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Topics

• Monitoring and Accountability under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)

• Academic Indicator: Changes to the 2019 California School Dashboard (Dashboard)
  • Students with Disabilities (SWD) and District of Residence
  • Rules for SWDs Who Exit Special Education
  • Incorporation of California Alternate Assessment (CAA) results into the Academic Indicator

• California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) Certification Deadline Reminder
Monitoring under IDEA

The primary focus of the State's monitoring activities must be on:

1. Improving educational results and functional outcomes for all children with disabilities; and

2. Ensuring that public agencies meet the program requirements under Part B of the Act, with a particular emphasis on those requirements that are most closely related to improving educational results for children with disabilities.
Monitoring Priority Areas under IDEA

The State must monitor the LEAs located in the State, using quantifiable indicators in each of the following priority areas:

1. Provision of a free appropriate public education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment.

2. State exercise of general supervision, including child find, effective monitoring, the use of resolution meetings, mediation, and a system of transition services.

3. Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services, to the extent the representation is the result of inappropriate identification.
California’s Monitoring System

Intensive Monitoring:
- Comprehensive Review
- Significant Disproportionality

Targeted Monitoring:
- Data Identified Noncompliance
- Disproportionality
- Performance Indicator Review

Universal Monitoring:
- Data Collection
- Technical Support
Which Entity is Responsible?

34 Code of Federal Regulations 300.201

• The LEA, in providing for the education of children with disabilities within its jurisdiction, must have in effect policies, procedures, and programs that are consistent with the State policies and procedures established under §§ 300.101 through 300.163, and §§ 300.165 through 300.174.

§§ 300.101 can be found at https://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/34/300.101.
§§ 300.165 can be found at https://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/34/300.165.

California Education Code 48200.

• Each person subject to compulsory full-time education shall attend the public full-time day school or continuation school or classes and for the full time designated as the length of the school day by the governing board of the school district in which the residency of either the parent or legal guardian
Why is this sometimes different for students with disabilities?
Because it Depends on…

• The Student’s Special District of Special Education Accountability (DSEA)
• The District of Special Education Accountability (DSEA) for a student with an Individualized Education Program (IEP) is defined to be **either of the following**:

• The district of GEOGRAPHIC residence, if any of the following conditions apply:
  – The student’s parents or guardians reside in the same district in which the student is receiving special education instruction and related services.
  – The student is placed outside of his/her district of geographic residence through the IEP process;

OR
Determining the District of Special Education Accountability (2 of 3)

– A district OTHER THAN the district of geographic residence, if any of the following conditions apply:
  – The student has a formal inter-district transfer agreement under Education Code 63600. (The district receiving the student becomes the District of Special Education Accountability or DSEA.)
  – The student attends a charter school. (The DSEA = the school code of the charter. The accountability lies with the charter school if the charter is an LEA for special education purposes, otherwise it’s the charter authorizer.)
  – The student is a ward of the court and housed in a juvenile court, court/community school, or licensed children’s institution. (The DSEA = the county/district code of the COE serving the student while the student is incarcerated or institutionalized.)
Determining the District of Special Education Accountability (3 of 3)

– The student is a ward of the court and housed in a licensed children’s institution. (The DSEA = the county/district code of the district where the LCI is located.

– The student is housed in an adult county jail. (The DSEA = the county/district code of the district where the student’s parents reside or if the parents’ location cannot be determined, the LEA that was last responsible for the student’s IEP.)

• DSEA for a private school student with an Individualized Service Plan (ISP) is defined to be:
  – The public school district in which the private school is located.
  – Note: the student's parents may also request that the student be evaluated for services by the district in which they geographically reside.
California’s Monitoring System and Districts of Special Education Accountability

Intensive Monitoring:
- Comprehensive Review (District of Special Education Accountability)
- Significant Disproportionality (District of Special Education Accountability)

Targeted Monitoring:
- Data Identified Noncompliance
- Disproportionality (District of Special Education Accountability)
- Performance Indicator Review (District of Special Education Accountability)

Universal Monitoring:
- Data Collection
- Technical Support
SWD and the District of Special Education Accountability
Options for Districts that Cannot Directly Provide Services to SWDs

- Currently, if a district cannot provide the needed services for its SWDs, it can enter into an Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with:
  - Another district (public)
    - Special education school in another district
    - Non-special-education school in another district (e.g., school with a special education program on campus)
  - The county office of education (COE)
    - Special education school in the COE
  - A Non-Public School (NPS)
Non-Academic Measures: Which Entity Is Accountable for SWDs?

- Which entity is accountable for students who receive services under an MOU?

- The school of attendance (school of service) and the local educational agency (LEA) of attendance (LEA of service) are held accountable for all non-academic measures on the Dashboard:
  - Suspension
  - Chronic Absenteeism
  - Graduation Rate
  - College/Career Indicator
Academic Indicator: Which Entity is Accountable for SWDs?

• At school level, accountability rests with school of attendance (i.e., school of service)

• At the LEA level, accountability for the Academic Indicator depends on multiple factors
Academic Indicator: Current Business Rule

• For the **Academic Indicator only**, if a student receives services *from a special education school* (based on ownership code) *or a Non-Public School (NPS)*, the assessment results are sent back to the **District of Special Education Accountability** for inclusion in their Dashboard.

  – Business rule was used in former accountability systems (i.e., API and AYP), including all Dashboard releases (i.e., 2017 and 2018 Dashboards)

• The Assessment results are not included in the Dashboard for the LEA of Services
Changes for the 2019 Dashboard

• Expand the District of Special Education Accountability rule
  – For the Academic Indicator only, the District of Special Education Accountability will be held accountable for all SWDs, not just those who receive services from a special education school or NPS school

• This ensures that the LEA receiving federal IDEA funding for these students is held accountable for the outcomes of all SWDs.
### Which Entity Is Accountable for SWDs for the 2019 Dashboard?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Indicator</th>
<th>School of Attendance</th>
<th>District of Special Education Accountability</th>
<th>District of Attendance</th>
<th>Charter School</th>
<th>Charter School Authorizer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td><strong>Responsible</strong></td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
<td><strong>Responsible</strong></td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td><strong>Responsible</strong></td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Absenteeism</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td><strong>Responsible</strong></td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td><strong>Responsible</strong></td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td><strong>Responsible</strong></td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELPI</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td><strong>Responsible</strong></td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes Beyond the 2019 Dashboard: Expand Rule to All State Indicators

• The CDE is proposing to apply the District of Special Education Accountability rule to all the state indicators for the 2020 Dashboard to align with transition from CASEMIS to CALPADS.

  – Provides sufficient notice
## Which Entity Is Accountable for SWDs for the 2020 Dashboard and Beyond?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Indicator</th>
<th>School of Attendance</th>
<th>District of Special Education Accountability</th>
<th>District of Attendance</th>
<th>Charter School</th>
<th>Charter School Authorizer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Absenteeism</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELPI</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Any Questions?
District of Special Education Accountability in CALPADS
Which District is Responsible for Reporting Data for SWD to CALPADS?

• The LEA that provides the majority of instruction and special education-related services or **District of Service** is responsible for maintaining enrollments and other data in CALPADS for students with disabilities
  – This may or may not be the District of Special Education Accountability
## Examples: Districts Responsible for Reporting SWD Data to CALPADS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If the student resides in:</th>
<th>If the student is attending school at:</th>
<th>And the student receives special education services from:</th>
<th>Then the District of Service is:</th>
<th>And the District of Special Education Accountability is:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District A</td>
<td>District A</td>
<td>District A</td>
<td>District A</td>
<td>District A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District A</td>
<td>District A</td>
<td>District B</td>
<td>District A</td>
<td>District A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District A</td>
<td>District B (per IEP)</td>
<td>District B</td>
<td>District B</td>
<td>District A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
How is the DSEA Submitted to CALPADS?

• Through 2018-19 the District of Service submits the DSEA for a student on:
  – Field # 3.22 in Student Program (SPRG) File – District of Special Education Accountability
    ○ Must be populated for students with an Education Program Code of 144 – Special Education
    ○ Comes from student information systems

• Beginning in 2019-20 the District of Service will submit the DSEA for a student on:
  – The new Special Education (SPED) file which will come directly from local special education data systems
CALPADS Flash #160
https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sp/cl/calpadsupdflash160.asp

• Contains the district of residence rule

• If LEAs wish to view the DSEA for each student, they can, for this year, request a Student Program (SPRG) Operational Data Store (ODS) extract with program code 144 for enrollments from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019
Ensuring Data Quality

• CALPADS administrators should work with local special education data administrators to ensure this field is populated correctly and is in alignment with the data in the special education data system

• Data from the CALPADS submission end-of-year (EOY) 3 will be pulled on August 30, 2019
Rules for SWDs Who Exit Special Education
New Rule for Students Who Exit Special Education

• Beginning with 2019 Dashboard, students who exited a special education program beyond the current school year will no longer be included in the SWD student group.

  – The performance level (color) for the Academic Indicator will no longer reflect the results of students who exited the program for up to two year.
Question Time
Incorporation of CAA Results into the Academic Indicator
Methodology to Incorporate CAA Results

• Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) requires states to include assessment results of all students—including those with significant cognitive disabilities—into accountability systems
  – California Alternate Assessment (CAA) is already included in participation rate calculations but excluded from calculation of distance from standard (which is used to determine performance colors)
  – Department has been working with the Technical Design Group (TDG) on a methodology for incorporating these assessments.
Challenges for Incorporating CAA Results into Academic Indicator

• Beginning with the 2019 Dashboard, the CAA results will be included in the calculations for the Academic Indicator.

• CAA based on different set of standards than those used for SBAC:
  – Common Core Alternate Standards

• Students evaluated against their level of “understanding” (rather than meeting the standard, as in the case for the SBAC).

• SBAC and CAA have different reporting scales with distinct distributions.
Additional Challenges for Incorporating CAA Results into Academic Indicator

• Students taking the CAA are placed in one of three levels of understanding (in contrast to one of four levels for the SBAC)
  – Level 1 is “limited understanding”
  – Level 2 is “foundational understanding”
  – Level 3 is “understanding” of alternate standards

• Sample sizes vary between the two assessments
Methodology Options for Incorporating the CAA into the Academic Indicator

• At the April 2019 TDG meeting, members considered the methodologies:
  – Effect Size Approach
  – Middle-of-the-Range Approach
  – Top-of-the-Range Approach
Effect Size Methodology

• Apply the DFS methodology to the CAA, where “Standard” represents “understanding of alternate standards” (Level 3).

• Convert CAA scores using the standard deviations for each of the two assessments.
  – For example, if a CAA score is 0.5 standard deviations from Level 3 that CAA score is converted to the SBAC score that is 0.5 standard deviations from Level 3, as shown on next slide.
Example of Effect Size

Grade 3 English Language Arts
Student 0.5 Standard Deviation Above Level 3 Threshold Score on CAA (370)
Translated to 0.5 Standard Deviation Above Level 3 Threshold Score on SBAC (2,477)
Middle-of-the-Range Methodology

• For performance levels 1–3 on the CAA, a student’s CAA score would be substituted with the mid-range score of the same SBAC achievement level.

– Example: A grade 3 student scoring anywhere in Level 2 on CAA for ELA would receive the midpoint score of the Level 2 range on the SBAC ELA, 2399 (SBAC scale range is 2367-2431)
Top-of-the-Range Methodology

• For performance levels 1–3 on the CAA, a student’s score would be substituted with the top score of the same SBAC achievement level.

  –Example: A grade 3 student scoring anywhere in Level 2 on CAA for ELA would receive the highest score of the Level 2 range on the SBAC ELA, 2431.
Impact Summary for the Three Methodologies

• Removing students who received a LOSS improved outcomes.
• Top of the scale range methodology, excluding LOSS scores, resulted in the smallest difference between DFS scores for the SBAC and CAA.
• The DFS for SWDs improved, under all three methodologies, when the CAA was incorporated. This is because the scores of students who take the CAA are generally closer to Level 3 (for that test) than are the scores for SWDs who take the SBAC (i.e., DFS is generally greater).
CDE Recommendation

• Top-of-the-Range, excluding the CAA LOSS scores
  – Easier to communicate than the Effect Size

• Methodologies have been reviewed by several stakeholder groups, including the Advisory Commission on Special Education (ACSE) which supported the top-of-range methodology

• Will be proposed to the State Board of Education (SBE) in September 2019.
Additional Questions?
CALPADS Certification
Deadline Reminder
CALPADS Used for State Indicators

- Majority of state indicators use data derived from CALPADS, including demographic data for student group determinations.

- LEAs must meet CALPADS certification timeline (August 30, 2019). Once the amendment window closes, there are no additional opportunities to correct the data for the Dashboard!

- **Caution!** If you update data after certifying it, don’t forget to:
  1. De-certify
  2. Make updates
  3. Re-certify

- Updates will not be captured if these steps are not followed!