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# California State Board of Education March 2018 Agenda Item #03

## Subject

Indicator 17 of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report for Special Education: Indicator 17

## Type of Action

Action and Information

## Summary of the Issue(s)

This item is the second of two items concerning California’s Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2016 State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) for special education, required annually by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). The first item, covering Indicators 1–16, was approved at the January 2018 meeting of the State Board of Education (SBE), Item 2. Indicator 17, the recently-established federal requirement for a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), is presented in this item. The SSIP requirement reflects the OSEP’s shift in focus from ensuring state and local compliance with special education law to also targeting improved outcomes for students through the development of state level systemic plans for increasing student academic performance. This report, also known as the Phase III update, is due to the OSEP on April 2, 2018.

The Special Education Division (SED) of the California Department of Education (CDE) has developed the SSIP Phase III report based on instructions provided by the OSEP and with substantial input on multiple occasions from a variety of stakeholders. California’s SSIP addresses plans for increasing academic performance of students with disabilities (SWD). The SSIP covers the six year period from fiscal year 2013–14 through 2018–19, as required by the OSEP. The SSIP is to be developed in three phases, with specific sections required to be completed in each phase. The Phase III report builds on the work reported in the Phase I and Phase II reports. 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 SWD. The Phase II

report established the structure and details of California’s SSIP. Phase III, which focuses on evaluation and refinement of the SSIP, extends for a four-year period, with updates due to the OSEP each year. This report covers the second year of Phase III.

The Phase III report provided with this item includes detailed descriptions of:

* An overview of the state’s SSIP, including a description of any changes that have occurred in the state
* Progress made over the year in plan implementation
* Progress toward achieving intended improvements
* Plans for next year

California’s SSIP has been developed to align with and support the state’s improvement efforts under the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) and use of the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) to move toward the state’s goal of establishing a single system of public education serving all students.

## Recommendation

The CDE recommends that the SBE approve the SSIP, Attachment 1, prepared by the SED to be submitted to the OSEP by the mandated submission date of April 2, 2018.

## Brief History of Key Issues

California is required to have in place a SPP to guide the state’s implementation of Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), and to describe how the state will meet the SPP implementation targets. The OSEP requires that states annually revise and report on the SPP, and provide state data through an APR. California submitted its initial SPP and APR to the OSEP on December 2, 2005. Each year the SPP and APR have been updated to align with changes to federal requirements. In 2013–2014, the OSEP made several important changes to the SPP and APR:

1. Combined the SPP and APR into a single document for submission.
2. Eliminated four indicators (complaints, due process, general supervision, and state data) that required data to be collected and reported.
3. Eliminated the practice of using improvement plans for individual indicators.
4. Created a new indicator, Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan.

These changes are part of the emphasis on Results Driven Accountability (RDA) initiated by the OSEP. The OSEP’s requirement that an SSIP be included for the new SPP Indicator 17 has required that the SED present to the SBE on Indicator 17 separately from the SPP and APR, as the due dates for the two documents are different. The SBE item presented in January 2018 addressed SPP Indicators 1 through 16. This SBE item addresses only Indicator 17, specifically, Phase III of the comprehensive, multi-year SSIP. The OSEP requires states to develop the SSIP in three phases:

1. Phase I (submitted to OSEP in April 2015): Analysis of the current state of California’s education system for the SSIP, including the following areas:
   1. Data analysis (current student performance data, etc.)
   2. Analysis of state infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity (California’s education structure at all levels)
   3. State identified measurable result (SIMR) for SWD (Outcome measure to be used to determine changes in the academic performance of SWD)
   4. Selection of coherent improvement strategies (activities to be implemented to improve academic performance of SWD)
   5. Theory of Action (graphic representation of the general components and intents of the SSIP)
2. Phase II (submitted to OSEP in April 2016): SSIP
   1. Infrastructure development
   2. Support for local educational agency implementation of evidence-based practices
   3. Evaluation
3. The Phase III Update (Attachment 1) provides an update of California’s SSIP and addresses specific subjects the OSEP requires to be included in the FFY 2016 APR submission.

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

In March 2015, the SBE approved California’s Phase 1 SSIP report (Item 1). In January 2016, the SBE approved California’s SPP and APR for 2014–15, reporting the state’s progress on federal compliance and performance indicators 1 through 16, as required by the IDEA (Item 01). In March 2016, the SBE approved California’s SSIP Phase 2 report (Item 20). In March 2017, the SBE approved California’s SSIP Phase 3 report 1 (Item 01). In January 2018, the SBE approved California’s SPP and APR for 2016–17, reporting the state’s progress on federal compliance and performance indicators 1 through 16, as required by the IDEA (Item 02). All of the board items can be found at the SBE Schedule Web page <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/mt/st/>.

## Fiscal Analysis (as appropriate)

There is no fiscal impact created by this requirement.

## Attachment(s)

* **Attachment 1:** State Systemic Improvement Plan: Ongoing Evaluation and Implementation Report Federal Fiscal Year 2016 (Program Year 2016–2017) (16 pages).

# Attachment 1

**California Department of Education**

**Special Education Division**

**Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004**

**State Annual Performance Report**

**State Systemic Improvement Plan**

**Ongoing Evaluation and Implementation Report**

**Federal Fiscal Year 2016 (Program Year 2016–17)**

## Introduction

California’s State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) has been a critical vehicle in bringing special education and students with disabilities (SWD) into the overall statewide system. Developed in 2013, prior to the launch of California’s new accountability system, the California Department of Education (CDE) hypothesized in the SSIP that by leveraging the intersectionality of SWD with the new Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) weighted student groups (students who are Foster Youth, English Learners, and/or socio-economically disadvantaged), all students would benefit. By aligning and integrating special education activities and technical assistance (TA) to the larger education system, it would lead to coherency among services for SWD and the overall statewide system.

Since the original development of the SSIP, California has entered into a new era of education funding and accountability. Under state law, local educational agencies are identified for additional state assistance (called “differentiated assistance”) based on the performance of student groups.

Due to this focus on student groups, special education and the performance of SWD have continued to become an integral part of the larger statewide system. In the fall of 2017, data in the new accountability system was published and the data showed SWD were among the lowest performing student groups in the state. Specifically, nearly two-thirds of local educational agencies (LEAs) identified for differentiated assistance are a result of the performance and outcomes of SWD. These data make clear that LEAs will benefit from a unified system to support the needs all learners, including SWDs.

The CDE, under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), is required to submit an Ongoing Evaluation and Implementation Report as part of Indicator 17 of the SSIP process. This process stretches over six Federal Fiscal Years (FFY) 2013–2018 and has three phases: Phase I, Phase II, and Phase III (which spans four FFYs.) This report, which provides a general update, analysis of California’s SSIP, and plans for continuous improvement, is the second Phase III report (FFY 2016) and is organized into four distinct sections:

* Section I describes California’s work to date on the SSIP and illustrates the evolution of the Theory of Action and definition of the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR).
* Section II describes evaluation questions developed from Phase I, II, and III outcomes, the Theory of Action, stakeholder input, and reviews of data and related literature.
* Section III outlines the work done by the CDE and evaluates the impact of each activity on improving academic achievement for SWD on state standardized tests.
* Section IV highlights California's plans toward continuous improvement for SWD.

## Section I: History of California Department of Education’s State Systemic Improvement Plan

### Phase I (FFY 2013–2014): Data and Infrastructure Analysis

In 2013, at the direction of the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), the CDE began to develop the SSIP in accordance with federal guidelines. With the assistance and input of a diverse stakeholder group, the CDE began Phase I, which included an analysis of statewide data and infrastructure. This stakeholder group met on a monthly basis to review data and determine the immediate needs of the state to be incorporated into the SSIP. Consensus from stakeholders supported the CDE’s Theory of Action (TOA) built on the foundation of alignment to the implementation of a new LCFF and a new accountability system known as the Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP). With stakeholder input, the CDE SIMR was developed. The SIMR was improved assessment outcomes for SWD in one or more of the LCFF student groups.

### Phase II (FFY 2014–2015): California’s Theory of Action

For the FFY 2014–2015, the CDE developed Phase II of the SSIP. Phase II was the implementation plan which was based on the data and infrastructure analysis in Phase I and the TOA as a framework for planning and implementing Phase II. California’s TOA is a graphic representation of how the various elements of the state and local education structures coordinate to implement an effective system that supports high-quality instruction and support for SWD. The TOA also illustrates the means to increase the state’s SSIP capacity to achieve improved teaching and learning in California's schools. A three tiered structure for the SSIP included an array of support resources all LEAs may access to address the academic, behavior, and school climate needs of SWD (Tier I); advanced TA resources for LEAs identified as “needs assistance” based on flagging performance (Tier II); and direct intervention activities for LEAs with ongoing performance issues that qualify as “needs intervention” (Tier III). This framework aligns with the framework developed for California’s overarching accountability system and support for LEAs and schools under the LCFF.

### Phase III (FFY 2015–2016, FFY 2016–2017, FFY 2017–2018): Process and Implementation Evaluation

In 2017, the CDE submitted the first Phase III report to OSEP intended to provide an evaluation of the process and implementation of California’s SSIP. Year-one of Phase III began the continuous improvement of the SSIP process to evaluate and revise initial hypotheses. Several factors attributed to changes to the first Phase III submission of the SSIP. For example, stakeholders expressed concern the initial plan to measure student outcomes from the original LCFF student groups of SWD would exclude other SWD (approximately 30 percent of SWD are not members of the three LCFF populations). In response to stakeholder input, California changed the student group to be included in its SIMR from “SWD who are also English Learners, foster youth, and/or students eligible for free and reduced price meals” to “all SWD.” In addition, the SSIP implementation was delayed because the LCAP implementation had not occurred as anticipated at the time of previous Phase submissions. Thus, the CDE submitted a year-one Phase III document stating implementation of the SSIP was delayed, but was expected to be on track for the FFY 2016 submission.

In April 2017, the CDE year-one Phase III plan, as approved by the California State Board of Education (SBE) at its March 2017 meeting, was submitted to the OSEP and included the following:

1. Continue to build the SSIP resource array by adding evidence-based improvement activities and resources to support LEAs in improving SWD performance.
2. Continue to support the state’s implementation of the LCAP requirement by identifying resources for improving outcomes for SWD for inclusion in the CDE’s LCAP support activities for LEAs.
3. Continue to refine the CDE’s Special Education Division (SED) TA contract activities to better assist LEAs in improvement activities, including self-assessment to identify areas for improvement, selecting effective improvement resources and activities, implementing selected improvement activities with fidelity, and reassessing and revising improvement plans as needed.
4. Continue and refine the SED’s process for providing annual information to each LEA concerning student and LEA performance on key indicators to assist LEAs in identifying areas for improvement and effective improvement activities.
5. Continue to interact with California’s SSIP stakeholders to review SSIP activities implemented, in-process, and planned, and consider appropriate revisions; review the SSIP resource array to identify resources to be removed, changed, or added to meet LEA needs; and review current federal indicator targets to determine whether any adjustments are recommended.
6. Continue to engage with the SSIP external evaluator to gauge implementation progress, aggregate stakeholder and resource consumer input, and assist the SED in a process of continuous improvement of California’s SSIP.

### Statewide Changes in California’s Educational System

Since the FFY 2013 Phase I submission, California has implemented significant changes to its funding formula, accountability, and support systems. Intended to level the playing field for a number of California’s most challenged student groups, the LCFF provides a weighted funding formula accompanied by a detailed LCAP each LEA is required to develop with input from local stakeholders. The newfound direction of improvement is guided by the state’s new LCFF principles, which outline eight state priorities and three student populations historically underserved and low achieving. The major shifts in California’s approach to improvement are outlined in the following table.

| **Education Improvement Before Local Control Funding Formula** | **Education Improvement After Local Control Funding Formula** |
| --- | --- |
| Top down transactional exchanges focused on schools in isolation | Support providers work alongside LEAs and schools to identify key challenges and opportunities |
| Packaged approaches for interventions | Systemic approach tailored to locally identified needs and strengths |
| Isolated team decision making | Engaging with local educators and communities as part of decision making |
| Redundancy and contradictions across state and federal programs | Streamlined and coherent expectations for LEAs across state and federal programs |
| Assistance disconnected from local priorities and focus | Assistance supports LEAs in aligning, prioritizing, and using resources to meet student needs identified in the LCAP |

The California School Dashboard (the Dashboard) is another step in the series of major shifts in California’s focus on educational improvement through supported student learning, transformed testing, and an increased focus on equity. The Dashboard (<https://www.caschooldashboard.org/>) was officially launched in November 2017, after a spring 2016 field test, and is an online tool designed to help communities across the state access important information about kindergarten through grade 12 districts and schools. California’s previous system of accountability focused solely on high-stakes, standardized test scores in English Language Arts and Math. In alignment with other changes made to improve educational support, California has broadened the accountability system to report on the broad skill set required for student success. In order to measure school success, California has selected state and local indicators that focus on the broad range of skills required to be college and career ready. The six state indicators allow for comparisons across schools and districts statewide and include:

* High School Graduation
* Academic Performance
* Suspension Rate
* English Language Learner Progress
* Preparation for College/Career
* Chronic Absenteeism

The four local indicators are based on information collected by school districts, county offices of education (COEs), and charter schools and include:

* Basic Conditions (teacher qualifications, safe and clean buildings, textbooks for all students)
* Implementation of Academic Standards
* School Climate Surveys
* Parent Involvement and Engagement

The Dashboard aims to provide information that will help parents, educators, school leaders, and students determine how districts and schools are meeting the needs of California’s diverse student population. The Dashboard focuses on equity, local control, and transparency through this new system of accountability that supports continuous improvement, progress, and growth.

Through the guidance of the LCFF principles, and using the Dashboard indicators, the California Statewide System of Support was developed and is currently in its inaugural year of implementation (2017–2018). The goal of the CASOS is:

*To assist LEAs and schools to meet the needs of each student served, with a focus on building capacity to sustain improvement and effectively address inequities in student opportunities and outcomes.*

California worked with stakeholders to develop tools for educators to use to help improve outcomes for students including the LCAP and the Dashboard. In addition to those tools and a new funding formula, the LCFF outlined a vision for support and assistance. This system of support has three levels as shown in the following table.

### Overview of Statewide System of Support

| **Level of Support** | **Description of Supports Available** |
| --- | --- |
| **Support for All LEAs and Schools (Level 1)** | Various state and local agencies provide an array of resources, tools, and voluntary assistance that **all** LEAs may use to improve student performance at the LEA and school level and narrow disparities among student groups across the LCFF priorities, including recognition for success and the ability to share promising practices. |
| **Differentiated Assistance (Level 2)** | County superintendents, the CDE, charter authorizers, and the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence (CCEE) provide **differentiated** **assistance** for LEAs and schools,in the form of individually designed assistance, to address identified performance issues, including significant disparities in performance among student groups. |
| **Intensive Intervention (Level 3)** | The State Superintendent of Public Instruction or, for charter schools, the charter authorizer, may require more **intensive interventions** for LEAs or schools with persistent performance issues over a specified time period. |

The goal for support is to assist LEAs and affiliated schools to meet the needs of each student served, with a focus on building capacity to sustain improvement and effectively address inequities in student opportunities and outcomes. This means the outcomes for this work include not only improvement on Dashboard indicators from year to year, but also progressing on interim measurements LEAs collect locally and use throughout the year.

The development of the CASOS began the shift away from a bifurcated, siloed process where LEAs supported special education and general education differently, to a single statewide system supporting LEA’s unique needs to improve outcomes for all children. This “all boats rise” approach will move special education off the sidelines and into the conversations and decisions being made about how the system will support the totality of an LEA, eliminating the requirement for separate plans and processes for different student groups. The CDE has taken part in a number of activities to develop and provide resources to the CASOS. The SED will be working with the CCEE to support LEAs by offering resources and TA based on the needs identified in a root cause analysis of LEAs selected for differentiated support in Tier 2.

### The California Department of Education Restructuring Aligns to California System of Support

At the beginning of 2017, the CDE realized the potential of realigning its branches and divisions to enhance coordinated support and better align to the organizational structure of school districts. The realignment affords the CDE the opportunity to engage in collaborative practices to provide integrated and coordinated support to LEAs through the CASOS. The initial realignment was executed on July 1, 2017, and will be refined through a continuous improvement process.

The realignment brings new opportunities for improving support and student outcomes at the state level and for students with disabilities in particular. First, the realignment provides the opportunity for all divisions that affect teaching and learning to work collaboratively and cohesively. Second, the realignment has allowed key CDE staff members to co-lead the CDE team engaged in a continuous improvement practice to ensure coordinated and integrated support to LEAs is implemented as efficiently and effectively as possible. This realignment reflects the CDE’s commitment to creating a unified system of support aligned to meet both constituents and need.

The result of this alignment is the SED’s reassignment to the Teaching and Learning Support Branch, which includes the Curriculum Frameworks and Instructional Support Division; the English Learner Support Division; the Educator Excellence and Equity Division; the Career and College Transition Division; the Early Education and Support Division; and the Expanded Learning Division. This change has already begun to bridge the common work of educating students with disabilities, and helped to further define the SED’s role as an integral part of the CASOS.

## Section II: Evaluation Question Development

This section is intended to provide information on how the CDE has continued to evaluate the activities and outcomes from each phase of the SSIP. As stated in Section II, California has experienced many statewide changes which have affected the SSIP. After a thorough analysis of the outcomes from Phases I–III, and the adoption of the new CASOS, the CDE developed evaluation questions to guide the year-two Phase III process and implementation evaluation of the SSIP.

The CDE used the cascading logic model[[1]](#footnote-1) to analyze each of the independent and dependent variables in the SSIP TOA plan to construct five evaluation questions in response to requirements from the OSEP. These final evaluation questions yielded responses identifying the underlying reasons for success, accidents, and failures in the SSIP. The following table shows how the cascading logic model was applied to the OSEP SSIP evaluation requirements as the inputs and assisted in evaluation question development through analyzing the TOA input and output variables in the SSIP.

| **Input/How** | **California State Systemic Improvement Plan Theory of Action Plan Input Variables** | **California State Systemic Improvement Plan Theory of Action Plan Desired Output** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| How will students with disabilities benefit? | Well-developed, aligned, or integrated LEA improvement plans, implemented effectively, that include evidence-based strategies and goals targeted to improve SWD access to instruction and academic performance. | SWD will benefit from increased instructional opportunities and improved academic outcomes as measured by improved performance on statewide assessments. |
| How will students with disabilities and their families be supported? | LEAs optimize use of resources by aligning LCAPs and SWD improvement plans. | SWD will benefit from increased instructional opportunities and improved academic outcomes as measured by improved performance on statewide assessments. |
| How will District and school implementation teams be developed and supported? | Use enhanced resources to target factors impeding academic progress for all students, ensuring improved academic results of high-needs students  Create LEA plans, as well as plans for SWD, with improvement efforts targeting high-needs students, establishing clear, aligned efforts to improve LEA performance.  Implement locally-developed improvement plans, using state resources as needed | SWD will benefit from increased instructional opportunities and improved academic outcomes as measured by improved performance on statewide assessments. |
| How will the CDE supports be developed to support district and school implementation teams? | Fiscal Input:  Provide base funding, plus supplemental funding for all high-needs students, and concentration grants for LEAs serving large numbers of high needs students  Instructional Input:  Develop instructions for LCAP and accountability structure to ensure plans include appropriate improvement activities and goals  Facilitate use of federally funded support activities in state improvement activities  Support Input:  Create a tiered system supporting LEA improvement plans | SWD will benefit from increased instructional opportunities and improved academic outcomes as measured by improved performance on statewide assessments. |
| How will State Transformation Specialists and the State Capacity Building work group be developed? | Reprioritize state education resources and efforts to address high-needs students: SWD, English Learners, foster youth, and socio-economically disadvantaged (LCFF)  Require each LEA to establish a comprehensive improvement plan (LCAP)  Implement general supervision system, providing oversight and assistance to LEAs to ensure that SWD receive access to education with necessary supports. | SWD will benefit from increased instructional opportunities and improved academic outcomes as measured by improved performance on statewide assessments. |

The analysis of California’s SSIP TOA through the lens of the cascading logic model resulted in the development of four fundamental questions which address the quality of improvement of the CASOS while focusing on the ultimate goal of continuous improvement of students with disabilities’ academic success and opportunities. The questions developed from this process were:

1. How has the CASOS been impacted by the goals of the SSIP and the work of the SED?
2. How were students with disabilities represented in the larger statewide accountability system?
3. How has the CDE, SED, changed its practices to align with the larger CDE system and the CASOS?
4. What does the data from the FFY 2016 evaluation imply for future actions to be measured for the FFY 2017 submission?

As represented in this model and the evaluation questions, California envisions general education and special education working together seamlessly as one system designed to address the needs of all students, as soon as those needs are identified. Within this system, students with disabilities receive effective services, learn in classrooms guided by rigorous standards alongside general education peers when appropriate, and are equipped to succeed as adults. In this coherent system of education, all children, including SWD, are considered general education students and all educators, regardless of which students served, have a collective responsibility to ensure all children receive the education and supports needed to maximize development and potential, allowing meaningful participation in the nation’s economy and democracy[[2]](#footnote-2).

## Section III: Items Accomplished Given the Changes in California

This section is intended to address the evaluation questions by highlighting the work the SED accomplished through the implementation of the SSIP in FFY 2016. Each of the activities were planned, implemented, and evaluated internally by the SED and externally by stakeholders representing LEAs, Special Education Local Plan Areas (SELPAs), and the Advisory Commission on Special Education (ACSE).

### Evaluation question number one

How is CASOS impacted by the SSIP and the work of the SED?

Within the multiple collaborative statewide initiatives described in Section II, the SED participated as a key partner in numerous department and statewide efforts:

* The Director of the SED is a member of both the internal CDE California System of Support Team as well as the Statewide Cross-Agency System of Support Team.
  + The Director of the Special Education is a team representative of the CASOS at public meetings, including the SBE.
* The Director of the SED and the California IDEA, Part B, Data Administrator are members of the statewide accountability team.
  + The Director of the SED and the California IDEA, Part B, Data Administrator attended twelve meetings and contributed to four SBE presentations on the accountability system, the CASOS, and other federal updates.

 An SED focused monitoring administrator is a member of the LCAP Support Team to work on alignment of special education and SWD within the LCAP process and template.

* The CCEE has created a Special Education Collective which includes members of the CDE, SELPA Directors, California County Superintendents Educational Services Association (CCSESA), and other prominent experts in the education field.
  + The Director of the SED and the California IDEA, Part B, Data Administrator are members of this collective and have met on three occasions.
* The SED reviewed and adjusted existing contracts to ensure alignment with the goals and initiatives of the larger statewide system, and developed a plan to implement new contracts and deliverables.
  + For 2019 the SED continues to address alignment through contracts including, but not limited to, the California Services for Technical Assistance and Training (Cal-Stat), the State Performance Plan Technical Assistance Project (SPP-TAP), and Supporting Inclusive Practices (SIP).

### Evaluation question number two

How are students with disabilities represented in the larger statewide accountability system?

In November 2017, the CDE published the Dashboard using 2016–17 data which identified 163 LEAs in need of differentiated assistance for SWD student groups. The SED has participated in the following activities to ensure data is accurately represented in the CASOS:

* Data for the new accountability system will include accountability data for SWD.
  + The Dashboard provides the state and local indicator data with SWD as a student group.
* The CDE is continuing to work on integrating special education data into the state longitudinal data system known as the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS).
  + The SED’s IDEA, Part B, Data Administrator leads weekly meetings with a team of both special education and CALPADS data staff to develop a timeline for integration of special education data into the CALPADS.
  + In preparation for the merger of special education data into the CALPADS, the SED’s IDEA, Part B, Data Administrator has trained more than 500 LEA staff on the transition.

### Evaluation question number three

How has the SED changed its practices to align with the larger system and the CASOS?

The SED has been working through the fall of 2017 to align monitoring activities with the Dashboard and LCFF priority areas to allow for a more streamlined, whole systems approach to assistance and continuous improvement. This is an ongoing, multi-year process which will be refined on an annual basis. Also, beginning January 2018, the SED reconfigured existing staff and monitoring units from four to six Focused Monitoring and Technical Assistance (FMTA) units. Final details of this reorganization will be posted on the CDE Web site in February 2018.

The restructuring of the FMTA Units will:

* Allow for the development of streamlined and transparent monitoring activities which include TA components driven by data to inform continuous improvement of the SED monitoring and TA activities.
* Allow for greater expertise through more specialized units which can assist LEAs and regional entities in addressing specific special education challenges.
* Allow SED staff to work in cross-disciplinary teams, leveraging a wider range of expertise, and encouraging a deeper level of collaboration and alignment across the various monitoring and TA activities.

In addition to restructuring, the SED is in the process of revamping and expanding a number of its current TA contracts to allow a larger number of LEAs, COEs, and SELPAs to benefit from the expertise cultivated through contracts within existing COEs. Further, an existing resource and TA hub will be updated and aligned to current LCAP priorities and will house all of the SED evidence based solutions, resources, and links to all identified special education challenges, pedagogy, and LEA identified areas of weakness related to SWD.

Understanding one size does not fit all, the SED will continue to cultivate a variety of TA options LEAs may access. Options will range from very specific TA via a trained TA provider for a highly specific identified need, to a referral through one of the TA projects to a “lighthouse model” available to be replicated. These activities are currently underway and will be expanded to meet state needs.

Within current monitoring activities, the majority of LEAs identified in the Dashboard for the SWD student group are already involved with the SED through monitoring of the requirements in the IDEA. For LEAs identified through multiple state and federal accountability activities, the SED is working to limit duplicative requirements of plans and activities with the goal of supporting greater LEA system alignment.

As the activities described in this section affect how California will measure and improve its SIMR, the CDE is proposing a change. In Year One of the SSIP, the CDE field tested the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CASSPP). As such, the only available scores for target setting at the time the SSIP was created was the alternate assessment. The CDE consulted with OSEP, and it was determined the baseline and targets would be set based on available data. The CDE agreed to continue to use those targets until CASSPP scores stabilized. The CDE is now confident the CASSPP scores should be used as the basis for the benchmark and targets for the SIMR. In the CDE SSIP submission for FFY 2015, the OSEP was informed the SIMR would be assessment scores for all students with disabilities. The data on which the targets were based is no longer being collected therefore the targets should be based on data that is current and collected by the CDE. The CDE proposes to use the current FFY 2016 CASSPP scores reported in Indicator 3 as the targets and results for the SIMR.

| Type of LEA | English/Language Arts (ELA) Target | ELA Result | Target Met | Math Target | Math Result | Target Met |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Elementary School Districts | 13.0% | 17.6% | Yes | 11.6% | 14.7% | Yes |
| High School Districts | 13.9% | 18.5% | Yes | 11.6% | 8.2% | No |
| Unified School Districts and COEs | 13.9% | 15.7% | Yes | 11.6% | 12.3% | Yes |

## Section IV: Upcoming Activities for the System of Support and State Systemic Improvement Plan

This section describes the work the SED will accomplish based on the data collected from FFY 2016. The proposed activities are planned in response to the fourth and final evaluation question.

### Evaluation question number four

What does the data from the FFY 2016 evaluation imply for future actions to be measured for the FFY 2017 submission?

The CDE will implement the following activities and report results in the FFY 2017 submission:

* Prepare and execute a number of data support trainings throughout the state for the 163 LEAs selected for differentiated assistance in order to develop a grounded understanding of the data sources for all students. This work will lay the foundation for the root cause analysis LEAs will complete in the spring of 2018 as part of amending LCAPs.
* Engage the CCEE in a collaborative process to support LEAs in differentiated assistance, participate in, and provide resources, to the Special Education Collective.
* Ensure all 2018–19 TA contracts are aligned to the Dashboard state and local indicators as appropriate, and ensure support is provided to LEAs in conjunction with the CASOS.
* Align the SED performance monitoring calendar to coincide with the publishing of the Dashboard and the identification of LEAs for Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III support.
* Select LEAs for performance monitoring using the same methodology for graduation, assessment, and suspension/expulsion as used in the Dashboard.
* Ensure consistent and engaged representation of the SED on the following CASOS and Dashboard workgroups:
  + LCAP Support Team[[3]](#footnote-3)
  + Dashboard Alternative School Status[[4]](#footnote-4)
  + Special Education Cross Agency Collective
  + System of Support Leadership team[[5]](#footnote-5)
* Continue to increase the expertise of the SED staff members in specific content areas to provide TA to LEAs.
* Work in cross-division teams within the SED to identify the greatest needs of LEAs based on performance data.
* Engage SELPAs to be regional support hubs for LEAs on a wide range of special education content areas.

## Conclusion

Since 2013, education in California has experienced a number of monumental changes. These changes have been reflected in the development of the SSIP for submission to the OSEP. Each iteration of California's SSIP has been responsive to the changes in California’s larger accountability system. The intended purpose of a four year Phase III process is to evaluate process and implementation. The SSIP has changed over time and the continuous improvements meet the goal of the SSIP to be responsive to the results of evaluation and adhere to the principles of implementation science.

As a result, all students benefit from the CASOS, and more importantly all SWDs and LEAs benefit from the resources and expertise provided by the SED through this iteration of the SSIP.

1. <http://nirn.fpg.unc.edu/learn-implementation/implementation-drivers/scaling> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. See Report of California’s Statewide Task Force on Special Education (2015) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The LCAP is a tool for local educational agencies to set goals, plan actions, and leverage resources to meet those goals to improve student outcomes. This page provides resources to support the planning, implementation, and evaluation of an LCAP. The LCAP Support Team is a group of CDE staff members that represent the different divisions that make up the CDE. For more information, visit the LCAP Web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/re/lc/>. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The Dashboard Alternative School Status (DASS) is defined through modified methods of measurement for indicators that are aligned with the evaluation rubrics of the LCFF. These measures evaluate the success or progress of schools that serve high-risk students. The DASS Workgroup is a group of CDE staff members that represent the different divisions that make up the CDE. For more information, visit the DASS Web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/dass.asp>. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The California Statewide System of Support (CASOS) has been developed to, “assist LEAs and schools to meet the needs of each student served, with a focus on building capacity to sustain improvement and effectively address inequities in student opportunities and outcomes.” The CA SOS Leadership Team is a group of CDE division directors, CDE staff members, and community stakeholders. For more information, visit the CA SOS Web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/sw/ss/>. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)