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## Subject

State Annual Performance Report for Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 2004 covering program year 2022–23.

## Type of Action

Action, Information

## Summary of the Issue(s)

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

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

The APR describes California’s progress on five compliance indicators, eleven performance indicators, and one indicator with both compliance and performance components. The attached report is for program year 2022–23.

## Recommendation

The California Department of Education (CDE) recommends the SBE review and approves the Executive Summary of the FFY 2022 APR for Part B of the IDEA covering program year 2022–23 as prepared by the Special Education Division (SED).

## Brief History of Key Issues

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

Indicator 17, known as the SSIP, is a three-phase plan to address systemic improvement for SWDs in California. The SSIP describes California’s plan for improving outcomes for SWDs and it includes what is referred to as The Theory of Action which posits that when accountability efforts and resources are aligned to ensure that evidence-based improvement strategies are included in comprehensive improvement plans to meaningfully address SWDs along with their peers, SWDs performance outcomes will improve.

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

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

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

In January 2023, the SBE approved the FFY 2023 APR Executive Summary which reported on the progress of the 2021–22 compliance and performance indicators as required by the IDEA. The SBE also approved California’s SSIP Phase III report 7. Please see item 12: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr23/agenda202301.asp>.

In January 2022, the SBE approved the FFY 2020 APR Executive Summary which reported on the progress of the 2020–21 compliance and performance indicators as required by the IDEA. The SBE also approved California’s SSIP Phase III report 6. Please see item 4: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr22/agenda202201.asp>.

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

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

In September 2021, the SED presented the proposed new targets covering program years 2020–21 through 2025–26, to the SBE for review and feedback. Please see item 4: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr21/agenda202109.asp>.

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

## Fiscal Analysis (as appropriate)

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

## Attachment(s)

Attachment 1: California Department of Education Special Education Division State Annual Performance Report Executive Summary Federal Fiscal Year 2022 (Program Year 2022–23) (63 pages).
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## Special Education in California

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

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

## Accountability and Data Collection

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

The CDE is required to publish the APR for public review. The current APR reflects data collected during Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2022, which is equivalent to California’s school year 2022–23. Indicators 1, 2, and 4 (graduation, dropout and expulsion/suspension rates, respectively) are reported in lag years using data from school year 2021–22. The 17 federal indicators include 11 performance indicators, 5 compliance indicators, and 1 indicator with both performance and compliance components (Indicator 4). All compliance indicator targets are set by the ED at either 0 or 100 percent. Performance indicator targets were established based on recommendations from interested parties and approved by the State Board of Education (SBE) in November 2021 (Table 4).

### Table 1: California State Indicators

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

## Overview of Population and Services

During FFY 2022 a total of 813,529 students from birth to twenty-two years received special education services from LEAs. There are 5,852,585 kindergarten through grade twelve students enrolled in California; of those 766,688 are SWDs whom comprise 13.1 percent of that population. Almost half of SWDs in California (47 percent) are between six and twelve years of age; two-thirds of SWDs are male (66 percent); and almost a quarter are English-language learners (23 percent). Of all students with disabilities, Hispanic/Latino students represent the greatest numbers of students in need of special education and related services (59 percent) followed by white students (19 percent). Tables two and three are based on SWDs birth to twenty-two years.

California students identified as having at least one disability are eligible for individualized services to meet their unique needs. There are 14 disability categories, as displayed in Table 2. The most common primary disability category designation for students is Specific Learning Disability (34.32 percent), followed by Speech or Language Impairment (21.2 percent).

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

| **Disability** | **Number of Students** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Specific Learning Disability (SLD) | 279,200 | 34.32 |
| Speech or Language Impairment (SLI) | 172,423 | 21.19 |
| Autism (AUT) | 149,925 | 18.43 |
| Other Health Impairment (OHI) | 118,306 | 14.54 |
| Intellectual Disability (ID) | 40,401 | 4.97 |
| Emotional Disturbance (ED) | 21,593 | 2.63 |
| Hard of Hearing (HH) | 9,417 | 1.16 |
| Multiple Disability (MD) | 8,147 | 1.00 |
| Orthopedic Impairment (OI) | 6,905 | 0.85 |
| Deafness (DEAF) | 2,851 | 0.35 |
| Visual Impairment (VI) | 2,581 | 0.32 |
| Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) | 1,312 | 0.16 |
| Established Medical Disability (EMD) | 381 | 0.05 |
| Deaf Blindness (DB) | 87 | 0.01 |
| Total | 813,529 | 100.0 |

Source: CALPADS, Fall 2022

In California, SWDs receive a variety of services to address their unique needs. During FFY 2022–23, there were 3,483,617 services provided to California’s students with disabilities, many receiving multiple services. Table 3 lists the most commonly provided services to students. The most common singular service provided was Specialized Academic Instruction (28 percent) followed by Language and Speech (19.34 percent).

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

| **Services** | **Number of Services Provided** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Specialized Academic Instruction | 975,223 | 28.00 |
| Language and Speech | 673,874 | 19.34 |
| Vocational/Career Services | 939,454 | 26.96 |
| Mental Health Services | 377,476 | 10.83 |
| All Other Services | 517,590 | 14.87 |
| Total | 3,483,617 | 100.0 |

Source: CALPADS, Fall 2022

## 2022–23 Annual Performance Report Indicators

During FFY 2022, California met 6 of the 17 indicators. Table 4 identifies each indicator, its target, the FFY 2022 state results, and whether or not the target was met. The pages following Table 4 provide an overview of each individual indicator, including a description of the indicator, the target, the data collected, the results, and whether there was an increase or decrease in the results from the prior year.

### Table 4: Indicators, Target, Results, and Change

| **Indicators** | **Targets** | **Results** | **Met Target** | **Change from Prior Year** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 Graduation | 76% | 82.98% | Yes | +5.62% |
| 2 Drop Out | 9% | 10.04% | No | -2.83% |
| 3 Statewide Assessment | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 3A Participation | 95% ELA/Math | Various | Yes/No | Various |
| 3B Grade Level Assessments Proficiency | Various | Various | Yes/No | Various |
| 3C Alternate Assessment Proficiency | Various | Various | Yes/No | Various |
| 3D Achievement Gap | Various | Various | Yes | Various |
| 4 Suspension/Expulsion | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 4A Suspension and Expulsion Rate Overall | 2.6% | 0.67% | Yes | +0.67% |
| 4B Suspension and Expulsion Rate by Race/Ethnicity | 0% | 0% | Yes | No Change |
| 5 Education Environments | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 5A Regular Class 80 Percent or More | 63% | 61.3% | No | +0.48% |
| 5B Regular Class Less than 40 Percent  | 16.5% | 18.38% | No | -0.22% |
| 5C Separate Schools, Residential Facilitates, or Homebound/Hospital Placements | 3% | 2.54% | Yes | -0.03% |
| 6 Preschool Least Restrictive Environments | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 6A Regular Preschool | 43% | 19.86% | No | +1.0% |
| 6B Separate Schools or Classes | 29% | 47.48% | No | -0.39% |
| 6C Home | 3.5% | 5.64% | No | -2.33 |
| 7 Preschool Assessment | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 7A Positive Social-Emotional Skills | 78%/78% | 69.0%/80.4% | No/Yes | -0.5%/+12.7% |
| 7B Use of Knowledge and Skills | 78%/78% | 70.4%/84.7% | No/Yes | +1.4%/+19.5% |
| 7C Use of Appropriate Behaviors | 78%/78% | 68.3%/85.3% | No/Yes | -3.2%/+13.1% |
| 8 Parent Involvement  | 96% | 99.67% | Yes | +0.04% |
| 9 Disproportionate Representation | 0% | 0.33% | No | -0.14% |
| 10 Disproportional Representation by Disability Category | 0% | 2.98% | No | -1.45 % |
| 11 Child Find | 100% | 94.03% | No | +0.04% |
| 12 Early Childhood Transition | 100% | 76.09% | No | -2.06% |
| 13 Secondary Transition | 100% | 95.25% | No | +0.36% |
| 14 Post-school Outcomes | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 14A Enrolled in Higher Education | 57% | 50.81% | No | +2.88% |
| 14B Enrolled in Higher Education or Competitively Employed within a Year | 78% | 75.06% | No | +0.53% |
| 14C Enrolled in Higher Education, Postsecondary Education or Training or Competitively Employed | 88% | 90.46% | Yes | -0.66% |
| 15 Resolution Sessions | 42% | 5.38% | No | -2.8% |
| 16 Mediation | 67% | 9.15% | No | -7.77% |
| 17 State Systemic Improvement Plan | 15% | 14.57% | No | 0.50% |

## Indicator 1: Graduation Rate

### Description

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

### Measurement

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

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

### Target Met: Yes

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

| **Indicator 1** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 75% | 75.5% | 76% | 77% | 78% | 79% |
| Result | 77.02% | 77.36% | 82.98% | - | - | - |
| Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | - | - |

## Indicator 2: Dropout Rate

### Description

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

### Measurement

Data are reported in lag years using data from CALPADS.

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

### Target Met: No

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

| **Indicator 2** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 11% | 10% | 9% | 8% | 7% | 6% |
| Result | 10.38% | 12.87% | 10.04% | - | - | - |
| Target Met | Yes | No | No | - | - | - |

## Indicator 3: Statewide Assessment

### Description

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

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

### Measurement

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

### Target Met:

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

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

| **Indicator 3a ELA** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade 4 Target | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% |
| Grade 4 Result | 19% | 94.66% | 96.10% | - | - | - |
| Grade 4 Target Met | No | No | Yes | - | - | - |
| Grade 8 Target | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% |
| Grade 8 Result | 20% | 91.68% | 93.02% | - | - | - |
| Grade 8 Target Met | No | No | No | - | - | - |
| Grade 11 Target | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% |
| Grade 11 Result | 33% | 82.36% | 86.47% | - | - | - |
| Grade 11 Target Met | No | No | No | - | - | - |

| **Indicator 3a Math** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade 4 Target | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% |
| Grade 4 Result | 20% | 94.48% | 95.94% | - | - | - |
| Grade 4 Target Met | No | No | Yes | - | - | - |
| Grade 8 Target | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% |
| Grade 8 Result | 20% | 91.18% | 92.57% | - | - | - |
| Grade 8 Target Met | No | No | No | - | - | - |
| Grade 11 Target | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% |
| Grade 11 Result | 33% | 81.59% | 85.75% | - | - | - |
| Grade 11 Target Met | No | No | No | - | - | - |

| **Indicator 3b ELA** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade 4 Target | 15% | 15% | 15% | 16% | 17% | 18% |
| Grade 4 Result | 18% | 19.26% | 18.66% | - | - | - |
| Grade 4 Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | - | - |
| Grade 8 Target | 12% | 12% | 12% | 13% | 14% | 15% |
| Grade 8 Result | 11% | 12.70% | 12.68% | - | - | - |
| Grade 8 Target Met | No | Yes | Yes | - | - | - |
| Grade 11 Target | 14% | 14% | 14% | 15% | 16% | 17% |
| Grade 11 Result | 17% | 15.82% | 17.21% | - | - | - |
| Grade 11 Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | - | - |

| **Indicator 3b Math** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade 4 Target | 15% | 15% | 15% | 16% | 17% | 18% |
| Grade 4 Result | 17% | 18.0% | 19.24% | - | - | - |
| Grade 4 Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | - | - |
| Grade 8 Target | 8% | 8% | 8% | 9% | 10% | 11% |
| Grade 8 Result | 6% | 6.52% | 7.18% | - | - | - |
| Grade 8 Target Met | No | No | No | - | - | - |
| Grade 11 Target | 8% | 8% | 8% | 9% | 10% | 11% |
| Grade 11 Result | 6% | 4.09% | 4.65% | - | - | - |
| Grade 11 Target Met | No | No | No | - | - | - |

| **Indicator 3c ELA** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade 4 Target | 15% | 15% | 15% | 16% | 17% | 18% |
| Grade 4 Result | 13% | 12.22% | 15.43% | - | - | - |
| Grade 4 Target Met | No | No | Yes | - | - | - |
| Grade 8 Target | 10% | 10% | 10% | 11% | 12% | 13% |
| Grade 8 Result | 11% | 9.44% | 12.72% | - | - | - |
| Grade 8 Target Met | Yes | No | Yes | - | - | - |
| Grade 11 Target | 14% | 14% | 14% | 15% | 16% | 17% |
| Grade 11 Result | 16% | 15.10% | 13.64% | - | - | - |
| Grade 11 Target Met | Yes | Yes | No | - | - | - |

| **Indicator 3c Math** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade 4 Target | 7% | 7% | 7% | 8% | 9% | 10% |
| Grade 4 Result | 6% | 6.04% | 4.69% | - | - | - |
| Grade 4 Target Met | No | No | No | - | - | - |
| Grade 8 Target | 8% | 8% | 8% | 9% | 10% | 14.5% |
| Grade 8 Result | 14% | 11.66% | 10.42% | - | - | - |
| Grade 8 Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | - | - |
| Grade 11 Target | 6% | 6% | 6% | 7% | 8% | 11% |
| Grade 11 Result | 11% | 10.78% | 9.63% | - | - | - |
| Grade 11 Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | - | - |

| **Indicator 3d ELA** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade 4 Target | 31% | 31% | 31% | 30% | 29% | 23% |
| Grade 4 Result | 24% | 24.96% | 25.07% | - | - | - |
| Grade 4 Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | - | - |
| Grade 8 Target | 37% | 37% | 37% | 36% | 35% | 34% |
| Grade 8 Result | 36% | 33.94% | 32.99% | - | - | - |
| Grade 8 Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | - | - |
| Grade 11 Target | 42% | 42% | 42% | 41% | 40% | 39% |
| Grade 11 Result | 42% | 38.98 | 38.20% | - | - | - |
| Grade 11 Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | - | - |

| **Indicator 3d Math** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade 4 Target | 25% | 25% | 25% | 24% | 23% | 18% |
| Grade 4 Result | 19% | 20.26% | 21.55% | - | - | - |
| Grade 4 Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | - | - |
| Grade 8 Target | 29% | 29% | 29% | 28% | 27% | 24% |
| Grade 8 Result | 25% | 22.71% | 22.75% | - | - | - |
| Grade 8 Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | - | - |
| Grade 11 Target | 27% | 27% | 27% | 26% | 25% | 24% |
| Grade 11 Result | 29% | 22.89% | 22.71% | - | - | - |
| Grade 11 Target Met | No | Yes | Yes | - | - | - |

## Indicator 4A: Suspension and Expulsion Overall

### Description

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

### Measurement

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

### Target Met: Yes

### Suspension and Expulsion Targets and Results for FFYs 2020–25

| **Indicator 4a** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 3% | 2.8% | 2.6% | 2.4% | 2.2% | 2% |
| Results | 0.51% | 0% | 0.67% | - | - | - |
| Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | - | - |

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

### Description

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

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

### Measurement

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

### Target Met: Yes

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

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

## Indicator 5: Education Environments

### Description

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

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

### Measurement

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

### Target Met

1. No
2. No
3. Yes

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

| **Indicator 5** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5a Target | 58% | 60% | 62% | 64% | 67% | 70% |
| 5a Result | 57.82% | 60.82% | 61.3% | - | - | - |
| 5a Target Met | No | Yes | No | - | - | - |
| 5b Target | 19.5% | 18% | 16.5% | 15% | 13.5% | 12% |
| 5b Result | 17.73% | 18.60% | 18.38% | - | - | - |
| 5b Target Met | Yes | No | No | - | - | - |
| 5c Target | 3.4% | 3.2% | 3.0% | 2.8% | 2.6% | 2.4% |
| 5c Result | 2.90% | 2.57% | 2.54% | - | - | - |
| 5c Target Met | Yes | Yes | No | - | - | - |

## Indicator 6: Preschool Least Restrictive Environments

### Description

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

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

### Measurement

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

### Target Met

1. No
2. No
3. No

### Preschool Environments Targets and Results for FFYs 2020–25

| **Indicator 6** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6a Target | 39% | 41% | 43% | 45% | 47% | 49% |
| 6a Result | 29.16% | 18.86% | 19.86% | - | - | - |
| 6a Target Met | No | No | No | - | - | - |
| 6b Target | 33% | 31% | 29% | 27% | 25% | 23% |
| 6b Result | 37.02% | 47.87% | 47.48% | - | - | - |
| 6b Target Met | No | No | No | - | - | - |
| 6c Target | 3.5% | 3.5% | 3.5% | 3.5% | 3.5% | 3.4% |
| 6c Result | 5.64% | 7.97% | 5.64% | - | - | - |
| 6c Target Met | No | No | No | - | - | - |

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

### Description

Indicator 7A is a performance indicator that measures the percent of children aged three through five with IEPs who demonstrate improvement in Positive Social-Emotional Skills, including social relationships. This data is collected in CALPADS in partnership with Desired Results (DR) Access.

These are the following progress categories:

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

### Measurement

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

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

### Target Met: No/Yes

### Preschool Outcomes–Positive Social-Emotional Skills Targets and Results for FFYs 2020–25

| **Indicator 7a** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 76%/76% | 77%/77% | 78%/78% | 79%/79% | 80%/80% | 81%/81% |
| Result | 71%/68% | 69.5%/67.7% | 69%/80.4% | - | - | - |
| Target Met | No | No | No/Yes | - | - | - |

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

### Description

Indicator 7B is a performance indicator that measures the percent of children aged three through five with IEPs who demonstrate improvement in acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, including early language/communication and early literacy. This data is collected in CALPADS in partnership with DR Access. These are the following progress categories:

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

### Measurement

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

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

### Target Met: No/Yes

### Preschool Outcomes–Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills Targets and Results for FFYs 2020–25

| **Indicator 7b** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 76%/76% | 77%/77% | 78%/78% | 79%/79% | 80%/80% | 81%/81% |
| Result | 69.5%/65.7% | 69.0%/65.2% | 70.4%/84.7% | - | - | - |
| Target Met | No | No | No/Yes | - | - | - |

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

### Description

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

These are the following progress categories:

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

### Measurement

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

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

### Target Met: No/Yes

### Preschool Outcomes–Use of Appropriate Behaviors Targets and Results for FFYs 2020–25

| **Indicator 7c** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 76%/76% | 77%/77% | 78%/78% | 79%/79% | 80%/80% | 81%/81% |
| Result | 73.7%/69.3% | 71.5%/72.2% | 68.3%/85.3% | - | - | - |
| Target Met | No | No | No/Yes | - | - | - |

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

### Description

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

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

### Measurement

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

### Target Met: Yes

### Parent Involvement/Input Targets and Results for FFYs 2020–25

| **Indicator 8** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 95% | 95.5% | 96% | 96.5% | 97% | 97.5% |
| Result | 99.64% | 99.63% | 99.67% | - | - | - |
| Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | - | - |

## Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

### Description

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

### Measurement

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

### Target Met: No

### Disproportionate Representation Targets and Results for FFYs 2020–25

| **Indicator 9** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Result | 0.27% | 0.47% | 0.33% | - | - | - |
| Target Met | No | No | No | - | - | - |

## Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation by Disability Categories

### Description

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

### Measurement

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

### Target Met: No

### Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories Targets and Results for FFYs 2020–25

| **Indicator 10** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Results | 6.0% | 4.43% | 2.98% | - | - | - |
| Target Met | No | No | No | - | - | - |

## Indicator 11: Child Find

### Description

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

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

### Measurement

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

### Target Met: No

### Child Find Targets and Results for FFYs 2020–25

| **Indicator 11** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Result | 97.62% | 93.99% | 94.03% | - | - | - |
| Target Met | No | No | No | - | - | - |

## Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

### Description

Indicator 12 is a compliance indicator that measures the percent of children referred by the infant program (IDEA Part C, early intervention services for children birth through age 2) prior to age three, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday. These data were collected through CALPADS and data from the Department of Developmental Services (DDS). The DDS is the lead agency for IDEA Part C.

### Measurement

The indicator is calculated as follows:

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

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

### Target Met: No

### Early Childhood Transition Targets and Results for FFYs 2020–25

| **Indicator 12** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Result | 72.59% | 78.15% | 76.09% | - | - | - |
| Target Met | No | No | No | - | - | - |

## Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

### Description

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

### Measurement

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

### Target Met: No

### Secondary Transition Targets and Results for FFYs 2020–25

| **Indicator 13** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Results | 95.33% | 94.89% | 95.25% | - | - | - |
| Target Met | No | No | No | - | - | - |

## Indicator 14: Post-school Outcomes

### Description

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

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

### Measurement

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

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

### Target Met:

1. No
2. No
3. Yes

### Post-school Outcomes Targets and Results for FFYs 2020–25

| **Indicator 14** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 14a Target | 55% | 56% | 57% | 58% | 59% | 60% |
| 14a Result | 46.6% | 47.93% | 50.81% | - | - | - |
| 14a Target Met | No | No | No | - | - | - |
| 14b Target | 75% | 76.5% | 78% | 79.5% | 81% | 82.5% |
| 14b Result | 70.3% | 74.53% | 75.06 | - | - | - |
| 14b Target Met | No | No | No | - | - | - |
| 14c Target | 87% | 87.5% | 88% | 88.5% | 89% | 89.5% |
| 14c Result | 88.9% | 91.12% | 90.46% | - | - | - |
| 14c Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | - | - |

## Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

### Description

Indicator 15 is a performance indicator that measures the percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. This data is collected by the California State Office of Administrative Hearings and reported to the CDE.

### Measurement

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

### Target Met: No

### Resolution Sessions Targets and Results for FFYs 2020–25

| **Indicator 15** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 40% | 41% | 42% | 43% | 44% | 45% |
| Result | 9.86% | 8.18% | 5.38% | - | - | - |
| Target Met | No | No | No | - | - | - |

## Indicator 16: Mediation

### Description

Indicator 16 is a performance indicator that measures the percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. This data is collected by the California State Office of Administrative Hearings and reported to the CDE.

### Measurement

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

### Target Met: No

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

| **Indicator 16** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 65% | 66% | 67% | 68% | 69% | 70% |
| Result | 18.79% | 16.92% | 9.15% | - | - | - |
| Target Met | No | No | No | - | - | - |

## Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

### *Section A: Data Analysis*

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

The comprehensive improvement efforts initiated by LEAs are outlined in their local control and accountability plans (LCAPs). The Theory of Action for California’s SSIP hypothesized that if California required each LEA to establish a comprehensive improvement plan and developed instructions to ensure that the plan included appropriate improvement activities for SWDs, then each LEA would create an improvement plan that included evidence-based strategies and goals targeting high-needs students, including SWDs, which would result in increased access to instruction for SWDs and improved academic outcomes accordingly. Since Phase III, California progressed toward ensuring that LCAPs include and address performance of SWDs, including the passage of legislation [Assembly Bill (AB)1808, Chapter 32, Statutes of 2018] to ensure the integration of LEA efforts to improve outcomes for SWD and the LCAP specifically. The Theory of Action can be found here: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/mar17item01.doc>, attachment 4.

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

In the 2022-23 state budget, California continued to invest in the SSOS by expanding the consideration of SWDs in the LCAP. Commencing on July 1, 2025, identified LEAs will be required to create and submit an IDEA LCAP addendum. The intent of the IDEA addendum is to outline LEA plans and efforts to improve outcomes for SWDs.

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

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

California’s State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR) is the performance of all SWDs who took the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress in both English Language Arts and Mathematics. California’s SSIP is focused on creating systemic and sustainable changes, including necessary alignment in statewide accountability and improvement structures like the SSOS to improve outcomes for SWDs.

Reflected in the table below is the percentage of students with IEPs whom a proficiency level was assigned for the assessment.

### Progress toward the SiMR

| **Indicator 17** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 14% | 14% | 15% | 16% | 17% | 18% |
| Result | 12.2% | 14.07% | 14.57% | - | - | - |
| Target Met | No | Yes | No | - | - | - |

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

This next section highlights the principal activities, measures, and outcomes that were implemented since the last SSIP submission. The next sections illustrate the improvement strategies that were implemented and the short-term outcomes that were achieved. Additionally, specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities which demonstrated an impact to the SiMR are also outlined.

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

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

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

### Open Access Project

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

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

The OA project aligns with the SSOS goals of increasing access to inclusive environments and quality curriculum and instruction for SWDs. In turn, increasing access to inclusive environments and engagement with quality curriculum and instruction will positively impact academic achievement, discipline rates, graduation rates, and post-secondary outcomes and support students served in the LRE. Another valuable student outcome is improved student agency, development of students’ voices, and self-advocacy skills.

In the Universal Support TA, includes supporting capacity development at multiple levels through disseminating content regarding UDL foundation learning, UDL exploration, and by curating an extensive online UDL resource bank. In the area of Targeted Support TA, OA developed two primary activities. The first is a capacity building trainer of trainer program. The second, provides support to LEAs who voluntarily undertake continuous improvement work related to the dashboard and state indicator targets. Intensive Support TA is focused on building regional leadership teams with extensive resources and knowledge to support SELPAs, LEAs, and County Office of Education (COEs) to build capacity in the chosen strand of practice. Intensive Supports are specifically designed to support directed TA to engage in continuous improvement work related to the dashboard and state indicator targets.

### California Autism Professional Training and Information Network

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

### SELPA System Improvement Leads

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

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

The SIL team provides a wide range of continuous improvement and system thinking trainings including: Introduction to Improvement Science, Improvement Science Basics, Root Cause Analysis in Action, and Compassionate Systems Leadership. One core offering, Improvement Science Basics, is a four-month course designed to provide a hands-on introduction to the tools and principles of improvement science. One hundred percent of participating teams reported making progress on their selected problem of practice. In addition, post-course surveys indicated that participants continue to utilize continuous improvement tools and methods and apply them to a range of situations including differentiated assistance, site-based improvement initiatives, and LCAP development. The SIL project continues to develop its hub for continuous improvement resources. SIL improvement facilitators guide teams through the System Improvement Journey by providing coaching support, connecting teams to tools and resources, and facilitating capacity building.

In an effort to build capacity around the implementation of High Leverage Practices (HLPs), the SIL Team has developed guidebooks, handouts, online on demand training modules and in-person training opportunities meant to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. For example, SIL offers multiple opportunities throughout the state for educators to participate in trainings such as High Leverage Practices around Mathematical Thinking and Practices for reading Routines and virtual book clubs for educators to connect on effective instructional strategies.

### Imperial County SELPA

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

The IC SELPA’s work has been built around assisting the CDE with the statewide dissemination and implementation of the California Practitioners’ Guide for Educating English Learners with Disabilities. The IC SELPA has created various PD, a website which hosts numerous resources, and has engaged in TA with practitioners statewide, to improve the practices of SELPA, COE & LEAs. Practitioners are provided with support to address key themes and topics within the CA Practitioners’ Guide for Educating ELs with Disabilities to include, but not limited to: MTSS and targeted interventions for multilingual learners, pre-referral and referral processes, culturally and linguistically appropriate assessment, evidence-based instructional practices and pedagogy for ELs with disabilities, IEP development, and reclassification of ELs with disabilities.

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

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

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

The ED&D team identified different ways to meet the challenge of measuring student-level outcomes, while also focusing on building capacity for good data use and the implementation of MTSS to prevent disproportionality. The ED&D collected comprehensive survey data from LEAs all over California about disproportionality awareness, practices that contribute to disproportionality, and practices that reduce disproportionality. The ED&D continues to use the data to inform and develop more services for promoting equity in schools.

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

### Open Access Project

The OA project supports the delivery of UDL and EBPs through the MTSS model utilizing three tiers of support accessible to LEAs: Universal, Targeted, and Intensive.

Universal Support: OA offers robust content to support exploration and foundational knowledge development for UDL and EBPs. Resources and tools are accessible on the OA Website (<https://www.openaccess-ca.org/>). LEAs, COEs, and SELPAs have the opportunity to explore the resources and tools produced and shared on the website to build foundational knowledge to explore future implementation. Content and supports include exploration of UDL, foundational understanding of UDL, and how to apply the principles of UDL in individualized contexts. Actionable tools (UDL Troubleshooting Approach, UDL Lesson Look Fors, stations for Math, Reading, Writing, Science;), resources (UDL Roadmap, UDL QuickGuide, Digital Tools & Support Guide) and virtual learning modules (e.g., UDL Goal Writing; Designing Effective Assessments, Expert Learning) are readily accessible and deepen understanding of new UDL learners. All of the resources are also available through the OA link on the CalTAN website, not only to LEAs but to anyone worldwide seeking information about the UDL framework and evidence-based and best practices for student accessibility.

Targeted Capacity Building: OA continues the development of content capacity building utilizing its current trainer-of-trainer model to support geographic areas in need of a Regional Lead. COEs, SELPAs and/or LEAs interested in serving as a Regional Lead in one of the three focus areas (AT, AAC, UDL) may complete a Regional Readiness Assessment to determine if they have the capacity to serve as a Regional Lead. The Regional Readiness Assessment supports the development of goals for implementation and an action plan.

Intensive Support: Activities support directed technical assistance to engage in continuous improvement work related to the dashboard and state indicator targets. LEAs in Intensive Support are referred through CDE or SSOS partners. At the Intensive Level, OA provides sustained Technical Assistance activities for LEAs and COEs identified through Continuous Improvement Monitoring (CIM) or Differentiated Assistance (DA) due to identified root cause problems directly related to student access. Intensive Support activities include all elements and activities in the Universal and Targeted levels with additional alignment and support for DA and CIM reporting activities. LEAs receiving technical assistance at the intensive tier will also participate in monthly implementation and progress monitoring meetings and optional weekly office hours for support. Additionally, OA offers support in the development of an implementation plan for the establishment of a UDL demonstration site by designing a professional learning plan to support educators at all levels: administrators, teachers, service providers, and paraeducators, emphasizing shared accountability. OA supports the development of UDL demonstration sites with the use of the CCEE UDL Journey Guide, Implementation Science, and the District Capacity Assessment. These tools help to develop an organizational model that incorporates data-based decision-making, facilitates and develops leadership around the EBPs and can develop system interventions that address barriers and enhance the ability to scale up activities from the demonstration site to the district as a whole.

The OA project measures impact at all three levels. There is a dynamic feedback loop built into the structure where successful practices and strategies at the Targeted and Intensive levels are reviewed and shared back out at the Universal level ensuring access to practices and strategies that have been proven effective.

OA qualitative measurements include but are not limited to the following: the number of LEAs with UDL Demonstration Sites, number of participants trained, number of trainings. Qualitative measures include: Fidelity of Training, Fidelity of Coaching, Facilitator Review, Pre/Post Knowledge and Skill of Learners, and others.

Organizational (District/Site) Quantitative Measures include, but are not limited to: District Capacity Assessment, District/Site Readiness, UDL Site Readiness.

### California Autism Professional Training and Information Network

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

The CAPTAIN Cadre members continue to implement trainings on EBPs for Autism and other developmental disabilities using fidelity measures for effective adult education/training practices. Each training is accompanied by an established pre- and post-assessment of knowledge to determine the effectiveness of the trainer at conveying the core components to the training participants. The CAPTAIN has developed and posted free trainings on: *What is Autism*, *Understanding and Selecting EBPs for Autism* and 27 EBP trainings for Autism all of which include pre- and post- training knowledge assessments. The CAPTAIN Cadre provide coaching using the National Professional Development Center on Autism coaching model. Coaching is a requirement of all the school-based CAPTAIN Cadres because it is a key ingredient for the successful implementation of EBPs for Autism and other developmental disabilities. Coaching ensures that educators make informed decisions about instruction and program organization that will lead to intervention practices that help children and youth with Autism and other developmental disabilities learn more effectively.

The CAPTAIN website [www.captain.ca.gov](http://www.captain.ca.gov/) is the repository of the tools and resources used in these efforts to implement EBPs with fidelity for individuals with Autism and other developmental disabilities to improve student outcomes. From July 1, 2022, through June 30, 2023, the website has recorded 18,000 users in 31,000 Sessions. The most visited pages were those posting free materials and resources, pre-made EBP trainings and the page especially dedicated to families of individuals with Autism and family support personnel.

### SELPA System Improvement Leads

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

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

* Participation in Networked Improvement Communities (NICs)
* Engagement in the CIM activities required by the CDE
* More than 100 improvement projects focused on improving outcomes for SWDs in a variety of areas [e.g., disproportionality, FAPE in the LRE, IEP development and facilitation, special education policy and procedure]

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

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

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

### Imperial County SELPA

The IC SELPA *Improving Outcomes for ELs with Disabilities* content lead grant project continues to be committed to improving an educational system where the implementation of equitable and inclusive servicers are inherent in every LEA, that lead to pathways to success for ELs with disabilities which are fully developed and positive outcomes for dually identifies students are evident. To accomplish this critical work, the IC SELPA team extends the reach of support state-wide through a tiered system of support including through Level 1 supports: statewide in-person or virtual PD, TA & access to website/resources; Level 2 supports: Level 1 supports, including targeted and customized PD and TA for SELPAs, COE and/or LEA multidisciplinary teams and/or LEA Community of Practice (CoP) data-based identified needs; and Level 3 supports: Level 1 & 2 supports, plus additional year(s) of customized PD, TA, and consultative support to further integration of resources, best practices, and continued data analysis with CoPs multidisciplinary team members.

To date the IC SELPA has trained 6,698 practitioners across California, representing various roles including, but not limited to: general & special education teachers and site administrators, LEA & COE EL Specialists, SELPA administrators, COE & LEA Special Education administrators, School Psychologists, and Speech Pathologists. Participants represent: 141 SELPAs, 52 COEs & 631 LEAs from across California.

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

Qualitative data measures are summarized through survey, and social media feedback, from attendees of content lead provided statewide PD, satisfaction of participants of institutes and conferences. Also, the feedback received from participants of customized PD & TA sessions as obtained from each survey provided after each session, surveys administered to measure educator’s increase in self-efficacy in their own abilities to implement best practices as outlined in the CA Practitioners Guide for Educating ELs with Disabilities to increase positive outcomes.

Based on the state-evaluated outcomes for each improvement strategy and evaluation data, presented by RTI International’s “SELPA Lead Evaluation (2022 – 2023) Overview of Findings”, the Improving Outcomes for ELs with Disabilities, SELPA Content Leads decided to continue implementing each improvement strategy listed above. The state-evaluated outcome data indicated, coaching, targeted/customized PD, responsiveness, collaboration, practice and implementation opportunities, tools and resources, along with network connections all were positive features to support capacity building with ratings above 90% in all areas. As many as 97% of participants strongly agreed to the use of continuous improvement strategies with the support of SELPA leads.

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

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

The ED&D team will continue to expand services and partnerships. The ED&D will continue providing professional learning opportunities to support school and district multi-disciplinary teams with the implementation of academic and social-emotional interventions that promote increased learning with diverse learners. The ED&D will provide technical assistance to LEAs, SELPAs as well as County Office’s in their equity goals and in addressing their DA and or CIM status via customizable PD training, coaching opportunities, and technical assistance with a human centered approach. Using iTAAP, a real time analytic data tool, LEAs will also be able to monitor their Dashboard Indicators, CIM Indicators and prepare/predict future performance, ensure compliance and prevent disproportionality.

### SELPA System Improvement Leads

The CDE’s monitoring framework uses a tiered system that differentiates the level of monitoring and TA support for each LEA based on data analyses and that LEA’s need. At the core of the monitoring framework is the CIM process.

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

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

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

### Open Access Project

The OA project began providing TA to 15 LEAs that were identified for Intensive Monitoring as each district worked through the CIM process. The TA provided to LEAs by the OA team includes: individual and team coaching, data analysis, analysis of strengths and weaknesses, provision of resources to support required activities, and meeting facilitation.

**A Summary of Each Infrastructure Improvement Strategy and the Anticipated Outcomes**

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

Moving forward through June 2023, ED&D will continue to use the three guiding tenets of the project: awareness, action, and scale. At the heart of the ED&D project is the community-based design model. By taking this collaborative approach, ED&D continues to establish cross-functional teams that approach Disproportionality and SWD outcomes through the three guiding tenets. The ED&D looks to further strengthen the relationship between SELPA leads, COEs, industry partners and stakeholders to help build and define its community-based design model.

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

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

### Open Access Project

Over the next five years, OA will continue to network and expand the work by prioritizing planned and intentional collaboration with state leads and partners. Open Access will continue to develop and co-host UDL exploration webinars with EWIG/CCIL. OA will collaborate with partners within the SSOS for LEAs with access-related root causes, problems of practice for TA support, and resource development.

The OA Project continues to be committed to continuing to build the infrastructure of technical assistance, training resources, trainers, coaches, and regional implementation teams to ensure that the educational system moves closer to making UDL frameworks the way of teaching and learning.

### California Autism Professional Training and Information Network

The CAPTAIN will continue to provide implementation coaching to build the capacity of the SELPA Director, Regional Implementation Lead and the SELPA Autism Implementation Team at each of the 17 CAPTAIN regions in California to develop the necessary system to sustain the work of this grant. The CAPTAIN will base the TA on the Active Implementation Frameworks using resources and tools developed by the NIRN and the SISEP Center to ensure sufficient attention is given to stabilization, sustainability, scaling, and efficiency. The CAPTAIN will incorporate the following principles:

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

The CAPTAIN will conduct activities in 17 CAPTAIN regions in California that will lead to the development of demonstration sites where EBPs for Autism and other developmental disabilities can be observed in a variety of classroom settings. The CAPTAIN will continue to develop the CAPTAIN data system to support the fidelity of high-quality training and implementation coaching of EBPs for autism and other developmental disabilities that supports data driven decision-making. The CAPTAIN is committed to supporting teams to develop their implementation capacity to ensure sustainability and will continue to scale up support across the state to improve outcomes for students with autism and other developmental disabilities.

### SELPA System Improvement Leads

Looking toward the next reporting cycle, the SIL project will continue its direct support to SELPAs, COEs, and LEAs. In addition to providing support to individual improvement efforts, the SIL will serve as a hub for a NIC in FFY 2023. This network will bring together teams across the state with a common aim of improving the quality of IEPs for students with disabilities. The SIL will provide advanced data analysis, coaching support, and access to research-based change ideas to all teams participating in the network. Key learnings will be shared out with the field to allow for spread of these strategies. The SIL will also continue to develop the IDC and provide access to data tools that allow for analysis of current special education data including disaggregating to the student level. These reports will be a powerful complement to the existing historical data displays on the IDC, empowering leaders to engage in ongoing analysis of their special education data. The SIL team is committed to walking alongside teams as they tackle their most pressing challenges and will continue to scale up support across the state in service of improving outcomes for students with disabilities.

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

### Imperial County SELPA

The IC SELPA team will continue to collaborate with existing leads working on supports for multilingual learners statewide by leveraging existing lead agency partnerships and mechanisms to extend the reach of support. The IC SELPA team intends on continuing to provide PD, resources and TA on topics related to the California Practitioners’ Guide for Educating ELs with Disabilities through a 3-tier approach.

Level one support will offer all Lead Agencies, SELPAs, COEs, and LEAs, access to on-demand professional development modules and resources. Participants will streamline their PD needs from a wide range of training modules and resources specifically designed on topics within the CA Practitioners’ Guide for Educating ELs with Disabilities. PD courses are designed and organized with a range of audiences in mind (i.e.. General and Special educators, administrators, and service providers) and will be accessible to all statewide. Access to our website, containing various resources related to CA English Language Development Standards, EL Roadmap, and CAASSPP resources will continue to be available as it supports leaders, multidisciplinary teams, and practitioners statewide.

Level 2 support will include in-person and virtual customized PD and resources to State lead agencies including (Regional English Learner Leads (RELS), Geo Leads, CalECse, Open Access), and COEs to build their capacity in identified areas of need/problems of practice related to dually identified students. The best practices as referenced in the California Practitioners’ Guide for Educating ELs with Disabilities will be the grounding resource for these sessions and will be designed to equip the state lead agencies with training tools, common language, and resources to implement and facilitate training and technical assistance to their respective COEs, SELPAs, and LEAs within their regions. At the level 2 tier of support, we plan to collaborate with existing special education resource leads and other lead agencies to co-facilitate or share and build integrated resources, to leverage the established partnerships with the State lead agencies to develop CoP cohorts.

Level 3 support will focus on establishing north and south cohorts of multidisciplinary teams (MDTs) to include, at a minimum, a REL and a Special education lead within regions to engage in CoP. This CoP will focus on problems of practice related to dually identified students in their respective regions and the MDTs will receive customized PD, resources, and TA to support them through the state monitoring CIM process. Additionally, work with selected LEAs provided by the CDE to support their practices in supporting Multilingual learners with disabilities. In addition to the professional development, resources and TA provided through the levels of support, our team will participate as presenters in a select number of conferences including the California Association for Bilingual Education Conference (CABE), the California Assessment Conference (CAC), the ACSA Every Child Counts and Equity Conferences, and the California MTSS Conference.

Through these activities, the IC SELPA, Improving Outcomes for Multilingual Learners with Disabilities team will focus our resources to establish partnerships with lead agencies statewide and continue to collaborate with existing partners working together on designing and refining systems to support the needs of dually identified students statewide.

### The Evidence-based Practices Implemented in the Reporting Period

In this section, there is a summary of evidence-based practices implemented by two California funded projects. They are as follows:

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

The Supporting Inclusive Practices (SIP) Project

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

### California Multi-Tiered System of Support

The CA MTSS Framework is a systemic, continuous-improvement framework designed to provide effective TA for LEAs and schools to address every student’s academic, behavioral, and socio-emotional needs in the most inclusive and equitable learning environment. Driven by policies and practice, strong leadership, family and community engagement, staff collaboration, and data-driven decision-making, the framework aims to help LEAs and schools increase attendance, prevent dropouts, lower disciplinary rates, improve school climate, and boost academic performance. The CA MTSS Framework aligns with numerous state, regional, county, district, school, family, and community resources to provide a unified educational framework that is universally designed and differentiated to meet individual needs. The framework contains three levels or tiers: 1) universal support for all students, 2) supplemental services for students who require more academic or behavioral assistance and 3) individualized help for those with the most significant needs.

Co-leading this effort is the Orange County Department of Education (OCDE) and the Butte County Office of Education (BCOE). This collaborative effort involving a state design and advisory team created a pilot program (2018-2023) to implement a school culture/climate training based on the CA MTSS Framework. This work aimed to expand upon restorative approaches, positive behavior intervention, as well as support social and emotional learning, and minimize the use of emergency interventions. The OCDE created an online certification course, the CA MTSS Pathway Certification for Schools, to build knowledge of the CA MTSS Framework and make explicit and meaningful connections to the participant’s work as an educator in order to provide more inclusive and equitable learning environments for all students and families. The Course Learning Objectives are: (1) Deepen understanding of the What, Why, and How of CA MTSS, (2) Discover resources to support implementation of CA MTSS in the work as educators, support inclusive and equitable learning environments, and engage students and families in the community, (3) Collaborate with other educators to share practices that support the academic, behavioral, and social-emotional success of all students, and (4) Determine CA MTSS/LCAP alignment to support working with students in order to enhance and implement LCAP and school site goals and services. Specific evidence-based practices include: Continuous improvement via Implementation Science and Improvement Science, Social-emotional learning to support social-emotional competencies, Restorative practices, Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports, Universal Design for Learning, Culturally Linguistically Relevant and Responsive Teaching, and Trauma informed practices. The OCDE continues to utilize the CA MTSS Pathway Certification for Schools online course as professional learning for school sites, LEAs, and coaches for Phase 3 (2021-2026). Additionally, the Guide to Implementing California MTSS serves as a useful tool for district and school leadership teams and provides practical guidance and resources for educators implementing the CA MTSS Framework.

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

CoPs are groups of practitioners who share a domain of interest and strive to do it better. Membership implies a commitment to the domain and, therefore, a shared competence that distinguishes members from others. In pursuing their interest in their domain, members engage in joint activities and discussions, build relationships, help and learn from each other, share information, and care about their standing with each other—in short, a shared practice.

### Supporting Inclusive Practices

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

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

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

The second set of practices articulated via the Blueprint is associated with building support for inclusion through evidence, including: (1) gathering data about inclusion from stakeholders; (2) assessing the environment to determine areas of strength and limitation; (3) building support through collaborative strategic planning focused on equity; and (4) examining current policies and practices associated with inclusion. The building approach is based upon two evidence-based practices: (1) data-driven decision making or using evidence to inform practice; and (2) collaborative, community-based support for policy and practice changes.

The third domain, implementing, focuses on evidence surrounding organizational change that unfreezing an organization and focusing on a learning and growth culture are essential for transformation. The aim with this phase is to support schools and districts in adopting a learning and growth disposition to inclusion policy and practice. The implementation phase is about assisting districts in implementation of EBPs. These practices include co-teaching, UDL, scheduling work with master calendars that foster inclusive classrooms, active and culturally relevant pedagogical strategies, leadership commitment and actions supporting inclusion.

Scaling up, the fourth domain, refers to broadening the use of EBPs across a district. In this instance those practices are identified by the SIP Matrix of Classroom practices, which include evidence-based domains associated with: (1) culturally responsive pedagogy, (2) evidence-based learning environment elements, (3) behavior interventions, (4) engagement, (5) representation in action and expression.

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

**A Summary of Each of the Evidence-based Practices and Activities**

### California Multi-Tiered System of Support

CA MTSS Pathway Certification for Schools:

Learning opportunities provided in the certification course, coaching, and CoP build or enhance the social-emotional well-being of youth. The CA MTSS Pathway Certification for Schools is a self-paced, asynchronous course designed to be completed individually, with a colleague, or school team. Educators must complete the following sections to obtain certification (in 12-18 months, recommended):

* Get Started CA MTSS (Section 1),
* Foundations of CA MTSS - What, Why, and How (Sections 2-4),
* Role-Specific Pathways for Teachers, Administrators, School Counselors, School Psychologists, School Based Mental Health Clinicians, Paraeducators, Coaches, and Higher Education-Teacher Educators (Sections 5-10), and
* Reflection and Call to Action (Section 11).

Within each module, learners engage in lessons, discussions, and activities that require reading and writing related to the above-mentioned topics. Each level builds upon the previous one, and each section has a series of Reflections and BADGE Activities. Reflections are optional, while all BADGE Activities are required to advance to the next activity. Some BADGE Activities provide a choice on how to complete the activity. Even though there is a choice, the activity submission of the is required. Each role-specific pathway of the course allows educators to make connections to their role to provide a continuum of support to meet students’ academic, behavioral, social-emotional and mental health needs.

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

Each Region or COE has formed a CoP for the purpose of providing ongoing TA and support for schools and LEAs as they continue to scale up and sustain their work with CA MTSS implementation. Members engage in joint activities and discussions, help each other, learn from each other and share information. CoPs are hosted in person or online or combination option. Each CoP identifies one of the CA MTSS Domains or Features to further explore and share best and/or current practices.

### Supporting Inclusive Practices

This approach is built upon asking district SIP participants to engage in all five of the evidence-based domains of the Blueprint for Inclusion as outlined above. The way SIP supports the implementation of those five domains is seen in the tiered approach to grant implementation.

What SIP delivers is the content associated with the five domains of the Blueprint for Inclusion. How SIP delivers that content is through a tiered system of support. In this tiered model, all districts in California have access to the Blueprint via professional development and information provided via our website and the SpecialEDge newsletter (Tier One), but districts specifically involved in the project have dedicated support in the form of an identified SIP Staff member who provides TA, coaching/mentoring, and PD, as well as connecting the district to further resources (Tiers Two and Three). For district grantees who are formally engaged in the SIP project, SIP delivers Blueprint content through: (1) TA (each district has an assigned SIP staff member); (2) PD events; (3) The SpecialEDge Newsletter; (4) Annual Conference, i.e. the Spring Institute; (5) Virtual and in-person meetings that assist grantees in working through the Blueprint domains; (6) Culture of Accountability Workshops.

The theory of change (logic model) is that we use PD, TA, and ongoing mentoring/coaching to assist districts in engaging the five evidence-based practices of the Blueprint for Inclusion. Data from our projects reveals two key findings about the implementation of the five domains of the Blueprint. First, the more extensive the engagement in multiple domains, the more likely districts are reported by SIP staff as making progress on key inclusion goals, such as key measures of LRE. Second, the data show that the longer a district is involved in the SIP project, the more likely they are to have meaningful work across multiple blueprint domains and the more likely they are to have made significant progress toward targets on key measure of LRE. When districts take a systems approach to change related to inclusion practices – that includes leadership, using data and evidence, implementing inclusion practices, scaling up the work, and developing sustainability plans (the five blueprint domains) – they show real progress on key LRE measures.

The theory of change then is that if districts engage in the evidence-based practices of the five domains of the Blueprint of Inclusion, then increases in the knowledge, belief, and use of inclusion practices will occur, and if increases in the knowledge, belief, and use of inclusion practices occur, then districts will experience shifts in their collection organization (culture, practice, and policy) that will result in increases in LRE and student success.

**Data Collected to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation and to Assess Changes in Practice**

### California Multi-Tiered System of Support

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

The SWIFT-Fidelity Integrity Assessment (FIA) is a self-assessment used by School Leadership Teams to examine the current status of school-wide practices that have been demonstrated, through research, to provide a basis for successfully including all students who live in the school community. Results show that schools and sites in Phase 2 and Phase 3, Cohort A made progress towards implementing or sustaining implementation of the practices described in the FIA. Schools/sites in Phase 3, Cohorts B and C are already implementing or sustaining implementation on some of the practices.

The Schoolwide Implementation Tool (SIT) is a self-assessment used by School Leadership Teams to examine the current status in addressing the four domains necessary for schools to improve their climate and cultures. SIT results show that schools and sites in Phase 2 and Phase 3, Cohort A made progress toward implementing or sustaining implementation of the practices described in the SIT. Schools/sites in Phase 3, Cohorts B and C are already implementing or sustaining implementation on some of the practices.

The LEA Self-Assessment (LEASA) is a self-assessment for LEA/District Leadership Teams to examine the current status of systemic practices consistently demonstrated through research to be the components of effective district systems. Some LEAs in Phase 2 and Phase 3 made progress toward implementing or sustaining implementation on the practices described in the LEASA.

Annual outcome reports gather additional anecdotal evidence of successes and challenges and about the relationship between the CA MTSS Framework and school climate for Phase 2. For Phase 2, school administrators report on their progress toward fostering positive school climate and conditions, improving pupil-teacher relationships, increasing pupil engagement, and promoting alternative discipline practices. For Phase 3, school administrators report on establishing inclusive academic and behavior instruction and support, inclusive transformative social-emotional instruction and mental health support, trauma screening, trauma-informed practices, and culturally relevant, affirming, and sustaining practices.

### Supporting Inclusive Practices

For the grantees we monitor / evaluate progress related to their implementation of the Blueprint in three ways, keeping with the SIP logic model / theory of change which articulates the following:

In keeping with the SIP logic model / theory of change that is aligned with the Blueprint for Inclusion, district engagement is examined first in the projects through tracking participation and the Blueprint areas of focus for their work. Without involvement, the theory of action would suggest, there would not be desired changes in individual knowledge of, belief about, and use of inclusive practices. Engagement data collection is completed through a project monitoring process and database that each SIP Staff member complete on a quarterly basis. This quarterly reporting involves each SIP district liaison team member recording their interactions with the content of the work (related to the Blueprint) and participation of districts. Data indicates that grantees on average met multiple times per quarter with the SIP team, and overwhelmingly are focused on the scaling up component of the Blueprint, or the broad adoption of evidence-based inclusion practices in classrooms.

Second, the immediate outcomes of the project were evaluated (as noted in the SIP Logic Model) for increased knowledge, belief, and use of blueprint domains of practices through two evaluation methods:

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

Third, continually examine “what works.” During the 2022-23 academic year, four rigorous case studies were conducted of successful SIP districts. the findings illuminated the importance of systemic efforts to reform and build upon the five domains of the Blueprint. There were four key takeaways that relate to fidelity of implementation to access practice change. One, action often precedes belief in inclusion. This finding indicates that beliefs don’t change through more training, but rather through having educators see and try inclusive practices. Two, confirming domain one of the Blueprint, leadership support is central to districts that have been successful in implementing inclusive practices. Third, building collective investment was a key characteristic of success stories associated with inclusion. Fourth, champions of inclusion were found in each case study as drivers of practices and actions that helped to create success with implementation of the five domains of the Blueprint for Inclusion.

Fourth, the theory of change indicates that if immediate outcomes are associated with increased knowledge, belief, and use of Blueprint domains of practice, then there are desired changes in least restrictive environments. We annually examine state data associated with least restrictive environment to examine whether or not desired changes can be observed over the long term. Positive changes in LRE have occurred particularly in districts that have done two things: (1) broadly implemented the Blueprint for Inclusion; and (2) stay in the project for multiple years.

**Next Steps for each Evidence-Based Practices and the Anticipated Outcomes to be Attained During the Next Reporting Period**

### California Multi-Tiered System of Support

CA MTSS Pathway Certification for Schools:

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

Coaching:

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

Communities of Practice (CoP):

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

Annual fidelity of implementation measures are anticipated to show the following: Progress at the school level towards addressing the four domains necessary for schools to improve their climate and cultures as measured by the SIT; progress at the school level towards implementing school-wide practices that have been demonstrated through research to provide a basis for successfully including all students who live in the school community as measured by the SWIFT-FIA; progress at the LEA level towards sustainable systemic practices that have been consistently demonstrated through research to be the components of effective district systems as measured by the LEASA, and reports of school sites’; and progress in fostering positive school climate and conditions, improving pupil-teacher relationships, increasing pupil engagement, and promoting alternative discipline practices along with how efforts will be sustained after the grant period ends.

Growth in the above areas is expected to lead to positive student outcomes including changes in rates of suspensions or expulsion, discipline referrals, referrals to special education, pupil attendance, incidents of bullying or harassment, graduation rates, dropout rates, and measures of pupil academic achievement.

### Supporting Inclusive Practices

A key finding from our 2022–23 case studies of successful SIP districts was that seeing and doing key practices associated with the Blueprint for Inclusion was important in creating the mindset shifts necessary to support deep, sustainable inclusion work. Mindset is a central element of success in advancing inclusion in any school or district. With our findings associated with the importance of seeing inclusion at work and supporting individuals to then try those practices in their own schools’ contexts, we have envisioned SIP 3.0. SIP 3.0 will have a focus on the identification of schools that are exemplars in inclusion and then creating opportunities for SIP participant districts to visit those schools to see inclusion at work. In this way we are transforming our work to make examples of deep implementation of the Blueprint for Inclusion visible.

### Section C: Stakeholder Engagement History

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

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

**Specific Strategies Implemented to Engage Interested Parties in Key Improvement Efforts**

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

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