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## Subject

New Targets for State Performance Plan Indicators in the Annual Performance Report for Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004, covering program years 2020–21 through 2025–26.

## Type of Action

Action, Information

## Summary of the Issue(s)

In accordance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 (IDEA), California is required to develop and implement a State Performance Plan (SPP), a multi-year, statewide improvement plan. The U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) defines the instructions and indicators to be used in developing the SPP. These indicators include 5 compliance indicators, 11 performance indicators, and 1 indicator with both compliance and performance components. Every state is required to submit a new SPP to OSEP at least every six years. The SPP includes the state’s targets for each indicator over the multi-year cycle (e.g. performance indicator targets may increase each year to encourage progress, while compliance indicators are preset by OSEP). These indicator targets are developed by the CDE with input from community partners, for the State Board of Education’s (SBE) consideration and approval.

The current seven-year cycle of the SPP, which included Federal Fiscal Years (FFYs) 2013 to 2019, has concluded. The CDE presents proposed targets for the performance indicators for the next six-year SPP, covering program years 2020–21 through 2025–26, for SBE consideration for approval.

## Recommendation

The CDE recommends the SBE approve the proposed new targets covering program years 2020–21 through 2025–26.

## Brief History of Key Issues

The IDEA requires each state to develop a SPP using the instructions determined by OSEP. Additionally, each year, states must report on progress toward meeting the indicator targets outlined in the SPP in an 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 17 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 16 of the indicators. The APR is presented to the SBE for review and approval annually at the January SBE meeting. 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 students with disabilities. Beginning with the 2022 year, the SSIP will also be presented to the SBE for review and approval at the January 2022 SBE meeting, in accordance with the new direction from OSEP. Previously, CDE presented Indicator 17 to the SBE at the March 2022 SBE meeting.

The SPP/APR is one component of OSEP’s Results Driven Accountability (RDA) framework. The RDA framework was developed in 2014, prior to the passage of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) in 2015. OSEP developed the RDA framework in an effort to shift their accountability efforts away from a primary emphasis on compliance, to a framework that focused on improved results for students with disabilities, while continuing to assist states in ensuring compliance with the IDEA’s requirements. As part of this shifted approach to accountability, OSEP directed states to develop a SSIP focused on a single metric which serves as the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) for measuring improved outcomes for students with disabilities.

While an improvement from a primarily compliance-driven accountability framework, this federally defined approach to holding states accountable for students with disabilities under the auspices of IDEA remains structurally out of alignment with the multiple measures accountability framework California has adopted to meet the needs of all students, including students with disabilities, as defined in California’s integrated local, state, and federal accountability and continuous improvement system grounded in the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF).

Despite this structural misalignment, the CDE has worked to align accountability and continuous improvement efforts for students with disabilities across the requirements of IDEA and LCFF to the greatest extent practicable.

**California’s approach to integrating state and federal IDEA accountability for students with disabilities**

Under the IDEA, California is required to publicly report on the performance of the state overall, and for each of its LEAs, in serving students with disabilities through the APR. The APR data describes the progress of LEAs and the state toward meeting the performance and compliance indicator targets identified in the SPP. Prior to the launch of the California School Dashboard (Dashboard), the APR would primarily guide the CDE’s selection of LEAs for monitoring activities under IDEA. The CDE used the results of the APR to help determine the level and type of monitoring and technical assistance to be provided to LEAs throughout the state.

Several APR indicators overlap with Dashboard indicators, including indicators for graduation rate, suspension/expulsion, and assessment. OSEP has a defined calculation methodology for each indicator on the APR, which differs from the SBE adopted calculation methodology for these indicators on the Dashboard. States do not have the authority to modify the calculation methodology of indicators for purposes of APR reporting. However, states have the discretion to use state-defined indicators, such as the Dashboard indicators, for the purpose of selecting LEAs for monitoring activities.

In an effort to improve alignment between LEAs’ monitoring selection under IDEA, and eligibility determinations for differentiated assistance under LCFF, the CDE identifies LEAs for IDEA monitoring activities based on their Dashboard result for assessments, suspension/expulsion and graduation rate, in addition to other APR indicators.

To aid the field in understanding the similarities and differences between these different sets of accountability indicators, the Special Education Local Plan Area System Improvement Leads (SELPA SILs) developed the State Performance Plan Indicator Guide, available at <https://systemimprovement.org/uploads/resources/State-Performance-Plan-Indicator-Guide.pdf>.

**California’s Statewide System of Support**

The CDE’s goal is to align, to the greatest extent possible, LCFF and IDEA continuous improvement activities to improve outcomes for students with disabilities with the expertise of the Statewide System of Support (SSOS). Aligning and integrating special education activities and technical assistance to the larger system of support for LEAs should lead to greater coherence among services for students with disabilities and improve outcomes.

The primary goal of the SSOS is to support LEAs in building their capacity to improve teaching and learning over time, address achievement gaps, and strengthen outreach and collaboration with their community partners, particularly in the development of the Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP).

There are two types of special education resource leads within the SSOS: SELPA System Improvement Leads (SIL) and SELPA Content Leads. The SIL are charged with building the foundational knowledge and capacity in systems improvement processes for SELPAs across the state. In the past year, the SIL have worked collaboratively within the SSOS to build the capacity of SELPAs and LEAs with a common goal to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. The work of the SIL focuses on building necessary partnerships to support LEAs in: 1) data use and governance, 2) continuous improvement, and 3) implementation of high leverage practices. The SELPA Content Leads within the SSOS focus on building the capacity of SELPAs across the state in an identified content area of need. The SELPA content leads work to cultivate necessary expertise related to evidence-based practices and interventions that prove effective for improving performance of students with disabilities.

The continued expansion of Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) in California through the Orange County Department of Education’s (OCDE) Scale-Up MTSS Statewide (SUMS) initiative is critical to setting a foundation for LEAs to improve outcomes for SWD. One of the evidence-based, highly regarded comprehensive strategies for increasing access to instruction is to employ a MTSS framework when delivering services to students. California’s MTSS is an integrated, comprehensive framework for LEAs that aligns academic, behavioral, and social-emotional learning in a fully integrated system of support for the benefit of all students. The MTSS framework offers the potential to create systematic change through intentional integration of services and supports to quickly identify and meet the needs of all students.

The SELPA SILs, SELPA Content Leads, the MTSS and others provide support to LEAs to implement practices to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. However, all expert leads in the SSOS have a role in improving outcomes for students with disabilities. Supplementing the state resources in the SSOS, the SED has increased the number of IDEA-funded technical assistance contracts that target specific areas of need, such as Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) for all students with disabilities, ages three through 21. The CDE plans on working together with all of the SSOS partners to explore and develop more resources and supports for LEAs and teachers to address the more rigorous targets for LRE.This increasingly integrated approach is intended to support LEAs in approaching continuous improvement efforts targeting students with disabilities within a single coherent system designed to improve outcomes for all students.

**The Federal Fiscal Year 2020-2025 State Performance Plan**

In February 2020, the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) announced that it would be revising the calculation methodologies for SPP/APR indicators, effective beginning with the 2020–21 program year. This revision would inform the development of states’ next six-year SPP. OSERS engaged in two rounds of public comment on revisions to the indicators’ measurements, commencing with a 60-day public comment period from February 19, 2020 through April 20, 2020. Following the response to the initial public comment period, OSERS published a revised indicator measurement table for a 30-day public comment period from July 7, 2020 through August 10, 2020. While several states provided input to OSERS encouraging a shift in the calculation methodologies for several indicators to better align with state accountability systems, OSERS ultimately published a final indicator measurement table in October 2020 that results in greater differences between how California measures assessment and graduation rate indicators on the Dashboard, and how California will now be required to report on these two indicators on the APR for purposes of IDEA.

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 community engagement meetings 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 community partners from various backgrounds - educators, parents, school administrators, policy advisors, school psychologists, Family Empowerment Centers, early education, advocacy groups, and state advisory board members. The CDE leveraged these community partners, 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 community engagement meetings, 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 OSEP. The twelve performance indicators were partnered with detailed presentations to inform the community members 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 community members to discuss statewide data, target setting, and how the CDE can provide supports for LEAs to meet more rigorous targets. Following the publication of the revised measurement table, the CDE reconvened the community engagement group to discuss the changes to key indicators, including assessment, school age least restrictive environment, preschool least restrictive environment, parent involvement, post school outcomes, and graduation rate, and provided community partners with the opportunity to refine their recommendations for these targets in light of the new calculations.

The following table provides dates and a brief summary of these community engagement meetings.

| Date | Location | Description |
| --- | --- | --- |
| August 2, 2019 | Virtual | The SED hosted a virtual meeting to introduce the purpose of the workgroup and participation roles along with providing an overview of the SPP/APR. |
| August 21, 2019 | In Person/Virtual | The SED presented the assessment indicators, 3a-b; suspension/expulsion indicators, 4a-b; and school age least restrictive environment indicators, 5a-c. |
| August 26, 2019 | In Person/Virtual | The SED presented the preschool least restrictive environment indicators, 6a-c; preschool assessment indicators, 7a-c; and post school outcomes indicators, 14a-c. |
| September 9, 2019 | In Person/Virtual | The SED presented the dropout indicator, 2; parent involvement indicator, 8; and the mediation and dispute resolution indicators, 15 and 16. |
| September 24, 2019 | Virtual | The SED hosted a short meeting to review the summary of community partner feedback collected by that date. |
| December 5, 2019 | Virtual | The SED presented a preliminary draft of initial targets recommendations. |
| August 12, 2020 | Virtual | Following OSERS publication of the revised SPP/APR instructions and new measurement table, the SED hosted a set of community engagement meetings to review these changes.  At this meeting, the SED presented the revised assessment indicator. |
| August 26, 2020 | Virtual | The SED presented the revised school age least restrictive environment, preschool least restrictive environment, parent involvement, and post school outcomes. |
| June 8, 2021 | Virtual | The SED presented the revised graduation indicator,1; and the state systemic improvement plan indicator, 17. |

Setting appropriately challenging SPP indicator targets for the 2020–21 through 2025–26 school years provides an opportunity for the CDE and LEAs to re-examine the expectations for improving outcomes for students with disabilities. The data trends from the prior SPP/APR cycle also highlight the critical importance of deepening integrated technical assistance and supports to LEAs to effectively improve practices, and ultimately student outcomes.

**Update on the ONE System: Reforming Education to Serve All Students**

The Special Education Statewide Task Force was formed in 2013 to examine California’s complex systems for serving students with disabilities to forward recommendations to the SBE, the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC), and the CDE for consideration. The Task Force was originally called for by former SBE President Michael Kirst and then CTC Chair Linda Darling-Hammond who is now the current SBE President. The Task Force worked for months to evaluate the status of special education in the state, to examine best practices in California and nationally, and to propose recommendations for strengthening the system.

The task force produced the 2015 report titled, ONE System: Reforming Education to Serve All Students. The report proposed seven focus areas for improvement: early learning; evidence-based school and classroom practices; educator preparation and professional learning; assessment; accountability; family and student engagement; and special education financing.

WestEd has produced an update report which describes California’s progress toward achieving policy and system changes in the seven focus areas. The final report will be made available on the CDE website.

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

In September 2021, the SED presented the proposed new targets covering program years 2020–21 through 2025–26, to the SBE for review and feedback.

## Fiscal Analysis (as appropriate)

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

## Attachment(s)

Attachment 1: California Department of Education Special Education Division Recommendations for New SPP/APR Targets for Program Years 2020–21 through 2025–26. (39 pages).
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## Special Education in California

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

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

## Introduction

In accordance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 (IDEA), California is required to submit an Annual Performance Report (APR) to the U.S. Department of Education (ED) on California’s performance and progress meeting targets defined in the State Performance Plan (SPP). The APR requires the California Department of Education (CDE) to report on 17 indicators that examines a comprehensive array of compliance and performance requirements relating to the provision of special education and related services. The current seven-year cycle of the SPP, which included Federal Fiscal Years (FFYs) 2013 to 2019, is ending. The CDE is tasked with developing and recommending new targets for the performance indicators for the next six years.

Beginning in August 2019 the CDE commenced a series of community engagement meetings to discuss and recommend targets for the new six-year cycle of the SPP. These meetings were held over a two-year period and were designed to engage community partners from various backgrounds - educators, parents, school administrators, policy advisors, school psychologists, Family Empowerment Centers, early education, advocacy groups, and state advisory board members. The CDE leveraged these community members, 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 community engagement meetings, 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 Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). The twelve indicators were partnered with detailed presentations to inform the community partners of the history and data trends to make informed recommendations. The presentations included how each indicator is defined, measured, and calculated; an in-depth history of statewide results over the last five years; and how California compares to similar states, along with data forecasting was also included.

Outlined in this report are the SPP target recommendations for FFY 2020 to FFY 2025.

### Table 1: California State Indicators

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

## Indicator 1: Graduation Rate

### Measurement

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

Data are reported in lag years using data from the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS). States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

### Notable Change(s)

The graduation calculation will start using a one-year calculation and will no longer use the four-year adjusted cohort rate.

### Community Partners Feedback

Graduation is a lag year indicator and therefore the effects of Covid-19 may be felt longer than with other indicators. To account for this, community partners recommended target have a slower increase with a more aggressive increase toward the end of the six-year cycle. Since the data source and calculation has changed it is being recommended to set a new baseline.

### Graduation Rate New Targets

| **Indicator 1** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 75% | 75.5% | 76% | 77% | 78% | 79% |

### Graduation Rate Old Targets

| **Indicator 1** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 90% | 90% | 90% | 90% | 90% | 90% | 90% |
| Result | 61.8% | 62.2% | 64.5% | 65.5% | 65.0% | 66.3% | 67.7% |
| Target Met | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |

## Indicator 2: Dropout Rate

### Measurement

Indicator 2 is a performance indicator that measures the percent of students with disabilities dropping out of high school.

Data are reported in lag years using data from CALPADS. States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

### Notable Change(s)

While OSEP is now limiting States to only using a one-year calculation, this change does not affect California as this indicator is already calculated that way.

### Community Partners Feedback

The community partners recommended the trajectory of the target for indicator two remain the same, a one percent decrease per year. The CDE believes these to be achievable yet ambitious targets.

### Dropout Rate New Targets

| **Indicator 2** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 11% | 10% | 9% | 8% | 7% | 6% |

### Dropout Rate Old Targets

| **Indicator 2** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 15.72% | 14.72% | 13.72% | 12.72% | 11.72% | 10.72% | 9.72% |
| Result | 15.7% | 17.5% | 14.4% | 13.7% | 11.3% | 11.2% | 15.41% |
| Target Met | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No |

## Indicator 3: Statewide Assessment

### Measurement

Indicator 3 is a performance indicator that measures the participation and performance of students with disabilities 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.

### Notable Change(s)

Indicator 3 is the indicator with the most significant changes. OSEP removed a sub indicator that as no longer being reported, altered how proficiency rates are reported, and added a sub indicator to track proficiency rate gaps. The other notable change is that these rates will only be calculated for grades 4, 8, and 11.

### Community Partners Feedback

1. To keep in line with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act, the CDE is maintaining the target at 95%.
2. This new sub indicator measures the proficiency rate of students with disabilities taking the regular assessment calculated separately for English Language Arts (ELA) and math and by grades 4, 8, and 11. The recalculation of these subject areas by grade level demonstrated that grade 4 was prone to show more growth, in both subjects, compared to grade 8 and grade 11. Therefore, community partners, believed the grade 4 targets could be higher than the grade 8 and 11 targets.
3. This new sub indicator measures the proficiency rate of students with disabilities taking the alternate assessment calculated separately for ELA and math and by grades 4, 8, and 11. The recalculation of these subject areas by grade level showed overlapping results. This population of students is also much smaller to calculate and is susceptible to more volatility.
4. This new sub indicator measures the proficiency gap for students with IEPs who tested proficient against grade level academic achievement standards compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievements. This does not incorporate the data for students who take the alternate assessment. This is calculated separately for ELA and math for grades 4, 8, and 11. Several community members expressed dissatisfaction with this new indicator. Many believed that the onus of this indicator rests on students with disabilities. The targets for this indicator should decrease over time.

### Assessment New Targets

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator 3a ELA Targets** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Grade 4 | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% |
| Grade 8 | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% |
| Grade 11 | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator 3a Math Targets** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Grade 4 | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% |
| Grade 8 | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% |
| Grade 11 | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator 3b ELA Targets** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Grade 4 | 15% | 15% | 15% | 16% | 17% | 18% |
| Grade 8 | 12% | 12% | 12% | 13% | 14% | 15% |
| Grade 11 | 14% | 14% | 14% | 15% | 16% | 17% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator 3b Math Targets** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Grade 4 | 15% | 15% | 15% | 16% | 17% | 18% |
| Grade 8 | 8% | 8% | 8% | 9% | 10% | 11% |
| Grade 11 | 8% | 8% | 8% | 9% | 10% | 11% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator 3c ELA Targets** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Grade 4 | 15% | 15% | 15% | 16% | 17% | 18% |
| Grade 8 | 10% | 10% | 10% | 11% | 12% | 13% |
| Grade 11 | 14% | 14% | 14% | 15% | 16% | 17% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator 3c Math Targets** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Grade 4 | 7% | 7% | 7% | 8% | 9% | 10% |
| Grade 8 | 8% | 8% | 8% | 9% | 10% | 11% |
| Grade 11 | 6% | 6% | 6% | 7% | 8% | 9% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator 3d ELA Targets** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Grade 4 | 31% | 31% | 31% | 30% | 29% | 28% |
| Grade 8 | 37% | 37% | 37% | 36% | 35% | 34% |
| Grade 11 | 42% | 42% | 42% | 41% | 40% | 39% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator 3d Math Targets** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Grade 4 | 25% | 25% | 25% | 24% | 23% | 22% |
| Grade 8 | 29% | 29% | 29% | 28% | 27% | 26% |
| Grade 11 | 27% | 27% | 27% | 26% | 25% | 24% |

### Old Assessment Targets

### Percent of LEAs Meeting AYP for Disability Student Group (3A)

| **Indicator 3A** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 58% | 59% | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Result | 17% | 78.5% | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Target Met | No | Yes | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |

\* This indicator is not currently reported per direction from the ED.

### Percent of Participation for Students with IEPs Old Targets

| **Indicator 3B** | **2013\*** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019\*\*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ELA Target | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% |
| Result | 18% | 94.2% | 93.4% | 95.0% | 94.1% | 94.5% | N/A |
| Target Met | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | N/A |
| Math Target | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% |
| Result | 13% | 93.8% | 94.6% | 94.7% | 93.8% | 94.1% | N/A |
| Target Met | No | No | No | No | No | No | N/A |

\*Pilot year for California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress, only California Alternate Performance Assessment data was included.

**\*\*** No results due to Covid-19.

### Percent Proficient for Students with Disabilities Old Targets

| **Indicator 3C ELA** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Elementary School Districts | 100% | 100% | 12.0% | 13.0% | 14.0% | 15.0% | 16.0% |
| High School Districts | 100% | 100% | 12.9% | 13.9% | 14.9% | 15.9% | 16.9% |
| Unified School Districts and County Offices of Education | 100% | 100% | 12.9% | 13.9% | 14.9% | 15.9% | 16.9% |

| **Indicator 3C Math** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Elementary School Districts | 100% | 100% | 10.6% | 11.6% | 12.6% | 13.6% | 14.6% |
| High School Districts | 100% | 100% | 10.6% | 11.6% | 12.6% | 13.6% | 14.6% |
| Unified School Districts and County Offices of Education | 100% | 100% | 10.6% | 11.6% | 12.6% | 13.6% | 14.6% |

## Indicator 4A: Suspension and Expulsion Overall

### Measurement

Indicator 4A is a performance indicator that measures the percent of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for students with disabilities.

The data are reported using the CALPADS data from the prior year. The percent is calculated by the number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of students with IEPs for greater than 10 days in a school year divided by the number of LEAs in the state, multiplied by 100.

### Notable Change(s)

There were no notable changes to either the measurement or calculation for this indicator. OSEP made language changes such as “district” to “local educational agency”.

### Community Partners Feedback

CDE agreed with community members that more rigorous targets should be recommended for this indicator. The results for this indicator have fluctuated over the last six years, CDE believes that with more rigorous targets this will encourage a continued decline.

### Suspension and Expulsion New Targets

| **Indicator 4a** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 3% | 2.8% | 2.6% | 2.4% | 2.2% | 2% |

### Suspension and Expulsion Old Targets

| **Indicator 4A** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | ≤10% | ≤10% | ≤10% | ≤10% | ≤10% | ≤10% | ≤10% |
| Result | 1.2% | 2.1% | 2.3% | 3.2% | 3.6% | 1.4% | 2.5% |
| Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

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

### Measurement

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

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

The data are reported using the CALPADS data from the prior year. This percent is calculated by the number of LEAs that have: (1) A significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of 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 divided by the number of LEAs in the state, multiplied by 100.

### Notable Change(s)

There were no measurement or calculation changes to this indicator. OSEP made language changes such as “district” to “local educational agency”.

### Community Partners Feedback

Indicator 4b is a compliance indicator and the target has been established by OSEP.

### Suspension and Expulsion by Race or Ethnicity New Targets

| **Indicator 4b** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

### Suspension and Expulsion by Race or Ethnicity Old Targets

| **Indicator 4B** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Result | 1.8% | 2.3% | 5.7% | 2.7% | 6.3% | 4.8% | 4.0% |
| Target Met | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |

## Indicator 5: Education Environments

### Measurement

Indicator 5 is a performance indicator that measures the percent of students with disabilities, aged five who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged six to twenty-two, served inside the regular class 80 percent or more of the day; inside the regular class less than 40 percent of the day, and served in public or private separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placement.

The calculation is as follows:

1. The number of students with disabilities served inside the regular class 80 percent or more of the day divided by the total number of students aged five who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged six to twenty-two with disabilities.
2. The number of students with disabilities served inside the regular class less than 40 percent of the day divided by the total number of students aged five who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged six to twenty-two with disabilities.
3. The number of students with disabilities served in public or private separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements divided by the total number of students aged five who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged six to twenty-two with disabilities.

### Notable Change(s)

To align with the federal data collection file specifications, States now must include five-year old’s who are enrolled in kindergarten in the calculation.

### Community Partners Feedback

1. The community members believed more ambitious targets would encourage better placement and earlier interventions for students with disabilities. These recommended targets are more rigorous than previous targets, a 12 percent growth over six years.
2. The community members recommended a more rigorous decrease, two to three percent per year. The CDE recommends a 1.5 percent per year decrease.
3. The community members agreed that Indicator 5c should stay with the current gradual decrease of 0.2 percent per year. CDE agrees with this recommendation.

### Education Environment New Targets

| **Indicator 5** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5a Target | 58% | 60% | 62% | 64% | 67% | 70% |
| 5b Target | 19.5% | 18% | 16.5% | 15% | 13.5% | 12% |
| 5c Target | 3.4% | 3.2% | 3.0% | 2.8% | 2.6% | 2.4% |

**Education Environment Old Targets**

| **Indicator 5** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5a Target | 49.2% | 49.2% | 49.2% | 50.2% | 51.2% | 52.2% | 53.2% |
| 5a Result | 56.3% | 53.3% | 54.0% | 54.9% | 56.1% | 56.8% | 58.3% |
| 5a Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 5b Target | 24.6% | 24.6% | 24.6% | 23.6% | 22.6% | 21.6% | 20.6% |
| 5b Result | 23.6% | 22% | 21.5% | 20.6% | 19.8% | 19.5% | 18.2% |
| 5b Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 5c Target | 4.4% | 4.4% | 4.4% | 4.2% | 4% | 3.8% | 3.6% |
| 5c Result | 3.9% | 3.3% | 3.6% | 3.5% | 3.4% | 3.1% | 3.1% |
| 5c Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

## Indicator 6: Preschool Least Restrictive Environments

### Measurement

Indicator 6 is a performance indicator that measures the percent of children with disabilities ages three through five years, enrolled in a preschool program attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related service in the regular early childhood program; as well as children with disabilities attending a separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility; and receiving special education and related services in the home.

The calculation is as follows:

1. Percent = (number of children ages three through five 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 three through five with IEPs), multiplied by 100.
2. Percent = (number of children ages three through five with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility) divided by the (total number of children ages three through five with IEPs), multiplied by 100.
3. Percent = (number of children ages three through five with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total number of children ages three through five with IEPs), multiplied by 100.

### Notable Change(s)

There are two changes to this indicator. The first is the removal of five-year old’s who are in kindergarten. The second more significant change, is the addition of the third subcategory – home. While data for this setting has always been collected it has never been reported before in the SPP/APR.

### Community Partners Feedback

1. The community members believed these targets could be achieved based on past data and the availability of new grant money creating new supports. The CDE agrees with this recommendation. The most common concern for this indicator was the lack of universal preschool and how that impacts preschool placements.
2. Community members recommended more rigorous targets for this indicator to encourage more regular classroom placements. The CDE agrees with this recommendation.
3. Community members were very conflicted over this new sub indicator. Most community members believed that parents should have this setting as an option available, especially for the youngest students, as this may be the best fit for the student. Based on community member input the CDE recommends this target should stay relatively flat.

### Preschool Environments New Targets

| **Indicator 6** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6a Target | 39% | 41% | 43% | 45% | 47% | 49% |
| 6b Target | 33% | 31% | 29% | 27% | 25% | 23% |
| 6c Target | 3.5% | 3.5% | 3.5% | 3.5% | 3.5% | 3.4% |

### Preschool Environments Old Targets

| **Indicator 6** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6a Target | 32.9% | 32.9% | 32.9% | 33.9% | 34.9% | 35.9% | 36.9% |
| 6a Result | 32.9% | 32.9% | 44.1% | 45.1% | 37.3% | 36.5% | 34.45% |
| 6a Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| 6b Target | 34.4% | 34.4% | 34.4% | 33.4% | 32.4% | 31.4% | 30.4% |
| 6b Result | 34.4% | 34.4% | 31.4% | 29.8% | 33.8% | 33.8% | 35.76% |
| 6b Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No |

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

### Measurement

Indicator 7A is a performance indicator that measures the percent of children with disabilities who demonstrate improvement in Positive Social-Emotional Skills, including social relationships.

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.

### Notable Change(s)

OSEP made no changes to this indicator.

### Community Partners Feedback

Overall the community members agreed since the current targets were already high there was not much room for dramatic upward growth. There was also consensus on resetting the baseline to the next available dataset and then a steady increase of one or 0.5 percent per year for all six subparts. The CDE agrees with this recommendation.

### Preschool Outcomes–Positive Social-Emotional Skills New Targets

| **Indicator 7a** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7a1 Target | 76% | 77% | 78% | 79% | 80% | 81% |
| 7a2 Target | 76% | 77% | 78% | 79% | 80% | 81% |

### Preschool Outcomes–Positive Social-Emotional Skills Old Targets

| **Indicator 7A** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016\*** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 72.7%/  82.1% | 72.7%/ 82.1% | 72.7%/ 82.1% | 82.2%/ 78.5% | 83.2%/  79.5% | 84.2%/ 80.5% | 85.2%/ 81.5% |
| Result | 59.4%/ 60.8% | 60.9%/ 60.3% | 67.6%/ 72.5% | 82.2%/ 78.5% | 76.7%/  77.6% | 76.0%/  76.7% | 79.5%/  76.8% |
| Target Met | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No |

\*Targets were changed this year

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

### Measurement

Indicator 7B is a performance indicator that measures the percent of children with disabilities who demonstrate improvement in acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, including early language/communication and early literacy.

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.

### Notable Change(s)

OSEP made no changes to this indicator.

### Community Partners Feedback

Overall the community members agreed since the current targets were already high there was not much room for dramatic upward growth. There was also consensus on resetting the baseline to the next available dataset and then a steady increase of one or 0.5 percent per year for all six subparts. The CDE agrees with this recommendation.

**Preschool Outcomes–Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills** New **Targets**

| **Indicator 7b** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7b1 Target | 76% | 77% | 78% | 79% | 80% | 81% |
| 7b2 Target | 76% | 77% | 78% | 79% | 80% | 81% |

### Preschool Outcomes–Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills Old Targets

| **Indicator 7B** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016\*** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 70% / 82.5% | 70% / 82.5% | 70% / 82.5% | 79.7%/ 77.57% | 80.7%/ 78.57% | 81.7%/ 79.57% | 82.7%/ 80.57% |
| Result | 60.9% / 60.3% | 60.2% / 59.6% | 68.6% / 71.2% | 79.7%/ 77.6% | 76.1%/  76.7% | 75.2%/  76.2% | 78.1%/  76.4% |
| Target Met | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No |

\* Targets were changed this year due to new assessment tool

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

### Measurement

Indicator 7C is a performance indicator that measures the percent of children with disabilities who demonstrate improvement in Use of Appropriate Behaviors to meet their needs.

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.

### Notable Change(s)

OSEP made no changes to this indicator.

### Community Partners Feedback

Overall the community members agreed since the current targets were already high there was not much room for dramatic upward growth. There was also consensus on resetting the baseline to the next available dataset and then a steady increase of one or 0.5 percent per year for all six subparts. The CDE agrees with this recommendation.

**Preschool Outcomes–Use of Appropriate Behaviors New Targets**

| **Indicator 7c** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7c1 Target | 76% | 77% | 78% | 79% | 80% | 81% |
| 7c2 Target | 76% | 77% | 78% | 79% | 80% | 81% |

### Preschool Outcomes–Use of Appropriate Behaviors Old Targets

| **Indicator 7C** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016\*** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 75%/  79% | 75%/  79% | 75%/  79% | 73.7%/ 76.45% | 74.7%/ 77.45% | 75.7%/ 78.45% | 76.7%/ 79.45% |
| Result | 65.9%/ 65.7% | 65.8%/  65.8% | 68.7%/  70.4% | 73.7%/ 76.5% | 75.3%/  77.0% | 75.4%/  76.7% | 79.4%/  77.8% |
| Target Met | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes/No | No | Yes/No |

\* Targets were changed this year due to new assessment tool

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

### Measurement

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.

These data are 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?”

Percent = [(# 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 # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

### Notable Change(s)

There were no changes to the calculation or measurement for this indicator. When reporting the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, States must choose a secondary category in addition to race and ethnicity (which is already reported).

### Community Partners Feedback

The community members recommended the target continue to increase each year.

### Parent Involvement/Input New Targets

| **Indicator 8** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 95% | 95.5% | 96% | 96.5% | 97% | 97.5% |

### Parent Involvement/Input Old Targets

| **Indicator 8** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 90% | 90% | 90% | 91% | 92% | 93% | 94% |
| Result | 99.1% | 99.2% | 93.8% | 99.5% | 99.5% | 99.5% | 99.6% |
| Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

## Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

### Measurement

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.

It is calculated by (number of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size 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 for one or more racial/ethnic groups) times 100.

### Notable Change(s)

OSEP made no changes to this indicator.

### Community Partners Feedback

Indicator 9 is a compliance indicator and the target has been established by OSEP.

### Disproportionate Representation New Targets

| **Indicator 9** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

### Disproportionate Representation Old Targets

| **Indicator 9** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Result | .09% | .09% | 0% | 2.57% | 0.88% | 1.60% | 2.05% |
| Target Met | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | No |

## Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation by Disability Categories

### Measurement

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.

This indicator is calculated by the (number of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size 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 for one or more racial/ethnic groups) times 100.

### Notable Change(s)

OSEP made no changes to this indicator.

### Community Partners Feedback

Indicator 10 is a compliance indicator and the target has been established by OSEP.

### Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories New Targets

| **Indicator 10** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

### Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories Old Targets

| **Indicator 10** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Result | .57% | .87% | .75% | 17.14% | 27.76% | 9.90% | 14.11% |
| Target Met | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |

## Indicator 11: Child Find

### Measurement

Indicator 11 is a compliance indicator that measures the percent of students with disabilities 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.

These data were calculated using CALPADS data fields related to parental consent date and initial evaluation date. The indicator is calculated by the (number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days) divided by (the number of children whom parental consent to evaluate was received) multiplied by 100.

### Notable Change(s)

OSEP made no changes to this indicator.

### Community Partners Feedback

Indicator 11 is a compliance indicator and the target has been established by OSEP.

### Child Find New Targets

| **Indicator 11** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

### Child Find Old Targets

| **Indicator 11** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Result | 98.1% | 96% | 98.7% | 98.5% | 97.8% | 96.1% | 96.2% |
| Target Met | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |

## Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

### Measurement

Indicator 12 is a compliance indicator that measures the percent of children referred by the infant program (IDEA Part C) 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.

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.

### Notable Change(s)

OSEP made no changes to this indicator.

### Community Partners Feedback

Indicator 12 is a compliance indicator and the target has been established by OSEP.

**Early Childhood Transition New Targets**

| **Indicator 12** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

### Early Childhood Transition Old Targets

| **Indicator 12** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Result | 98.5% | 93.5% | 86% | 94% | 95.1% | 89.7% | 87.63% |
| Target Met | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |

## Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

### Measurement

Indicator 13 is a compliance indicator that measures the percent of students with disabilities 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.

### Notable Change(s)

OSEP made no notable changes to either the measurement of calculation of this indicator. OSEP did clarify that there must be evidence, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP meeting.

### Community Partners Feedback

Indicator 13 is a compliance indicator and the target has been established by OSEP.

### Secondary Transition New Targets

| **Indicator 13** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

### Secondary Transition Old Targets

| **Indicator 13** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Result | 93.5% | 99.4% | 99.6% | 99.8% | 99.7% | 99.2% | 96.3% |
| Target Met | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |

## Indicator 14: Post-school Outcomes

### Measurement

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

The indicator is calculated as follows:

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.

### Notable Change(s)

There were no notable changes to the calculation or measurement for this indicator. When reporting the extent to which the demographics of respondents are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, States had to choose a secondary category in addition to race and ethnicity. The CDE already reports disability category prior to this new requirement, race and ethnicity will be added to this analysis.

### Community Partners Feedback

1. For indicator 14a the community members wanted to continue to see a slow and steady increase over the next six years.
2. For indicator 14b the community members wanted to continue to see a slow and steady increase over the next six years.
3. The community members recommended the indicator 14c target to gradually increase to around 90 percent by 2025.

### Post-school Outcomes New Targets

| **Indicator 14** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 14a Target | 55% | 56% | 57% | 58% | 59% | 60% |
| 14b Target | 75% | 76.5% | 78% | 79.5% | 81% | 82.5 |
| 14c Target | 87% | 87.5% | 88% | 88.5% | 89% | 89.5% |

### Post-school Outcomes Old Targets

| **Indicator 14** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 14a Target | 52.3% | 52.3% | 52.3% | 52.3% | 53.3% | 54.3% | 55.3% |
| 14a Result | 52.3% | 50.4% | 52.3% | 48.9% | 53.9% | 54.8% | 56.7% |
| 14a Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 14B Target | 72.4% | 72.4% | 72.4% | 72.4% | 73.4% | 74.4% | 75.4% |
| 14b Result | 72.4% | 72.4% | 75.5% | 72.6% | 77.6% | 70.7% | 75.9% |
| 14b Target Met | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes |
| 14c Target | 81% | 81% | 81% | 81% | 82% | 83% | 84% |
| 14c Result | 81% | 82.1% | 83.2% | 81.7% | 85.5% | 89.3% | 94.1% |
| 14c Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

## Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

### Measurement

Indicator 15 is a performance indicator that measures the percent of due process hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

The indicator is calculated by the number of resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements divided by the number of resolution sessions multiplied by 100.

### Notable Change(s)

OSEP made no changes to this indicator.

### Community Partners Feedback

The data for this indicator can greatly fluctuate year to year. The CDE, with the Office of Administrative Hearings, is developing a clearer operational definition of what is considered a ‘successful’ agreement. The community members were very interested in how successful agreement would be defined in the future and how that could impact the data. Since this discussion is currently ongoing CDE recommends using 2020 as a new baseline and starting point for new ambitious targets.

### Resolution Sessions New Targets

| **Indicator 15** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 40% | 41% | 42% | 43% | 44% | 45% |

### Resolution Sessions Old Targets

| **Indicator 15** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 55% | 56% | 57% | 58% | 59% | 60% | 61% |
| Result | 32.7% | 30.2% | 32.1% | 31.2% | 24.1% | 21.9% | 25.9% |
| Target Met | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |

## Indicator 16: Mediation

### Measurement

Indicator 16 is a performance indicator that measures the percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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.

### Notable Change(s)

OSEP made no changes to this indicator.

### Community Partners Feedback

The data for this indicator can greatly fluctuate year to year and is difficult to accurately forecast. The CDE, with the Office of Administrative Hearings, is developing a clearer operational definition of what is considered a ‘successful’ agreement. The community members were very interested in how successful agreement would be defined in the future and how that could impact the data. Since this discussion is currently ongoing CDE recommends using 2020 as a new baseline and starting point for new ambitious targets.

### Mediation New Targets

| **Indicator 16** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 65% | 66% | 67% | 68% | 69% | 70% |

### Mediation Old Targets

| **Indicator 16** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 55% | 56% | 57% | 58% | 59% | 60% | 61% |
| Result | 65.1% | 62.6% | 60.0% | 53.6% | 57.8% | 62.1% | 53.1% |
| Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No |

## Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

### Measurement

The State Systemic Improvement Plan indicator describes how the state identified and analyzed key data, including data from the SPP/APR indicators, section 618 of the IDEA data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) Select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) (SiMR) for students with disabilities, and (2) Identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the state should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement.

### Notable Change(s)

OSEP made no notable changes to either the measurement or calculation for this indicator. OSEP now requires the SSIP to be submitted in February, along with the other 16 indicators, instead of April.

### Community Partners Feedback

The CDE uses statewide assessment data to measure progress toward the SiMR. While indicator 3 has several targets, OSEP only allows one target for the SSIP. Community members agreed to keep the SSIP targets similar to the 3b math and ELA assessment targets and on the same trajectory. These targets are on the higher end to account for all grades.

### SSIP New Targets

| **Indicator 17** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 14% | 14% | 15% | 16% | 17% | 18% |

### SSIP Old Targets

| **Indicator 17** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019\*\*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | \* | 28.3% | 29.3% | 12.6% | 13.6% | 14.6% | 15.6% |
| Result | \* | 2.11% | 11.10% | 14.5% | 13.0% | 14.0% | N/A |
| Target Met | \* | No | No | Yes | No | No | N/A |

\* The SSIP was not reported this year.

\*\* No results were available for 2019 due to Covid-1