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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 2023–24.

## 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 eighteen 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 eighteen 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 OSEP has added Indicator 18 to the FFY 2023 submission of the SPP/APR. This is a compliance indicator and will be a permanent addition to the number of indicators. This indicator focuses on the states’ exercise of its general supervision responsibility to monitor its LEAs for requirements under Part B of the IDEA through the reporting on timely correction of noncompliance. Since this is a compliance indicator, the target is set at 100 percent by OSEP and did not require SBE approval.

The APR describes California’s progress on six compliance indicators, eleven performance indicators, and one indicator with both compliance and performance components. The attached report is for program year 2023–24.

## Recommendation

The California Department of Education (CDE) recommends the SBE review and approve the Executive Summary of the FFY 2023 APR for Part B of the IDEA covering program year 2023–24 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 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 18 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 2024, the SBE approved the FFY 2022 APR Executive Summary which reported on the progress of the 2022–23 compliance and performance indicators as required by the IDEA. The SBE also approved California’s SSIP Phase III report 8. Please see item 05: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr24/agenda202401.asp>.

In January 2023, the SBE approved the FFY 2021 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 04: <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 03: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr21/agenda202103.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 2023 (Program Year 2023–24) (64 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 (SWDs), 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 SWDs. 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 SWDs 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 for SWDs in California.

## Accountability and Data Collection

In accordance with the IDEA, California is required to report annually to the US 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 18 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 SWDs. 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 FFY 2023, which is equivalent to California’s school year 2023–24. Indicators 1, 2, and 4 (graduation, dropout, and expulsion/suspension rates, respectively) are reported in lag years using data from school year 2022–23. The 18 federal indicators include 11 performance indicators, 6 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 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, in another postsecondary education/training program, 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 |
| Compliance | 18 | General Supervision |

## Overview of Population and Services

During FFY 2023 a total of 851,011 students from birth to twenty-two years received special education services from LEAs. There are 5,837,690 transitional kindergarten through grade twelve students enrolled in California; of those 805,271, are SWDs who comprise 13.79 percent of that population. Almost half of SWDs in California (48.6 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 (22 percent). Of all students with disabilities, Hispanic/Latino students represent the greatest numbers of students in need of special education and related services (60 percent) followed by white students (19 percent). Tables 2 and 3 are based on SWDs birth to twenty-two years.

California serves 91,976 SWDs aged 3 to 5 years old. Almost 44 percent of those students attend preschool; almost half (49 percent) of 3 to 5 year olds have a primary disability of Speech or Language Impairment followed by Autism (40 percent). Additionally, there are 522,241 students in just transitional kindergarten and kindergarten; of those 56,993 are SWDs. Almost 11 percent of students in the two-year kindergarten grades are SWDs.

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 (32.92 percent), followed by Speech or Language Impairment (21.31 percent).

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

| **Disability** | **Number of Students** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Specific Learning Disability (SLD) | 280,123 | 32.92 |
| Speech or Language Impairment (SLI) | 181,379 | 21.31 |
| Autism (AUT) | 169,430 | 19.91 |
| Other Health Impairment (OHI) | 126,335 | 14.84 |
| Intellectual Disability (ID) | 40,298 | 4.74 |
| Emotional Disturbance (ED) | 21,765 | 2.56 |
| Hard of Hearing (HH) | 9,538 | 1.12 |
| Multiple Disability (MD) | 8,872 | 1.04 |
| Orthopedic Impairment (OI) | 6,147 | 0.72 |
| Deafness (DEAF) | 2,818 | 0.33 |
| Visual Impairment (VI) | 2,528 | 0.30 |
| Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) | 1,331 | 0.16 |
| Established Medical Disability (EMD) | 352 | 0.04 |
| Deaf Blindness (DB) | 95 | 0.01 |
| Total | 851,011 | 100.0 |

Source: CALPADS, Fall 2023

In California, SWDs receive a variety of services to address their unique needs. During FFY 2023–24, there were 3,407,047 services provided to California’s SWDs, many receiving multiple services. Table 3 lists the most commonly provided services to students. The most common singular service provided was Specialized Academic Instruction (33.7 percent) followed by Language and Speech (22.8 percent).

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

| **Services** | **Number of Services Provided** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Specialized Academic Instruction | 975,223 | 33.76 |
| Language and Speech | 673,874 | 22.80 |
| Vocational/Career Services | 704,749 | 20.68 |
| Mental Health Services | 275,023 | 8.07 |
| All Other Services | 778,178 | 22.84 |
| Total | 3,407,047 | 100.0 |

Source: CALPADS, Fall 2023

## 2023–24 Annual Performance Report Indicators

During FFY 2023, California met 9 of the 17 indicators. Table 4 identifies each indicator, its target, the FFY 2023 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 | 77% | 79.26% | Yes | -3.36% |
| 2 Drop Out | 8% | 7.60% | Yes | -2.44% |
| 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 | 2.4% | 1.04% | Yes | +0.36% |
| 4B Suspension and Expulsion Rate by Race/Ethnicity | 0% | 0.33% | No | +0.33 |
| 5 Education Environments | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 5A Regular Class 80 Percent or More | 64% | 62.66% | No | +1.21% |
| 5B Regular Class Less than 40 Percent | 15% | 18.11% | No | -0.31% |
| 5C Separate Schools, Residential Facilitates, or Homebound/Hospital Placements | 2.8% | 2.36% | Yes | -0.19% |
| 6 Preschool Least Restrictive Environments | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 6A Regular Preschool | 45% | 25.36% | No | +5.02% |
| 6B Separate Schools or Classes | 27% | 45.80% | No | -2.82% |
| 6C Home | 3.5% | 4.74% | No | -1.04% |
| 7 Preschool Assessment | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 7A Positive Social-Emotional Skills | 79%/79% | 67.4%/81.9% | No/Yes | -1.6%/+1.5% |
| 7B Use of Knowledge and Skills | 79%/79% | 72.2%/85.8% | No/Yes | +1.8%/+1.1% |
| 7C Use of Appropriate Behaviors | 79%/79% | 64.4%/85.2% | No/Yes | -3.9%/-0.1% |
| 8 Parent Involvement | 96.5% | 99.69% | Yes | +0.02% |
| 9 Disproportionate Representation | 0% | 0.43% | No | +0.10% |
| 10 Disproportional Representation by Disability Category | 0% | 2.50% | No | -0.49% |
| 11 Child Find | 100% | 94.06% | No | +0.03% |
| 12 Early Childhood Transition | 100% | 85.05% | No | +8.96% |
| 13 Secondary Transition | 100% | 94.48% | No | -0.77% |
| 14 Post-school Outcomes | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 14A Enrolled in Higher Education | 58% | 53.20% | No | +2.40% |
| 14B Enrolled in Higher Education or Competitively Employed within a Year | 79.5% | 74.50% | No | -0.56% |
| 14C Enrolled in Higher Education, Postsecondary Education or Training or Competitively Employed | 88.5% | 90.30% | Yes | -0.17% |
| 15 Resolution Sessions | 43% | 4.49% | No | -0.9% |
| 16 Mediation | 68% | 8.68% | No | -0.47% |
| 17 State Systemic Improvement Plan | 16% | 14.98% | No | +0.43% |
| 18 General Supervision | 100% | 100% | Yes | N/A |

## Indicator 1: Graduation Rate

### Description

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

### Measurement

Data is reported in lag years using data from the CALPADS.

Percent = [the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14 to 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 to 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% | 79.26% | - | - |
| Target Met | Yes | 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 to 21) who exited special education due to dropping out] divided by [the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14 to 21) in the denominator] times 100.

### Target Met: Yes

### 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% | 7.60% | - | - |
| Target Met | Yes | No | No | Yes | - | - |

## 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% | 96.06% | - | - |
| Grade 4 Target Met | No | No | Yes | Yes | - | - |
| Grade 8 Target | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% |
| Grade 8 Result | 20% | 91.68% | 93.02% | 92.79% | - | - |
| Grade 8 Target Met | No | No | No | No | - | - |
| Grade 11 Target | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% |
| Grade 11 Result | 33% | 82.36% | 86.47% | 87.46% | - | - |
| Grade 11 Target Met | No | 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% | 95.95% | - | - |
| Grade 4 Target Met | No | No | Yes | Yes | - | - |
| Grade 8 Target | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% |
| Grade 8 Result | 20% | 91.18% | 92.57% | 92.41% | - | - |
| Grade 8 Target Met | No | No | No | No | - | - |
| Grade 11 Target | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% |
| Grade 11 Result | 33% | 81.59% | 85.75% | 86.79% | - | - |
| Grade 11 Target Met | No | 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% | 18.60% | - | - |
| Grade 4 Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | - |
| Grade 8 Target | 12% | 12% | 12% | 13% | 14% | 15% |
| Grade 8 Result | 11% | 12.70% | 12.68% | 13.19% | - | - |
| Grade 8 Target Met | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | - |
| Grade 11 Target | 14% | 14% | 14% | 15% | 16% | 17% |
| Grade 11 Result | 17% | 15.82% | 17.21% | 17.55% | - | - |
| Grade 11 Target Met | Yes | 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% | 19.16% | - | - |
| Grade 4 Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | - |
| Grade 8 Target | 8% | 8% | 8% | 9% | 10% | 11% |
| Grade 8 Result | 6% | 6.52% | 7.18% | 7.98% | - | - |
| Grade 8 Target Met | No | No | No | No | - | - |
| Grade 11 Target | 8% | 8% | 8% | 9% | 10% | 11% |
| Grade 11 Result | 6% | 4.09% | 4.65% | 4.84% | - | - |
| Grade 11 Target Met | No | 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% | 14.26% | - | - |
| Grade 4 Target Met | No | No | Yes | No | - | - |
| Grade 8 Target | 10% | 10% | 10% | 11% | 12% | 13% |
| Grade 8 Result | 11% | 9.44% | 12.72% | 16.67% | - | - |
| Grade 8 Target Met | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | - | - |
| Grade 11 Target | 14% | 14% | 14% | 15% | 16% | 17% |
| Grade 11 Result | 16% | 15.10% | 13.64% | 20.66% | - | - |
| Grade 11 Target Met | Yes | Yes | No | -Yes | - | - |

| **Indicator 3c Math** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade 4 Target | 7% | 7% | 7% | 8% | 9% | 10% |
| Grade 4 Result | 6% | 6.04% | 4.69% | 5.14% | - | - |
| Grade 4 Target Met | No | No | No | No | - | - |
| Grade 8 Target | 8% | 8% | 8% | 9% | 10% | 14.5% |
| Grade 8 Result | 14% | 11.66% | 10.42% | 11.60% | - | - |
| Grade 8 Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | - |
| Grade 11 Target | 6% | 6% | 6% | 7% | 8% | 11% |
| Grade 11 Result | 11% | 10.78% | 9.63% | 11.86% | - | - |
| Grade 11 Target Met | Yes | 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% | 25.29% | - | - |
| Grade 4 Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | - |
| Grade 8 Target | 37% | 37% | 37% | 36% | 35% | 34% |
| Grade 8 Result | 36% | 33.94% | 32.99% | 32.76% | - | - |
| Grade 8 Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | - |
| Grade 11 Target | 42% | 42% | 42% | 41% | 40% | 39% |
| Grade 11 Result | 42% | 38.98 | 38.20% | 38.17% | - | - |
| Grade 11 Target Met | Yes | 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% | 22.04% | - | - |
| Grade 4 Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | - |
| Grade 8 Target | 29% | 29% | 29% | 28% | 27% | 24% |
| Grade 8 Result | 25% | 22.71% | 22.75% | 23.59% | - | - |
| Grade 8 Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | - |
| Grade 11 Target | 27% | 27% | 27% | 26% | 25% | 24% |
| Grade 11 Result | 29% | 22.89% | 22.71% | 23.06% | - | - |
| Grade 11 Target Met | No | Yes | 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% | 1.04% | - | - |
| Target Met | Yes | 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:

(1) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for students with disabilities; and (2) policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. The data is 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: No

### 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% | 0.33% | - | - |
| Target Met | No | Yes | Yes | No | - | - |

## 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 TK and kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80 percent or more of the day) divided by the (total number of students aged 5 who are enrolled in TK and kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
2. Percent = [(number of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in TK and kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40 percent of the day) divided by the (total number of students aged 5 who are enrolled in TK and kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
3. Percent = [(number of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in TK and 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 TK and 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% | 62.66% | - | - |
| 5a Target Met | No | Yes | No | No | - | - |
| 5b Target | 19.5% | 18% | 16.5% | 15% | 13.5% | 12% |
| 5b Result | 17.73% | 18.60% | 18.38% | 18.11% | - | - |
| 5b Target Met | Yes | No | No | No | - | - |
| 5c Target | 3.4% | 3.2% | 3.0% | 2.8% | 2.6% | 2.4% |
| 5c Result | 2.90% | 2.57% | 2.54% | 2.36% | - | - |
| 5c Target Met | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | - | - |

## Indicator 6: Preschool Least Restrictive Environments

### Description

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

1. attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services 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% | 25.36% | - | - |
| 6a Target Met | No | No | No | No | - | - |
| 6b Target | 33% | 31% | 29% | 27% | 25% | 23% |
| 6b Result | 37.02% | 47.87% | 47.48% | 45.80% | - | - |
| 6b Target Met | No | 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% | 4.74% | - | - |
| 6c Target Met | No | No | No | No | - | - |

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

### Description

Indicator 7A is a performance indicator that measures the percentage 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 six 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 six 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% | 67.4%/  81.9% | - | - |
| Target Met | No | No | No/Yes | 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 six 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 six 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% | 72.2%/  85.8% | - | - |
| Target Met | No | No | No/Yes | 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 six 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 six 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% | 64.4%/  85.2% | - | - |
| Target Met | No | No | No/Yes | 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% | 99.69% | - | - |
| Target Met | Yes | 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% | 0.43% | - | - |
| Target Met | No | 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% | 2.5% | - | - |
| Target Met | No | 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.

This data was 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% | 94.06% | - | - |
| Target Met | No | 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% | 85.05% | - | - |
| Target Met | No | 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% | 94.4% | - | - |
| Target Met | No | 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,
3. enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program,
4. competitively employed, or
5. 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% | 53.2% | - | - |
| 14a Target Met | No | No | No | No | - | - |
| 14b Target | 75% | 76.5% | 78% | 79.5% | 81% | 82.5% |
| 14b Result | 70.3% | 74.53% | 75.06 | 74.5% | - | - |
| 14b Target Met | No | No | No | No | - | - |
| 14c Target | 87% | 87.5% | 88% | 88.5% | 89% | 89.5% |
| 14c Result | 88.9% | 91.12% | 90.46% | 90.3% | - | - |
| 14c Target Met | Yes | 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% | 4.49% | - | - |
| Target Met | No | 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% | 8.68% | - | - |
| Target Met | No | 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 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 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 (EBPs) to effectively serve 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 seven 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

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 who scored proficient on the assessments.

### 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% | 14.98% | - | - |
| Target Met | No | Yes | No | 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 EBPs that were implemented and the strategies or activities which demonstrated an impact to the SiMR are also outlined.

**The System Improvement Leads**

The System Improvement Leads (SIL) project works collaboratively within the SSOS to build capacity of SELPAs and LEAs in the areas of continuous improvement, data best practices, and high-leverage change ideas. These foundational processes ground organizations in system alignment and coherence, ultimately resulting in meaningful, sustainable improvement in outcomes for SWD. SIL provides a broad range of support to LEAs, SELPAs, County Offices of Education (COEs), and state agencies using a tiered model:

* Universal Tier: At the Universal tier, SIL project offers free access to professional learning, resources, and tools at: <https://systemimprovement.org/>.

* Targeted Tier: At the Targeted tier, the SIL project offers customized data analysis, root cause analysis, and/or continuous improvement training and coaching at the organization’s request.
* Intensive Tier: At the Intensive tier, the SIL project works in partnership with the LEA as determined by the CDE and the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence (CCEE) to provide intensive support to assist the LEA in addressing individual needs and improve student outcomes.

**Imperial County SELPA: Project MuSE**

Imperial County (IC) SELPA is a Special Education Resource Lead within the SSOS. The project has been renamed Project MuSE: Improving Outcomes for multilingual students with exceptional needs. Given the complex needs of English learners with Disabilities, the IC SELPA provides statewide in-person and virtual training opportunities for teachers, teacher-leads/coaches, support personnel, general and special education service providers, and administrators. Project MuSE is committed to building the collective efficacy of general and special educators and their leaders, within every SELPA, to advance the achievement of English learners with Disabilities locally and across the state.

**The State Performance Plan Technical Assistance Project**

The State Performance Technical Assistance Project (SPP-TAP) provides support and services to LEAs identified by the CDE as disproportionate or significantly disproportionate to remedy both compliance and performance issues. This support includes: the development and continual training of TA facilitators that provide direct and individualized services to LEAs; virtual and live workshops for LEAs providing information on the requirements of IDEA and the CDE Compliance and Improvement Monitoring (CIM) process; coaching, resource dissemination including research on EBPs, and referrals of best practice. In 2023­­–­24, SPP-TAP provided direct support to 179 LEAs and 79 SELPAs.

**Alternative Dispute Resolution Pathways to Partnership**

Pathways to Partnership (P2P) is a new project to the SSOS network. This project was funded to provide direct TA and capacity building around special education dispute prevention and resolution to the field, including educators, community members, families, and the disability community. As this was the first year of the project, P2P was in a design phase. This design phase included leadership team members from SELPAs and family empowerment centers (FEC). P2P worked with the SED Director's Office within this design phase to integrate direct TA support within the Complaints Division at the CDE. Additionally, within the capacity building and design phase, P2P provided robust professional development (PD) to the field with over 60 offerings, statewide and co-hosted the only Special Education Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) conference with the SELPA Administrators of California Association. The improvement strategies within this process were around two prongs: Design and Capacity Building, including PD, TA, accountability and monitoring (complaints division), and scaling up across the state.

**The California Early Childhood Special Education Network**

The California Early Childhood Special Education Network (CalECSE) provides TA, professional learning, and resources that directly support Part C to Part B transitions, evaluations, and program support as well as Child Find activities. The vision of the project is to improve outcomes for children and their families by addressing and eliminating barriers to successful transition, assessment, and access to educational programming for California’s youngest children with disabilities across agencies throughout California.

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

**The System Improvement Leads**

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 through guidebooks, handouts, on-demand videos. The IDEA 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 SPP indicator data, access to annual performance reports, and analytic tools to use with data files extracted from CALPADS for 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. In the 2023–24 school year, use of the IDC more than doubled, with over 90 percent of LEAs in California, using the tool. There are more than 6,000 users utilizing the IDC to analyze data for students with disabilities.

**Imperial County SELPA: Project MuSE**

The IC SELPA, through Project MuSE continues its commitment to improving an educational system where the implementation of equitable and inclusive servicers is inherent in every LEA, that lead to pathways to success for ELs with disabilities which are fully developed and positive outcomes for dually identified students are evident. Project MuSE has designed and curated resources utilizing a tiered level of support structure that strives to recognize and honor all practitioners’ entry points and level of support needs.

Project MuSE launched a new website in October 2023 with an intuitive design that facilitated exploration and navigation of practitioner resources that run the gamut from downloadable, savable, fillable, and printable translated appendices to video modules that touch on specific issues related to the intersection of language status and the manifestation of the disability identified. Project MuSE has championed the multidisciplinary team approach, as a means of ensuring that whatever your role within your organization is, you will find a resource or tool to support meeting the needs of dually identified students.

The establishment of the new website allows practitioners to retain access to the previous grant cycle resources as well as all new content created through Project MuSE and our collaborative efforts with other members of the SSOS. Ensuring continued access long after grant funding has ended is critical to the team as well as the development and provision of on-demand, free, and asynchronous learning via Canvas.

**The State Performance Plan Technical Assistance Project**

During the 2023–24 fiscal year, SPP-TAP provided 35 PD events (in-person, virtual, and recorded) serving 973 educational staff working to address disproportionality in their LEA. Additional supports and services were provided to the SPP-TAP cohort of TA Facilitators, CDE staff and administrators, and other TA providers. SPP-TAP conducts ongoing monitoring and evaluation of all TA support provided to LEAs. The information gathered from LEAs is used for continuous improvement and enhanced services to the LEAs. Across all events 90 percent of participants rate the services received at the highest ratings (4 or 5 on a 5-point Likert scale) when asked to rate the usefulness of the information provided.

Equally important, SPP-TAP tracks and monitors the impact of services to LEAs across time. As part of ongoing evaluation efforts, SPP-TAP conducted the annual analysis of the CIM Plans submitted in the prior years (2020–2022) to find trends within the LEAs including risk ratios, root causes, improvement activities, and TA Facilitator involvement. This data is used to determine trends and best practices that result in improved student outcomes. Part of this analysis is reviewing the progression of LEAs over time.

Addressing significant disproportionality and improving equitable outcomes for all student groups involves systemic changes, the improved outcomes are typically evident over a course of 3–5 years. SPP-TAP analyzed the outcome data for 144 LEAs that were identified as significantly disproportionate in 2020 or 2021 that completed the development and implementation of one or more Plan for Improvement. As of 2024, 90 of these LEAs had reduced their disproportionality enough to not be identified by the CDE as significantly disproportionate. The rate of success across this period is 62.5 percent. The data did also show a small recidivism rate, resulting in a sustained success rate of nearly 58 percent.

**Alternative Dispute Resolution Pathways to Partnership**

In the area of PD, P2P has offered over 60 free High Quality PD opportunities to educators, parents, community members, and advocates, with over 1,100 participants statewide. P2P partnered with the SELPA Administrators of California Association to cohost the Annual Special Education ADR Conference, including offering access to 30 parents to attend the conference. P2P provided support within the conference, including offering speakers to include the lens of family and community. P2P has worked on the creation of Facilitated IEP training, piloting in several regions for feedback and revision. This training is branded and ready to be implemented statewide. P2P also partnered with the high-quality IEP resource lead to develop an IEP toolkit with an ADR focus. Established relationships with key parent and family organizations through partnerships with FECs and SEEDs of Partnership. These individuals were partners in all design phases and remain on the P2P leadership team. P2P have also established relationships with the Center for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education, the national ADR Institute and TA provider to the Federal Department of Education. Also, established a partnership with the Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund with plans to cohost training. In the area of TA and monitoring, P2P has provided direct TA to the CDE Complaints Unit and resolved cases, providing the pilot to the CDE Constituency Office. P2P has worked alongside CDE leadership in the design of Constituency office for 2024–25 implementation, as well as provided ADR training for CDE staff directly. P2P has established and created a sustainable statewide community of practice (CoP) model for educators, parents/families/advocates for the continuum of ADR.

**The California Early Childhood Special Education Network**

In the area of PD, CalECSE identified seven areas of practice that have an impact on Part C to be B transitions. These seven areas include (1) Interagency Collaboration, (2) Assessment Practices, (3) Assessment Team Leadership, (4) Preschool Child Find, (5) Parent Outreach and Support, (6) Data Governance, and (7) Innovative and Inclusive Practices. Support in these seven areas provides practitioners in the field examples and guided learning of the best practices that ensure timely and successful transitions, quality assessments, and positive outcomes for preschool age students as they transition to LEAs.

During the 2023–24 school year, the project provided 29 virtual training sessions that were available to LEA practitioners, including district administrators, school psychologists, educational specialists, speech and language specialists, as well as Part C to B agency staff and providers. The content for these CoP training sessions was specific to the seven areas of practice. The number of participants in attendance at each session is reflected in the following data: Interagency Collaboration four sessions with 718 participants, Assessment Team Leadership three sessions with 199 participants, Assessment Practices three sessions with 382 participants, Preschool Child Find two sessions with 113 participants, Parent Outreach six sessions with 443 participants, and Innovative and Inclusive Practice two sessions with 205 participants. CalECSE also provided eight in-person presentations of various sizes, ranging from approximately 30 to 120 attendees consisting of PD training, CoP groups, and/or consultations regarding application of resources.

The project has also successfully captured the essential themes of six areas of best practice through recorded mini videos ranging from four to six minutes long: Interagency Collaboration (1 video), Assessment Team Leadership (1 video), Assessment Practices (1 video), Preschool Child Find (2 videos), Parent Outreach (1 video), and Innovative and Inclusive Practices (2 videos). A longer recorded training for Data Governance on LRE and Indicator 6 was also made available on the CalECSE website.

CalECSE also provided support and answered questions from a variety of LEA practitioners and agency staff through the Network’s communication system. For the 2023–24 school year, the CalECSE Network team received inquiries for support and engaged with 117 individuals representing LEAs, Regional Centers, Colleges, FECs and others working in the field of early childhood or early childhood special education.

In addition to the virtual training that the Network hosted through the 2023–24 year, CalECSE hosted a professional two-day symposium offering in person PD with sessions provided by experts in the field. Over 600 individuals attended the event. Attendees of the symposium predominantly included LEA school psychologists, speech and language therapists, school nurses, occupational therapists, early childhood teachers and district administrators. In addition, agency staff attended including representatives from Regional Centers, FECs, and Family Resource Centers. Representatives from the CDE were also in attendance and supported a panel that provided the audience policy and position updates as they relate to serving young children with disabilities in the state of California. A total of 51 sessions were offered with a range of topic areas including assessments practices, addressing challenging behaviors, early childhood mental health, instructional strategies including Universal Design for Learning (UDL), supporting multi-language learners, inclusion including co-teaching, best practices to support Part C to B transitions, assistive and augmentative communication and successful agency collaboration.

In the area of TA, CalECSE also provided direct support to LEAs who had been identified by CDE as requiring direct TA based on their local data for Indicators 6 and 7. CalECSE supports LEAs at the implementation phase as identified in their CIM Plan. The project supports the LEAs with tangible resources and monthly meetings to support the implementation of the LEAs CIM plan. During the 2023–24 school year, CalECSE was assigned four LEAs and will continue to support these districts through the completion of their improvement plans.

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

### The System Improvement Leads

In 2023–24, the SIL team facilitated three statewide improvement networks. These networks connect educators across the state to work together on a shared problem of practice. Collectively, the networks serve more than 39,000 students with disabilities in California. Participating LEAs in the networks have increased the percentage of IEP goals met by 17 percent and improved the quality of those IEP goals by 13 percent.

**The State Performance Plan Technical Assistance Project**

As the CDE has continued to refine its CIM process, SPP-TAP made some changes to the support provided to LEAs to support improvement in student outcomes. In the 2023–24 fiscal year, SPP-TAP was able to increase the support hours provided to the 26 LEAs that were newly identified as significantly disproportionate in 2023–24, allowing for individualized support in the development of their CIM Plan. The CDE also identified several LEAs with ongoing identification of significant disproportionality who have struggled to reach compliance. SPP-TAP was able to provide more intensive support to these LEAs in collaboration with the CDE Focused Monitoring and Technical Assistance (FMTA) Consultants. SPP-TAP also developed a new CoP for LEAs that are no longer identified as significantly disproportionate to provide shared learning opportunities that enhance the sustainability of their improvement efforts and support the continued improvement of student outcomes tied to identification, placement, and discipline. Two virtual CoP meetings were held in 2023–24 with over 30 LEAs participating in the sessions.

**Alternative Dispute Resolution Pathways to Partnership**

P2P in collaboration and under direction of the CDE Director of Special Education worked to design and implement a new ADR process to occur before and concurrently with any state complaints, if complainant provided permission. This new process has resulted in the development of a new Constituent’s Office within the CDE. Additionally, P2P works to create regional implementation leads to assist in this direct TA. This was co-designed with the CDE in a continuous improvement model with the support of another special education resource lead within the SSOS, the SIL. Design and prototyping including processing mapping, intended outcomes, key processes, needs, infrastructure, and action steps. Intended future outcomes include: decreased number of CDE Special Education complaints, decreased number of state Office of Administrative Hearings filings, and Improved family/LEA relationships. Other intended outcomes are to collect accurate data related to dispute prevention and resolution as the current data collection only included when a family has made a formal complaint or due process filing. Those data collection structures have been set up.

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

**The System Improvement Leads**

Looking toward the next reporting cycle, the SIL project will continue its direct support to SELPAs, COEs, LEAs, and state agencies. The project will continue providing high quality TA to LEAs as needing intensive-level support through the CIM process. SIL will also continue supporting LEAs to make measurable improvement at the student-level by facilitating statewide improvement networks. The project will continue to maintain the IDC so special education data is accessible and can be used to inform meaningful improvement. The project will also continue updating and providing high quality free resources such as the root cause analysis suite of tools and trainings, improvement science trainings, and to document and spread high leverage change ideas across the state. The SIL team is committed to walking alongside teams as they tackle their most pressing challenges and will continue to scale support across California in service of improving outcomes for students with disabilities.

**Imperial County SELPA/Project MuSE**

Project MusE’s tiered levels of assistance and support are designed with multidisciplinary teams (MDTs) in mind and include, but are not limited to: on-demand, web-based learning opportunities; customized PD and/or TA; data mining and analysis; as well as consultative support and coaching in plan development related to CIM & informing the Differentiated Assistance process for dually identified students; and issues of disproportionality. All levels of support include Professional development; TA and resources, as provided; statewide to practitioners, via in-person; and virtual & on-demand, via a web-based portal.

Level one support will offer all Lead Agencies, SELPAs, COEs, and LEAs, access to on-demand PD modules and resources found on our website. 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 to 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 (OA), and COEs to build their capacity in identified areas of need/problems of practice related to dually identified students. These sessions will be designed to equip the state lead agencies with training tools, common language, and resources to implement and facilitate training and TA to their respective COEs, SELPAs, and LEAs within their regions. At the level 2 tier of support, Project MuSE plans to collaborate with existing special education resource leads and other lead agencies to co-facilitate or share and build integrated resources, to leverage our partners’ collective expertise within the statewide system of support.

Level 3 support will focus on establishing north and south cohorts of MDTs to include, at a minimum, a REL and a Special education lead within regions to engage in CoPs. 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 PD, resources and TA provided through the levels of support, our team will participate as presenters in a select number of conferences.

**The State Performance Plan Technical Assistance Project**

SPP-TAP continues to work collaboratively with the CDE and other CDE TA providers to improve the CIM process and improve the outcomes for students based on the implementation of meaningful systemic improvements that address disproportionality in LEAs with compliance and performance issues. For the 2024—25 year, the goal is to improve consistency in messaging and adjustments to enhance cohesiveness in the process to help LEAs navigate the available supports more easily. Some improvements will be focused on alignment across written materials and resources. Other improvements will be around how the support is provided. For example, in-person supports will continue to be provided to LEAs at least once per year, but efforts will be made to align the SPP-TAP workshops with the in-person site visits provided by the CDE FMTA Consultants.

**Alternative Dispute Resolution Pathways to Partnership**

P2P is continuing to recruit and contract with each regional implementation lead based on size and scope of each region. P2P created an inventory resources and hyperlinks, including a toolkit co-developed with High Qualities IEP Special Education Resource Lead (SERL). P2P is creating an intake process for the new Constituents office and training CDE staff on the ADR procedures. Additionally, P2P has collaborated with the CDE on revisions to the Complaint process and created a decision tree for CDE staff related to the ADR continuum of direct TA support through P2P. Refine data intake and collection models, disseminate the templates and resources for collaboration meetings, including agendas and norms. P2P is pushing ahead and rolling out the Facilitated IEP training to the field and providing the field with information on this new design, resources, and TA available. There are also plans to continue to co-host the annual Special Education ADR conference with the SELPA Administrators of California.

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

In this section, there is a summary of EBPs implemented by three California funded projects. They are as follows:

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

The SIP Project

The OA Project/UDL

**A summary of each of the EBPs.**

### 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. 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 EBPs include: Continuous improvement via Implementation Science and Improvement Science, Social-emotional learning to support social-emotional competencies, Restorative practices, Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports, UDL, 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 EBPs: (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.

During the 2023–2024 academic year, a cross walk of evidence-based change strategies and the inclusion Blueprint helped to guide the support provided by the SIP team to school districts.

The cross walk aligns change and technical support strategies with Blueprint aligned domains of inclusion work to provide SIP Team members with evidence-based tools and strategies to support school staff in advancing their inclusion practices and policies

**The Open Access Project: Universal Design for Learning**

The Placer County SELPA OA is dedicated to enhancing outcomes for SWD. By ensuring access to quality curriculum and fostering active engagement in inclusive learning environments, the project aims to eliminate barriers and improve educational experiences for all students. The OA Project supports integrated planning and learning for all students while promoting equity and inclusion. The project aims to optimize teaching practices to ensure all students have access to rigorous standards. By using an equity lens and intentional instructional planning, it supports educators in meeting students where they are and fostering their academic growth.

The OA project improves inclusive practices through building educators’ skills (content, competence, and confidence) in leveraging effective instructional practices in the areas of 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. Increasing access to inclusive environments and engagement with quality curriculum and instruction will, in turn, positively impact academic achievement, discipline rates, graduation rates, and post‐secondary outcomes, while supporting students in the least restrictive environment (LRE). Another valuable student outcome is improved student agency, development of students’ voices, and self‐advocacy skills.

Universal Support 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, OA continues to develop the capacity of SELPAs, LEAs, and COEs by building upon the trainer of trainer program. OA continues to provide support to LEAs who voluntarily undertake continuous improvement work related to the California Dashboard and state indicator targets. Intensive Support is focused on building regional leadership teams with extensive resources and knowledge to support SELPAs, LEAs, and 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 California Dashboard and state indicator targets.

**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 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. Communities of practice are hosted in person or online or combination option. Each CoP identifies one of the CA MTSS Domains or Features to further explore and share best and/or current practices.

### Supporting Inclusive Practices

The SIP approach is built upon districts engaging in all five domains of the Blueprint: envisioning, building, implementing, scaling up and sustaining as supported by progress monitoring and use of data for continuous improvement. This is accomplished through a tiered approach. All districts in California have access to the Blueprint and information via PD and information the CDE provides via the SIP website, *The Special EDge* newsletter, and annual virtual conference.

Tier One: Districts specifically involved in the project have dedicated support in the form of an identified SIP staff member who provides technical assistance, PD and connection to further resources within Tiers Two and Three.

Tiers Two and Three: Grantees who are formally engaged in the SIP project are offered additional support in the form of the following: (1) TA, (2) tailored PD, (3) participation at the Spring Institute, (4) virtual and in-person meetings, and (5) grant funds to support inclusion efforts.

Data from the SIP project reveals two key findings: (1) the more extensive the engagement in multiple domains, the more likely districts make progress on key inclusion goals and (2) the longer a district is involved in the SIP project, the more likely they are to have meaningful work across multiple domains.

The SIP theory of change then is that if districts engage in the EBPs of the five domains of the Blueprint for 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 see shifts in their collective organization (culture, practice, policy) that will result in increases in LRE and student success.

**The Open Access Project: Universal Design for Learning**

The OA project supports the delivery of UDL and EBPs through the MTSS model utilizing tiers of support accessible to LEAs.

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 at the following link <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 support encompass an exploration of UDL, a foundational understanding of its principles, and practical application in individualized contexts. Accessible tools such as the UDL Troubleshooting Approach and UDL Lesson Look Fors, along with resources like the UDL Roadmap, UDL Quick Guide, and Digital Tools & Support Guide, and virtual learning modules, enhance the understanding of UDL for new learners. OA social media actively engages educators statewide, promoting UDL and EBP knowledge.

Targeted Capacity Building: OA continues to enhance content capacity by utilizing its current train‐the‐trainer model to support regions needing a Regional Lead. COEs, SELPAs, and/or LEAs interested in becoming a Regional Lead in one of the three focus areas (AT, AAC, UDL) can complete a Regional Readiness Assessment to evaluate their capacity to serve in this role.

Intensive Support: Activities provide TA to support continuous improvement efforts related to the California Dashboard and state indicator targets. LEAs receiving intensive tier TA participate in monthly implementation and progress monitoring meetings, with optional weekly office hours for additional support. OA aids in developing UDL Showcase Sites using the OA Site Readiness Assessment, CCEE UDL Journey Guide, Implementation Science, and the District Capacity Assessment. These tools foster an organizational model that incorporates data‐based decision‐making, enhances leadership around EBPs, and develops system interventions to address barriers, enabling the scaling up of activities from the Showcase Site to the entire district.

The OA qualitative measurements encompass various metrics, including the number of LEAs designated as UDL Showcase Sites, site readiness data, number of participants trained, and number of training sessions conducted. Qualitative measures also include Fidelity of Training, Fidelity of Coaching, Facilitator Reviews, Pre/Post Knowledge and Skill assessments of learners, among others.

**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 Schoolwide Integrated Framework for Transformation (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 and 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 and evaluate progress related to their implementation of the Blueprint in three ways, keeping with the SIP logic model and theory of change which articulates the following:

SIP first examines district engagement in the projects via data collection completed through a project monitoring process that each SIP staff member completes on a quarterly basis. Interactions with the content of the work (related to the Blueprint) and participation of districts are recorded. Data indicates that grantees on average meet multiple times per quarter with the SIP team, and overwhelming numbers are focused on the scaling up component of the Blueprint, or the broad adoption of evidence-based classroom inclusion practices.

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

* Survey of project participants related to inclusion policy and practice completed twice per year
* Walkthroughs of classrooms

Third, SIP continually examines “what works”. Case studies of successful districts illuminate the importance of systemic efforts at reform. There were four key takeaways from this work: (1) action often precedes belief in inclusion, (2) leadership support is central to districts that have been successful in engaging inclusion, (3) building collective investment was a key characteristic of success stories associated with inclusion, and (4) champions of inclusion were found in each case study as drivers of practices and actions.

Fourth, the SIP theory of change indicates that if there are immediate outcomes associated with increased knowledge, beliefs, and the use of Blueprint domains of practice, then in turn a desired change in LRE will be seen. SIP annually examines state data associated with LRE to examine whether or not over the long-term desired changes can be observed. SIP has observed positive changes in LRE particularly in districts that have done two things (1) implemented broadly the Blueprint for Inclusion and (2) stayed in the project for multiple years.

**The Open Access Project: Universal Design for Learning**

Data collection systems are a focus of OA. OA is continuously enhancing the data collection systems to track statewide impact and gather student impact data.

First, OA schedules regular check‐ins with grant partners and regional leads to accurately monitor the impact of the work. Regular communication with grant partners and regional leads has been crucial in accurately monitoring the impact of the work. The check‐ins provide an opportunity to promptly address challenges, share successes, and ensure alignment and coherence. Establishing a consistent schedule for these interactions helps to maintain momentum and foster a collaborative environment.

The OA team recognizes the critical importance of robust data collection systems. Accurate and comprehensive data collection is essential for tracking progress and measuring the impact of the work. The need for continuous improvement in data tracking systems has been a recurring theme. The team has made significant strides in refining these systems to ensure effectiveness and efficiency. This iterative process of improvement has proven invaluable in maintaining the relevance and accuracy of the data collection methods. OA continues to improve the existing data collection systems to better capture the breadth and depth of OA trainings throughout the state and to gather meaningful student impact data.

**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 percent 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:

Communities of Practice 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.

**The Open Access Project: Universal Design for Learning**

OA will continue to increase the supports offered. These supports will increase knowledge for educators across the state and increase access to inclusive settings for all students.

One area of growth is increasing access to OA trainings for educators across the state within the universal level. OA will offer in‐person and virtual trainings in the areas of AT, AAC, and UDL that are available to all educators. These trainings will also be offered in an asynchronous format to address the barriers of substitutes and time during the school day to attend training. A monthly webinar, Inclusive Learning Circles, will also be offered virtually, recorded and stored on the OA website to increase access.

One of the most promising areas for future growth within the OA project is the creation of "UDL in Action" videos. By providing visual and practical examples, OA aims to bridge a significant gap in educator resources, helping teachers understand and apply the three Principles and various Checkpoints of the UDL Framework. The creation of these videos is expected to fill a crucial need by offering concrete illustrations of UDL principles in action. Many educators struggle with conceptualizing how to implement UDL strategies effectively. These videos will serve as valuable tools for demonstrating how UDL can be integrated into everyday teaching practices, thereby enhancing educators' ability to create inclusive and supportive learning environments. The visual nature of the videos will make the principles of UDL more accessible and understandable, leading to more effective implementation and better student outcomes.

OA is revising the current coaching model to address barriers that have been identified by grant partners, regional leads, and districts within the Targeted level of support. The OA Coaching Model will be a group‐based coaching model to increase access to participants across the state and increase the capacity of OA coaches. The benefits of this coaching model include enhancing accessibility, boosting participation, ensuring sustainability for regional implementation leads, as coaching responsibilities will be distributed among Regional Leads, encouraging different perspectives, building community, and learning from each other and accountability partners.

Over the next year, one of the most significant areas for future growth for the OA Team will be the expansion of regional leads and hubs throughout the state. This strategic focus will be instrumental in expanding efforts and ensuring that support is readily available across various regions. By increasing regional hubs, OA will establish localized centers of excellence that address specific needs and challenges unique to each area, ensuring access to learning and participation for all students across the state. By focusing on capacity building, OA aims to empower these partners to expand and sustain independently over time.

OA will continue to build upon the process of creating UDL Showcase Sites, with at least one of the sites being a TA District who is focusing on UDL implementation in the coming year. The purpose of the UDL Showcase Site is to provide educators from around the state opportunities to observe best practices in action and adapt what they have learned to their own contexts. The Showcase Site will continue to grow its inclusive culture and refine practices that contribute to equitable learning for all students. OA will support the Showcase Site in creating the systems, processes, and inclusionary practices that contribute to equitable outcomes for students with and without disabilities.

### 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, FECs, 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 support 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 LRE, preschool LRE, 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**

New for the FFY 2023 SSIP, the CDE partnered with the SIL and SEEDS of Partnership to create at-a-glance documents for parents and families explaining and detailing what the SSIP is and how it impacts their student. The CDE collected feedback forms from several parent and family organizations as a way to measure how effective this strategy was and how to improve for the next cycle.

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 EBPs 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.

## Indicator 18: General Supervision

### Description

Indicator 18 is a compliance indicator that measures the percentage of noncompliance findings issued and corrected within one year of identification. This data is collected through the SED system used to identify noncompliance.

### Measurement

Percent = [(number of findings of noncompliance issued the prior FFY) divided by the (number of noncompliance the state verified were corrected no later than one year after the state’s written notification of findings of noncompliance)] times 100.

### Target Met: Yes

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

| **Indicator 18** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | N/A | N/A | N/A | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Result | N/A | N/A | N/A | 100% | - | - |
| Target Met | N/A | N/A | N/A | Yes | - | - |