inclusion within schools that is based upon five evidence-based domains of practice. No single EBP leads to greater inclusion, and the achievement of the LRE for each child, or greater success for every student. Rather, evidence of school reform indicates that it is the use of a system of practices across multiple domains that will transform a school and district toward greater inclusion as measured by the LRE and measures of student success.

To articulate the collection of practices that are based upon evidence of efficacy the Blueprint for Inclusion was developed with five domains: Envisioning, building, implementing, scaling up and sustaining as supported by progress monitoring and use of data for continuous improvement.

Envisioning builds upon the evidence associated with transformational leadership as a foundation for school transformation. The SIP approach is to assist LEAs in building strong leadership support for inclusion, then having leaders articulate an inclusion vision clearly and urgently through formal articulation (vision/ mission/ goals) and via priority setting. Additionally, taking advantage of the evidence of diffusion of innovation SIP focuses first on early adopters of inclusion as a means to leverage the diffusion of innovation evidence for organizational transformation.

The second set of practices articulated via the Blueprint is associated with building support for inclusion through evidence, including: (1) gathering data about inclusion from stakeholders; (2) assessing the environment to determine areas of strength and limitation; (3) building support through collaborative strategic planning focused on equity, and examining current policies and practices associated with inclusion. The building approach is based upon two evidence-based practices; (1) data-driven decision making, or using evidence to inform practice, and (2) collaborative, community-based support for policy and practice changes.

Implementing focuses on evidence surrounding organizational change that unfreezing an organization and focusing on a learning and growth culture are essential for transformation. The aim with this phase is to support schools and LEAs in adopting a learning and growth disposition to inclusion policy and practice.

Scaling up refers to broadening the use of evidence-based practices across a district. In this instance those practices are identified by the SIP Matrix of Classroom practices which include evidence-based domains associated with (1) culturally responsive pedagogy, evidence-based learning environment elements, behavior interventions, engagement, representation and action and expression.

Finally, sustaining is seen as practices associated with codifying inclusion as part of organizational policies and practices. The process of sustaining is one that seeks to ensure that policies and practices associated with inclusion are codified in district documentation and informal practice.

The SIP approach is foundationally built upon asking SIP participants to engage in all five of the evidence-based domains of the Blueprint for Inclusion as outlined above.

SIP delivers content through a tiered system of support. Tier 1 includes free in-person and virtual professional learning events available to anyone in California, archived resources, website, social media, and dissemination of the *Special EDge* newsletter. Tier 2 includes selected grantees (LEAs, COEs, SELPAs, and single school sites) that receive direct support through: (1) TA with each LEA which have an assigned SIP staff member; (2) customized PD events; (3) annual conference, (4) the Spring Institute, (5) virtual and In-person meetings that assist grantees in working through the Blueprint domains, (6) Culture of Accountability Workshops. Tier 3 includes facilitation through the CIM process for those LEAs identified as Intensive Level 2 and statewide committee membership.

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

**California Multi-Tiered System of Support**

Multiple measures will assess the sites’ fidelity for implementing the CA MTSS Framework. Baseline implementation measurements are taken to coincide with each cohort’s first full year of participation. (Phase 2A: 2019–2020, Phase 2B: 2021–2022, Phase 3A: 2022–2023, Phase 3B: 2022–2023, and Phase 3C: 2023–2024). Follow-up implementation measurements are conducted annually through the end of each respective grant period (Phase 2A and 2B: June 2023; Phases 3A, 3B, and 3C: June 2026).

* SWIFT-Fidelity Integrity Assessment (FIA) by October 31-annually

A 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. FIA results show that schools and sites in Phase 2A made progress toward Implementing or Sustaining Implementation of the practices described in the FIA but remain at the Installing level on most items. On most items, schools and sites in Phase 2B started at the Laying the Foundation or Installing level.

* Schoolwide Implementation Tool (SIT) by December 1-annually

A self-assessment used by School Leadership Teams to examine the current status in addressing the four domains necessary for schools to improve their climate and cultures. The SIT results show that schools and sites in Phase 2A made progress toward Implementing or Sustaining Implementation of the practices described in the SIT but remain at the Installing level on most items. On most items, schools and sites in Phase 2B started at the Laying the Foundation or Installing level.

* LEA Self-Assessment (LEASA) by June 30-annually

A self-assessment for LEA/District Leadership Teams to examine the current status of systemic practices consistently demonstrated through research to be the components of effective district systems. Overall, results show that LEAs in Phase 2A remain in the Installing stage, as indicated by their most frequently selected descriptors. In addition, progress towards implementing or sustaining implementation was made in the 3 of the 6 components. LEAs in Phase 2B started at the Installing or Implementing levels on most items.

* Annual Year-End Reports

Annual outcome reports gather additional anecdotal evidence of successes and challenges and about the relationship between the CA MTSS Framework and school climate for Phase 2. For Phase 2, school administrators report on their progress towards fostering positive school climate and conditions, improving pupil-teacher relationships, increasing pupil engagement, and promoting alternative discipline practices.

For Phase 3, school administrators will report on their progress towards inclusive transformative social-emotional instruction and mental health support such as implementing social-emotional learning/addressing the social-emotional needs of pupils, trauma screening, implementing trauma-informed practices, and implementing culturally relevant, affirming, and sustaining practices. Phase 3 schools’ first annual year-end report will cover the 2022–2023 school year.

**Supporting Inclusive Practices**

SIP grantees progress is monitored and evaluated related to their implementation of the Blueprint in the three ways in keeping with the SIP logic model/ theory of change which articulates the following:

If LEAs engage in the EBPs of the five domains of the Blueprint of Inclusion, then increases in the knowledge, belief and use of inclusion practices will occur, and if increases in the knowledge, belief and use of inclusion practices occur, then LEAs will see shifts in their collective organization (culture, practice and policy) that will result in increases in the LRE and student success.

In keeping with the logic model, SIP first examines district engagement in the projects through tracking participation and the Blueprint areas of focus for their work. Without involvement the theory of action would suggest there will not be desired changes in individual knowledge, belief and use of inclusive practices. Engagement data collection is completed through a project monitoring process and database, where each team member records their interactions with, the content of the work (related to the Blueprint) and participation of LEAs. Data indicates that grantees on average meet multiple times per quarter with the SIP team, and overwhelmingly are focused on the scaling up component of the Blueprint, or the broad adoption of evidence-based classroom inclusion practices.

Second, the SIP specifically evaluates the immediate outcomes of the project associated with increased knowledge, belief and use of blueprint domains of practices through two evaluation methods:

* Survey of project participants related to inclusion policy and practice completed twice per year. Among survey responses there are high levels of belief and self-support use of the evidence-based practices of the Blueprint.
* Walkthroughs of selected classrooms in participating LEAs to observe classroom inclusion practices, which are then tabulated as inclusion data. Walkthrough data from 2021–2022 revealed that classrooms that had support through TA and PD for evidence-based practices showed statistically significant gains in observed use of evidence-based classroom inclusion practices.

Third, the theory of change indicates that if immediate outcomes are associated with increased knowledge, belief and the use of Blueprint domains of practice, in turn there will be desired changes in the LRE. The SIP annually examines state data associated with least restrictive environment to examine whether or not desired changes are observed over the long term.

**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**

CA MTSS Pathway Certification for Schools:

Course completion will be monitored as cohorts and COE staff progress through each module of the certification course. All Phase 2 sites are expected to completed the course by June 2023. For Phase 3, 90% of a school’s certificated and paraprofessional staff are recommended to complete the CA MTSS Pathway Certification for Schools course during the grant period to support fidelity of implementation. For COEs, the ideal is to have 2–5 county office staff complete the CA MTSS Pathway Certification for Schools (Coach Pathway) during the grant period.

Coaching:

Coaching will continue to be provided to Phase 2A and 2B schools as needed through June 2023. For Phase 3, coaching for the 3A cohort started in April 2022 for 3A and will begin for cohorts 3B and 3C when they begin the certification course. Coaching for Phase 3 will continue as needed through June 2026. Site administrators will report increased confidence or efficacy to implement the envisioned changes, access resources needed to make the changes envisioned and build capacity to transform and sustain practices.

Communities of Practice:

CoPs will also continue to meet in order to provide ongoing TA and support for schools and LEAs who have completed the CA MTSS training series as they continue to scale up and sustain their work with CA MTSS implementation.

Annual fidelity of implementation measures are 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 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-FIA.
* 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 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 including changes in rates of suspensions or expulsion, discipline referrals, referrals to special education, pupil attendance, incidents of bullying or harassment, graduation rates, dropout rates, and measures of pupil academic achievement.

**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 California Assembly’s 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 of PD events
* Regionalized TA for Tier I grantees
* Examine data collection systems with respect to data quality and allow for access to current versus lag data
* Culture of Accountability for Tier II grantees
* Collaborate with SSOS Lead Agencies
* Continue to build and scale collective teacher efficacy with respect to educating and including SWDs and their families

### *Section C: Stakeholder Engagement History*

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 meetings with interested parties 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 interested parties 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 interested parties, 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 meetings with interested parties, the 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 the OSEP. The twelve performance indicators were partnered with detailed presentations to inform the interested parties 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 interested party 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 the interested parties with the opportunity to refine their recommendations for these targets in light of the new calculations.

**Specific strategies implemented to engage interested parties in key improvement efforts.**

The CDE engaged with a diverse set of interested parties over the course of the last fiscal year. The CDE staff presented the SSIP and the SSOS to interested parties 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 interested parties on all aspects of the SSIP. Moving forward the CDE plans to meet with this group of interested parties biannually to be transparent about the work supporting the SSIP and the SSOS as well as to continuously collect feedback to improve efforts.

This targeted engagement with interested parties was in addition to standard 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 SBE meetings.