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## Subject

Approval of Indicator 17 of the State Performance Plan and 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) 2019 State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) for special education, required annually by the U.S. Department of Education (ED), Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). The first item, covering Indicators 1–16, was approved at the January 14, 2021, meeting of the State Board of Education (SBE), Item 16. 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, 2021.

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 seven-year period from FFY 2013–14 through 2019–20, 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 five-year period, with updates due to the OSEP each year. This report covers the fifth year of Phase III.

Beginning this Phase III reporting cycle, the OSEP is encouraging States to use an ED developed template. The purpose of the template is to streamline States SSIPs and create a more uniform SSIP across all reporting States and territories. California has opted to use the template this year.

The Phase III template provided with this item includes has three sections:

* Data Analysis: A description of the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR) and California’s progress toward the SiMR.
* Phase III Implementation, Analysis, and Evaluation: California’s progress in implementing infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices. This section identifies the continuing efforts to align supports and services provided to local educational agencies (LEA) that benefit SWD in order to improve outcomes.
* Stakeholder Engagement: Strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

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, 2021.

## 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 2021 addressed SPP Indicators 1–16. This SBE item addresses only Indicator 17, more 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.

## 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>).

In March 2019, the SBE approved California’s SSIP Phase 3 report 3 (See Item 1 on the March 2019 SBE agenda web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr19/agenda201903.asp>).

In March 2020, the SBE approved California’s SSIP Phase 3 report 4 (See Item 6 on the March 2020 SBE agenda web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr20/agenda202003.asp>).

## Fiscal Analysis (as appropriate)

There is no fiscal impact created by this requirement.

## Attachment(s)

Attachment 1: FFY 2019 Indicator B-17 Annual Performance Report (APR) Optional Template. (18 pages).

**Attachment 1
FFY 2019 Indicator B-17/C-11 Annual Performance Report (APR) Optional Template**

**Section A: Data Analysis**

**What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR).** (Please limityourresponseto 785 characters without space)*.*

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

**Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission?** No

**If “Yes”, provide an explanation for the change(s), including the role of stakeholders in decision-making.** (Please limityourresponseto 1600 characters without space)*.*

N/A

**Progress toward the SiMR**

**Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below** (expressed as actual number and percentages)*.*

**Baseline Data:** 14.5%

**Has the SiMR target changed since the last SSIP submission?** No

**FFY 2018 Target**: 14.6% **FFY 2019 Target**: 15.6%

**FFY 2018 Data:** 14.0% **FFY 2019 Data:** No Data Available

**Was the State’s FFY 2019 Target Met?** No

**Did slippage[[1]](#footnote-1) occur?** No

**If applicable, describe the reasons for slippage.** (Please limityourresponseto 1600 characters without space).

N/A

**Optional: Has the State collected additional data *(i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey)* that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR?** No

**If “Yes”, describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.**(Please limityourresponseto 1600 characters without space)*.*

N/A

**Did the State identify any provide describe of general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period?**

 No

**If “Yes”, describe any data quality issues specific to the SiMR data and include actions taken to address data quality concerns.** (Please limityourresponseto 3000 characters without space).

N/A

**Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period?** Yes

**If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State’s ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.** (Please limityourresponseto 3000 characters without space).

On March 19, 2020 the Governor of California issued a shelter in place order and schools immediately closed. At the time the California Department of Education (CDE) was unsure how long school closures would last, yet immediately recognized the impact school closures would have on certain data elements, the most pressing of which was the upcoming statewide assessments. The U.S Department of Education issued a Key Policy Letter signed by Former Education Secretary DeVos, dated March 20, 2020, which issued the following guidance. “Due to the extraordinary circumstances created by the Covid-19 pandemic and resulting school closures, I am providing flexibility to all States regarding the assessment and accountability requirements under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). Given the widespread, extended school closures, I know many States will be unable to administer their statewide assessments to all students in the spring of 2020. As statewide accountability systems rely on fair, reliable, and valid assessment results, I also recognize that States that do not administer their assessments will also not be able to annually meaningfully differentiate among public schools or identify schools for support and improvement, as required under section 1111(c)(4) and 1111(d)(2)(C)-(D) of the ESEA. Therefore, pursuant to my authority under section 8401(b) of the ESEA, I am inviting your State to request a waiver, for the 2019-2020 school year, of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, the accountability and school identification requirements in sections 1111(c)(4) and 1111(d)(2)(C)-(D), and certain reporting requirements related to assessments and accountability in section 1111(h).” The complete policy letter can be located at: https://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/secletter/200320.html. California applied and was approved for the federal waiver; therefore, California did not administer any statewide assessments for the 2019-20 school year. Seeing as how California did not administer any statewide assessments, there was no assessment data to collect as well as no assessment data to report for this indicator.

**Section B: Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation**

**Is the State’s theory of action new or revised since the previous submission?** No

**If “Yes”, please provide a description of the changes and updates to the theory of action** (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space).

N/A

**Did the State implement any new (previously or newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during** **the reporting period?**Yes

**If “Yes”, describe each new (previously or newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved*.*** (Please limityourresponseto 1600 characters without space)*.*

The Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) System Improvement Leads (SILs) are charged with building the foundational knowledge and capacity in systems improvement processes for SELPA across the state. In the past year, the SELPA SILs have worked collaboratively within California’s SOS to build the capacity of SELPAs and local educational agencies (LEAs) with a common goal to improve outcomes for SWD. In the work to continue capacity building SIL conducted 32 in-person and virtual trainings from July 2019 through June 2020 for over 1,500 participants. The trainings focused on the following topics: continuous improvement, data governance, high leverage practices, equity and including Students with Disabilities in the accountability and continuous improvement system. Along with publishing new tools and resources for SELPA leaders to use, SIL launched a series of “Coffee Talks”. At the start of the Covid-19 pandemic, the SIL project pivoted in order to continue to support SELPA administrators and LEAs. The Coffee Talks were weekly virtual facilitated meetings for SELPA administrators to focus on pressing topics surrounding school closures and related challenges.

**Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy that the State continued to implement in the reporting period, including the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved** (Please limityourresponse to 3000 characters without space).

Last year the SIL project launched their website, systemimprovment.org, along with the Improvement Data Center (IDC). The SIL IDC displays six years of State Performance Plan (SPP) indicator data and analytic tools that assist SELPA and LEA administrators in identifying patterns, trends, and data trajectories in order to better identify and address potential problems of practices and student inequalities at the local level.

The Imperial County SELPA serves within the SOS as the SELPA content lead for Improving Outcomes for English Learners (EL) with Disabilities. The Imperial County SELPA conducted in-person and virtual training around the California Department of Education (CDE) published CA Practitioners’ Guide for Educating English Learners with Disabilities. There are 16 archived, pre-recorded training modules which can be found on the Imperial County SELPA website: https://www.icoe.org/selpa/el-swd/training-modules ranging from topics related to pre-referral strategies, assessment of ELs who may be eligible as a student with a disability, and reclassification. To date, these archived training events have received 1,471 views. 98% of participants who attended the events have indicated it met and/or exceeded their expectations; 80% of participants agreed/strongly agreed that they learned skills they could immediately use.

As a SELPA content lead within the SOS, San Diego South County SELPA through the “Equity, Disproportionality and Design: Preventing Disproportionality in Our Schools” (ED&D) program is focused on building capacity in other SELPAs to lead a movement towards effective solutions for improving equity and decreasing disproportionality. As highlighted in the FFY2018 SSIP, ED&D developed a disproportionality tool, with continued testing and has become operational. By putting this tool in the hands of SELPA leads and LEAs, ED&D has continued to build a collaborative knowledge base while assisting SELPA leads and LEAs be proactive around their disproportionality data and how it impacts SWD outcomes.

Placer County SELPA serves as a SELPA content lead within the SOS focused on improving outcomes for SWDs by building capacity around Universal Design for Learning (UDL), Assistive Technologies (AT), and Augmentative Alternative Communication (AAC) for students with complex communication needs. As highlighted in the FFY 2018 SSIP, after the launch of the Open Access website found here: https://www.openaccess-ca.org/, Placer County SELPA selected 30 regional implementation teams across the state to train, coach, and provide technical assistance to school sites in UDL, AT, and AAC.

Marin County SELPA, in partnership with the California Autism Professional Training and Information Network (CAPTAIN), serves as the SELPA content lead within the SOS to build SELPA capacity across the state to support the implementation of EBPs for Autism. Marin County SELPA and CAPTAIN have continued to work in the 17 regions in the state, each having a SELPA Director and Regional Implementation Lead who are knowledgeable in creating implementation capacity for evidence-based practices (EBPs). The CAPTAIN Cadre members continue to implement trainings on EBPs using fidelity measures for effective adult education/training practices. Each training is accompanied by an established pre- and post-assessment of knowledge to determine the effectiveness of the trainer at conveying the core components to the training participants.

**Provide a description of how the State evaluated outcomes for each improvement strategy and how the evaluation data supports the decision to continue implementing the strategy.** (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space):

The SIL project utilized a series of knowledge, skill, and satisfaction surveys which assessed satisfaction, quality, and relevance of services, trainings, and other opportunities for participants. Participants reported high levels of satisfaction with both the facilitator and the content presented in the training modules. Over 90 percent of respondents indicated they agreed or strongly agreed that trainers demonstrated expertise in the subject matter, were responsive to participants’ questions, were sensitive to the diversity of participants and used appropriate training strategies. Over 88 percent of respondents indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed that the training was well organized, included a good mix of learning activities and that the amount of time for the training was appropriate for the content provided. Lastly, over 77 percent of respondents indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed that their understanding of topics covered in training increased and that their training experience was highly valuable. Based on this feedback SIL continues to move forward with the virtual meetings and training sessions.

The Imperial County SELPA strives to continuously directly impact systems and indirectly improve student outcomes, by assisting SELPAs, their COEs & LEAs, as related to needs associated with their EL and SWD populations. The website has received upwards of 8,000 unique visits and views. These views have resulted in positive outcomes, whereby use of the various resources have been reported by SELPAs, COEs, LEAs, CA regional EL specialists, as well as institutes of higher education. For further information related to these resources, please visit the Imperial County SELPA Content Lead website: https://www.icoe.org/selpa/el-swd.

The ED&D team is committed to using appropriate techniques to measure the impact of their work on California school systems. Their measurement approach includes the use of surveys, collection of personal stories, process metrics, and interviews with training participants by the external evaluator about their use of ED&D tools. The ED&D team is discussing different ways to meet the challenge of measuring student level outcomes, while also focusing on building capacity for good data use and the implementation of MTSS to prevent disproportionality.

Following the outbreak of COVID-19, Open Access quickly pivoted to continue to support the immediate need of special education providers, launching the Accessible Distance Learning website as schools returned to school via virtual learning after the initial school closures. Open Access mobilized specialists across the state to develop guidance documents, best practice recommendations and actionable tools and resources to support teaching and learning for students with complex educational needs.

Marin County SELPA and CAPTAIN developed ten trainings on EBPs for Autism which include pre- and post- training knowledge assessments. All trainings are posted on the CAPTAIN website that is a clearinghouse for research-based resources for Autism Spectrum Disorder and asynchronous presentations made available to the public at no cost. From July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020, the website has recorded 16K Users in 27K sessions.

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.** (Pleaselimit your response to 3000 characters without space)**:**

Looking toward the next reporting cycle, the SIL project, in conjunction with WestEd are working to develop and administer a fidelity tool to assess the extent to which participants in target SELPA lead trainings are able to apply the target practices. These assessments can be used by the SIL project to inform ongoing and future improvement efforts.

Imperial County SELPA continues to provide support to SELPAs through targeted and detailed workshops and modules as well as collaborative conversations and connections. Imperial County SELPA will continue to develop statewide and professional learning communities (PLC). The Imperial County SELPA is in a position to provide targeted support and detailed resources to meet the unique needs of each PLC.

Moving forward ED&D will continue to use the three guiding tenets of the project; awareness, action, and scale. At the heart of the ED&D project is the community-based design model. By taking this collaborative approach, ED&D continues to establish cross-functional teams that approach Disproportionality and SWD outcomes through the three guiding tenets. ED&D looks to further strengthen the relationship between SELPA leads, COEs, industry partners and stakeholders to help build and define its community-based design model. Recognizing the impact Covid-19 has had on SELPAs and LEAs and the unique challenges they face, ED&D utilized a virtual platform and continued their support for SELPAs and LEAs through online networking, professional development collaboration, and created a toolkit checklist for inclusive distance learning planning.

As part of the SOS, Open Access will continue to offer professional development and resources for educators, administrators, and organizations to enhance their understanding of UDL and how to leverage digital and AT to meet the needs of all learners in kindergarten through grade twelve (K–12) settings. The project further aims to provide; universal shared resources and tools on the Open Access website where robust resources are universally available in each of the project’s focus areas, and options for technical assistance and resources to assist SELPA Lead teams in building capacity around eliminating barriers to access

CAPTAIN Cadre will continue to provide coaching on the EBPs to selected providers using fidelity measures for effective coaching practices based on the National Professional Development Center on Autism Spectrum Disorder (NPDC-ASD) coaching model. Practice profiles and implementation checklists are used to assist teachers and providers in reaching fidelity of implementation of the EBPs for which they are trained. These fidelity measures were developed by the NPDC-ASD (Autism Focused Intervention Resources and Modules). In their work as the SELPA Content Lead, Marin County SELPA and CAPTAIN have developed Google forms and regional databases to collect all fidelity and training outcome data. This system will be used for ongoing fidelity monitoring and continuous improvement. A comprehensive data system is being developed in fall/winter of 2020-21 and will be launched to all statewide SELPAs in the fall of 2021.

**Did the State implement any new (previously or newly identified) evidence-based practices?** No

**If “Yes”, describe the selection process for the new (previously or newly identified) evidence-based practices.** (Please limityourresponseto1600characterswithoutspace):

N/A

**Provide a summary of the continued evidence-based practices and how the evidence-based practices are intended to impact the SiMR.** (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space):

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

The continued expansion of Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) in California through the Orange County Department of Education’s (OCDE) Scale-Up MTSS Statewide (SUMS) initiative is critical to setting a foundation for LEAs to improve outcomes for SWD. The SUMS project 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 SWD, and address the unique needs of underserved populations. OCDE has partnered with the Butte County Office of Education and the School-wide Integrated Framework for Transformation Center (SWIFT Center) to implement this large-scale effort. The SUMS initiative aims to identify existing evidence-based resources, professional development activities, and other efforts currently available at the state, federal, and local levels, as well as develop new evidence-based resources and activities.

**Describe the data collected to evaluate and monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.** (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space)***:***

Data analysis for the 45 SIP participating LEAs in 2019–20 is largely descriptive in nature given the availability of key indicator data. The data available for the most recent outcomes analysis was from the 2015–16 through 2018–19 academic years. There are two indicators that show improvement for the participating LEAs. The first analysis is assessment participation and proficiency. Participating SIP LEAs, on average, surpassed the 2018 target of 95% participation rate in both English Language Arts (ELA) and Math. The ELA and Math proficiency rates also improved over the course of four years; a 4.05% increase in ELA and a 2.41% increase in Math. The second indicator for analysis is Least Restrictive Environment (LRE). Trend analysis indicated over the course of four years, LRE data trended in the desired direction. On average, 4.54% more students being included in general education 80% or more of the day and 2.87% fewer being included for less than 40% of the day. The percentage of students served in separate schools also decreased by .54%, over this time period.

The evaluation of the delivery and quality of services to LEAs, as sub-grantees, through the SUMS initiative include formative and summative elements. Formative elements include but are not limited to: technical assistance logs, training materials, website content, and surveys to gather sub-grantees’ feedback. Summative measures assess sub-grantees’ increased capacity to integrate and sustain MTSS initiatives, improve fidelity of implementation, and show positive student outcomes over time. Three measures of fidelity of implementation assess sub-grantees’ increased capacity to integrate and sustain MTSS initiatives: the LEA Self-Assessment, the SWIFT Fidelity Integrity Assessment, and the SWIFT Fidelity Implementation Tool.

**Describe the components (professional development activities, policies/procedures revisions, and/or practices, etc.) implemented during the reporting period to support the knowledge and use of selected evidence-based practices.** (Pleaselimit your response to 1600 characters without space):

The level of investment and engagement by participating LEAs certainly impact the rate and level at which goals are achieved. As part of their three-tier approach, SIP provides various district- and site-based initiatives (e.g. UDL and co-teaching), regional in person professional development, webinars, and virtual resources. SIP created resources and materials including documents, presentations, and interactive modules that support the SPP, APR indicators, and the SOS to provide a collaborative community to sustain the implementation of practices for SWDs. For a comprehensive look at the various events and resources available more can be discovered at the SIP website: https://www.sipinclusion.org/what-we-do/resources/. More information about California’s SIP project can be found by visiting the SIP website at https://www.sipinclusion.org/.

As the SUMS initiative continues to support LEAs in implementation, and the expansion of MTSS continues within the SOS, SWD and their peers will benefit from an adequately responsive learning environment. It is reasonable to believe that as this work moves forward, outcomes for SWD will ultimately improve. The SUMS initiative and MTSS resources can be accessed at the OCDE website here: https://ocde.us/mtss/Pages/default.aspx.

Additionally, the CDE has established a webpage for the System of Support at https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/sw/t1/csss.asp#leadagencies The work and resources of the SOS lead agencies charged with building capacity and promoting evidence-based practices for serving students with disabilities is highlighted on the following webpage: https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/ac/selparesourcelead.asp

**Section C: Stakeholder Engagement**

**Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.** (Pleaselimit your response to 3000 characters without space):

With the impact of Covid-19 creating exceptional challenges for LEAs across the state, the CDE used it as an opportunity to engage stakeholders across the state to get feedback on various topics related to SWDs, outcomes, and distance learning. Initiated by Superintendent Thurmond to provide practical guidance to teachers and administrators in order to support students and families in the shift to distance learning, CDE formed the Innovative Solutions Workgroup. The CDE was able to partner with the SIP Project to culminate and vet distance learning resources. The resources are housed on the SIP website for universal public access and can be found here: https://www.sipinclusion.org/distance-learning-resources/. The CDE began with broadcasting webinars every Thursday covering various topics; supporting families and parents, related services, and mental health and behavior. These recorded webinars can be accessed at the CDE website at https://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/he/hn/covid19webinars.asp.

The Innovative Solutions Workgroup had over 130 participants that consisted of parents, teachers, service providers, administrators, and representatives from professional organizations. The workgroup held several meetings and participants broke out into smaller subgroups to discuss the challenges LEAs faced effectively continuing improvement efforts. Topics included, but were not limited to; early childhood resources, LRE, mild/moderate support needs, extensive support needs, supporting parents and families, supports and related services, mental health, and resources.

The CDE, the Special Education Division, and Superintendent Thurmond distributed a survey to Special Education Directors at LEAs across the state to gather feedback that was used to design CDE webinars and meetings. This survey helped develop guidance and resources available to the field. Of the LEAs that responded, results were equally distributed across the board in terms of LEA geographic location, rural or urban, and LEA size.

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

**Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities?**No

**If “Yes”, describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.** (Please limityourresponseto1600 characters without space)*:*

N/A

**If applicable, describe the action(s) that the State implemented to address any FFY 2018 SPP/APR required OSEP response.** (Pleaselimit your response to 3000 characters without space):

N/A

1. The definition of slippage: *A worsening from the previous data AND a failure to meet the target.* The worsening also needs to meet certain thresholds to be considered slippage:

	1. For a "large" percentage (10% or above), it is considered slippage if the worsening is more than 1.0 percentage point. For example:
	2. It is not slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator X are 32% and the FFY 2018 data were 32.9%.
	3. It is slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator X are 32% and the FFY 2018 data were 33.1%.
	4. For a "small" percentage (less than 10%), it is considered slippage if the worsening is more than 0.1 percentage point. For example:
		1. It is not slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator Y are 5.1% and the FFY 2018 data were 5%.
		2. It is slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator Y are 5.1% and the FFY 2018 data were 4.9%. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)