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# California State Board of Education March 2019 Agenda Item #01

## Subject

Approval of Indicator 17 of the Annual Performance Report for Special Education.

## Type of Action

Action, Information

## Summary of the Issue(s)

This item is the second of two items concerning California’s Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2017 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 10, 2019, meeting of the State Board of Education (SBE), Item 21. Indicator 17, the 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 Phase III report is due to the OSEP on April 1, 2019.

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 input 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 FFY 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 SWD academic performance. 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 third year of Phase III.

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

* California’s progress in implementing the SSIP, including examples of continuing efforts to align supports and services provided to local educational agencies (LEA) that benefit SWD in order to improve outcomes.
* Data on implementation and outcomes by using the same evaluation questions developed in the FFY 2016 Phase III report and by highlighting two statewide projects.
* Efforts to ensure data quality to better inform selection for differentiated assistance and SED monitoring activities, as well as improvement strategies.
* California’s progress toward achieving intended improvements.
* California’s 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 and Local Control and Accountability Plan, including work to build the statewide system of support, in order to achieve 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 prepared by the SED to be submitted to the OSEP by the mandated submission date of April 1, 2019.

## Brief History of Key Issues

California is required to have in place an SPP to guide the state’s implementation of Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 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 the 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 fiscal year 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 SSIP.

These changes were part of the emphasis on Results Driven Accountability 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 2019 addressed SPP Indicators 1-16. This SBE item addresses only Indicator 17, specifically, Phase III of the comprehensive, multi-year SSIP. The OSEP has required 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 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 LEA implementation of evidence-based practices
   3. Evaluation
3. The Phase III Report (Attachment 1) provides an update of California’s SSIP and addresses specific subjects the OSEP requires to be included in the FFY 2017 APR submission.

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

In March 2015, the SBE approved California’s Phase 1 SSIP report (See Item 1 on the March 2015 SBE agenda web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr15/agenda201503.asp>).

In March 2016, the SBE approved California’s SSIP Phase 2 report (See Item 20 on the March 2016 SBE agenda web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr16/agenda201603.asp>).

In March 2017, the SBE approved California’s SSIP Phase 3 report 1 (See Item 1 on the March 2017 SBE agenda web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/agenda201703.asp>).

In March 2018, the SBE approved California’s SSIP Phase 3 report 2 (See Item 3 on the March 2018 SBE agenda web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/agenda201803.asp>).

## 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 2017 (Program Year 2017–2018) (24 pages).
* Attachment 2: To review California’s State Systemic Improvement Plan Theory of Action, please see the March 2017 State Board of Education agenda Item 01, Attachment 4, page 2 on the March 2017 SBE agenda web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/mar17item01.doc>.
* Attachment 3: Special Education Resource Lead: Systems Improvement Lead Request for Application Instructions on the CDE website at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/r18/documents/selpa18rfa.pdf>. (35 pages).
* Attachment 4: Special Education Resource Lead: Content Lead Request for Application Instructions on the CDE website at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/r18/documents/selpacontentlead18rfa.pdf>. (35 pages)
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## California’s State Systemic Improvement Plan Phase III Report, Year Three

### Section A. Introduction

California’s State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) addresses plans for improving outcomes for students with disabilities (SWD). The Theory of Action (TOA) established at the beginning of the SSIP process to serve as the roadmap for systemic change, 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 SWD along with their peers, SWD performance outcomes will improve. To review the SSIP TOA, please see the March 2017 State Board of Education (SBE) agenda Item 01, Attachment 4, page 2 on the March 2017 SBE agenda web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/mar17item01.doc> (Attachment 2).

As required by the US Department of Education’s Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), the SSIP covers the six year period from fiscal year 2013–14 through 2018–19. The SSIP was developed in three phases, with specific requirements to be completed in each phase following instructions from OSEP. 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, which provides a general update on implementing the SSIP, covers the third year of Phase III for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2017. The report was organized into five distinct sections to mirror the SSIP State Phase III Report Organizational Outline distributed by OSEP (dated November 1, 2016):

* Section B describes California’s progress in implementing the SSIP, including examples of continuing efforts to align supports and services provided to local educational agencies (LEAs) that benefit SWD in order to improve outcomes.
* Section C offers data on implementation and outcomes by using the same evaluation questions developed in the FFY 2016 Phase III report and highlighting two statewide projects.
* Section D outlines efforts to ensure data quality to better inform selection for differentiated assistance and Special Education Division (SED) monitoring activities, as well as improvement strategies.
* Section E discusses California’s progress toward achieving intended improvements.
* Section F describes California’s plans for next year.

### Section B. Progress in Implementing the State Systemic Improvement Plan

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

Under existing state law, LEAs are identified for level II support (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 be highlighted by the statewide accountability system. In the fall of 2018, new data was published on the California School Dashboard[[1]](#footnote-1) (the Dashboard) and, similar to the year prior, showed SWD were among the lowest performing student groups in the state. Specifically, nearly 65 percent of LEAs identified for differentiated assistance were identified as a result of the performance and outcomes for SWD. These data make clear that comprehensive improvement efforts designed to increase student outcomes should consider the impact of those efforts on the performance of SWD.

The comprehensive improvement efforts initiated by LEAs are outlined in their local control and accountability plans (LCAPs). The TOA for California’s SSIP hypothesized that if California required each LEA to establish a comprehensive improvement plan and developed instructions to ensure that the plan included appropriate improvement activities for SWD, then each LEA would create an improvement plan that included evidence-based strategies and goals targeting high-needs students, including SWD, which would result in increased access to instruction for SWD and improved academic outcomes accordingly. In the past year, and in accordance with the TOA, California has made significant progress toward ensuring that LCAPs include and address performance of SWD. The SED of the CDE worked with the California Department of Finance, legislative staff, and interested stakeholders to initiate changes to California statute that supports the integration of LEA efforts to improve outcomes for SWD and the LCAP specifically. This work included ongoing consultation about achieving the intended impact of statutory change. Assembly Bill (AB) 1808 (Chapter 32, Statutes of 2018) added language to the California *Education Code* (*EC*) supporting this intent. AB 1808 added the following language to Section 52062 of the *EC*:

(a) Before the governing board of a school district considers the adoption of a local control and accountability plan or an annual update to the local control and accountability plan, all of the following shall occur:

. . . (5) The superintendent of the school district shall consult with its special education local plan area administrator or administrators to determine that specific actions for individuals with exceptional needs are included in the local control and accountability plan or annual update to the local control and accountability plan, and are consistent with strategies included in the annual assurances support plan for the education of individuals with exceptional needs.

This new language, now a requirement of law, honors the collaborative work that has been accomplished since the inception of the SSIP to align infrastructure, initiatives, and the statewide accountability system to explicitly include and address the performance of SWD in California. Although SWD have been addressed in LCAPs prior to the passage of this language, the process requiring LEAs to consult their Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) when determining specific actions for SWD that will be included in the LCAP marks an important step in ensuring the efficacy of delineated improvement strategies. A robust LCAP that meaningfully includes supports for SWD is a critical component of improving student outcomes. To further strengthen this concept, AB 1808 added language to the *EC* requiring SELPAs across the state to assure that their member LEAs will be supported to achieve the goals, actions, and services identified in their LCAP[[2]](#footnote-2). The Director of the SED, as well as several SED staff, continue to cultivate the relationships and initiate the conversations necessary to impact this level of change.

#### California’s Statewide System of Support

LEA efforts to implement the improvement strategies outlined in their LCAPs and monitor the intended improvement are supported by the SSS. California is in year two of creating a coordinated and coherent state structure to ensure that LEAs receive resources and support to meet identified student needs, including disparities in student outcomes and opportunities. The LCFF is the foundation for reimagining California’s accountability and continuous improvement system. This was recognized in early iterations of the SSIP and in the development of the TOA, and, as outlined in this report, significant progress has been made to ensure that infrastructure changes, education policy, and statewide initiatives reflect a commitment to ensuring equity for SWD through intentionally considering them as the accountability system is built.

The 2018 California Budget Act, signed on June 27, 2018, included a substantial investment of state funding aimed at developing the infrastructure of the SSS by increasing the capacity and expertise of agencies required to provide assistance within the system, and providing greater clarity of roles and responsibilities to ensure that California’s continuous improvement approach to support can be sustained. Additionally, the 2018 Budget Act established and provided funding for new roles with specific responsibilities aimed at developing the capacity of agencies responsible for providing differentiated assistance and ensuring access to a broad range of expertise within the SSS*.*

Of particular note, the 2018 Budget Act required the CDE and the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence (CCEE) to jointly select between up to 10 SELPAs to serve as special education resource leads within the SSS. The resource leads will collectively receive a total of $10 million ongoing annual funding to build the capacity of SELPAs across the state to support their member LEAs to improve outcomes for SWD. The budget explicitly incorporated special education resource leads (SELPA leads) into the SSS, which was a significant development related to SSIP implementation and achieving alignment across systems.

In addition to the SELPA leads, the 2018 Budget Act established the following agency leads and initiatives as part of the SSS: geographic lead agencies, a community engagement lead, Title III English Learner resource specialists, the early math initiative, and a school climate lead agency charged with expanding multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) in California. The SELPA leads will work collaboratively with the other lead agencies in the SSS, with a focus on building the capacity of SELPAs statewide. There are two types of SELPA leads:

* SELPA System Improvement Leads, which focus directly on building the foundational knowledge and capacity in systems improvement processes for SELPAs statewide. They will do this through providing training in and supporting the use of data best practices, evidence-based practices, root cause analyses, systems alignment, and coherence. The awarded consortia of SELPA Improvement Leads include the El Dorado County SELPA, the West San Gabriel SELPA and the Riverside County SELPA. See Attachment 3 on the CDE website at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/r18/documents/selpa18rfa.pdf> to review the SELPA System Improvement Leads Request for Applications (RFA), which details the anticipated scope of work and desired impact.
* SELPA Content Leads, which will focus on building the capacity of SELPAs across the state in an identified content area of need. This will be done through increasing the use of evidence-based practices leading to demonstrated positive academic and social emotional outcomes for SWD. See Attachment 4 on the CDE website at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/r18/documents/selpacontentlead18rfa.pdf> to review the SELPA Content Leads RFA, which details the anticipated scope of work and desired impact. The following SELPA Content Leads and their respective areas of focus were selected in January 2019:
* Marin County SELPA - in partnership with the California Autism Professional Training and Information Network to scale up the use of Evidence Based Practices
* Placer County SELPA - Open Access Project (focus on Universal Design for Learning, Assistive Technology, and Augmentative Alternative Communication strategies)
* South County SELPA - Disproportionality
* Imperial County SELPA - SWD and English Language Learners

The seven selected SELPA leads (systems improvement and content leads) will serve a critical role within the SSS to positively impact outcomes for SWD by serving as capacity builders and cultivating necessary expertise across the state related to evidence-based practices and interventions that prove effective for addressing performance of SWD. In addition, the SELPA leads will build relationships with other entities within the SSS charged with supporting LEAs, resulting in a collaborative, cross-systems approach to support and improvement. Within the SSS, those representing a variety of interests (general education, special education, English Language Learners, school climate, and community engagement) will all have a seat at the same table with a common goal of collectively improving student outcomes. The SED, in collaboration with the CCEE, will have a direct, ongoing relationship with the SELPA leads to oversee the funding, provide guidance and support, and ensure aligned and common messaging, as well as ensure the intended impact is achieved. The SED is considering establishing a designated staff position to serve as a liaison in coordinating the SSS work and on-going relationship with the SELPA leads, as a way to solidify this connection and be apprised of the work being done to improve outcomes of SWD across the state.

#### School Climate Lead Agency: Multi-Tiered System of Support

Although the Special Education Resource Leads will be working collaboratively with all other leads that comprise the SSS, the expansion of MTSS in California through the Orange County Scale-Up MTSS Statewide (SUMS) initiative is particularly promising in setting a critical foundation to improve outcomes for SWD.

One of the evidence-based, highly regarded comprehensive strategies for increasing access to instruction is to employ a MTSS framework when delivering services to students. California’s MTSS is an integrated, comprehensive framework for LEAs that aligns academic, behavioral, and social-emotional learning in a fully integrated system of support for the benefit of all students. The MTSS framework offers the potential to create systematic change through intentional integration of services and supports to quickly identify and meet the needs of all students.

As background, in April 2016, the Orange County Department of Education (OCDE) was selected as the lead agency to receive $10 million in funding through the Developing, Aligning, and Improving Systems of Academic and Behavioral Supports grant to scale up the development, alignment, and improvement of academic and behavioral supports in California through the use of an MTSS process and framework. An additional $20 million was approved in the Governor’s budget revise (May 2016). The OCDE has titled this effort the SUMS Initiative. The SUMS initiative prioritizes inclusive practices to increase access to high-quality education and resources for all students. It aims to re-engage marginalized students, reduce disproportionality of discipline referrals for minority students and students in special education, and address the unique needs of underserved populations such as children living in poverty, foster youth, juvenile justice involved youth, charter school students, and rural schools. The OCDE has partnered with the Butte County Office of Education (BCOE) and the School-wide Integrated Framework for Transformation (SWIFT) Center to implement this large scale effort. More information on recent outcomes related to the work under the SUMS initiative is provided in Section C. iv. of this year-three, Phase III report.

The 2018 Budget Act allocated an additional $15 million for a partnership led by the OCDE to further expand California MTSS. The funding will allow the OCDE, working jointly with the BCOE, to partner with the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) Center for the Transformation of Schools to expand the state’s MTSS framework to develop evidence-based tools and training for educators and school systems[[3]](#footnote-3). This work will include expanding restorative justice, bullying prevention and positive behavior interventions, as well as minimizing the use of emergency interventions.

The OCDE, BCOE and the Center for the Transformation of Schools will collaborate to create a pilot program to assist LEAs to promote positive school climates by improving pupil teacher relationships, increasing pupil engagement and promoting alternative discipline practices. The pilot program will include regional workshops. This may be particularly impactful to mitigate suspensions and expulsions of SWD and increase positive outcomes. Due to efforts to align initiatives under the SSIP, the SED of the CDE will have staff on the Design Team to develop these evidence-based tools and training. In addition, the Director of the SED will serve on the Statewide Advisory Team for this work.

#### Local Control Funding Formula Priorities/Whole Child Resource Map

To support capacity of the CDE and LEAs to better achieve the goals of the LCFF priorities and further integrate the SSIP and the SSS, the CDE continues to pursue “one system” of education serving the “whole child.” In Fiscal Year (FY) 2017–2018 the CDE’s One System Action Team (OSAT), including staff from the SED, developed a department wide inventory of CDE developed resources that were available to LEAs. This “One System of Connected Resources and Supports” inventory highlighted existing resources identified by staff throughout different divisions within the CDE, including the SED. The OSAT aligned the identified resources to support LEA improvement within each of the LCFF priorities. This effort supports the SSIP TOA by making resources and evidence based practices, from programs or initiatives throughout the CDE, readily available for LEAs to include in their plans to improve outcomes for SWD by targeting those factors impeding academic progress.

The development of the resource inventory involved both interdepartmental collaboration as well as collaboration with other stakeholders (e.g. county offices of education). The inventory was ultimately used to develop the LCFF/Whole Child Resource Map (Resource Map). The Resource Map aligns specific CDE resources to the LCFF priority areas and to the tenets of the Whole Child. It allows LEAs to investigate and select from the CDE provided resources to assist in identifying evidence based practices that lead to improved student outcomes as measured on the California Dashboard. The LCFF Priorities/Whole Child Resource Map is available to LEAs on the LCFF Priorities/Whole Child Resource Map web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/eo/in/lcff1sys-resources.asp>. The CDE will continue to curate resources to populate the whole child tenets. Work to improve on the Resource Map will continue with plans to add professional learning opportunities in the future.

#### Update on Action Items from Federal Fiscal Year 2016 Phase III Report

The CDE outlined the following activities in the FFY 2016, year-two Phase III report as action items for FFY 2017. Under each activity is a description of the progress made on each objective:

##### Activity 1:

*Select LEAs for performance monitoring using the same methodology for graduation, assessment, and suspension/expulsion as used in the Dashboard.*

Using FFY 2017 data, the SED used the same calculation methodologies used for the Dashboard to calculate graduation rate, performance on statewide assessments, and suspension and expulsion rates to select LEAs for monitoring activities required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)[[4]](#footnote-4), and pursuant to Section 300.600(d) of Title 34 of the *Code of Federal Regulations*. This change made the selection process for monitoring more consistent and streamlined, as described in California’s FFY 2016 SSIP submission. The way certain indicators are calculated for purposes of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) reporting under the IDEA are different from the way they are calculated for purposes of the larger statewide accountability system and the Dashboard. For example, calculations for graduation rate in the SPP/APR are based on lag year data, whereas the Dashboard uses more current data to calculate graduation rate for LEAs. In addition to using more current data, the CDE implemented the status and change methodology used in the Dashboard, which allows LEAs to be measured not only on static performance but also on growth. Calculation methodologies for the Dashboard can be found at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/cm/documents/dashboardguide18.pdf>. Using the same methodology to select LEAs for IDEA monitoring activities that is used to measure LEA performance under the statewide accountability system for the same indicator (e.g. graduation rate) ensures that LEAs are supported by a coherent system that consistently measures success across programs. The SBE approved the integration of these indicators in March 2018 after stakeholders, including LEAs and SELPAs, provided input and the opportunity for public comment was provided.

##### **Activity 2:**

*Align the SED performance monitoring calendar to coincide with the publishing of the Dashboard and the identification of LEAs for Level I, Level II, and Level III support.*

Using FFY 2017 data, the SED aligned the performance monitoring calendar with the release of the statewide Dashboard. This change ensures LEAs can view all related data for SPP/APR indicators for their SWD student group along with the Dashboard data. Every year, the LEA receives an annual determination notification under the IDEA. The annual determination notification also outlines any SED monitoring activity the LEA has been selected to participate in for the current school year. By changing the monitoring calendar to coincide with the release of the Dashboard and aligning the calculation methodology, as explained above, the SED’s monitoring system will act as an early warning system to identify and treat LEAs that are beginning to show signs of underperformance before their performance appears in the most severe category on the Dashboard. For example, if an LEA is identified as “Red” (the lowest performance level) for the suspension indicator alone for the SWD student group, SED can assist the LEA through its monitoring processes to address the root cause of the problem before the LEA falls into the “red” performance level for other indicators, such as achievement, that would cause the LEA to be identified for differentiated assistance in the statewide accountability system[[5]](#footnote-5). California sent the annual determination notifications for   
2017-2018 to LEAs on December 14, 2018, to coincide with the dashboard release on December 7, 2018.

##### **Activity 3:**

*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.*

In May and June of 2018, the SED, with support from the California Services for Technical Assistance and Training, presented six data training workshops for 258 participants from over 55 LEAs spanning the state. The data workshops focused on a crosswalk between state accountability metrics and special education monitoring activities to assist LEAs in finding the connection and relationship between the data. Teams walked through and reviewed LEA specific data to better understand the sources and uses of the data, and provided opportunities for each LEA team to develop strategies for improving data quality. Almost 70 LEAs were identified and invited to participate based on tiered priority. The highest priority were those LEAs who were selected for differentiated assistance for the SWD student group and had high levels of data discrepancies between their general education and special education data submissions, followed by LEAs who were selected for differentiated assistance for the SWD student group with lower instances of data discrepancies between their general education and special education data submissions. Next were LEAs who were selected for differentiated assistance but not for the SWD student group. Each LEA sent interdepartmental teams made up of district cabinet members, administrators, general education data technicians, special education data technicians, and information technology staff. Teams learned about the importance of data quality, reviewed their own data for the purpose of conducting a root cause analysis and completed a Self-Assessment of data systems developed in conjunction with the Center for the Integration of the IDEA Data. The CDE intends to develop materials to train SELPAs and County Offices of Education (COE) staff to conduct those data trainings and provide ongoing data support to their member LEAs.

##### **Activity 4:**

*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 SSS.*

Over the past year, the SED held a series of meetings to align the 2018–19 SED contracts with TA providers to ensure that each respective scope of work reflected the intent of the SSIP, along with a clear connection to the LCFF priority areas and the SSS.

The meetings consisted of discussions and development of a California SSS Inventory Survey. The purpose of the inventory survey was to identify available resources across contracts and ensure the services and resources made available by TA providers was more accessible to the public and LEAs that require assistance. After developing the inventory survey, the TA providers completed the survey providing valuable information about the services and resources specific to their individual projects and programs. The information gathered through the survey may eventually be used as part of an overall needs assessment that will link potential recipients of assistance (e.g. LEA in differentiated assistance) with the TA provider best suited to meet their needs.

##### **Activity 5:**

*Engage the CCEE in a collaborative process to support LEAs in differentiated assistance, participate in, and provide resources, to the Special Education Collective.*

As described in previous SSIP submissions, the CCEE is a key partner in the implementation of the SSIP and the cohesive system of support offered to LEAs to improve outcomes for SWD. During FFY 2017, the CCEE hired a director of Special Education to work closely with the SED to align activities and work collaboratively to provide resources to LEAs and stakeholders. Together, the CCEE and SED have led the Special Education Collective to identify areas of need using data analyzed by researchers from the Harvard School of Education. The CCEE, SED, and SBE staff also worked collaboratively to develop and publish the aforementioned SELPA Resource Leads RFA and selected the grant recipients described above. The partnership with CCEE helps to further the TOA of the SSIP by ensuring that agencies identified in the LCFF and LCAP process are working together and that representatives for SWD are at the table providing a voice to improve outcomes for all children. This continued collaboration will ensure that LEAs in need of support are provided tailored resources rooted in evidence based practices.

##### **Activity 6:**

*Ensure consistent and engaged representation of the SED on the following SSS and Dashboard workgroups:*

* + *LCAP Support Team[[6]](#footnote-6)*
  + *Dashboard Alternative School Status[[7]](#footnote-7)*
  + *Special Education Cross Agency Collective*
  + *System of Support Leadership team[[8]](#footnote-8)*

The SED has continued to engage with the aforementioned workgroups in meaningful ways, providing partnership, leadership, and valued expertise. This engagement is evident by the accomplishments made in the last year, as outlined in this report. These accomplishments include significant steps toward meaningfully addressing SWD performance in LEA LCAPs, continuing to collaboratively identify strategies for improvement with the Special Education Collective, and directing the development of a SSS that will adequately support LEA efforts to improve student outcomes. As a notable highlight, engagement with the Dashboard Alternative School Status workgroup included consultation on state policy governing accountability for alternative schools regarding students who receive the State’s certificate of completion. These discussions, both internally and with stakeholders, have helped inform larger policy discussions in the state about developing an alternate diploma in accordance with the Every Student Succeeds Act.

#### Stakeholder Involvement

Stakeholder input has proven to be an integral part of SSIP implementation, the development of the SSS, and all efforts to integrate relevant data and improvement efforts. The SED regularly consults with stakeholders and seeks input through the following:

* 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
* Bi-monthly State Board of Education meetings

In addition, SED’s participation on several workgroups, such as the Special Education Collective and the SSS Cross Agency Leadership Team, presents unique opportunities to engage with stakeholders representing various viewpoints. SED staff is mindful to allow for stakeholder input and discuss SSIP implementation progress and overall intent as policy is developed.

### Section C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes

#### State Systemic Improvement Plan Implementation Evaluation Questions

This section is intended to provide information on how the CDE has continued to evaluate the activities and outcomes of the SSIP. Last year, the CDE developed evaluation questions to guide the year-two Phase III process and implementation evaluation of the SSIP. For consistency in how progress is evaluated and for the purpose of identifying trends, challenges, or successes from year to year, the same evaluation questions will be answered in this year-three Phase III report.

The process used to develop the evaluation questions remains unchanged from last year. As background, the CDE used the cascading logic model[[9]](#footnote-9) to analyze each of the independent and dependent variables in the SSIP TOA to construct five evaluation questions in response to requirements from the OSEP[[10]](#footnote-10). The analysis of California’s SSIP TOA through the lens of the cascading logic model resulted in the development of four fundamental questions:

1. How has the SSS 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 SSS?
4. What does the data from the FFY 2017 evaluation imply for future actions to be measured for the FFY 2018 submission?

#### Responses to State Systemic Improvement Plan Implementation Evaluation Questions

##### 1. How has the SSS been impacted by the goals of the SSIP and the work of the SED?

The development of California’s SSIP precedes the state’s development of the SSS. At the time of California’s SSIP Phase I submission, the state had just implemented LCFF and LCAP requirements. Successful integration of programs and accountability measures for LEAs regarding services to SWD and other high needs students had yet to occur. Though the LCFF made great strides in reducing siloes in services to English Language Learners, students eligible for free and reduced price meals, and foster youth, there remained many opportunities to bring services to SWD into the fold and strategically pool resources and align intervention strategies in a way that would benefit all students. The SSIP has served as one of the primary driving forces for system wide integration, coalescing internal and external stakeholders around the idea of one unified, coherent system that serves all students. As SSIP implementation has progressed over the years, it has prompted the linkage of improvement efforts targeted toward SWD to schoolwide improvement efforts (e.g. MTSS) and intentional changes to the statewide accountability system to align measures of success and challenges for SWD outcomes to the information available through the Dashboard. These important changes have resulted from ongoing discussions and decisions that can be traced back to the original framework and conceptualization behind the SSIP.

The FFY 2016 year-two Phase III report documented SED participation in departmental and statewide efforts to further develop and align the SSS with the understanding that all parties are working toward creating “one system.” These efforts have continued and led to further integration of special education within the SSS. Please see the response to Evaluation Question 2 for specific, tangible ways the SSS has been built to reflect the goals of the SSIP.

##### **2. How are students with disabilities represented in the larger statewide accountability system**?

The statewide accountability system is generally comprised of the Dashboard, which provides data to identify areas of need, and the SSS, which serves to support LEAs in successfully improving in those areas. The 2018 Dashboard data continues to provide state and local indicator data specific to SWD (as an identified student group). The Dashboard data highlights areas of need specific to SWD, but also provides LEAs, and anyone else accessing the Dashboard data, with a more holistic, comprehensive picture of how LEAs are performing across student groups and across measures. In addition, as previously described, the SED has made significant progress toward integrating and aligning available data on outcomes for SWD and supporting LEAs to do the same. This ideally prevents a narrow focus on a singular problem and encourages a more systemic approach to improvement.

Regarding the SSS, several important steps have been made in the past year to increase the capacity of the SSS to support LEAs as they work to improve outcomes for SWD specifically. As outlined earlier in this report, those significant markers of progress include:

* Legislative changes to further define SELPAs role in LCAP development and review process to ensure that LCAPs include improvement activities for SWD.
* New funding to establish SELPA Resource Leads which consists of two types of statewide special education leads: SELPA Systems Improvement Leads and SELPA Content Leads. The main goal of the SELPA Leads is to build the capacity of the SSS by providing the expertise necessary to support LEAs to improve outcomes for SWD.
* New funding for the School Climate Lead Agency to expand the MTSS framework statewide.

It is evident that the SSS is being developed thoughtfully and intentionally to recognize and address those issues impacting LEAs and the performance of SWD. This aligns with the SSIP TOA and overarching intent to explicitly link efforts to improve outcomes for SWD to the statewide accountability system, including the Dashboard, LCAP, and SSS.

##### 3. How has the SED changed its practices to align with the larger system and the SSS?

In the past year, the SED has worked to align and incorporate the Dashboard data into our monitoring processes. As previously described, for the first time in 2018, to select LEAs for monitoring activities under the IDEA, the SED aligned calculations for graduation rate, performance on statewide assessment, and suspension and expulsion rates to the Dashboard’s accountability calculations to make the selection process more consistent and streamlined. Using the same methodology to select LEAs for the IDEA monitoring activities that is used to measure LEA performance under the statewide accountability system for the same indicator (e.g. graduation rate) ensures that LEAs are supported by a coherent system that consistently measures success across programs.

In addition, various updates were made in 2018 to the Performance Indicator Review (PIR) process that enhances alignment between the SSS, SSIP, and the SED’s monitoring activities. LEAs are selected for participation in the SED’s PIR process when the LEA does not meet the target for a performance indicator, using data from the SPP/APR indicators and the Dashboard (further reflecting the integration of data discussed above). Each participating LEA undertakes a process that includes purposeful engagement between special education and general education staff in an effort to build LEA capacity and improve the performance of SWD. Each LEA develops and submits a PIR improvement plan. Last year, the submission date for the improvement plan was moved to align the development process for the PIR improvement plans to coexist with, and inform, annual LCAP development.

The alignment of the LCAP and PIR processes allows LEAs to identify, within each of the LCAP priorities, any current initiatives that may address the issues impacting the LEA’s ability to meet the performance indicator target and how SWD are included in those strategies or activities. Currently, LEAs may submit their LCAP as their PIR plan as long as it addresses the required components of a PIR plan. The required components of a PIR plan include:

* A schedule of meetings for data analysis and plan writing
* A list of the planning team participants, names, and title/position including:
* SELPA
* District Special Education administration
* Site level administration
* General education and special education staff
* A summary of the LEA’s current performance on each unmet indicator target on the 2017–18 APR or Dashboard indicator
* A summary of any current LEA initiatives or plans aimed at improving the LEA’s performance on each unmet indicator target
* An Improvement Plan that includes the following components:

1. Root causes that led to the LEA’s failure to meet the target for the specified indicator
2. Strategies and activities to address root causes as well as other improvement strategies
3. Resources needed to support the strategies/activities
4. Name(s) and role(s) of person(s) responsible for carrying out activities
5. Dates by which each activity will be initiated and/or completed
6. Methods and standards used to measure progress
7. A schedule to regularly monitor the implementation of the improvement plan and progress attained

The integration of improvement plans shows progress on implementing the SSIP, by facilitating the understanding that improvement plans should appropriately address the performance of SWD and perpetuating the notion that LCAPs can serve that purpose in accordance with the SSIP TOA.

Finally, the FFY 2016 year-two Phase III report described the organizational restructuring of the SED and Focused Monitoring and Technical Assistance (FMTA) units to adequately support LEAs and implement the changes to SED’s monitoring practices. The restructure, initiated in fall 2017, was fully implemented in 2018. The restructure of the FMTA Units has allowed each monitoring unit to build deeper expertise and efficiencies in their program area. This has also increased role clarification for LEAs that are seeking technical assistance from SED staff. The SED structure now allows for each unit to serve as experts in their particular areas, while allowing for collaboration with other units that builds necessary capacity for the SED to be responsive to LEAs and the public.

**4. What does the data from the FFY 2017 evaluation imply for future actions to be measured for the FFY 2018 submission?**

The data from the FFY 2017 evaluation demonstrates significant progress in SSIP implementation, while highlighting work that should continue in FFY 2018. For specific activities and objectives for FFY 2018, please refer to Section F of this report.

#### Evaluating Outcomes: Supporting Inclusive Practices Project

California’s SSIP was predicated on the notion that broad, systemic change that resulted in a statewide accountability system that supported LEAs to create comprehensive improvement plans and employ resources and strategies to improve outcomes for all students would, eventually and inevitably, positively impact outcomes for SWD. This notion is difficult to quantify as one student’s score on assessments, impacted by infinite variables, is several steps away from measuring successful systems change. Therefore, California’s approach to evaluating implementation of the SSIP measures progress in building a system that is structured to impact change at the student level. This has been done by answering the evaluation questions in Section C.ii of this report. However, to demonstrate the connection to outcomes for SWD, the following provides information on one of SED’s contract TA providers, the Supporting Inclusive Practices (SIP) Project.

The SIP Project is an existing TA provider that works within the SSS and will work with the newly created SELPA Resource Leads to build capacity across the state to assist LEAs. The SIP project assists in supporting local 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 California and one in southern California to ensure statewide coverage. The project includes eight LEA “exemplars” that have inclusive best practices implemented at their site. The SIP project trains the exemplar LEA sites who, in turn, provide support to LEAs identified as needing level II intervention (differentiated assistance) in the SSS. This creates a trainer-of-trainer model for sustainability.

In addition to targeting local indicators, the project targets SPP/APR Indicators 3, 5, 6, and 7, which focus on LRE, preschool LRE, preschool student outcomes, and statewide assessments specifically for students in preschool to age twenty-two. SIP provides LEAs support with root cause analysis, action planning as it relates to systems alignment to eliminate duplication efforts, Universal Design for Learning, inclusion, co-teaching, data analysis, master scheduling, creation of communities of practice, and creating inclusive programs.

### Supporting Inclusive Practices Project Least Restrictive Environment Outcome Data

A data analysis was conducted related to classroom inclusion practices of SIP participant LEAs to identify the project’s long-term impact. Specifically identified were the SPP/APR Indicators 5 and 6 with measures of >80 percent (i.e. in the general education classroom setting more than 80 percent of the time) and <40 percent (i.e. in the general education classroom setting less than 40 percent of the time) inclusion classroom rates. The data gathered was from 2014–15 through the preliminary 2017–2018 data. The data analysis sought to identify exemplar LEA sites, first year, and third year SIP participants that have seen shifts in their >80 percent classroom and <40 percent classroom inclusion rates.

#### Data Analysis and Results

Two hypotheses were tested: 1. that exemplar districts would have the strongest (most positive) inclusion rates, and 2. that as LEAs participated in the SIP project a positive trajectory related to student inclusion in classrooms would be observed. To test the two hypotheses, the >80 percent classroom inclusion and <40 percent classroom inclusion variables were examined first. It was found that exemplar LEA sites had higher >80 percent and lower <40 percent inclusion rates as compared to other SIP participant LEAs with each of these improving over time from 2014–15 to present. It was also observed that the LEAs that have been in the project for only one year have a higher >80 percent and lower <40 percent inclusion rate than those that have been in the project for three years. A potential explanation for this finding is that the LEAs selected for inclusion in the project three years ago were less advanced in their inclusion practices than those selected more recently, due to a generally increased emphasis on inclusionary practices in federal and state education policy.

To test the second hypothesis, rates of inclusion were compared over four academic years from 2014–15 to 2017–18, for exemplar LEA sites, first year SIP participants, and third year SIP participants. The analysis generated evidence that supports that LEAs participating in SIP see meaningful increases in self-reported classroom inclusion of students over time. Specifically, LEAs that have participated in the project for the past three years have seen significant progress in both increasing the >80 percent classroom inclusion rate and decreasing the <40 percent rate.

On average, LEAs in the project for three years have seen a 12 percent increase in >80 percent classroom inclusion and a 6 percent decrease in the <40 percent rate. The LEAs in the project for one year also see a change in the past two years that fully accounts for the 5 percent change seen over the past four academic years, providing evidence that, on average, LEAs participating in the project see changes in inclusion rates differently than when they were not involved in the project. These findings demonstrate the positive trends observed on average among participating LEAs in the SIP project.

The data analysis conducted supports that the SIP project has been successful with higher rates of inclusion observed in participating LEAs (an average of 12 percent increase in >80 percent classroom inclusion and a 6 percent decrease in the <40 percent rate over a three year period) accompanied by positive attitudes towards inclusion observed among educators, and adoption of measurable inclusive instructional practices within actual classrooms which are indicative of viable change.

Furthermore, data indicates that as the standard of inclusive practices, policies, and culture is enhanced, as seen in exemplar LEA sites which serve as a model, higher rates of inclusion are achieved. This is very encouraging for LEAs who are considering inclusion or are already committed and looking to progress inclusive practices at their sites. Overall, the SIP project has done pioneering work by adopting a comprehensive model of inclusion comprised of research based activities, outputs, and outcomes. This has led to very successful outcomes for participating LEAs, and more importantly has started a network of educators committed to the vision of full inclusion in all schools.

#### Supporting Inclusive Practices and the State Systemic Improvement Plan

The outcomes data related to the SIP project is shared as an example of the SSS in action. The SSIP TOA hypothesizes that an integrated system of accountability and improvement will benefit outcomes for SWD. The SIP Project functions as a TA provider within the system, not only providing TA for the purposes of special education accountability, but also providing TA to LEAs in differentiated assistance for overall improvement. The practices encouraged by the SIP project have been shown to have impact on LRE rates and inclusion, as demonstrated by the outcome data shared above. There is a growing body of research indicating that all students benefit from inclusive environments. Inclusive learning opportunities for SWD can lead to improved long term outcomes, including gains in academics, social-emotional competency, and college and career readiness. As high quality, evidence based inclusive practices are employed and scaled up across the state, supported by the SSS and TA providers like the SIP project, it is reasonable to hypothesize that outcomes for SWD, including performance on assessment, would improve. In this way, as we build the SSS to clearly and thoughtfully address issues impacting SWD performance by cultivating expertise and resources available through SSS TA providers, the intent of the SSIP to positively impact student achievement by effectively mitigating those issues through systemic change will be realized.

#### Evaluating Outcomes: California Scale-Up Multi-Tiered System of Support Statewide Initiative

To further demonstrate the connection of the SSIP’s foundation and the development of the SSS to positively impact outcomes for SWD, the following section provides information on the California SUMS Initiative. As outlined earlier in this report, since 2016, the OCDE has received funding to serve as the lead agency for scaling up the development, alignment, and improvement of academic and behavioral supports in California through the use of an MTSS process and framework. In the past year, the OCDE and BCOE were selected to serve as the School Climate lead agencies within the SSS to further expand MTSS. The responsibilities in this role include expanding the state’s MTSS framework to foster a positive school climate in both academic and behavioral areas, including, but not limited to, positive behavior interventions and support, minimizing the use of emergency interventions, restorative justice, bullying prevention, social and emotional learning, trauma-informed practice, and cultural competency. This work will be done in partnership with the UCLA Center for the Transformation of Schools. As California looks forward to benefitting from this work to expand MTSS as part of the SSS, it is worth noting the progress that has already been accomplished under the SUMS initiative.

In FY 2017–18, activities conducted and resources developed under the SUMS initiative included:

* A four-tiered network of coaches and trainers to provide professional learning and technical assistance to LEAs and charter schools.
* A customized professional learning series based on SWIFT Center’s five evidence-based domains and national technical assistance model.
* Evidence-based evaluation tools LEAs and schools can use to monitor progress and measure the effectiveness of their implementation.
* Regional and statewide conferences to provide educators with the latest research-based practices to scale up an MTSS framework.
* An online portal to collect and disseminate evidence-based best practices and training modules. Resources to support LEAs with the utilization of an MTSS framework, including professional learning modules, are available on the OCDE’s online portal web page at<https://oconline.ocde.us/implement/camtss>.
* Competitive startup sub-grants for LEA and school personnel to attend trainings and conferences.
* Updated OCDE web page for CA MTSS with videos and resources available at <http://ocde.us/mtss>.

To assess impact of the work completed in FY 2017–18, data was collected on the number of educators and pupils served. Those numbers included:

* Over 2,000 educators representing schools, districts, counties, regions and the State Leadership Team attended the MTSS Training Series. These educators could potentially serve 143,646 other educators and 831,223 pupils.
* Over 1,700 educators from across the state attended the MTSS Professional Learning Institute in July 2018, hosted by the OCDE. The annual institute focuses on how to integrate academic, behavioral, and social-emotional supports to meet the needs of the whole child.

The SUMS initiative serves to inform and motivate systems change at the LEA level to create an academic environment suited to meet the needs of diverse learners with a variety of needs. The MTSS framework is a schoolwide approach that has proven effective in addressing the needs of all students, including struggling learners and SWD. As the SUMS initiative continues to develop and disseminate best practices, and the expansion of MTSS continues within the SSS, SWD and their peers will benefit from a responsive learning environment. It is reasonable to believe that as the MTSS framework is scaled up statewide, outcomes for SWD will improve.

### Section D. Data Quality Issues

California’s SSIP is a broad, comprehensive plan to drive systemic change in an effort to improve outcomes for SWD. Since the SSIP was first developed, California has made various changes, in consultation with stakeholders, to the way that SSIP goals are accomplished, including a change to the State-Identified Measurable Result (SIMR). These changes were made to conform and respond to various infrastructure changes and new statewide initiatives that prompted innovation. The changes have been purposeful and productive, yet create challenges when it comes to evaluation of SSIP implementation over time. Additionally, the nature of California’s SSIP lends itself to qualitative evaluation measures, which produces information that is more representative of SSIP implementation progress. However, connecting this qualitative information to a single quantitative measure, the SIMR, presents unique challenges. California continues to work toward effectively demonstrating how SSIP implementation and the creation of the SSS will impact outcomes for SWD and the SIMR, specifically.

The CDE has engaged in many efforts to ensure data quality, overall, which will improve calculation of the SIMR. Over the last several years SED has been working toward integrating special education data, maintained in the California Special Education Management Information System (CASEMIS), into the state longitudinal data system known as the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS). The SED anticipates full implementation and integration starting in FFY 2019. Since FFY 2016, the SED and the IDEA Part B Data Administrator have lead weekly meetings with both special education and CALPADS staff to develop timelines, data structure, and technical assistance guides in anticipation of this transition and integration. In FFY 2017, the IDEA Part B Data Administrator trained more than 700 LEA staff on the transition and eventual integration. Collecting special education data and general education data within one system will provide better data quality not just at the state level but at the LEA level as well. Having an integrated system will eliminate data mismatches between the general education data and special education data and encourage LEAs to have a better understanding of where the data is coming from. In addition, the integration will encourage relationships at the local level necessary to develop a strong data culture. Improving data quality and improving data culture at the LEA level makes data actionable. This means that when LEAs are selected for SED performance monitoring activities or identified for differentiated assistance, they have a better understanding of the areas of need based on the data and a clear understanding of why they were selected. Increased data quality will also better inform root cause analyses and direct efforts to address the issues identified. Increased data quality will also support an accurate, demonstrative SIMR for purposes of the SSIP.

### Section E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements

California’s SIMR for the SSIP is the performance of all SWD who took the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress in both English Language Arts and Mathematics during the FFY 2017 school year.

The following table displays the SIMR results for FFY 2017:

| Type of LEA | English/Language Arts (ELA) Target | ELA Result | Target Met | Math Target | Math Result | Target Met |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Elementary School Districts | 14.0% | 16.1% | Yes | 12.6% | 12.9% | Yes |
| High School Districts | 14.9% | 15.9% | Yes | 12.6% | 7.2% | No |
| Unified School Districts and COEs | 14.9% | 14.8% | No | 12.6% | 11.3% | No |

This year-three, Phase III report has outlined a number of infrastructure changes that support the SSIP and the reasons why those changes will likely positively impact outcomes for SWD and ultimately the SIMR. In addition, Sections C iii and iv of this report describe specific projects and initiatives within the SSS that apply evidence-based practices to achieve desired outcomes for students, thus demonstrating the impact of changes that can be attributed, in part, to the intent of the SSIP. The CDE acknowledges that the data shows slippage in FFY 2017 for these measures. However, it may take some years of further defining and implementing the SSS and the process for delivering TA to see measurable progress on the SIMR alone. For example, the SELPA leads, authorized by the 2018 Budget Act, have only recently been selected. Similarly, many of the agency leads within the SSS are newly established and are just beginning the collaborative work to support LEAs. As these important aspects of the SSS are articulated and reinforced in the coming years, and as LEAs in differentiated assistance are meaningfully supported by a comprehensive TA network, desired outcomes at the student level, including measurable progress on the SIMR, are anticipated.

### Section F. Plans for Next Year

California looks forward to continued progress toward SSIP implementation over the next year. Based on the success and challenges experienced in FFY 2017, the following activities and objectives are planned for FFY 2018:

* Further refine the role of the SELPA Leads within the SSS and monitor related activities and efforts to ensure intended impact on improved performance for SWD. Strengthen SED’s connection to the SELPA Leads by establishing a liaison position to oversee this work.
* Build on partnership with the CCEE to support LEAs in differentiated assistance and continue to participate in the Special Education Collective.
* Continue work to ensure SED TA contracts are aligned with the SSS and provide meaningful, targeted TA. Ensure that contracts specify support for LEAs eligible for differentiated assistance.
* Continue to refine and align SED monitoring processes with the SSS through use of LCAPs and dashboard data.
* Launch the integration of special education data into the state’s longitudinal pupil achievement data system by merging CASEMIS to CALPADS. Provide data trainings, as appropriate.
* Continue to have the SED engage in collaborative statewide initiatives and department efforts to refine and enhance the SSS. Ensure consistent representation on workgroups related to improving performance for SWD.

1. For more information, visit: <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. EC 56122(c) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. For more information, see: <https://ampersand.gseis.ucla.edu/ucla-center-for-the-transformation-of-schools-partners-in-new-statewide-effort-to-change-school-discipline-practices-strengthen-school-culture-and-climate/> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. SED monitoring activities include, but are not limited to, Performance Indicator Reviews, Data Identified Noncompliance, Preschool Reviews, Disproportionality Reviews, Significant Disproportionality, and Comprehensive Reviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. In general, LEAs are eligible for differentiated assistance when any student group does not meet performance standards for two or more LCFF priority areas. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The LCAP is a tool for LEAs 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-6)
7. 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 comprised of staff members across the CDE. For more information visit the DASS web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/dass.asp>. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. The California SSS 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 SSS Leadership Team is a group of CDE division directors, CDE staff members, and community stakeholders. For more information visit the SSS web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/sw/t1/csss.asp>. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. http://nirn.fpg.unc.edu/learn-implementation/implementation-drivers/scaling [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. For more detailed information on the process of applying the cascading logic model to develop evaluation questions, please refer to California’s year-two FFY 2016 Phase III report. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)