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1,328

This data will be prepopulated in indicators B3A, B4A, B4B, B9, and B10.

**General Supervision System:**

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

---

**Overview of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report Development**

In California, the State Board of Education (SBE) is the lead State Education Agency (SEA). Hereafter, the term California Department of Education (CDE) refers to the CDE operating under the policy direction of the SBE.

The State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) are prepared using instructions forwarded to the CDE, Special Education Division (SED) by the U.S. Department of Education (ED), and the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). For 2014-15 Instructions were drawn from several sources:

- California’s 2014-15 Compliance Determination letter and Response Table (June 15)
- General Instructions for the SPP/APR
- SPP/APR Part B Indicator Measurement Table

In June 2015, the Department had determined that California was "needs assistance" in implementing the requirements of Part B of the IDEA. Based on this compliance determination California accessed services provided by the National Center for Systemic Improvement including the cross-state collaboratives offered on Results Driven Accountability and School Turnaround. Based on that support and technical assistance, California is now implementing a tiered system of support to its Local Education Agencies who do not meet targets and experience slippage from previous year in assessments, compliance, and student outcomes. California is also requiring the use of evidence-based practices with its contractors who provide technical assistance to Local Education Agencies and expanding Communities of Practice for student outcomes. Finally, California is implementing a Performance Indicator Review process for each Local Education Agency that is failing to meet the target and experiencing slippage from the previous year in each performance outcome indicator, during which a plan for improvement will be required and additional monitoring will be completed.

**General Supervision System**

The CDE general supervision system consists of established components and procedures under the Quality Assurance Process (QAP) to ensure federal and state laws, regulations, policies, and procedures are consistent with all requirements of the IDEA. All of the QAP components are used to review and monitor for procedural compliance which includes local plans, annual budget, and service plans, school and district policies, procedures, and practices through their dispute resolution processes, and evaluation of student and district-level data. The dispute resolution activities (complaints and due process hearings) may also generate findings of noncompliance which require additional oversight activity efforts. Any of the review processes may result in findings of noncompliance at the student and district-level. When noncompliant items are found, sanctions may be instituted along with provisions of technical assistance, and professional development. Schools and districts are required to make corrections, and demonstrate that they are implementing the policies, procedures, and practices correctly.

The CDE has a general supervision system that includes the following key components.
1. SPP/APR. The SPP/APR are central to the system of general supervision in California. The SPP includes 17 indicators addressing a broad range of both compliance processes and student outcomes. The indicators cover each of the priority areas identified in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA); Free and Public Education (FAPE) in the Least Restrictive Environment, Disproportionality, Effective General Supervision, including Child Find, and Effective Transitions. The SPP identifies the baselines, benchmarks, and targets in each of the 17 indicator areas and provides a structure for annually reporting at the state and local level.

The SPP/APR are developed through a stakeholder process using information from CDE’s student and district-level data collections, integrated monitoring activities, and dispute resolution procedures. Similarly, the SPP/APR data are used for the selection of programs for review, identification of statewide and local needs, determination of monitoring activities, and provision of training and technical assistance. The SPP, APR, and related calculations serve as the basis for additional state and local reporting for; public reporting of local educational agencies (LEAs) indicators, LEA compliance determinations, and identification of districts having significant disproportionality.

2. Policies, Procedures and Effective Implementation. The CDE has procedures in place to review state and federal statutes and regulations to ensure that state policies and procedures are consistent with the requirements of the IDEA. Additionally, the CDE ensures that Special Education Local Plan Areas (SELPAs), school districts, County Offices of Education, Charter Schools, State Special Schools, and public education agencies operated by other state agencies have established and implemented policies, procedures, and practices required by Part B of the IDEA.

The review of local plans and annual budget and service plans is only one way that CDE checks for complaint policies, procedures, and practices. The CDE reviews policies, procedures, and practices through its integrated monitoring activities, dispute resolution processes, and the evaluation of student and district-level data. Whenever policies, procedures, and practices are found noncompliant, districts are required to make corrections, and demonstrate that they are implementing the policies, procedure, and practices correctly.

3. Data on Processes and Results. California Special Education Management Information System (CASEMIS). The CDE draws on both General Education (GE) and Special Education (SE) data bases to implement California’s system of general supervision. In SE, the CASEMIS includes demographic information about students referred for evaluation as well as all students with Individualized Family Service Plans (IFSPs), Individualized Education Plans (IEPs), and Individualized Service Plans (ISPs). CASEMIS also includes information about services, discipline, preschool assessments and post-school outcomes. CASEMIS is collected two times per year, December 1 and June 30. December 1 data is a snapshot of students enrolled in the program as of that date. June 30 is a cumulative count for the entire fiscal year. The data set is updated biannually and described in detail in the CASEMIS Technical Assistance Guide. CASEMIS software contains rigorous internal data checks and requires certification by the submitting SELPAs. The software also identifies data anomalies, which are unusual or substantial changes from one year to the next. SELPAs and districts are required to explain these changes that are often the result of changes in data collection practices or definitions. Lastly, CASEMIS data are verified on-site as a part of the monitoring processes.

4. Other Special Education Data. Parent input data are collected through CASEMIS and also through a contract with the Sacramento County Office of Education (COE). In addition, the SED of the CDE maintains three data bases related to (1) monitoring findings and correction, (2) complaints findings and correction, and (3) due process hearing findings and correction. A separate data system is maintained by the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) regarding the procedures, time lines and outcomes of due process hearings.

5. General Education Data. The CDE has a number of data bases used in the CDE system of general supervision. First, the CDE has a student-level data base through the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS). This source of information is used to make calculations related to disproportionality, graduation, and assessments. On a more general level, the CDE maintains a master district-level database (Data Quest) that provides information to the public about students, staff and programs in every district in California.

6. Uses. In addition to calculating SPP/APR indicators, the CDE uses data to generate state and local indicator data. This is used for reporting the 618 data collection, public reporting of LEA data, local compliance determinations, and the identification of districts that are significantly disproportionate. These data are used to identify statewide needs and trends to focus our overall monitoring efforts and to target training, technical assistance, and product development. The Assessment, Evaluation and Support Unit also compares data between CASEMIS and CALPADS to ensure continuity across databases. Lastly, these data are used to shape district-level monitoring plans. Information about SPP indicator values, parent input information and compliance history data are entered into CDE-developed monitoring software to generate the monitoring review instruments and the interview protocols.

7. Targeted Technical Assistance and Professional Development. The CDE provides training, technical assistance, and print and electronic materials to support the implementation of the SPP. At the most basic level, each SELPA and district has a SE consultant assigned to act as a contact, to interpret state and federal requirements, to facilitate self-review activities, to conduct Verification Reviews (VRs), and to provide technical assistance and/or link the district to appropriate resources. The CDE maintains a Web site (http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/) related to SE that includes information about administration, current issues, data collection, family involvement, laws and regulations, quality assurance, and services and resources. The CDE sponsors annual conferences (e.g., secondary transition, Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)), conducts statewide training, participates in professional meetings and administrator organizations. In addition, the CDE has a number of contractors who have specific requirements to support parents and professionals in particular areas/activities.

As noted above, the topics and directions for these activities are derived from our student and program databases. Twice a year the CDE assembles the Improving Special Education Services (ISES) stakeholder group. This input is combined with input from the California’s Advisory Commission on Special Education (ACSE) and the review of student outcome and monitoring data by the SED management team to identify progress and determine additional needs for assistance. Please see the section on Targeted Technical Assistance and Professional Development for more information about this area.

8. Effective Dispute Resolution and State Complaints. Pursuant to the IDEA, as amended in 2004, the CDE investigates allegations of violations of state and federal SE law. Complaint investigators in the Complaints Resolution Unit review initial complaint files developed by the Procedural Safeguards Referral Services Unit and complete research to address allegations. Major responsibilities include developing an investigation plan, contacting all parties to the complaint, gathering and analyzing evidence to establish compliance, and developing an investigation report within 60 days of receiving the complaint. The report is sent to each party named in the complaint. The report includes the allegation, the position of the parties, evidence, findings of fact, and conclusions. When noncompliance is determined, the report includes corrective actions and time lines to complete the required actions. Staff of the appropriate FMTA Unit monitors resolution of any required corrective actions. CDE staff also offer technical assistance regarding the development of a local resolution.

The CDE:

- Provides technical assistance in the local resolution of complaints
- Develops written reports within a federally required 60-day time line
- Designs corrective actions for districts and other public agencies with a time line for completion and submission of the corrective action documentation
procedures and additional training requirements. All findings of noncompliance require that the district or the district. In such circumstance the district may also be required to show evidence of compliant policies and practices.

10. Improvement, Correction, Incentives and Sanctions. Every finding of noncompliance includes a corrective action. These may be standardized through the software as in the case of the SESRs, the VRs, data-based monitoring software so that every district reviews particular items.

Due Process Hearings: The CDE contracts with the OAH to complete all mediation and due process hearings in accordance with the IDEA. In addition to overseeing the contract and ensuring all requirements of the IDEA are met in all mediation and due process hearing proceedings, the CDE:

- Reviews all OAH decisions to identify any procedural and/or substantive violations of SE laws and regulations
- Reviews all OAH decisions to identify any potential errors made by the hearing officer for the purposes of training that hearing officer
- Prescribes corrective actions that ameliorate any unresolved noncompliance found as the result of OAH due process decisions within one year
- Notifies LEAs of findings within three months of receiving OAH decisions
- Investigates, through the Department’s complaints procedure, any complaints alleging the failure of an LEA to implement a due process order
- Enforces implementation of a due process order should the investigation determine that the LEA failed to implement a due process order
- Monitors completion of due process orders through regional consultants

Alternative Dispute Resolution: The CDE provides funds to LEAs through the SELPAs to develop and test procedures, materials, and training to support alternate dispute resolution (ADR) in SE. Parents or guardians of students with disabilities, LEAs, and SELPAs may utilize the ADR program to resolve disputes at the local level. ADR grants are currently being refocused to assist in the local resolution prevention of complaints prior to state-level involvement.

9. Integrated Monitoring Activities. The CDE conducts a number of monitoring activities including reviews of SPP data indicators for all districts; Special Education Self reviews (SESRs), VRs; nonpublic school (NPS) reviews and special self-reviews related to Indicators 4, 9, and 10. In addition, dispute resolution activities (complaints and due process hearings) generate findings of noncompliance and form a third type of activity in the integrated monitoring effort. Each type of review is described in more detail under general supervision activities, below.

Monitoring Priorities: California uses a focused monitoring approach. For CDE, monitoring is focused on: 1) requirements related to SPP indicators where a district has failed to meet its benchmarks; 2) issues identified through parent input; and 3) the district’s compliance history (e.g. repeated findings over time). Additional priorities may be identified as a result of recommendations of the ISES stakeholder group, concerns expressed by the legislature or other state control agencies, or through a review of data by the SED management team. These priorities may result in a special process (e.g., review of students receiving mental health services) or the addition of specific review items to the monitoring software so that every district reviews particular items.

Review Cycles: Data reviews are conducted annually for each district. SESR reviews are on a four-year cycle. NPS are monitored annually and on-site at least every three years. VRs are conducted each year. Districts are identified based on data, compliance history, or other compliance concerns. Dispute resolution activities are continuous and noncompliance is identified on a flow basis.

Findings of Noncompliance: The SED makes findings upon identifying LEA noncompliance with a state or federal law or regulation. A finding contains the state's conclusion that the LEA is noncompliant and includes the citation of the statute or regulation as well as a description of the evidence or occurrence supporting the conclusion of noncompliance. Findings of noncompliance are made as a result of VRs, SESRs, other special self-reviews, NPS reviews, complaint investigations, due process hearings reviews, and review of CASEMIS data related to indicators 11, 12, and 13.

An instance of noncompliance is not a finding until it has been reported by CDE to the districts. For any instance of potential noncompliance, the CDE has three choices – 1) to make a finding, 2) to seek additional verification that the instance is or is not noncompliant, or 3) to remove the instance if evidence of correction is provided before the finding is reported to the district. Typically, CDE uses a 90 day guideline (per OSEP’s Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) on compliance) for reporting findings to a district following a monitoring activity. Nonpublic school reviews report findings within 60 days as required by state regulation.

All student level findings of noncompliance require corrective action. Additional corrective actions may be applied to a district when the number of findings for a particular compliance item is high relative to the size of the district. In such circumstance the district may also be required to show evidence of compliant policies and procedures and additional training requirements. All findings of noncompliance require that the district or the
At the June 2009 meeting of SELP As, the CDE shared the OSEP’s requirement along with plans to implement the requirement in the 2010–11 school year. Specifically, the CDE reviewed records, data system, or statewide representative sample or 618 data. If a State examines data through its database and determines that they show noncompliance with the “...a State must account for all noncompliance, whether collected through the State’s on-site monitoring system, other monitoring processes such as self-assessment or desk review of records, data system, or statewide representative sample or 618 data. If a State examines data through its database and determines that they show noncompliance with the requirements of the IDEA, the State must make a finding and require correction as soon as possible, and in no case later than one year after the State’s identification.”

Sanctions: There are several conditions under which the state uses enforcement actions and sanctions if an LEA cannot demonstrate timely correction of noncompliance. The SED employs the sanctioning process when LEAs are substantially out of compliance, fail to comply with corrective action orders, or fail to implement the decision of a due process hearing.

The SED has a range of enforcement options available to use in situations when an LEA is substantially out of compliance, fails to comply with corrective action orders, or fails to implement the decision of a due process hearing. California law and regulation allows the State Superintendent of Public Instruction (SSPI) to apply a hierarchy of sanctions to enforce correction of noncompliance, including: 1) requiring submission of data to demonstrate correction; 2) issuing letters of noncompliance; 3) holding local board hearings; 4) implementing focused and continuous monitoring; 5) applying adverse certification action for nonpublic schools; 6) requiring intermediary agency assurance; 7) implementing specialized corrective actions; 8) requiring compensatory services; 9) issuing grant awards with special conditions; 10) withholding of state and federal funds; and 11) employing writs of mandate.

11. Fiscal Management. The state educational agency (SEA) ensures that LEAs, and/or charters are properly using Part B funds in accordance with Part B requirements through the annual financial data processes in the following ways:

- The SE consultants review the annual budget and service plans of each SELPA.
- The SE consultants reviews two local level maintenance of effort reports (templates) to ensure LEAs meet both the IDEA LEA Maintenance of Effort (MOE) compliance and eligibility standards. These special education LEA-level MOE templates include a calculation report and corresponding worksheets. Both LEA-level MOE templates include four comparison tests (state and local total or per capita or local only total or per capita). The LEA must pass one of these four comparisons to demonstrate compliance with the IDEA LEA MOE requirements.
- The SED distributes an excess cost worksheet that LEAs are required to complete and submit to their SELPA. The SELPA must maintain the excess cost worksheets and have them available upon the request of CDE.
- The SED Grants Office distributes grant awards that require SELPAs to sign and return assurances addressing the requirements for the use of IDEA funds. The grantee must also complete and submit an attached expenditure report. Upon receipt of both documents, the initial payment is made up to the actual expenditures reported. The SED Grants Office provides allocations of IDEA funds on a reimbursement basis, which ensures payments are limited to the actual, immediate cash requirements of the grantee.
- The SED Grants Office collects expenditure reports which include a unique field to report expenditures related to private parentally placed proportionate share and coordinated early intervening services.
- The SEA further ensures the accuracy of the use of funds through the Standardized Account Code Structure (SACS). Within SACS, one of the required fields is a resource code field. The resource code field allows LEAs to account separately for activities funded with revenues that have restrictions on how they are spent (e.g., proportionate share and coordinated early intervening services). SE funds are assigned unique resource codes.
- The LEA single audits are used by the SEA as part of the compliance determination. The LEA single audits are part of the methodology used to determine which LEAs need to participate in the fiscal monitoring process.

General Supervision Activities

The following activities listed below are components of the QAP for the CDE general supervision system:

- VRs are conducted annually for districts whose compliance determinations are lowest, along with other compliance information. The VR is based on a monitoring plan that is developed from parent input, SPP indicator data, and compliance history information. The four primary review activities in the VR process are student record reviews (focusing on procedural compliance, educational benefit, and IEP implementation); policy and procedure reviews; interviews; and a SELPA governance review. Each VR is customized based on its monitoring plan through the use of the CDE-developed monitoring software that generates customized review protocols, compliance reports, and corrective action plans. The CDE staff in partnership with district staff conducts VRs. Follow-up visits of VRs are conducted to ensure 100 percent compliance in subsequent records review.
- Roughly a quarter of the districts are required to conduct SESRs each year. Coordinated through the SELPA of which a district is a part, a SESR is conducted primarily by district staff using the CDE-furnished software and directions. As is done for VR, each district prepares a monitoring plan based on parent input, SPP data, and its compliance history. The monitoring plan is submitted to the CDE for review and approval before the actual review begins. The CDE has provided SESR software that produces customized forms, compliance reports, and corrective action plans. Again, like the VR, SESR consists of multiple types of record reviews, a review of policies and procedures, and a SELPA governance review. Each district submits the data from their software, through the SELPA to the CDE for review evaluation and follow-up.

Data Based Findings of Noncompliance for Indicators 11, 12 and 13: In September, 2008, the OSEP released a frequently asked questions document regarding identification and correction of noncompliance. In that document, the OSEP indicated that:

“...a State must account for all noncompliance, whether collected through the State’s on-site monitoring system, other monitoring processes such as self-assessment or desk review of records, data system, or statewide representative sample or 618 data. If a State examines data through its database and determines that they show noncompliance with the requirements of the IDEA, the State must make a finding and require correction as soon as possible, and in no case later than one year after the State’s identification.”

At the June 2009 meeting of SELPAs, the CDE shared the OSEP’s requirement along with plans to implement the requirement in the 2010–11 school year. Specifically, the CDE indicated that it would be conducting a review related to the compliance indicators in the SPP/APR:

- Indicator 11 - Initial Evaluation;
**Non-Public School (NPS) reviews:** The NPS reviews are part of the general supervision system and include: (1) self-review; (2) on-site review; and (3) follow-up review.

1. **Self-Reviews:** The nonpublic school self-review (NPSSR) is one of several critical components in the QAP. Approximately a third of the certified nonpublic schools are selected for a review each year. The CDE sends a standard review instrument to these nonpublic schools. The nonpublic school site administrator collaborates with the LEA to complete the instructional materials survey and course of study of the NPSSR. Nonpublic schools generally have 45 days to complete the report and return to the CDE for review and approval.

2. **On-site Reviews:** The CDE invites schools scheduled for an on-site review to a training session at the beginning of each school year. Each school receives the evaluation instrument used to conduct the review and is navigated through the process by the CDE staff. The on-site review begins with an entrance meeting, followed by a review of documentation, school procedures, programs and a sampling of student IEPs, and records. Reviewers randomly select IEPs and student records to obtain a representative sample of students placed by contracting LEAs at the school. Compliance with federal and state law related to the IEP is determined. The CDE assigns any IEP-related required corrective action to the contracting LEA to complete. The review includes observations of implementation of student IEPs and access to the same standards-based core curriculum of students placed by contracting LEAs at the school. Compliance with federal and state law related to the IEP is determined. The CDE assigns any IEP-related required corrective action to the contracting LEA to complete. The review includes observations of implementation of student IEPs and access to the same standards-based core curriculum used by any school district with which the nonpublic school contracts. On conclusion of the review, the monitoring team holds an exit interview with school staff at which time potential findings are reviewed and plans to remedy any issues of noncompliance are developed. Within 60 days of the review, a written report is issued to the nonpublic school and the contracting LEAs. The report is forwarded to respective FMTA unit with geographical responsibility for LEAs contracting with the nonpublic school. The CDE NPS unit works with LEAs to resolve findings of noncompliance. Unresolved noncompliance is forwarded to the FMTA unit for further action.

3. **Follow-up Reviews:** The degree to which the CDE conducts follow-up reviews is dependent on areas in which the nonpublic school is found noncompliant. The CDE monitors the plan to ensure that progress is being made to correct areas of deficiency. This step may include desk audits and/or additional follow-up visits to the nonpublic school. The CDE provides technical assistance to the nonpublic school and the LEA in this regard.

Nonpublic schools and agencies are annually certified and continuously monitored by the CDE according to state and federal law. As required by California state law, on-site reviews are conducted once every three years or more frequently if necessary. The CDE involvement does not end until the nonpublic school is fully compliant or when the nonpublic school loses its certification status.

**Findings of Noncompliance:** A finding contains the state’s conclusion that the LEA is noncompliant and includes the citation of the statute or regulation as well as a description of the evidence or occurrence supporting the conclusion of noncompliance. All noncompliant findings require correction.

Formal noncompliance may be identified and corrective action plans developed through a wide variety of means, including data collection and analysis, investigation of compliance complaints and due process hearings, review of student records, and review of policies and procedures in local plans. For example, the CDE uses data collected through the CASEMIS to identify districts that are not completing annual reviews of IEPs in a timely way. Findings of noncompliance require a local education agency to complete and implement a corrective action plan.
Sanctions: There are several conditions under which the state uses enforcement actions and sanctions if an LEA cannot demonstrate timely correction of noncompliance. The CDE employs the sanction process when LEAs are substantially out of compliance, fail to comply with corrective action orders, or fail to implement the decision of a due process hearing.

California law and regulation allows the SSPI to apply a hierarchy of sanctions to enforce correction of noncompliance, including: 1) requiring submission of data to demonstrate correction; 2) issuing letters of noncompliance; 3) holding local board hearings; 4) implementing focused and continuous monitoring; 5) applying adverse certification action for nonpublic schools; 6) requiring intermediary agency assurance; 7) implementing specialized corrective actions; 8) requiring compensatory services; 9) issuing grant awards with special conditions; 10) withholding of state and federal funds; and 11) employing writs of mandate.

Reporting and Correction Time Period: The CDE follows the 90 day guideline for reporting findings to a district following a monitoring activity in accordance with OSEP’s FAQs on compliance. The CDE reports findings on Nonpublic school reviews within 60 days as required by state regulation.

Compliance findings are reported in the year in which the district was notified of noncompliance. “On time” calculations are based on a span of one year from the date that the district was notified of noncompliance. As an example, noncompliance findings made in 2012–13 should be corrected within one year, with corrections completed in 2013–14.

At the student-level, the district must provide specified evidence of correction within a 45-day time period. At the district-level, the district must provide updated policies and procedures, and evidence that the new policies and procedures have been disseminated and implemented. In a six-month follow-up review of a representative sub-set of files, the district must demonstrate that no new instances of noncompliance, at the 100 percent level, in that area have occurred. The CDE has a variety of sanctions available to use in situations in which noncompliance goes uncorrected (e.g., special grant conditions, withholding of funds, and court action).

Other Monitoring and Accountability Activities for the General Supervision System

Local Plans, Budget and Service Plans: Each SELPA is required to submit an Annual Budget and Service Plan to the CDE in accordance with California Education Code (EC) Section 56205. The plans must identify expected expenditures and include a description of services, the physical location of the services, and must demonstrate that all individuals with exceptional needs have access to services and instruction appropriate to meet their needs as specified in their IEP. The IDEA, regulations, and the EC define the required components of SE local plans. The SE local plans shall include:

1. Local education agency assurance of compliance with federal requirements delineated in 20 United States Code (USC), Section 1412;
2. Local education agencies shall submit to the CDE, policies and procedures as outlined in California EC sections 56205 and 56207; and
3. Local education agencies shall maintain on file locally, policies and procedures as outlined in California EC Section 56195.

The SELPA SE local plans, annual budget and services plans are reviewed by the special education staff in the CDE. They approve and determine compliance in accordance with federal and state laws and regulations. The approval of a SE local plan does not set aside any federal or state laws or regulations. The SELPA may choose to amend their SE local plan at any time a change may be deemed necessary due to local changes, new legislative requirements, a new interpretation by the courts, or an official finding of noncompliance with federal law or state statutes or regulations determined by the CDE.

Fiscal Monitoring: The fiscal component of the SESR and VR assures that LEAs appropriately use IDEA funds by:

- Reviewing district time sheets and personnel assignments to ensure correct revenue resource for assigned SE staff;
- Ensuring equipment is correctly identified and used by assigned SE students;
- Sampling NPA contracted services to ensure that services are properly funded and delivered;
- Ensuring IDEA funds are properly used for professional development for SE staff;
- Reviewing A-133 annual LEA independent audits to determine whether SE audit exceptions were identified. Note: A-133 audit findings affect the compliance determination of the LEA;
- Reviewing local level MOE reports (templates) to determine whether LEAs meet both the IDEA LEA MOE compliance and eligibility standards;
- Ensuring each LEA has correctly calculated the proportionate share of IDEA funds available for private parentally placed students with disabilities; and
- Ensuring each LEA has correctly calculated the excess cost worksheet and has a method to spend the average per pupil state and local amount for SE students prior to spending IDEA funds.

Maintenance of Effort: The SEA annually collects financial data from all LEAs in the state, via the SACS. The CDE has developed software to allow LEAs to annually report their financial data. Templates are used for local level maintenance of effort reports to ensure LEAs meet both the IDEA LEA MOE compliance and eligibility standards. These special education LEA-level MOE templates include a calculation report and corresponding worksheets. Both LEA-level MOE templates include four comparison tests State and local total or per capita or local only total or per capita. The LEA must pass one of these four comparisons to demonstrate compliance with the IDEA LEA MOE requirements.

As the grantor of IDEA Part B funds, it is the SEAs responsibility to determine the eligibility of an LEA. To do this, the SEA reviews the LEA budget figures and compares them to the actual expenditures for the prior fiscal year. This is called the budget to actual test (Form LMCB) and is covered in federal regulations (34 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) sections 300.230–300.232).
If the LEA allocates in its budget at least as much as was spent in the prior fiscal year, then the LEA is eligible to receive a federal IDEA Part B grant. The CDE does not allocate federal funds to an LEA until the LEA passes this test.

The second test of MOE comes once the books of accounts for a fiscal year have been closed. Actual expenditures for the year are compared to the actual expenditures of the preceding fiscal year to determine if an LEA has expended at least as much as they did in the prior year. This is called the actual to actual test (Form LMCA). If the LEA, after consultation with CDE, cannot meet the required level of effort, that is expend at least as much in state and local and/or local funds in the most current fiscal year as to the prior fiscal year, then the LEA is invoiced by CDE for the amount it failed to expend to maintain its required level of expenditures. The LEA must pay the invoice using non-federal funds. The CDE in turn submits the payment to the U.S. Department of Education.

---

**Technical Assistance System:**

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

**Technical Assistance System and Professional Development System**

Focused Monitoring and Technical Assistance (FMTA): The SED staff in the CDE are assigned to each of the fifty-eight counties in California. FMTA staff responsible for coordinating monitoring and technical assistance activities for the districts and SELPAs in their assigned areas. FMTA administrators and staff:

- Ensure state and local compliance through a variety of data informed monitoring activities
- Provide technical assistance to local education agencies (LEA) and Special Education Local Plan Areas (SELPA) to ensure the provision of free appropriate public education (FAPE)
- Review and verify CAESMIS data
- Maintain uniformity and standardization for corrective action
- Provide technical assistance and work collaboratively with school districts to ensure all students are provided the opportunity for educational benefit

Primary activities involve:

- Reviewing local plans, including budget and service agreements
- Review waiver requests
- Approving district monitoring self-reviews
- Conducting Verification Reviews, and follow-up monitoring visits
- Monitoring the corrective actions that are the result of complaint investigations
- Provide technical assistance to districts and SELPAs to increase collaborative activity among parents, teachers administrative and community agency staff to ensure the educational benefit for students with disabilities, increase participation with non-disabled peers and the result in a successful transition to the community at large.
- Resolve noncompliance identified through the state complaint and OAH compliant processes

California Services for Technical Assistance and Training (CalSTAT): The CalSTAT is a special project of the California Department of Education, Special Education Division. CalSTAT is located at the Napa County Office of Education. It is funded through the Special Education Division and the California State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG), a federal grant. The SPDG supports and develops partnerships with schools and families by providing training, technical assistance and resources to both special education and general education. CalSTAT is involved in the following work:

Project Read is a collaborative, evidence-based project for LEAs to increase reading achievement and academic outcomes of middle school students with disabilities from low-performing middle schools throughout California.

Technical Assistance provides customized problem solving training to achieve outcomes desired outcomes and improve educational results through in-person or virtual training and/or coaching, or site-visits. Hundreds of technical assistance training days have been delivered to 1600 school sites in 56 of California’s 58 counties to approximately 45,000 participants to date. The technical assistance training focuses on specific situations relative to the following subject matter areas:

1. Reading/Literacy
2. Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports
3. Collaboration
4. Transition from School to Adult Life
5. School-Family-Community Partnerships
6. Least Restrictive Environment

---
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7. Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

8. Core Components to Response to Instruction and Intervention

9. Closing the Achievement Gap for Students with IEPs

Publications, Podcasts, and Webinars are produced for large scale dissemination across California. To date, CalSTAT has distributed nearly 1 million printed education related Special EDge newsletters, topic driven documents, videos, and compact discs at no cost to the recipient, such as a guide on Transition to Adult Living and another on Procedural Safeguards for parents. LEA staff may access approximately 25 distinct podcasts to hear recorded conversations with experts from the field on a variety of topics. Webinar presentations by regional institute sites and keynote speakers are archived and made available for leadership community site teams to share knowledge and experience through face-to-face networking and distance learning opportunities. The goal is to support the development of collaborative systems involving general and special educators, and families in implementing effective, research-based educational programs and strategies for the benefit of children with disabilities. Since the inception of leadership community site teams over a decade ago, CalSTAT has awarded 103 site teams who have delivered nearly 600 distinct training events to over 20,000 participants.

Evaluation and Data Tools are for reporting activities and outcomes on California’s system of personnel preparation and professional development to increase student achievement and improve outcomes for students with disabilities. The SPDG evaluators work closely with CalSTAT staff, the CDE, and key stakeholders in developing California’s evaluations and data tools for SPDG/CalSTAT activities. The goal is to report student outcomes in a format that makes the information useful and easily accessible to the wide range of SPDG partners. The SPDG Evaluation Task Force meets annually to review evaluation plans, data, and reports and then makes recommendations to the larger ISES Stakeholder Group. More information may be accessed at the CalSTAT Web site at http://www.calstat.org/.

Smarter Balanced Digital Library: The Smarter Balanced Digital Library provides online professional development learning opportunities regarding formative assessment strategies, practices, resources, and tools for educators to use in the classroom to tailor their instructional practices to meet the educational needs of students to achieve the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in English Language Arts/Literacy and Mathematics. The online library also offers support for teachers to interpret data and reports on student achievement. The Digital Library is a critical component of the Smarter Balanced system of assessments.


Brokers of Expertise: The state of California is large and diverse and the use of technology in classrooms varies systematically across teachers and schools. As such, the CDE established the Brokers of Expertise (BoE) Web site, with the support of the K-12 High Speed Network, for local education agencies to share online tools and resources. The goal is to provide a new level of online connectivity and cohesion across all educator categories and in all regions of California’s education system. The desired outcome is to build educators’ capacity to use technology while students benefit from evidenced-based practices that effective in the classroom. The BoE centers on teaching and learning focused on success for diverse students and schools. It identifies research, exemplary models of instruction and high quality professional development resources. Tools and strategies are strengthened to increase collegial connections for teachers to identify and develop effective lessons relative to the CCSC, and accessible to all students. The BoE online resources provide:

- Classroom tools and resources that are aligned to the California Common Core State Standards;

- Resources that are searchable by grade, content level, and demographic information;

- Opportunities for creating and publishing high-quality content that has proven effective for teachers; and,

- Communication facilitation and dialogue with educators across the state who have similar questions.

More information on BoE online resources may be accessed at http://www.myboe.org/.

Early Start Personnel Development: Early Start Personnel Development, under the California Early Intervention Technical Assistance Network, is a collaborative effort between the California Department of Education and the California Department of Developmental Services to provide professional development training for individuals teaching and working with infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. It is administered by the WestEd Center for Prevention and Early Intervention. The training is comprised of facilitated online and interactive courses and offered through Early Start Online, a Web-based, multi-media learning management environment. The Early Start Personnel Development online courses provide the foundational knowledge and basic skills early intervention personnel need to serve children with disabilities and their families. The content and learning outcomes are grounded in the comprehensive, evidence-based core curriculum, and grouped into three sessions for fall, winter, and spring. The courses employ various media, including slide presentations narrated by field personnel, video clips of real intervention techniques, individual learning activities and assignments that generate discussion and deepen learning. Parent-professional facilitator teams interact with participants to verify completion of assignments, support understanding of course content, and facilitate interactions with peers.

More information may be accessed at California Early Start Web site at http://www.celtan-earlystart.org/training/.

Professional Learning Opportunities: The CDE established the Professional Learning Opportunities Web site that offers a list of in-person and online statewide professional learning opportunities sponsored by the CDE, COEs, LEAs, institutes of higher education, (IHE) and the SBE approved providers, as well as other not-for-profit agencies. The CDE recognized the need for developing a statewide infrastructure for professional learning that supports educator/administrator communities and school improvement efforts. Entities enter their professional learning opportunities into the statewide professional learning Web site in a few easy steps. Professional learning opportunities associated with federal, state or locally developed programs must be aligned with those programs' associated criteria. Because California is a large and diverse state, training opportunities and frameworks are intended to provide access to information, but are not endorsed nor recommended by the CDE. No registration is required. More information may be accessed at the Professional Learning Opportunities Web site at http://www.cde.ca.gov/pd/oe/prodev07intro.asp.
Professional Development System:
The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

See the Technical Assistance Section.

Stakeholder Involvement:

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

The CDE and SED management collaborate with the stakeholders listed below:

Early Childhood Special Education Stakeholders (ECSES) is an ad hoc group of 28 key constituents broadly representing the infant care and toddler state funded preschool, federal head-start programs, California Department of Developmental Services, WestEd, child development education programs offered by universities and community colleges, county offices of education, and medical experts specializing in children with disabilities. They focus on early childhood outcomes relative to transition from Part C to Part B, serving preschool age children in the least restrictive environment, and assessment outcomes, and provide input on OSEP’s priorities by helping to:

a. Identify new targets for all performance indicators for the period 2014 through 2018;
b. Combine the SPP and APR into a single document; and,
c. Develop the statewide systemic improvement plan (SSIP).

Training and Technical Assistance Collaborative (TTAC): The Training and Technical Assistance Collaborative (TTAC) is composed of members from the federal, state, and local levels that share information on training efforts to increase the capacity of early childhood educators working with children with disabilities in a variety of service systems. A key mission of the collaborative is to build relationships and nurture trust among TTAC leaders in support of coordination and collaboration in planning and implementing early childhood/early intervention training and technical assistance activities. The focus is to promote inclusion and make high-quality programs available to all young children. TTAC establishes a strong infrastructure for the early intervention and early childhood special education field to comply with Part C and Part B under the IDEA that requires inclusive practices in the natural and least restrictive environments.

The goals are to:

• Prepare and train early childhood program providers to work effectively with young children with disabilities;
• Promote inclusive practices ensure that they are implemented in programs; and,
• Institute and preserve the supports and activities that address inclusion efforts.

More information may be found at the Training and Technical Assistance Web site, hosted by WestEd at [http://www.wested.org/project/training-and-technical-assistance-collaborative/](http://www.wested.org/project/training-and-technical-assistance-collaborative/).

Working Together for Inclusion and Belonging is a collaboration among early childhood education providers. The group combines efforts to offer technical assistance, professional development, other resources that address inclusive practice, promotion of healthy social-emotional development, and prevention of challenging behavior in early childhood, after-school, and in other education settings. Projects under the Working Together umbrella include:

1. Beginning Together: Caring for Infants & Toddlers with Disabilities or Special Needs in Inclusive Settings offers support for personnel working in the state funded Program for Infants and Toddler Care (PTC) in the form of technical assistance and resources, such as “training of trainers” institute, regional outreach activities, and revision and development of written materials, all to ensure that children with special needs are included, and appropriate inclusive practices are promoted.
2. California MAP to Inclusion and Belonging, Making Access Possible is a statewide collaborative project that offers technical assistance and resources to support child care providers in accommodating and including children with disabilities and other special needs ages birth to 21 in child care, after school and community settings.

3. California Collaborative on the Social & Emotional Foundations for Early Learning (CA CSEFEL) Teaching Pyramid provides a systematic framework for promoting social and emotional development, support for children's appropriate behavior, preventing challenging behavior, and addressing problematic behavior.

More information may be found at the Working Together for Inclusion and Belonging Web site at http://cainclusion.org/.

SED Staff, comprised of over 140 individuals that have been meeting along with program service providers monthly to discuss and review special education issues impacting California students and to recommend long-term institutional modifications to accommodate the OSEP's shift toward Results Driven Accountability, and support LEAs in achieving improved outcomes for students with disabilities.

SELPA directors` monthly meetings have included review and discussion of selected SPP revisions and APR data. Additionally, the SELPA directors annually participate in two separate CASEMIS training sessions each April and October to learn about results and the new SPP/APR requirements.

LEA administrators also annually participate in the two separate CASEMIS training sessions each April and October to learn about the results and to discuss the new SPP/APR requirements.

SEACO administrators’ quarterly meetings is a forum to present selected SPP revisions and APR data, as well as, solicit input.

The ACSE reviews and discusses the requirements of OSEP’s SPP/APR at their regularly scheduled meetings. In October 2015, the SED Director reported to the ACSE on the OSEP’s new priorities for the SPP/APR.

The SPP/APR was approved by the SBE in January 2016.

**Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File Name</th>
<th>Uploaded By</th>
<th>Uploaded Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No APR attachments found.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reporting to the Public:**

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2013 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State’s submission of its FFY 2013 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b) (1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State’s SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2013 APR in 2015, is available.

**Reporting to the Public and Web Site Posting**

- The revised SPP/APR are posted annually on the CDE Web site once they have been approved by the OSEP. The most recently approved SPP/APR may be found at [http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/qa/](http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/qa/).


- The CDE updates and maintains the Reauthorization of the IDEA 2004 information Web page which links to important references and resources including public reporting, data awareness, and data utilization used to reflect upon practice efforts as part of the obligation for the general supervision system under the IDEA of 2004. More information may be accessed at the Reauthorization of the IDEA 2004 Web site at [http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/lr/ideareathztn.asp](http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/lr/ideareathztn.asp).

- The CDE also updates and maintains the Services and Resources Web site that contains information on programs and services available to students with disabilities, publications, training and technical assistance opportunities, and recruitment resources and materials. It also constitutes public reporting, data awareness,
and data utilization for best practice efforts and part of the obligation for the general supervision system under of IDEA 2004. More information may be accessed at the Services and Resources Web site at http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/sr/#srinf.

The CDE staff and contractors collected data and made calculations for each of the 17 indicators that measure and report the state’s performance in educating students with disabilities.

Use of SPP/APR Data Source

The SPP/APR indicator data targets are central to the general supervision system in California and provide a structure for annually reporting at the state and local level. The CDE gathers information from student and district-level data collections, integrated monitoring activities, and mediation and complaint resolution outcomes. The information is used to: calculate the SPP/APR indicators; generate state and local indicator data; report the 618 data collection of IDEA which includes information on Child Count, Exiting, Discipline, Personnel, State Assessments and Due Process. This information is also used to report LEA data to the public; determine local compliance; and, to identify the districts that are significantly disproportionate.

The SPP/APR, and related data calculations serve as the basis to identify statewide needs and trends to focus monitoring efforts. The data are used to shape district-level monitoring plans, report on state and local education benefit outcomes for children with disabilities, compliance determinations, and identification of districts having significant disproportionality including:

- Selection of programs for review;
- Identification of statewide and local needs;
- Determination of monitoring activities;
- Provision of training and technical assistance; and
- Specification of professional development.

Information about SPP indicator values, parent input information and compliance history data are entered into CDE-developed monitoring software to generate the monitoring review instruments and the interview protocols.

CASEMIS

The CASEMIS is a statewide student level database for special education. CASEMIS information includes demographic information about students referred for evaluation, students with IFSPs, IEPs, ISPs, as well as parent data. It also has information on services, discipline, preschool assessments, and post-school outcomes.

The CASEMIS data set is collected two times per year, December 1 and June 30. December 1 data is a snapshot of students enrolled in the program as of that date while June 30 is a cumulative count of students moving in and out of a program for the entire fiscal year. The data set is updated biannually and described in detail in the CASEMIS Technical Assistance Guide. The CASEMIS software contains rigorous internal data checks and requires certification by the submitting SELPA. The software also identifies data anomalies, which are unusual or substantial changes from one year to the next. SELPAs and districts are required to explain these changes that are often the result of changes in data collection practices or definitions. The CASEMIS data are verified on-site as a part of the VRs and are part of the oversight of integrated monitoring activities of the CDE’s QAP.

Other Special Education Data Collection
The CDE also collects parent data through a contract with the Sacramento COE. This data is used primarily to inform areas for investigation in the Verification Review process. The SED of the CDE also maintains three data bases related to: (1) monitoring findings and correction, (2) complaints findings and correction, and (3) due process hearing findings and correction. A separate data system is maintained by the OAH regarding the procedures, time lines and outcomes of due process hearings relative to children with disabilities.

General Education Data Collection

The CALPADS is a longitudinal student-level data system used to maintain individual-level data including student demographics, course data, discipline, assessments, staff assignments, and other data for state and federal reporting. The Special Education Division (SED) uses the CALPADS data to make calculations related to disproportionality, graduation, and dropouts.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Accountability Progress Reporting System (APR)

The AYP/APR is a statewide accountability system mandated by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 which requires each state to ensure that all schools and districts make Adequate Yearly Progress. The SED uses the APR data reports, which includes the Academic Performance Index (API) reports, the AYP reports, and the Program Improvement (PI) reports to determine educational benefit for children with disabilities.

DataQuest

DataQuest is an online system that provides reports about California’s schools and school districts. It contains a wide variety of information including school performance indicators, student and staff demographics, expulsion, suspension, and truancy information and a variety of test results. Data are presented so that users can easily compare schools, districts and counties.

California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP)

The CAASPP is California’s new statewide student assessment system established January 1, 2014. The Special Education Division in the CDE will use the CAASPP assessment reports to determine educational benefit for children with disabilities. For the 2014-15 school years, the CAASPP assessment system encompasses the following required assessments:

- Smarter Balanced online system of assessments for mathematics and English–language arts (Smarter Balanced is a state-led consortium working collaboratively to develop next-generation assessments aligned to Common Core State Standards that accurately measure student progress toward college and career readiness.);

- California Standards Test (CST) for Science in grades five, eight, and ten;

- California Modified Assessment (CMA) for Science in grades five, eight, and ten; and,

- California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA) for Science in grades five, eight, and ten and for mathematics and English–language arts in grades two through eleven.

Indicator Data Sources

To support the General Supervision System, the CDE, with stakeholder input, determines the indicator targets delineated in the SPP and APR. The SPP/APR contains 17 indicators, which are for addressing a broad range of compliance processes and student outcomes. They are used to evaluate the performance
and progress on providing special education (SE) and related services for students with disabilities. The 17 indicators are differentiated as compliance indicators and performance indicators. They measure outcomes of the education benefit realized by students with disabilities. The indicators cover each of the priority areas identified in the IDEA of 2004, including but not limited to: FAPE in the LRE, Disproportionality, Effective General Supervision, Child Find, and Effective Transitions. Additionally, California is required to consider data for all compliance indicators when making local determinations based on the 2010–11 school year.

The SPP/APR indicator targets are collected from a variety of data sources with variations in collection methodologies, parameters, and time frames. As a result, indicator targets may show slight variations in counts. The baselines, benchmarks, and targets in each of the 17 indicator areas are identified. A description of each indicator, the data collected, calculations applied to each district’s performance, and the district’s performance measurement criteria are explained below.

- **Indicator 1:** (Graduation Rates) is gathered from the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) 2013–14.

- **Indicator 2:** (Dropout Rates) is gathered from the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) 2013–14.

- **Indicator 3:** (Statewide Assessment) is collected from the AYP Database.

- **Indicator 4A:** (Rates of Suspension and Expulsion Greater than 10 Days) is gathered from CASEMIS (2013–14).

- **Indicator 4B:** (Suspension and Expulsion by Ethnicity) is gathered from CASEMIS (2013–14) and LEA self-review of policies, procedures, and practices.

- **Indicator 5:** (LRE) is derived from CASEMIS December 2015.

- **Indicator 6:** (Preschool LRE) is derived from CASEMIS December 2015 and Department of Developmental Services (DDS).

- **Indicator 7:** (Preschool Assessment) is derived from CASEMIS in December 2015 and June 2015.

- **Indicator 8:** (Parent Involvement) is collected through CASEMIS data in June 2015.

- **Indicator 9:** (Disproportionality by Race and Ethnicity) is collected through CASEMIS December 2015, CALPADS and LEA self-review of policies, procedures, and practices.

- **Indicator 10:** (Disproportionality by Disability) is collected through CASEMIS December 2015, CALPADS and LEA self-review of policies, procedures, and practices.

- **Indicator 11:** (60-Day Time Line) is gathered through CASEMIS December 2015 and June 2015.

- **Indicator 12:** (Transition, Part C to Part B) is gathered through CASEMIS December 2015 and June 2015, with additional DDS Part C data for Indicator 12.
o Indicator 13: (Secondary Transition) is gathered through CASEMIS December 2015 and June 2015.

o Indicator 14: (Post-school) is collected from Table D in CASEMIS June 2015.

o Indicator 15: (Hearing Requests Resolved by Resolution Session) is gathered from the complaints database, July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2015.

o Indicator 16: (Mediations Resulting in Mediation Agreements) is gathered from the complaints database, July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2015.

o Indicator 17: (State Systemic Improvement Plan) is gathered from CALPADS, CASEMIS, and Assessment data.

Improvement Planning

The CDE seeks input regarding systematic improvement from broad stakeholder groups interested in educational issues concerning students with disabilities. Additionally, analysis and thoughtful planning of improvement activities for each of the indicators is formally designed to occur through two primary groups:

1. The broad-based stakeholder group ISES provides the CDE with feedback and recommendations for improvement activities based on data in the SPP/APR. For more information about ISES, please visit the California Services for Technical Assistance and Training (CalSTAT) Web site at http://www.calstat.org/spdgises.html. In addition to collaboration with ISES, the SED staff has worked to identify improvement activities for each indicator and to analyze data to identify effective improvement activities.

2. The ACSE is an advisory body required by federal (20 USC 1412(a)(21) and state statutes (EC 33590-6). The ACSE provides recommendations and advice to the SBE, the SSPI, the Legislature, and the Governor in new or continuing areas of research, program development, and evaluation in California related to special education. The ACSE consists of appointed members from the Speaker of the Assembly, Senate Committee on Rules, and the Governor. One member of the SBE serves as liaison to the ACSE. The membership also includes parents, persons with disabilities, persons knowledgeable about the administration of special education, teachers, and legislative representation from the California State Assembly and Senate. The SED staff provides the ACSE with information on the SPP/APR through information sharing updates, staff presentations, and through ACSE participation in the ISES stakeholder meetings.

The SED has sought to actively involve the ACSE, the SBE liaison, and the SBE staff in the development of the FFY 2014 SPP/APR. The ACSE members and the SBE liaison have been included in the membership of the ISES stakeholder group and have been invited to all ISES meetings during which the SED seeks advice regarding the effectiveness of improvement activities and recommendations for new activities. The SED provided the ACSE, the SBE liaison, and the SBE staff a calendar of important dates, instructions from OSEP to the CDE, dates of the OSEP technical assistance calls, data collection deadlines, and deadlines for submitting information and preparation of the SPP/APR. The SED provided drafts and updates the information regarding the development of the SPP/APR to the ACSE, the SBE liaison, and the SBE for comment and input.
Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

The State’s determinations for both 2014 and 2015 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP’s June 30, 2015 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2014 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2016, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.

Required Actions

The State’s IDEA Part B determination for both 2015 and 2016 is Needs Assistance.

In the State’s 2016 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities.

The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance.

The State must report, with its FFY 2015 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2017, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.
Indicator 1: Graduation

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>≥90.00%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>83.00%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>69.96%</td>
<td>72.86%</td>
<td>65.94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>91.00%</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>60.20%</td>
<td>64.80%</td>
<td>74.40%</td>
<td>76.30%</td>
<td>61.10%</td>
<td>61.89%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: 
- Gray – Data Prior to Baseline
- Yellow – Baseline
- Blue – Data Update

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>≥90.00%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

- Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [Introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

### Prepopulated Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Overwrite Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SY 2013-14 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)</td>
<td>12/2/2015</td>
<td>Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma</td>
<td>34,519</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2013-14 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)</td>
<td>12/2/2015</td>
<td>Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate</td>
<td>55,377</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2013-14 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)</td>
<td>12/2/2015</td>
<td>2012-13 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table</td>
<td>62.00%</td>
<td>Calculate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of youth with IEPs in the current year’s adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma</th>
<th>Number of youth with IEPs in the current year’s adjusted cohort eligible to graduate</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34,519</td>
<td>55,377</td>
<td>61.89%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>62.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Provide the four-year graduation cohort rate. The four-year graduation rate follows a cohort, or a group of students, who begin as first-time 9th graders in a particular school year and who graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years or less. An extended-year graduation rate follows the same cohort of students for an additional year or years. The cohort is “adjusted” by adding any students transferring into the cohort and by subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die during the years covered by the rate.

Under 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1)(iv), a “regular high school diploma” means the standard high school diploma awarded to students in a State that is fully aligned with the State's academic content standards and does not include a GED credential, certificate of attendance, or any alternative award. The term “regular high school diploma” also includes a “higher diploma” that is awarded to students who complete requirements above and beyond what is required for a regular diploma.

The requirements to graduate with a regular diploma in California are the same for all students. In addition to meeting the district’s requirements for graduation, all students are required to pass the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) to earn a public high school diploma. Beginning in July 1, 2009, California state law provides an exemption from the requirement to pass the CAHSEE as a condition of receiving a diploma of graduation for eligible students with disabilities who have otherwise met the district requirements for graduation, and allows districts to award a regular diploma to such students. In addition, at the request of the student’s parent or guardian, a school principal must submit to the local school governing board a request for a waiver of the requirement to pass the part(s) of the CAHSEE on which a modification was used and the equivalent of a passing score was earned.

### Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

### OSEP Response

```

```

### Required Actions

```

```
Indicator 2: Drop Out

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data
Baseline Data: 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>≤ 86.00%</td>
<td>88.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>87.00%</td>
<td>98.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>23.60%</td>
<td>91.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>22.60%</td>
<td>23.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>22.60%</td>
<td>22.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>22.10%</td>
<td>15.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>10.20%</td>
<td>10.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>17.90%</td>
<td>17.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline
Yellow – Baseline
Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFY 2014</td>
<td>≤ 14.72%</td>
<td>14.72%</td>
<td>13.72%</td>
<td>12.72%</td>
<td>11.72%</td>
<td>10.72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input
- Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.
- Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Overwrite Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SY 2013-14 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)</td>
<td>6/4/2015</td>
<td>Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)</td>
<td>18,841</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2013-14 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)</td>
<td>6/4/2015</td>
<td>Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)</td>
<td>10,272</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2013-14 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)</td>
<td>6/4/2015</td>
<td>Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)</td>
<td>1,367</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)</td>
<td>6/4/2015</td>
<td>Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)</td>
<td>6,506</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2013-14 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)</td>
<td>6/4/2015</td>
<td>Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) [a + b + c + d + e]</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out [d]</td>
<td>6,506</td>
<td>37,142</td>
<td>15.72%</td>
<td>14.72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Explanation of Slippage

A review of data has confirmed that one district has 884 additional drop outs for 2013-14, through changes in policies and procedures most of those students have returned to school and it is anticipated the rate will decrease in the future.

### Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

### OSEP Response

#### Required Actions

None
Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

(Historical Data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>53.90%</td>
<td>35.20%</td>
<td>24.85%</td>
<td>38.70%</td>
<td>18.30%</td>
<td>14.70%</td>
<td>11.20%</td>
<td>8.20%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: Grey – Data Prior to Baseline, Yellow – Baseline, Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>59.00%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>61.00%</td>
<td>62.00%</td>
<td>63.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Does your State have an ESEA Flexibility Waiver of determining AYP?

Yes  No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of districts in the State</th>
<th>Number of districts that met the minimum &quot;n&quot; size</th>
<th>Number of districts that meet the minimum &quot;n&quot; size AND met AYP</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,305</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>59.00%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of Slippage

Actions required in FFY 2013 response
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSEP Response</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 3A is not applicable for FFY 2014.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Actions</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE
Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum "n" size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Name</th>
<th>Baseline Year</th>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading A</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math A</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading A ≥ Overall</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>96.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math A ≥ Overall</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>96.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2013 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? yes

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? yes


Reading assessment participation data by grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>HS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Children with IEPs</td>
<td>48522</td>
<td>52387</td>
<td>53924</td>
<td>50978</td>
<td>48334</td>
<td>47453</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>35963</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations</td>
<td>40383</td>
<td>43493</td>
<td>44660</td>
<td>36034</td>
<td>34962</td>
<td>34689</td>
<td>27573</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Name</th>
<th>Number of Children with IEPs</th>
<th>Number of Children with IEPs Participating</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Overall</td>
<td>337,561</td>
<td>332,096</td>
<td>89.38%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>98.38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Name</th>
<th>Number of Children with IEPs</th>
<th>Number of Children with IEPs Participating</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Overall</td>
<td>336,291</td>
<td>331,236</td>
<td>88.96%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>98.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ay/aypreports.asp
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions required in FFY 2013 response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

### Historical Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Name</th>
<th>Baseline Year</th>
<th>FFY 2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td>Unified, HS 7-12, COE</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>23.00%</td>
<td>34.00%</td>
<td>45.00%</td>
<td>56.00%</td>
<td>67.00%</td>
<td>78.00%</td>
<td>89.00%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.60%</td>
<td>20.80%</td>
<td>24.19%</td>
<td>29.80%</td>
<td>32.30%</td>
<td>22.90%</td>
<td>35.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td>Elementary School Districts</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>24.40%</td>
<td>35.20%</td>
<td>46.00%</td>
<td>56.80%</td>
<td>67.60%</td>
<td>78.40%</td>
<td>89.20%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.80%</td>
<td>22.70%</td>
<td>26.28%</td>
<td>33.10%</td>
<td>35.20%</td>
<td>39.80%</td>
<td>39.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td>High School Districts</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>22.30%</td>
<td>33.40%</td>
<td>44.50%</td>
<td>55.60%</td>
<td>66.70%</td>
<td>77.80%</td>
<td>88.90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.70%</td>
<td>16.30%</td>
<td>18.55%</td>
<td>20.10%</td>
<td>20.50%</td>
<td>15.50%</td>
<td>26.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Name</th>
<th>Baseline Year</th>
<th>FFY 2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td>Unified, HS 7-12, COE</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>23.70%</td>
<td>34.60%</td>
<td>45.50%</td>
<td>54.40%</td>
<td>67.30%</td>
<td>78.20%</td>
<td>89.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.40%</td>
<td>24.30%</td>
<td>27.66%</td>
<td>31.60%</td>
<td>35.10%</td>
<td>17.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td>Elementary School Districts</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>26.50%</td>
<td>37.00%</td>
<td>47.50%</td>
<td>58.00%</td>
<td>68.50%</td>
<td>79.00%</td>
<td>89.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.80%</td>
<td>26.60%</td>
<td>30.28%</td>
<td>35.30%</td>
<td>38.60%</td>
<td>41.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td>High School Districts</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>20.90%</td>
<td>32.20%</td>
<td>43.50%</td>
<td>54.80%</td>
<td>66.10%</td>
<td>77.40%</td>
<td>88.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.80%</td>
<td>17.10%</td>
<td>17.43%</td>
<td>19.30%</td>
<td>19.20%</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- Gray – Data Prior to Baseline
- Yellow – Baseline
- Blue – Data Update

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Reading**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Name</th>
<th>FFY 2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td>Unified, HS 7-12, COE</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td>Elementary School Districts</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td>High School Districts</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Math**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Name</th>
<th>FFY 2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td>Unified, HS 7-12, COE</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td>Elementary School Districts</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td>High School Districts</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Name</th>
<th>Number of Children with IEPs Proficient</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Unified, HS 7-12, COE</td>
<td>25,870</td>
<td>79.39%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>11.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Elementary School Districts</td>
<td>9,575</td>
<td>84.89%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>12.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C High School Districts</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>84.29%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>14.55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanation of Group A Slippage**

In Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2013 California used only results from the alternate assessment because 2013—14 was a field test year for Smarter Balance. FFY 2014 data includes Smarter Balance assessment results.

**Explanation of Group B Slippage**

In Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2013 California used only results from the alternate assessment because 2013—14 was a field test year for Smarter Balance. FFY 2014 data includes Smarter Balance assessment results.

**Explanation of Group C Slippage**

In Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2013 California used only results from the alternate assessment because 2013—14 was a field test year for Smarter Balance. FFY 2014 data includes Smarter Balance assessment results.

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Name</th>
<th>Number of Children with IEPs Proficient</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Unified, HS 7-12, COE</td>
<td>21,121</td>
<td>66.82%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>9.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Elementary School Districts</td>
<td>8,361</td>
<td>71.03%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>11.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C High School Districts</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>74.96%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6.20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanation of Group A Slippage**

...
In Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2013 California used only results from the alternate assessment because 2013—14 was a field test year for Smarter Balance. FFY 2014 data includes Smarter Balance assessment results.

Explanation of Group B Slippage

In Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2013 California used only results from the alternate assessment because 2013—14 was a field test year for Smarter Balance. FFY 2014 data includes Smarter Balance assessment results.

Explanation of Group C Slippage

In Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2013 California used only results from the alternate assessment because 2013—14 was a field test year for Smarter Balance. FFY 2014 data includes Smarter Balance assessment results.

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ay/aypreports.asp

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

Required Actions
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>≤</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.40%</td>
<td>10.30%</td>
<td>10.30%</td>
<td>10.10%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gray – Data Prior to Baseline</td>
<td>Yellow – Baseline</td>
<td>Blue – Data Update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>≤</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State’s minimum n-size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy</th>
<th>Number of districts that met the State’s minimum n-size</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>2.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a)):

- Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology

Districts identified to have a significant discrepancy are required to review and revise, if necessary, their
FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

Statewide bar. In California, a significant discrepancy is defined as having a rate of suspension and expulsion greater than the statewide bar. In 2013–14, the statewide bar for the number of students with disabilities suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days was 2.13 percent. This was the percentage that was used to identify districts in the target data calculation above.

The corrective action process requires that districts correct noncompliant findings when individual student level or policy, procedure and practice noncompliance is found. All district policies, procedures, and practices documents are reviewed every four years or more frequently if data calculations warrant a review.

In 2014–15, verification of correction of student and district level noncompliance includes the review of:

- Evidence of student level correction;
- Review of policies, procedures, and practices including dissemination and staff training; and, in district level correction was needed, a review of a new sample of student records;
- A more stringent level of follow-up review and reporting is required of districts that have previously corrected non-compliance related to this indicator (Prong II). This is to ensure that LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

The CDE ensures correction using the standard identified in OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02): (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311; and (2) has corrected each individual case of Evidence of Review of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance


Description of review

The corrective action process requires that districts correct noncompliant findings when individual student level or policy, procedure and practice noncompliance is found. All district policies, procedures, and practices documents are reviewed every four years or more frequently if data calculations warrant a review.

In 2014–15, verification of correction of student and district level noncompliance includes the review of:

- Evidence of student level correction;
- Review of policies, procedures, and practices including dissemination and staff training; and, in district level correction was needed, a review of a new sample of student records;
- A more stringent level of follow-up review and reporting is required of districts that have previously corrected non-compliance related to this indicator (Prong II). This is to ensure that LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

The CDE ensures correction using the standard identified in OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02): (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311; and (2) has corrected each individual case of Evidence of Review of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction.
The State did NOT ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>null</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OSEP Response

The State did not report that it reviewed the districts’ policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2014 using FFY 2013 discipline data.

Required Actions

The State reported that it conducted the review required in 34 CFR §300.170(b), but did not specify that it reviewed policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with the IDEA for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2014 based upon FFY 2013 discipline data.
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Historical Data
Baseline Data: 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>7.30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: □ Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  ▫ Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided
- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State’s minimum n-size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity</th>
<th>Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements</th>
<th>Number of districts that met the State’s minimum n-size</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>1.89%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of Slippage

California is currently working to improve data quality in this indicator which has resulted in additional districts identified with significant discrepancy and with noncompliant policies, procedures, and practices. In future years, we expect to decrease the number of districts with significant discrepancy.

☑ All races and ethnicities were included in the review

State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology

Districts identified to have a significant discrepancy are required to review and revise, if necessary, their policies, procedures and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. For this indicator, federal
FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

Statewide bar. In California, a significant discrepancy is defined as having a rate of suspension and expulsion greater than the statewide bar. In 2014–15, the statewide bar for the number of students with disabilities suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days was 2.32 percent. This was the percentage that was used to identify districts in the target data calculation above.

Instructions require that the state report data for the year before the reporting year. The data reported here is from 2013–14.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance


Description of review

- Districts identified as having a significant discrepancy in any ethnicity are required to review and revise their policies (if district has noncompliance), procedures and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. In 2014–15, verification of correction of student and district level noncompliance included the review of:
  - Evidence of student-level correction; Review of policies, procedures, and practices including dissemination and staff training; and in cases where district level correction was needed, a review of a new sample of student records.
  - A more stringent level of follow-up review and reporting is required of districts that have previously corrected non-compliance related to this indicator (Prong II). This is to ensure that LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

The CDE will continue to ensure correction using the standard identified in OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02): (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

In 2014–15, verification of correction of student and district level noncompliance included the review of:

- Evidence of student-level correction;
- Review of policies, procedures, and practices including dissemination and staff training; and in cases where district level correction was needed, a review of a new sample of student records.
A more stringent level of follow-up review and reporting is required of districts that have previously corrected non-compliance related to this indicator (Prong II). This is to ensure that LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

The CDE will continue to ensure correction using the standard identified in OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02): (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Districts identified as having a significant discrepancy in any ethnicity are required to review and revise their policies (if district has noncompliance), procedures and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. In 2014—15, verification of correction of student and district level noncompliance included the review of:

- Evidence of student-level correction; Review of policies, procedures, and practices including dissemination and staff training; and in cases where district level correction was needed, a review of a new sample of student records.
- A more stringent level of follow-up review and reporting is required of districts that have previously corrected non-compliance related to this indicator (Prong II). This is to ensure that LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

The CDE will continue to ensure correction using the standard identified in OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02): (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

In 2014—15, verification of correction of student and district level noncompliance included the review of:

- Evidence of student-level correction;
- Review of policies, procedures, and practices including dissemination and staff training; and in cases where district level correction was needed, a review of a new sample of student records.

A more stringent level of follow-up review and reporting is required of districts that have previously corrected non-compliance related to this indicator (Prong II). This is to ensure that LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

The CDE will continue to ensure correction using the standard identified in OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02): (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.
OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator.

The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2014 have corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

Required Actions
Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

### Historical Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline Year</th>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 2005</td>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.00%</td>
<td>57.00%</td>
<td>62.00%</td>
<td>68.00%</td>
<td>76.00%</td>
<td>76.00%</td>
<td>76.00%</td>
<td>49.20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 2005</td>
<td>Target ≤</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.00%</td>
<td>21.00%</td>
<td>18.00%</td>
<td>14.00%</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
<td>24.60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 2005</td>
<td>Target ≤</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.20%</td>
<td>4.10%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
<td>4.40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: ☐ Gray – Data Prior to Baseline ☑ Yellow – Baseline ☐ Blue – Data Update

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target A ≥</td>
<td>49.20%</td>
<td>49.20%</td>
<td>50.20%</td>
<td>51.20%</td>
<td>52.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target B ≤</td>
<td>24.60%</td>
<td>24.60%</td>
<td>23.60%</td>
<td>22.60%</td>
<td>21.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target C ≤</td>
<td>4.40%</td>
<td>4.40%</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

- Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

### Prepopulated Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Overwrite Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)</td>
<td>6/4/2015</td>
<td>Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21</td>
<td>634,564</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)</td>
<td>7/2/2015</td>
<td>A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td>
<td>338,729</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)</td>
<td>7/2/2015</td>
<td>B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td>
<td>139,675</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Explanation of Alternate Data

Our calculation indicates that this is the correct data.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Overwrite Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C002; Data group 74)</td>
<td>7/2/2015</td>
<td><strong>c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools</strong></td>
<td>20,508</td>
<td>18,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)</td>
<td>7/2/2015</td>
<td><strong>c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities</strong></td>
<td>862</td>
<td>771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)</td>
<td>7/2/2015</td>
<td><strong>c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements</strong></td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>1,871</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

OSEP Response

Required Actions


Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline Year</th>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40.90%</td>
<td>40.90%</td>
<td>39.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.20%</td>
<td>38.80%</td>
<td>40.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>46.30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Target ≤</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.00%</td>
<td>23.00%</td>
<td>34.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>25.60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35.90%</td>
<td>34.44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: ☐ Gray – Data Prior to Baseline ☑ Yellow – Baseline ☐ Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target A ≥</td>
<td>40.80%</td>
<td>41.80%</td>
<td>42.80%</td>
<td>43.80%</td>
<td>44.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target B ≤</td>
<td>34.40%</td>
<td>34.40%</td>
<td>33.40%</td>
<td>32.40%</td>
<td>31.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:

Explanation of Changes

The prepopulated targets were not correct.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Overwrite Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)</td>
<td>7/2/2015</td>
<td>Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5</td>
<td>76,641</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)</td>
<td>7/2/2015</td>
<td>a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program</td>
<td>33,161</td>
<td>25,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)</td>
<td>7/2/2015</td>
<td>b1. Number of children attending separate special education class</td>
<td>22,712</td>
<td>23,801</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)  
7/2/2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Overwrite Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b2. Number of children attending separate school</td>
<td>2,411</td>
<td>2,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b3. Number of children attending residential facility</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Explanation of Alternate Data

Our calculation indicates that this is the correct data.

### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending</th>
<th>Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program</td>
<td>25,226</td>
<td>76,641</td>
<td>40.72%</td>
<td>40.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility</td>
<td>26,372</td>
<td>76,641</td>
<td>34.44%</td>
<td>34.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Explanation of A Slippage

Over the last year, California has been using resources from the IDEA Data Center to improve the quality of data reported in this indicator. The variation from the previous year is likely due to districts implementing those tools to improve data quality. As data quality improves, better decisions can be made about monitoring and improving performance in this area.

### Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

### OSEP Response

Required Actions
**Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes**

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

### Historical Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline Year</th>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63.60%</td>
<td>72.70%</td>
<td>72.70%</td>
<td>72.70%</td>
<td>72.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69.90%</td>
<td>82.50%</td>
<td>82.50%</td>
<td>82.50%</td>
<td>82.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65.40%</td>
<td>79.00%</td>
<td>79.00%</td>
<td>79.00%</td>
<td>79.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- [Gray] – Data Prior to Baseline
- [Yellow] – Baseline
- [Blue] – Data Update

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target A1 ≥</td>
<td>72.70%</td>
<td>72.70%</td>
<td>72.70%</td>
<td>72.70%</td>
<td>72.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target A2 ≥</td>
<td>82.10%</td>
<td>82.10%</td>
<td>82.10%</td>
<td>82.10%</td>
<td>82.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target B1 ≥</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>70.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target B2 ≥</td>
<td>82.50%</td>
<td>82.50%</td>
<td>82.50%</td>
<td>82.50%</td>
<td>82.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target C1 ≥</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>75.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target C2 ≥</td>
<td>79.00%</td>
<td>79.00%</td>
<td>79.00%</td>
<td>79.00%</td>
<td>79.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- [Gray] – Data Prior to Baseline
- [Yellow] – Baseline
- [Blue] – Data Update

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

- Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement
### Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Numerator</th>
<th>Denominator</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning</td>
<td>328.00</td>
<td>12392.00</td>
<td>59.45%</td>
<td>72.70%</td>
<td>59.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>4696.00</td>
<td>12392.00</td>
<td>59.45%</td>
<td>72.70%</td>
<td>59.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it</td>
<td>3374.00</td>
<td>12392.00</td>
<td>59.45%</td>
<td>72.70%</td>
<td>59.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>3994.00</td>
<td>12392.00</td>
<td>59.45%</td>
<td>72.70%</td>
<td>59.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>9074.00</td>
<td>12392.00</td>
<td>59.45%</td>
<td>72.70%</td>
<td>59.46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Outcome A1: Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. \((c+d)/(a+b+c+d)\)

- Numerator: 7368.00
- Denominator: 12392.00
- FFY 2013 Data: 59.45%
- FFY 2014 Target: 72.70%
- FFY 2014 Data: 59.46%

#### Outcome A2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. \((d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)\)

- Numerator: 13068.00
- Denominator: 21466.00
- FFY 2013 Data: 60.76%
- FFY 2014 Target: 82.10%
- FFY 2014 Data: 60.88%

### Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Numerator</th>
<th>Denominator</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning</td>
<td>209.00</td>
<td>12598.00</td>
<td>60.86%</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>60.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>4810.00</td>
<td>12598.00</td>
<td>60.86%</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>60.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it</td>
<td>3652.00</td>
<td>12598.00</td>
<td>60.86%</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>60.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>3927.00</td>
<td>12598.00</td>
<td>60.86%</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>60.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>8868.00</td>
<td>12598.00</td>
<td>60.86%</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>60.16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Outcome B1: Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. \((c+d)/(a+b+c+d)\)

- Numerator: 7579.00
- Denominator: 12598.00
- FFY 2013 Data: 60.86%
- FFY 2014 Target: 70.00%
- FFY 2014 Data: 60.16%

#### Outcome B2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. \((d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)\)

- Numerator: 12795.00
- Denominator: 21466.00
- FFY 2013 Data: 60.27%
- FFY 2014 Target: 82.50%
- FFY 2014 Data: 59.61%

### Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Numerator</th>
<th>Denominator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning</td>
<td>442.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>3380.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it</td>
<td>3528.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7/1/2016
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Numerator</th>
<th>Denominator</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>7368.00</td>
<td>11190.00</td>
<td>65.85%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>65.84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Numerator</th>
<th>Denominator</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>14116.00</td>
<td>21466.00</td>
<td>65.68%</td>
<td>79.00%</td>
<td>65.76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? No

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

Required Actions
Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?

### Historical Data

**Baseline Data: 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>69.00%</td>
<td>74.00%</td>
<td>78.00%</td>
<td>82.00%</td>
<td>86.00%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87.81%</td>
<td>83.60%</td>
<td>84.40%</td>
<td>97.50%</td>
<td>81.10%</td>
<td>98.80%</td>
<td>98.90%</td>
<td>99.19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- Gray – Data Prior to Baseline
- Yellow – Baseline
- Blue – Data Update

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>91.00%</td>
<td>92.00%</td>
<td>93.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement.

### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities</th>
<th>Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80017.00</td>
<td>80648.00</td>
<td>99.19%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>99.22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

The required question is asked of every student in California during the IEP process. It is expected that all California students ages 3–5 will have at least one IEP per year.

Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.

Ethnic Characteristics of Respondents 2014–15
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percent GE</th>
<th>Percent SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino of Any Race</td>
<td>53.64%</td>
<td>54.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native, Not Hispanic</td>
<td>0.59%</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, Not Hispanic</td>
<td>8.75%</td>
<td>6.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander, Not Hispanic</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino, Not Hispanic</td>
<td>2.54%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American, Not Hispanic</td>
<td>5.99%</td>
<td>8.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Not Hispanic</td>
<td>24.55%</td>
<td>25.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>2.82%</td>
<td>3.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None Reported</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was sampling used?  No

Was a collection tool used?  No

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

Required Actions
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

Baseline Data: 2005

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

### Historical Data

**Baseline Data: 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>[Gray]</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>[Yellow]</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
<td>4.19%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: [Gray] – Data Prior to Baseline  [Yellow] – Baseline

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FFY 2014 SPP/ APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- [ ] Number of districts in the State
- [ ] Number of districts that met the State’s minimum n-size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services</th>
<th>Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification</th>
<th>Number of districts that met the State’s minimum n-size</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

The methodology for Indicator 9 uses the E-formula and the alternate risk ratio. The E-formula, which falls under the broad category of measures known as Composition, has, among others, the following unique properties: (1) It is based on statistical principles of sampling theory; (2) it is sensitive to the size of districts; (3) it allows proportionately more tolerance for disproportionality for smaller districts than larger districts; (4) it has the lowest number of exclusions of cells from disproportionality calculations; (5) its results are not affected by external factors, such as state demographics; (6) it is least affected by small fluctuations of enrollments; and (7) it is applicable to racially homogeneous as well as heterogeneous districts.

The Alternate Risk Ratio, which falls under the broad category of measures known as Risk, has the following properties: (1) Its results are comparable across the districts in a state; (2) It is sensitive to very high or very...
low district rate of disability, compared to the state rate.

The final calculation is the number of districts identified as having 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 meeting the minimum n-size.

In FFY 2014, California identified one (1) district with noncompliant policies, procedures, or practices as a result of inappropriate identification. This determination was made by reviewing a sample of districts student files and their policies using a review tool. If any noncompliance was identified districts were required to correct the noncompliance using the standard identified in the OSEP Memorandum 09-02. Instructions for the completion of the review can be found at: https://www3.cde.ca.gov/exfiles/downloadurl.aspx?pid=81&dc=03663c1a81164c3793

The instruments can be found:  
https://www3.cde.ca.gov/exfiles/downloadurl.aspx?pid=81&dc=ccd6763e50374d64af
https://www3.cde.ca.gov/exfiles/downloadurl.aspx?pid=81&dc=84c2282516204b51ad
https://www3.cde.ca.gov/exfiles/downloadurl.aspx?pid=81&dc=f1e0ec23e4223ab
https://www3.cde.ca.gov/exfiles/downloadurl.aspx?pid=81&dc=df954e4673694ece95

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

In 2014–15, verification of correction of student and district level noncompliance included the review of:

- Evidence of student-level correction;
- Review of policies, procedures, and practices including dissemination and staff training; and in cases where district level correction was needed, a review of a new sample of student records.
- A more stringent level of follow-up review and reporting is required of districts that have previously corrected non-compliance related to this indicator (Prong II). This is to ensure that LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

The CDE will continue to ensure correction using the standard identified in OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02): (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.
Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

In 2014–15, verification of correction of student and district level noncompliance included the review of:

- Evidence of student level correction;
- Review of policies, procedures, and practices including dissemination and staff training; and,
- A more stringent level of follow-up review and reporting is required of districts that have previously corrected non-compliance related to this indicator (Prong II). This is to ensure that LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

The CDE will continue to ensure correction using the standard identified in OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02): (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

Explanation of Alternate Data

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator.

The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that the district identified in FFY 2014 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that the district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

Required Actions
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Historical Data
Baseline Data: 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>4.40%</td>
<td>0.87%</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided
- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State’s minimum n-size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories</th>
<th>Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification</th>
<th>Number of districts that met the State’s minimum n-size</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of Slippage

California is currently working to improve data quality in this indicator, which has resulted in additional districts identified with significant disproportionality and with non compliant policies, procedures, and practices. In future years, we expect to decrease the number of districts with significant disproportionality.

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

The methodology for Indicator 10 uses the E-formula and the alternate risk ratio. The E-formula, which falls under the broad category of measures known as Composition, has, among others, the following unique properties: (1) It is based on statistical principles of sampling theory; (2) it is sensitive to the size of districts; (3) it allows proportionately more tolerance for disproportionality for smaller districts than larger districts; (4) it has the lowest number of exclusions of cells from disproportionality calculations; (5) its results are not affected by external factors, such as state demographics; (6) it is least affected by small fluctuations of
enrollments; and (7) it is applicable to racially homogeneous as well as heterogeneous districts.

The Alternate Risk Ratio, which falls under the broad category of measures known as Risk, has the following properties: (1) Its results are comparable across the districts in a state; (2) It is sensitive to very high or very low district rate of disability, compared to the state rate.
The final calculation is the number of districts identified as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that are the result of inappropriate identification, divided by the number of districts in the state meeting the minimum n-size.

The final calculation is the number of districts identified as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that are the result of inappropriate identification, divided by the number of districts in the state meeting the minimum n-size.

In FFY 2014, California identified nine (9) districts with noncompliant policies, procedures, or practices as a result of inappropriate identification. This determination was made by reviewing a sample of districts student files and their policies using a review tool. If any noncompliance was identified districts were required to correct the noncompliance using the standard identified in the OSEP Memorandum 09-02. Instructions for the completion of the review can be found at: https://www3.cde.ca.gov/exfiles/downloadurl.aspx?pid=81&dc=03663c1a81164c2793
The instruments can be found: https://www3.cde.ca.gov/exfiles/downloadurl.aspx?pid=81&dc=ccd6763e50374d64af
https://www3.cde.ca.gov/exfiles/downloadurl.aspx?pid=81&dc=84c2282516204b51ad
https://www3.cde.ca.gov/exfiles/downloadurl.aspx?pid=81&dc=f78de0cf3114223ab
https://www3.cde.ca.gov/exfiles/downloadurl.aspx?pid=81&dc=df954e4673694e95

Actions required in FFY 2013 response
None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

In 2014—15, verification of correction of student and district level noncompliance included the review of:

- Evidence of student-level correction; Review of policies, procedures, and practices including dissemination and staff training; and in cases where district level correction was needed, a review of a new sample of student records.
- A more stringent level of follow-up review and reporting is required of districts that have previously corrected non-compliance related to this indicator (Prong II). This is to ensure that LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

The CDE will continue to ensure correction using the standard identified in OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02): (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory
Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

In 2014—15, verification of correction of student and district level noncompliance included the review of:

- Evidence of student-level correction;
- Review of policies, procedures, and practices including dissemination and staff training; and in cases where district level correction was needed, a review of a new sample of student records.

A more stringent level of follow-up review and reporting is required of districts that have previously corrected non-compliance related to this indicator (Prong II). This is to ensure that LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. The CDE will continue to ensure correction using the standard identified in OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02): (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator.

The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that the nine districts identified in FFY 2014 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2015 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

Required Actions
### Indicator 11: Child Find

*Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find*

Compliance indicator: Percent of children 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.


#### Historical Data

**Baseline Data: 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81.47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: 
- Gray – Data Prior to Baseline
- Yellow – Baseline

#### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received</th>
<th>(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72,483</td>
<td>69,613</td>
<td>98.07%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>96.04%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b] | 2,870 |

#### Explanation of Slippage

California has initiated several data quality policies and procedures for this indicator, which has resulted in additional findings. In the future we expect the rate to decrease.

#### Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

**Student Initial Evaluations that Exceeded Time Lines and the Number and Percent in Each Data Range:**

*Indicator 11–60 Day Time Line.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Late</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61 to 90 days</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>69.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 to 120 days</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>17.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121 to 150 days</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>7.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 to 180 days</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicate the evaluation timeline used
- The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.
- The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?
- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The data is collected through the California Special Education Management Information System’s (CASEMIS) June submission. The CASEMIS is a special education data reporting and retrieval system designed to accept and validate student level data submitted to the CDE. The CASEMIS is one of many tools used to support the CDE’s valid and reliable data efforts.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,944</td>
<td>1,944</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

*Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements*

In 2014–15, verification of correction of student and district level noncompliance included the review of:

- Evidence of student-level correction;
- Review of policies, procedures, and practices including dissemination and staff training; and in cases where district level correction was needed, a review of a new sample of student records.
- A more stringent level of follow-up review and reporting is required of districts that have previously corrected non-compliance related to this indicator (Prong II). This is to ensure that LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

The CDE will continue to ensure correction using the standard identified in OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02): (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311; and (2) has corrected each
Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

In 2014–15, verification of correction of student and district level noncompliance included the review of:

- Evidence of student level correction;
- Review of policies, procedures, and practices including dissemination and staff training; and,
- A more stringent level of follow-up review and reporting is required of districts that have previously corrected non-compliance related to this indicator (Prong II). This is to ensure that LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

The CDE will continue to ensure correction using the standard identified in OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02): (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

Required Actions
## Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>69.19%</td>
<td>75.62%</td>
<td>80.20%</td>
<td>92.57%</td>
<td>89.80%</td>
<td>98.21%</td>
<td>97.30%</td>
<td>98.20%</td>
<td>98.53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:  
- Gray – Data Prior to Baseline
- Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

- a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination. 15,625
- b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday. 1,809
- c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. 10,650
- d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied. 1,330
- e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays. 1,098

### Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. \[\frac{c}{(a-b-d-e)}\times100\]

- Numerator (c): 10,650
- Denominator (a-b-d-e): 11,388
- FFY 2013 Data*: 98.53%
- FFY 2014 Target*: 100%
- FFY 2014 Data: 93.52%

### Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e

- 738

### Explanation of Slippage

California has initiated several data quality policies and procedures for this indicator, which has resulted in additional findings. In the future we expect the rate to decrease.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, or e. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.
Range of days beyond third birthday - There are 738 children in a. that are not in b., c., d., or e (15,625-1,809-10,650-1,330-1,098). The table depicts the range of days beyond the third birthday of those children who were in a., but not in b., c., d., or e. Reasons cited for delays included: late referrals (before third birthday, but with insufficient time to complete the assessment), lack of staff, ineffective tracking systems, student illness, and failure to keep appointments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LATE RANGES</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 TO 14 AFTER</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>23.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 TO 30 AFTER</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 TO 60 AFTER</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>20.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 TO 90 AFTER</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 TO 180 AFTER</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREATER THAN 180 AFTER</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>28.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The data is collected through the California Special Education Management Information System’s June submission (CASEMIS) and from the California Department of Developmental Services. The CASEMIS is a special education data reporting and retrieval system designed to accept and validate student level data submitted to the CDE. The CASEMIS is one of many tools used to support the CDE’s valid and reliable data efforts.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.
In 2014–15, verification of correction of student and district level noncompliance included the review of:

- Evidence of student-level correction;
- Review of policies, procedures, and practices including dissemination and staff training; and in cases where district level correction was needed, a review of a new sample of student records.
- A more stringent level of follow-up review and reporting is required of districts that have previously corrected non-compliance related to this indicator (Prong II). This is to ensure that LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

The CDE will continue to ensure correction using the standard identified in OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02): (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

In 2014–15, verification of correction of student and district level noncompliance included the review of:

- Evidence of student-level correction;
- Review of policies, procedures, and practices including dissemination and staff training; and,
- A more stringent level of follow-up review and reporting is required of districts that have previously corrected non-compliance related to this indicator (Prong II). This is to ensure that LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

The CDE will continue to ensure correction using the standard identified in OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02): (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

Required Actions
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of youth 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, 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 services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>98.00%</td>
<td>91.00%</td>
<td>94.10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>72.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td>45.90%</td>
<td>80.70%</td>
<td>86.80%</td>
<td>93.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: □ Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  ▼ Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition</th>
<th>Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>126,567</td>
<td>127,324</td>
<td>93.49%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99.41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The data is collected through the California Special Education Management Information System’s June submission (CASEMIS) and from the California Department of Developmental Services. The CASEMIS is a special education data reporting and retrieval system designed to accept and validate student level data submitted to the CDE. The CASEMIS is one of many tools used to support the CDE’s valid and reliable data efforts.
**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8,334</td>
<td>8,334</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

In 2014–15, verification of correction of student and district level noncompliance included the review of:

- Evidence of student-level correction;
- Review of policies, procedures, and practices including dissemination and staff training; and in cases where district level correction was needed, a review of a new sample of student records.
- A more stringent level of follow-up review and reporting is required of districts that have previously corrected non-compliance related to this indicator (Prong II). This is to ensure that LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

The CDE will continue to ensure correction using the standard identified in OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02): (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

**OSEP Response**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.
If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

Required Actions
Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
C. 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

### Historical Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline Year</th>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 2009</td>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 2009</td>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 2009</td>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: [Gray – Data Prior to Baseline] [Yellow – Baseline] [Blue – Data Update]

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target A ≥</td>
<td>53.30%</td>
<td>54.30%</td>
<td>55.30%</td>
<td>56.30%</td>
<td>57.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target B ≥</td>
<td>73.40%</td>
<td>74.40%</td>
<td>75.40%</td>
<td>76.40%</td>
<td>77.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target C ≥</td>
<td>82.00%</td>
<td>83.00%</td>
<td>84.00%</td>
<td>85.00%</td>
<td>87.80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

- Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school</td>
<td>18119.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school</td>
<td>9134.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school</td>
<td>3980.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)</td>
<td>1545.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed)</td>
<td>229.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of respondent youth</td>
<td>Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Enrolled in higher education (1)</td>
<td>9134.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)</td>
<td>13114.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)</td>
<td>14888.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Explanation of A Slippage

California has been working to improve data quality and response rates for the post-school outcomes surveys. As LEAs use more reliable methods for post-school follow-up tracking, we expect the more accurate data will inform practices to improve employment and education outcomes for students with disabilities.

### Was sampling used?

No

### Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

### OSEP Response


### Required Actions


Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:  
- Gray – Data Prior to Baseline
- Yellow – Baseline
- Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>56.00%</td>
<td>57.00%</td>
<td>58.00%</td>
<td>59.00%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

- Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Overwrite Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints</td>
<td>11/5/2015</td>
<td>3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints</td>
<td>11/5/2015</td>
<td>3.1 Number of resolution sessions</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements</th>
<th>3.1 Number of resolution sessions</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>32.71%</td>
<td>56.00%</td>
<td>30.18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of Slippage

California continues to work with the Office of Administrative Hearings and Local Education Agency’s to accurately report this data. We anticipate that this rate will increase.
### Actions required in FFY 2013 response

| None |

### OSEP Response

| |

### Required Actions

| |

---
**Indicator 16: Mediation**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

### Historical Data

**Baseline Data: 2006**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>![Gray]</td>
<td>![Gray]</td>
<td>![43.00%]</td>
<td>![74.00%]</td>
<td>![60.00%]</td>
<td>![60.33%]</td>
<td>![67.20%]</td>
<td>![63.14%]</td>
<td>![64.77%]</td>
<td>![65.19%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>![Gray]</td>
<td>![Gray]</td>
<td>![43.00%]</td>
<td>![74.00%]</td>
<td>![60.00%]</td>
<td>![60.33%]</td>
<td>![67.20%]</td>
<td>![63.14%]</td>
<td>![64.77%]</td>
<td>![65.19%]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:  
- Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  
- Yellow – Baseline  
- Blue – Data Update

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>56.00%</td>
<td>57.00%</td>
<td>58.00%</td>
<td>59.00%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input
- Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

- Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

### Prepopulated Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Overwrite Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests</td>
<td>11/5/2015</td>
<td>2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints</td>
<td>1,282</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests</td>
<td>11/5/2015</td>
<td>2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests</td>
<td>11/5/2015</td>
<td>2.1 Mediations held</td>
<td>2,186</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints</th>
<th>2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints</th>
<th>2.1 Mediations held</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,282</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2,186</td>
<td>65.19%</td>
<td>56.00%</td>
<td>62.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Actions required in FFY 2013 response
None

### OSEP Response

### Required Actions

---

7/1/2016
Baseline Data: 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>Target ≥</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.33%</td>
<td>2.11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:  
- Gray – Data Prior to Baseline
- Yellow – Baseline
- Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>Target ≥</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:

Description of Measure

The baseline data presented above is the proficiency level for all students with disabilities who are either eligible for Free and Reduced Priced Meals, foster youth, or English Language learners. The data is from the 2012-2013 statewide assessments. California field tested the Smarter Balanced assessments in 2013-2014, and anticipated providing new proficiency scores with a new baseline and targets in its SSIP Phase II submission. However, due to the state’s interest in ensuring that students with disabilities (SWD) are served as part of a single education system that addresses all students, California will not revise its targets for SWD performance until it has completed current target setting for all students, slated for completion later in 2016. California will submit the new baseline and targets required by this element as soon as they are available, but no later than the due date for the SSIP Phase III submission, April 1, 2017. For more information on the development of California’s broader accountability system, see Attachments 7, 8, and 9.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Overview

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children 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 (e.g., 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. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

Data Analysis

This document is the first of five sections that constitute Phase I of California’s State Systemic Improvement
Plan (SSIP). The SSIP is a new requirement of the U.S. Department of Education and serves as the centerpiece for implementation of the Office of Special Education Programs’ (OSEP) initiative entitled “Results Driven Accountability,” which is its effort to focus more on student performance in the overall system of the state’s general supervision of local educational agencies (LEAs). Phase I is intended to provide a detailed analysis of data and state infrastructure that will guide the selection of coherent improvement strategies to increase the state’s capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs to improve measurable results for students with disabilities (SWD). While this section is being presented as an independent document in this item, it is meant to be considered in the context of OSEP’s overall instructions and is best read in concert with the other SSIP sections presented in this item.

Overview

In all phases of SSIP, California relied on strong stakeholder involvement to inform the process and propose a wide range of approaches to improving student performance outcomes. Stakeholders included staff from the California Department of Education (CDE) from both general education and special education offices, as well as a large group of external stakeholders from various elements of California’s public education sector. Through a series of meetings conducted over a full year, stakeholders assisted CDE special education staff in taking a broad view of both the potential barriers to improved student performance and potential effective improvement activities.

In conducting its Data Analysis, CDE special education staff worked with general education staff and external stakeholders through a review of several years of data to identify patterns of student performance to identify potential challenges to improvement, which could lead to identification of improvement activities that would directly address those challenges and support improvement among all students with disabilities in California. California’s data analysis included a review of the following areas:

- Current Annual Performance Results targets on all indicators
- Relative success of LEAs in meeting targets in prior years
- Patterns of performance based on LEA size, type, and geographic region
- Other demographic data, including race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement/LRE, and pattern of disciplinary actions

As discussed below, in reviewing and analyzing the data and discussing its implications, stakeholders made the following findings:

- Existing performance targets were no longer aligned with current data, were unattainable in many cases and consequently counterproductive, and needed to reset to appropriate, challenging yet attainable, levels in future years
- Compliance rates in California remain quite high, so lack of compliance with federal and state requirements does not appear to be a barrier to improved student performance
- Given the broad range in size, type, and internal capacity among California LEAs, improvement strategies must allow for sufficient flexibility in design to achieve applicability in all of the local contexts it must serve
- There is a significant correlation between high levels of suspensions and expulsions and low student academic performance
- The data showed no significant correlation between placement in a more restrictive environment and low student academic performance
There is a significant correlation between eligibility for free and reduced price meals and low student academic performance.

Based on these findings the stakeholders and CDE staff considered three potential areas of focus for improvement and the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR):

- Efforts to reduce incidences of suspension and expulsion to increase access to standards-based instruction, the results measured by an actual decrease in these discipline events
- Efforts to increase the number of students who successfully complete all academic requirements for a high school diploma, the results measured by increased graduation rates
- Efforts to improve student learning and academic performance through multiple means, as measured by improved performance on statewide assessments

CDE staff noted that suspension/expulsion results may not meet OSEP requirements for the SIMR, and that graduation rates would only be available at school districts that serve high school students. The focus on improved student learning through multiple means provides sufficient breadth and flexibility to apply effectively to all California school districts, and its measure meets OSEP criteria for the SIMR, so stakeholders determined it as the most promising focus for California’s SSIP.

As stakeholders refined their understanding of available data and identified its focus for improvement, California began to implement a major reform of its public school funding structure, the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), which provides significant supplementary funding to school districts that serve large numbers of high-needs students, including English learners, students eligible for free and reduced-price meals, and foster youth. The LCFF also required LEAs to develop a Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP), which establishes the LEAs overall plans and goals for improvement, including how the LEA will use its resources to implement those plans and achieve those goals. The LEA is required to work with the local community to develop its LCAP. SSIP Stakeholders noted the substantial focus and effort that LEAs were committing to their LCAPs, and strongly urged CDE staff to involve the LCAP process in the development of this SSIP. Given that the goals of the LCAP and the SSIP are so well-aligned, that the LCFF and LCAP have created momentum for increased local improvement planning and efforts, and that the student subgroups targeted by the LCFF include large numbers of students with disabilities, stakeholders and CDE staff concluded that SSIP improvement efforts should be closely aligned with ongoing LCAP activities.

Process and Outcomes

This Data Analysis section describes how California (1) identified, disaggregated, and analyzed key data, including compliance data; (2) selected the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) for students with disabilities to be used over time to measure changes in student performance; and (3) identified root causes that interfere with improved student academic performance in the state. This section also identifies potential areas for improvement in activities leading to improved student academic performance.

The California Department of Education (CDE), Special Education Division (SED) began the data analysis for the SSIP by examining the current federal performance indicators to help identify areas in which California may be chronically failing or may be struggling to achieve its targets. This analysis included outcome indicators such as graduation, drop out, assessment, suspension/expulsion, and post-school outcomes. Part of this analysis included disaggregation by district, district-type, and size, including the number of districts meeting the current target, and the potential root causes for not meeting the target.

Reestablishing the Annual Performance Results Targets

The CDE and stakeholders determined that the California performance targets were no longer aligned with
the data and benchmarks established in the first state performance plan in 2005. Many targets were unattainable for most districts and possibly counterproductive to improvement. For example, if a district was so far from these artificially high targets, then it may believe that it will never achieve the targets. This may cause district staff and stakeholders to ignore the targets or to believe that the results will never change.

Figure 1 below, an excerpt from the State Performance Summary Table, from the State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) for Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 2004 covering program year 2012–13, Executive Summary (Item 15, State Board of Education, November 7, 2013, agenda) shows the target and results discrepancy for two potential outcome indicators. Indicator 3A, Statewide Assessment, is one example of this discrepancy. Indicator 5, Least Restrictive Environment (LRE), is another clear example.

Figure 1. Example of State Performance Targets and Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Met Tar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Statewide Assessment</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A AYP</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Least Restrictive Environment</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A Percent Removed from Regular Class Less Than 21% of the Day</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B Percent Removed from Regular Class More Than 60% of the Day</td>
<td>Less than 9%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stakeholders questioned why California had low rates of target attainment. California based its targets on data trends prior to 2005 and used the 2005 baseline as a place to begin modest gains. Staff indicated that California had initially set very high target levels that had further increased with time. This was supported by a state-by-state analysis performed to compare California’s targets with those of other states and to prompt a discussion regarding the appropriateness of California’s SPP targets. Figure 2 below, a state-by-state comparison of targets, shows the comparison of states similar to California (based on population size and demographics) and the performance targets set by those states. As can be seen in the analysis, California’s targets are typically at the extreme edge of expected performance. This is particularly true for the bolded indicator values as shown: Indicator 1–Graduation, Indicator 3–Proficiency scores, Indicator 5–LRE, and Indicator 14–Postsecondary.

Figure 2. State-by-State Comparison of Annual Performance Report Targets for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2011
understanding those previously established indicator targets that were chronically unattainable and/or were set extremely high as compared to other states, stakeholders and staff considered appropriately reestablishing targets for the FFY 2013 APR. The new targets were approved by the SBE at the November 2014 meeting and subsequently submitted to OSEP.

### Analysis of Disaggregated Data

During the reestablishing of indicators for the SPP, the data was disaggregated by district type and size. This highlighted the different ways that regions and district types were challenged by the performance indicators. This led to a discussion for selection of the SIMR. For the SIMR selection, the CDE began with a broad approach to selection, considering a variety of potential outcome measures with the goal of selecting the outcome measure(s) that would most likely ensure success for students with disabilities in California. The outcome data was disaggregated by LEA and region. This analysis showed that regional disaggregation was less useful, but LEA type disaggregation provided considerable information for the stakeholders to discuss.

Figure 3 below provides an LEA level example of an initial LEA type target analysis for one indicator (Indicator 2–Dropout), which was presented to the CDE staff and stakeholders for discussion of current targets and consideration for reestablishing targets through FFY 2018. In this example, the group examined several target options, including setting one target for both statewide and district level data, establishing separate targets based on LEA type (high school, elementary, unified, county offices, and charter LEAs), or using a growth model that would also account for LEA size. A similar stakeholder process was used to scrutinize and obtain input on appropriate targets for each of the other federal indicators.

In the natural course of analyzing the data, the stakeholders began to form hypotheses concerning likely root causes for low student academic performance. These hypotheses were archived for inclusion in the formal root cause analysis process discussed later in this section.

**Figure 3. Disaggregated Data Analysis Reviewed by Stakeholder Groups in spring 2014**
The LEA type analysis was also applied to Indicator 5–LRE. It shows that elementary and high school LEAs had some differences in placements. California has approximately 1,500 LEAs; nearly 800 have fewer than 250 special education students. There are 550 elementary LEAs, and 300 high school LEAs. There are also approximately 400 charters that act as LEAs for the purposes of special education. It was clear that any potential solution or plan would need to address the varied type and size of LEAs in California. In order to scale up a plan for all students in the state, any plan would need to have flexibility to allow LEAs to individualize their unique needs and features. Figure 4 is an LEA type analysis showing the differences in LRE placements.

Figure 4. Evaluation of District Type for Least Restrictive Environment (APR Indicator 5)

Data was further disaggregated by race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, and discipline, and the results were presented with assessment data in several different cross tabulations to determine if there were any preliminary correlations that could be further examined. As exhibited in Figure 5, district level data was used with multiple variables to develop a correlational analysis.

Root Cause Analysis
The stakeholder groups discussed current likely root causes based on the data analysis, and considered what actions might improve the performance of LEAs (For data on other federal performance indicators, see Appendix A -- Disaggregated Data Analysis for All Federal Performance Indicators). The data in Figure 5 (below) was used to test several hypotheses. The first hypothesis was that for those districts with high levels of suspension and expulsion, it was expected that assessment scores were negatively correlated. Overall, this hypothesis was supported by the first correlation analysis using a Pearson’s R Correlation analysis (Pearson’s r= -.86). The analysis was performed using assessment data from 2012–13, because there
were no scores available for the field tests administered in 2013–14. Without the most recent assessment scores, additional data analysis will need to be performed with new baseline assessment data to establish more exact relationships. A hypothesis that placement, specifically placement in more restrictive settings, was negatively correlated with assessment scores was tested. A simple correlation analysis did not support this hypothesis (Pearson’s $r = -.31$). Stakeholders and advocates encouraged an examination of poverty (using free and reduced priced meals eligibility) and its relation to poor performance. Therefore, the correlational analysis was repeated with race/ethnicity and eligibility for free and reduced priced meals as potential variables. The findings revealed that free and reduced priced meals eligibility was a strong negative correlate with assessment proficiency (Pearson’s $r = -.71$). A more stringent statistical analysis was not necessary because the CDE used census data and not sample data, thus, a simple analysis such as this produces clear evidence of a relationship. In addition, this type of analysis is easily understood by stakeholders who were able to engage and give their input on a variety of likely root causes and potential improvement strategies. In summary, the data support the hypothesis that high levels of disciplinary events and high levels of poverty negatively affected assessment scores.

### Indicators Examined for SSIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Disproportionate representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Education enrollment</td>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In regular class less than 40% of the day</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In regular class more than 80% of the day</td>
<td>English Language learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in separate schools</td>
<td>Dropout rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language arts proficiency</td>
<td>Graduation rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics proficiency</td>
<td>60 day timeline compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline events</td>
<td>C to B transition compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline outcomes</td>
<td>Secondary transition compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal compliance</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool assessment</td>
<td>Preschool LRE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Choosing a State Identified Measurable Result

Based on the extensive experience of the staff and stakeholders, those involved believed strongly that keeping a student in the classroom and increasing student participation in the curriculum would improve other outcomes. Stakeholders for both general education and special education students strongly advocate that students’ presence in the classroom increases overall performance in all areas. As evidenced in both special education and general education data, LEAs in California have been reducing the number of suspensions and expulsions over the last several years based on the premise that more class time will improve student performance. The stakeholders in the SSIP group believed that this trend was something that should anchor the SSIP. However, in spite of strong stakeholder support, through interaction with the OSEP and their technical assistance centers over time, it was made clear to CDE staff that suspension and expulsion measures were not acceptable options to report for a SIMR, and that the CDE should consider alternatives. Based on information provided by the OSEP, and through a process of elimination, the CDE determined that the only options for a SIMR were graduation rates and assessment. Based on an analysis of the districts in California, approximately 500 districts serve elementary students only and thus do not have graduates. Therefore, scaling up of the SSIP with graduation rates as a SIMR would not be truly systemic. Based on OSEP’s requirements, the CDE and stakeholders concluded that among potential possible SIMRs California considered, only assessment was a viable option. This was confirmed by the Frequently Asked Questions disseminated to the states by the IDEA Data Center on December 1, 2014:

> As discussed above, the SIMR must be a child-level, measurable result that improves child outcomes. The “compliance indicators” measure compliance but do not measure child outcomes. This includes the compliance indicators under Part C (1, 7, and 8) and Part B (9, 10, 11, 12, and 13). In addition, there are some “results indicators” that are not appropriate to use as a SIMR, since they do not measure improvement in child outcomes.
Topics that would not be acceptable stand-alone SIMRs include those related to the following results indicators:

For Part C:
- Indicator 2–natural environments
- Indicators 5 and 6–child find
- Indicators 9 and 10–resolution sessions and mediation

For Part B:
- Indicator 2–dropout
- Indicator 4–suspension/expulsion
- Indicators 5 and 6–LRE
- Indicator 8–parent involvement
- Indicators 15 and 16–resolution sessions and mediation

Review of Compliance Data
The CDE examined compliance data, which indicated no barrier existed for the implementation of the SSIP. In all the district-level examinations, compliance factors had little influence on the final SIMR determination or the focus areas for improvement. As evidenced in Figure 5, the CDE examined compliance data from the indicators (4, 9, 10, 11, and 12) to identify any correlations or barriers. The data shows that nearly all districts are compliant yet variance in outcomes still exists, concluding that compliance was not an issue for implementation of the SSIP.

The data analysis was heavily focused on LRE, suspension/expulsions, and students who were eligible for free and reduced price meals. Feedback from stakeholders indicated that there were no data quality concerns, and that no additional data elements would need to be collected beyond those the CDE currently collects from LEAs, because the data necessary to measure performance and outcomes is already collected by the CDE.

Local Control Accountability Plan Root Cause Analysis

The CDE data analysis indicated that low assessment scores seem to have a similar root cause for both general and special education. Poverty was the strongest negative correlation with assessment scores in both populations. At the conclusion of this initial data analysis, staff and stakeholders conducted an environmental scan to determine the statewide initiatives that are being implemented in California. An earlier general education analysis reached similar conclusions. It found that three specific groups of students in California had a high level of need: students that were identified as English learners, foster youth, or eligible for the free and reduced price meals program. As a result, the Governor initiated a Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) in the spring of 2014 that provided a redirection of funds to support intensive services and programs to be aimed at those populations. LEA funding formulas were recalculated using a base calculation of average daily attendance, and additional programmatic funding was given to LEAs that had students identified as English learners, foster youth, or eligible for the free and reduced price meals program beginning in the 2014–15 school year. See the following CDE Web site at [http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/](http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/). Under this new funding formula, every district would need to create a Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP). These plans were meant to set local goals to improve outcomes for these targeted groups and other subgroups, including students with disabilities. The stakeholders voiced strong opinions that the LCFF was an initiative that had significant statewide impact, and any plan which aligned with the LCFF would have a greater chance at success and scale up.

Seizing on this new statewide initiative that will affect all students, the CDE performed an additional analysis using those three subgroups to determine the makeup of special education students in this population. As evidenced in Figure 6 below that was presented to stakeholders, special education students make up 11.2 percent of the total population, but their proportions are greater in the identified subgroups. Students with disabilities represent 14 percent of all low income students, 23 percent of English learners, and 33 percent of foster youth. In addition, there are students who are in more than one of these categories; that overlap is not represented in the chart but was an important point made by the stakeholder groups. It was clear that
student outcomes using the LCFF funding on those subgroups would also have a positive effect on students with disabilities. The CDE’s Special Education Division could positively support LEAs to implement local improvement activities that support improved outcomes for all students including students with disabilities.

Figure 6. Students with Individual Education Programs in the LCAP World

This enhanced representation of students with disabilities indicated that LEA implementation of LCAP goals would also significantly affect students with disabilities, not as separate subgroup, but as students who also make up portions of those populations.

One key question posed by the stakeholder group was how a LEA could maximize its efforts, using the new funding under the LCFF and its LCAP, to effect change among the broadest group of students. The LEA example in Figure 7 below was produced to answer that question. The dark column shows the number of students currently proficient (21,167) and the number that will need to become proficient (10,680) to meet California’s benchmark of 89 percent. The other columns show the effect that improving the performance of those subgroups would have on the overall proficiency rates. For example, based on their proportion within the LEA, increasing the African American subgroup to the benchmark would increase the overall LEA proficiency rate only 10 percent. Increasing the Hispanic subgroup to the target would only increase the overall district proficiency rate 5 percent. Because African Americans and Hispanics make up a small proportion of the overall LEA, focusing efforts on this subpopulation will have a small overall effect on the LEAs achievement. However, implementing programs and practices that would increase the students in poverty (as measured by free and reduced priced meal eligibility) to the target would increase the overall LEA proficiency rate 23 percent, due to the fact that students in poverty make up a large proportion of the overall student population in this LEA. The biggest impact for any initiative would be to focus on students in poverty.

Figure 7. Eliminate the Achievement Gap by Increasing Student Achievement as Evidenced on Standardized Tests
The same holds true for SWD. If the LEA focused its efforts solely on SWD, the overall impact would only be 5 percent. However, practices effective in increasing outcomes for students in poverty, English Learners, and foster youth would also have a positive effect on SWD. Figure 8 below shows that by increasing its low income student population to the benchmark, a LEA would also have an enhanced positive impact on its SWD.

Capitalizing on this analysis, it is clear that by aligning the SSIP with this initiative will make direct and positive gains, and improve results for SWDs in California in terms of assessment. Figure 8 shows that if the achievement for students in poverty increases, so does the proficiency of SWDs, because the SWD group includes students in poverty. While there will be SWD in an LEA that are not affected by the initiatives because they are not in poverty, the SSIP can assist LEAs in understanding the role that local plans will play in improving outcomes for all students. In addition, the SSIP will support LEAs in targeting resources to assist students with disabilities as a distinct population.

Figure 8. SSIP Relationship Showing Target Support for LCFF Subgroups Results In Improvement for SWD.

Appendix A – Disaggregated Data Analysis for All Federal Performance Indicators

Indicator 2-DROPOUT

NOTE: Targets for Dropout must Decrease over time

Method 1: Same Baseline for both the State and the LEA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Target</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Target</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Districts Meeting Target*</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Currently meet baseline. If nothing changes over the years, this is the percent meeting target.

Method 2: Separate Targets based on LEA Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School District</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified School District</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State *</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*COE and Elementary Districts are not included because counts are too low for these LEA types

Percent of Districts Meeting the LEA Target
## Method 3: Growth Model – Each LEA has its own Target

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large Sized</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Sized</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Target</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Method 1: Same Baseline for both the State and the LEA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 4a-SUSPENSION/EXPULSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOTE: Targets for Discipline must Decrease over time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Method 2: Separate Targets based on LEA Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Office of Education</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School District</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
<td>2.10%</td>
<td>1.90%</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School District</td>
<td>2.80%</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified School District</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
<td>2.10%</td>
<td>1.90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percent of Districts Meeting the LEA Target

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Office of Education</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School District</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School District</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified School District</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Method 3: Growth Model – Each LEA has its own Target

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large District</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium District</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Target</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Indicator 5a PERCENT OF STUDENT IN REGULAR CLASS 80% OR MORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Office of Education</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Office of Education</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School District</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School District</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified School District</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Percent of Districts Meeting the LEA Target

**Method 3: Growth Model – Each LEA has its own Target**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large District</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium District</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Target</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Method 1: Same Baseline for both the State and the LEA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Office of Education</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School District</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School District</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified School District</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Target</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percent of Districts Meeting the LEA Target

**Method 2: Separate Targets based on LEA Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Office of Education</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School District</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School District</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified School District</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Method 3: Growth Model – Each LEA has its own Target

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elk Grove</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Target</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Method 1: Same Baseline for both the State and the LEA

---

*Currently meet baseline. If nothing changes over the years, this is the percent meeting target.*

---

**5B—PERCENT OF STUDENTS IN REGULAR CLASS 40% OF DAY OR LESS**

---

**Method 2: Separate Targets based on LEA Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Office of Education</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School District</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School District</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified School District</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Target</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Percent of Districts Meeting the LEA Target**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Office of Education</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School District</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School District</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified School District</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Method 3: Growth Model – Each LEA has its own Target**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elk Grove</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Target</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Method 1: Same Baseline for both the State and the LEA**

---

**5c—PERCENT IN SEPARATE SCHOOLS**
### Method 2: Separate Targets based on LEA Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Office of Education</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School District</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School District</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified School District</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Target</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percent of Districts Meeting the LEA Target

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Office of Education</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School District</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School District</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified School District</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Method 3: Growth Model – Each LEA has its own Target

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large District</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium District</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Target</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Method 1: Same Baseline for both the State and the LEA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Target</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Target</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percent of Districts Meeting Target

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Office of Education</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School District</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified School District</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Elementary Districts are not included because counts are too low for these LEA types.
### Method 3: Growth Model - Each LEA has its own Target

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large District</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium District</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Target</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Method 1: Same Baseline for both the State and the LEA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Target</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Target</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Districts Meeting Target*</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Currently meet baseline. If nothing changes over the years, this is the percent meeting target.

### Method 2: Separate Targets based on LEA Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Office of Education</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School District</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School District</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified School District</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Target</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percent of Districts Meeting the LEA Target

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Office of Education</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School District</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified School District</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Elementary Districts are not included because counts are too low for these LEA types

### Method 3: Growth Model – Each LEA has its own Target

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large District</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium District</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Target</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Method 1: Same Baseline for both the State and the LEA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Target</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Target</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Districts Meeting Target*</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Currently meet baseline. If nothing changes over the years, this is the percent meeting target.

### Method 2: Separate Targets based on LEA Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Office of Education</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School District</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School District</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified School District</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Target</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Elementary Districts are not included because counts are too low for these LEA types

### Percent of Districts Meeting the LEA Target

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA Type*</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Office of Education</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

This document is the second of five sections that constitute Phase I of California’s State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The SSIP is a new requirement of the U.S. Department of Education and serves as the centerpiece for implementation of the Office of Special Education Programs’ (OSEP) initiative entitled “Results Driven Accountability,” which is its effort to focus more on student performance in the overall system of the state’s general supervision of local educational agencies (LEAs). Phase I is intended to provide a detailed analysis of data and state infrastructure that will guide the selection of coherent improvement strategies to increase the state’s capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs to improve measurable results for students with disabilities (SWD). While this section is being presented as an independent document in this item, it is meant to be considered in the context of OSEP’s overall instructions and is best read in concert with the other SSIP sections presented in this item.

Overview

Stakeholder involvement was particularly critical in California’s analysis of its infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity. Stakeholders involved in this process included staff from the California Department of Education (CDE) from both general education and special education offices. CDE general education staff was particularly helpful in providing information about current state general education initiatives, which expanded the scope of the infrastructure analysis to all aspects of California’s public education system. As with the other components of California’s SSIP development process, a large group of external stakeholders from various elements of California’s public education sector contributed to the analysis. Through a series of meetings conducted over a full year, stakeholders and CDE special education staff examined the state education structure generally, as well as examining an array of programs and activities currently being undertaken to improve teaching and learning.

CDE special education staff worked with CDE general education staff to develop information on various elements of California’s public education infrastructure and numerous improvement programs and activities either in implementation or development. CDE staff then interacted with external stakeholders over multiple meetings, allowing for thorough analysis, discussion, and ultimately stakeholder recommendations concerning how the state’s infrastructure could be enhanced to better support improved student performance, as well as recommendations concerning California’s SSIP and SIMR. The infrastructure analysis included the following subjects:

- Evaluation of the state’s current infrastructure and its ability to serve students with disabilities, including educator professional development activities, technical assistance provided to LEAs, other state
improvement efforts, the state’s system of general supervision, and means to support improvement of teaching and learning

- Improvement activities being conducted or overseen by other divisions of the CDE, including an effort to align the format and content of multiple disparate improvement plans to instead develop a single, coherent improvement plan document

- State-level initiatives currently being implemented and having the potential to significantly improve outcomes for students with disabilities (SWD), including Project READ, Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports (PBIS), Common Core State Standards, Multi-tiered System of Supports, English language development standards, the Family Engagement Framework, and the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) and accompanying Local Control Accountability Plans (LCAP)

CDE staff facilitated a stakeholder review of each of these subjects in a series of small group meetings, considering the potential impact of each to improve the performance of SWD, how the various activities support or diverge from other current state activities, and ways in which the current activity could be improved for greater efficacy. The small groups then met in large group settings to discuss each group’s findings, and built consensus around the activities that the large group determined were most suitable for statewide implementation, and greatest likelihood to improve student performance. The group’s findings included:

- California’s current infrastructure is designed to provide sufficient local flexibility to be responsive to the varied local contexts and needs in the state

- The combination of state and local oversight and technical support structures work to ensure that SWD are receiving the instruction and services to which they are entitled

- LEA performance is more likely to improve if LEAs develop and implement effective, coordinated LEA-wide improvement plans, with significant impact from local stakeholders, rather than multiple narrowly-focused and uncoordinated improvement plans

- While there are several promising initiatives currently being implemented in California, the state’s new LCFF and LCAP are the initiatives that most likely to drive improved educational opportunities for SWD, as well as other high-needs students who are targeted by the LCFF and LCAP

- The impact of the LCFF and LCAP on SWD could be enhanced by ensuring that LEAs align their local improvement activities for SWD with their LCAPs, and the CDE could assist LEAs toward this end by providing data and targeted technical assistance that supports alignment of improvement activities for SWDs with their general LEA improvement plans

**Process and Outcomes**

This Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity section describes how the California Department of Education (CDE) analyzed its capacity to support LEA improvement and build LEA capacity to improve results for SWD. Areas reviewed include governance, fiscal elements, instructional standards, professional development, data elements, technical assistance, and accountability and monitoring. Also included is a review of strengths of the current system, coordination of system elements, and current state-level plans and initiatives. This section also addresses OSEP’s requirement to identify recommendations for improvement of the state’s infrastructure to better support improved student performance. Those recommendations are provided in bold type at the end of the topic they address.

In response to the OSEP’s requirement that states move towards a system of general supervision that focuses on Results Driven Accountability (RDA), the CDE selected a subset from California’s Improving
Special Education Services (ISES) stakeholder group to conduct activities with staff of the Special Education Division (SED) to develop the SSIP. The subgroup included representatives of Special Education Local Plan Areas (SELPAs), Parent Training Information Centers (PTIs), Family Empowerment Centers (FECs), the California Advisory Commission on Special Education, and staff of the State Board of Education (SBE). (See Appendix A – State Systemic Improvement Plan Stakeholder Group).

The CDE staff and SSIP stakeholders met monthly between December 2013 and November 2014. Stakeholders participated in three types of infrastructure analysis:

1) Review and evaluation of current infrastructure related to providing services to students with disabilities; (December 2013, October 2014, and June 2014)

2) Review and evaluation of state level initiatives and local plans in general education that would facilitate improved results for children with disabilities (April 2014, May 2014, October 2014); and Review of infrastructure elements as related to achieving the state identified measurable results. (May 2014, August 2014, October 2014)

Section 1: Review and Evaluation of Current Infrastructure Related to Serving Students with Disabilities (Generally)

Stakeholders examined the draft instructions for the SSIP in December 2013 and conducted an analysis of a number of infrastructure elements, including:

- Professional development system
- Technical assistance system
- Connection with other state improvement efforts
- General supervision system
- Infrastructure to support improvement and build LEA capacity

For each of the areas listed above, a small group reviewed the OSEP instructions, discussed the infrastructure element, and made recommendations regarding further analysis of the area. Specific recommendations may be found in State Systemic Improvement Plan Preliminary Infrastructure Analysis, December 2013, (see Appendix B -- Infrastructure Evaluation). Overall, the group recommended that a more detailed analysis be conducted. To complete this analysis, the group suggested that a matrix be constructed. The matrix would be used to summarize the infrastructure (at each level of the system) and develop the analysis to generate the elements needed for the SSIP description:

- Current strengths of the systems
- The extent to which systems are coordinated
- Areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems

In a subsequent stakeholder meeting (October 2014), individual matrix descriptions were prepared by CDE staff in the following element areas:

- Governance
Each matrix provided a summary of the infrastructure for the organizational level being addressed. The levels of system review included:

- CDE (Special Education)
- CDE (General Education)
- SELPAs
- County Offices of Education (COE)
- LEAs
- Other (agencies, boards, and organizations having significant roles in the element being analyzed)

In addition, CDE staff included blank columns on each matrix form to record the results of the discussions related to:

- Strengths of the system
- Coordination of system(s)
- Areas for improvement

(For the infrastructure descriptions and a summary of discussions on each element, see Appendix C -- Infrastructure Descriptions and Recommendations.)

Section 2: Working with Other Divisions in the California Department of Education to Review and Evaluate State Level Initiatives and Local Plans as Applicable to Students with Disabilities

Review and Evaluation of Required Local Plans: Concurrent with the SSIP stakeholder process, the SED participated on a department-wide work group to assess the alignment of local plans. The need for alignment was created by the transition to a new statewide system of assessment (Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium), the revision of a state accountability system, and the implementation of a new funding system: the Local Control Funding Formula and the Local Control Accountability Plan (LCFF/LCAP). The State Superintendent of Public Instruction (SSPI), the CDE, and the SBE recognized the need to review current state and federal plan requirements in June 2014 and initiated a project under the name of the Plan Alignment and Coordination Project (PACP). A memorandum describing this joint CDE and SBE effort can be found at ftp://ftp.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/ds/ssipattachments
The purpose of the PACP is to study the alignment of the LCAP to other mandated plans. The plans reviewed by the PACP included the following:

- LCAP
- LEA
- Single School District Plan (SSD)
- Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA)
- Safe Schools Plan
- Program Improvement Addendum or Plan (Title I)
- Title II Non-Compliant Teacher Action Plan
- Title III Improvement Plan

The Plan Alignment and Advisory work is ongoing and is performed by CDE staff representing program-specific expertise department wide, including the participation of the SED. The PACP includes representatives and staff from the following:

- SBE
- District, School, and Innovation Branch Office (CDE)
- California Comprehensive Center
- School Fiscal Services Division (CDE)
- Educational Data Management Division (CDE)
- Legal Division (CDE)
- English Learner Support Division (CDE)
- Special Education Division (CDE)
- Charter Schools Division (CDE)
- Assessment Development and Administration Division (CDE)
- Professional Learning Supports Division (CDE)
- Local Agency Systems Support Offices (CDE)
- Measurement and Accountability Reporting Division (CDE)

The task of the CDE staff represented in the PACP is to provide feedback and advisory consultation. Staff has relied on the federal LEA plan and additional federal requirements (e.g., Title II and Title III) as a frame of reference to determine the degree of alignment with required federal and state plans. Specific tasks were slated to include:

- Identifying and selecting federally and state mandated plans to research and compare and contrast
The work completed by the PACP was used by the SED as the basis for preparing an analysis specifically related to proposed SSIP activities. Discussion of the alignment of local plans to the SSIP was conducted in October 2014. As noted in the section on the Review and Analysis of Current Infrastructure, the SED prepared matrices for evaluation by the stakeholder group. Drawing on the work of the PACP, SED staff prepared a matrix to facilitate evaluation of the alignment of the local plans to the SSIP: [ftp://ftp.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/ds/SSIPattachments/Infrastructure%20Analysis%20-%20Plan%20Alignment%20Matrix%20101314.xlsx](ftp://ftp.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/ds/SSIPattachments/Infrastructure%20Analysis%20-%20Plan%20Alignment%20Matrix%20101314.xlsx)

At this time, the PACP has recommended that the LCAP be used as a vehicle, when possible, to align the individual requirements found in other locally mandated state plans. The SSIP stakeholder group also determined that there is a high degree of alignment already in place between the components of the LCAP and what would be needed in the SSIP.

**Review and Evaluation of State Level Initiatives**: Another key part of the Infrastructure Analysis was to look at state level initiatives in both general and special education to evaluate the extent to which each initiative could contribute to improved results for SWD. The SED partnered with other divisions in the CDE to prepare and conduct these analyses. To do this, the CDE prepared summaries of other state education initiatives, including proposals for increased collaboration for supporting LEAs (See Appendix D -- State Initiative Summary and Discussion Guides). Stakeholders participated in one of the following state level initiatives:


- English Language Development Standards Web site at [http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/eldstandards.asp](http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/eldstandards.asp)
General education partners provided an overview of each area and led discussions to explore three questions in small stakeholder groups:

1) How does the CDE’s support and current activities relate to the implementation of the initiative as a focus area for improvement to ensure that students with disabilities have access to the initiative and thereby increase academic achievement?

2) How would the SED proposal enhance CDE’s efforts to improve student outcomes for students with disabilities?

3) What else should the SED do to increase academic achievement for students with disabilities through the initiative as the focus area for improvement?

After each SSIP stakeholder meeting, there was a debriefing between selected CDE staff and the SSIP stakeholders. The purpose of these debriefings was to: 1) summarize what was learned and capture key recommendations; and 2) begin planning for the next monthly meeting. As a result of the small group discussions, the debriefing group selected three of the six areas (initiatives) to continue discussions at the May meeting as potential focuses for improvement: Discipline, Multi-Tiered System of Supports, and Project READ.

For each of the areas discussed in the meetings, the SSIP stakeholder group considered the extent to which data was available and the potential that the initiative activities would produce improved performance. It should be noted that the activities related to implementation of the California Common Core State Standards (CA-CCSS) and the English Language Development Standards were identified as basic strategies for improvement, but did not need additional analysis or discussion. Similarly, Family Engagement was identified as a strategy that would be infused in all improvement strategies selected.

Lastly, the SSIP stakeholder group recommended that the elements of the SSIP be aligned to the LCFF and LCAP, the most sweeping initiatives affecting California education, including special education.

Based on the input from the SSIP stakeholders, the SED developed an agenda for the May 2014 SSIP stakeholder meeting to continue the analysis of data related to the remaining potential focus areas, and to begin to think about what a potential theory of action might be (i.e., if CDE does this, then LEAs will do this. If LEAs do this, then student results will improve in the following ways…) and how each improvement area might result in positive outcomes for students with disabilities. This agenda included an overview of the LCFF and LCAP, and a panel discussion of SELPA Directors to share their experiences with formulating an LCAP, including results for SWD. This was presented in general session for all participants at the meeting. Small groups also met in breakout sessions to review the discussions on the remaining focus areas for improvement from the April meeting. The breakout discussions were designed to have participants:

- Learn how data is collected related to each focus area for improvement
- Evaluate data collection and measurement for the particular improvement effort
Rate how likely implementation of that particular focus area for improvement area is to result in positive student outcomes

Begin to develop a theory of action related to that focus area

After the May meeting, the SSIP stakeholder debriefing group members were struck by how all-encompassing the LCFF and LCAP efforts are. The consensus was that whatever was done to develop an SSIP, it should align with the LCAP. Additional debriefing discussions focused on the information shared in each of the small SED focus areas for improvement groups. These discussions were generally organized by the following questions:

- How do the initiatives (focus areas for improvement) align to the requirements of the SSIP?
- How do the initiatives (focus areas for improvement) diverge?
- How do the initiatives (focus areas for improvement) align with the LCAP priority areas?
- How are the LEAs including SWD and what metrics are they using to measure programs?
- Does this suggest any focus areas for improvement (initiatives) to prioritize for the SSIP?
- For each of these, what would be the measurable student level outcome (State Identified Measurable Result [SIMR])?
- How would these potential SIMRs align with the LCAP?

As a result of this work, SSIP stakeholder participants felt that the chosen SSIP and the required SIMR should be supportive of LCAP requirements for student progress. The stakeholder group came to the following conclusions by the end of the May 2014 meeting:

1. A statewide planning, implementation, and accountability infrastructure is being put in place based on the LCFF and LCAP requirements created by the Governor, Legislature, and the SBE.
2. The infrastructure created by the LCFF and LCAP requirements is inclusive of general education and special education.
3. The eight priority areas included in the LCAP template are compatible with both improved
student outcomes and the selected SSIP strategies that lead to improved student performance (e.g., reduction of suspension and expulsion, multi-tiered system of support [MTSS], improved access to, and instruction in, the CA CCSS).

4. The potential SIMR was identified as student assessment results for SWD who are also English Learners, foster youth, and/or students who are eligible for free and reduced-price meals (FRPM).

5. The potential areas for improvement/coherent improvement strategies would be school climate/student discipline; student engagement/attendance; and access to, and instruction in, the CA CCSS.

**The LCFF and the LCAP:** The LCFF and LCAP provide a new state infrastructure for education in California (see [http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/](http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/)). The LCFF is a statewide policy enacted by the Legislature, with the Governor’s approval, and makes a sweeping change in funding of public education and accountability for student outcomes. The LCFF is being implemented by all districts and charter LEAs statewide. Components of the LCFF are intended to be scaled up over a period of three years. To date, all districts have developed and implemented an LCAP. The specifics of the accountability process and metrics are being developed and will be considered by the SBE in the fall of 2015.

**Funds:** The LCFF combines state (not federal) education funds, including funds that were previously devoted to categorical programs (except state special education funds). The funds include three components: 1) a base grant (funding based on average daily attendance); 2) a supplemental grant (based on the unduplicated number of students who are English Learners (ELs), low income and/or foster youth); and 3) a concentration grant (for districts with a high percentage of their total enrollment from the target groups).

**Local Planning:** In keeping with the emphasis on local control, state categorical program requirements were eliminated. The intended result is to give districts increased flexibility to respond to local conditions to their unique student populations. The LCFF places primary responsibility on the district to plan and implement programs that lead to improved student outcomes. While there are three student populations included in supplement funding allocations, it should be noted that all of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) disaggregated groups are included in the targets for the LCAP, including students with disabilities.

**Local Plan Review:** The LCAP is the vehicle that is used to summarize planning efforts and to document accountability. The SBE is responsible for creating and implementing the guidelines, templates, and evaluation criteria for the LCAP. LEA LCAPs have been initially prepared for a three year cycle. The first LEA LCAPs were submitted July 1, 2014, for approval by the governing board of the school district or COE after review by parent advisory committees and following public hearing. It is the responsibility of the COE, not the CDE, to review the LCAPs developed by all of the districts and charters within the county boundaries. The CDE is only responsible for reviewing LCAPs prepared by the COEs for students directly served by the COE.

**LCAP Contents:** The LEA LCAP goals and priorities apply to the LEA in general and individual schools within the LEA. LCAP template instructions require that the LEA LCAP must include:

Annual goals: All pupils (including ethnic subgroups, socioeconomically disadvantaged, ELs, students with disabilities, and foster youth) will have annual goals that address eight state priority areas:

1. Basic conditions of learning (teacher assignment and qualifications, standards aligned...
2. Implementation of academic content and performance standards

3. Parental involvement (including students with exceptional needs)

4. Pupil achievement (including assessment results)

5. Pupil engagement (attendance, graduation, and dropout rates)

6. School climate (suspension and expulsion rates)

7. Extent to which students are involved in a broad course of study

8. Pupil outcomes by subject area (e.g., math, English Language Arts [ELA], science, social science, arts, health, physical education and other State Board of Education prescribed subjects).

Evaluation Rubrics: As identified in the state LCFF legislation, the SBE is required adopt evaluation rubrics by October 2015. The rubrics are to be used to assist:

- A school district, county office of education, or charter school in evaluating its strengths, weaknesses, and areas that require improvement

- A county superintendent of schools in identifying school districts and charter schools in need of technical assistance, and the specific priorities upon which the technical assistance should be focused

- The SSPI in identifying school districts in need of intervention

The evaluation rubrics are intended to reflect a holistic, multidimensional assessment of school district and individual school site performance and must address all of the state priorities. As part of the evaluation rubrics, the SBE shall adopt standards for school district and individual school site performance, and expectations for improvement in regard to each of the state priorities.

Monitoring, Technical Assistance, and Accountability: The district is responsible for monitoring its performance using the rubrics as applied to its LCAP. The district is also responsible for using their resources to secure any technical assistance they identify as being needed.

The county superintendent of schools, however, has a primary role for providing technical assistance under any of the following conditions:
1. The governing board of a school district requests technical assistance

2. The county superintendent does not approve a local control and accountability plan or annual update; or

3. The school district that fails to improve pupil achievement across more than one state priority for one or more pupil subgroups (which includes SWD)

The technical assistance provided by the county superintendent of schools is intended to include one or more of the following:

1) Identification of the school district's strengths and weaknesses in regard to the state priorities, including a review of effective, evidence-based programs that apply to the school district's goals.

2) Assignment of an academic expert or team of academic experts to assist the school district in identifying and implementing effective programs that are designed to improve the outcomes for all pupil subgroups.

3) Request that the Superintendent assign the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence to provide advice and assistance to the school district.

The California Collaborative for Educational Excellence (CCEE): The CCEE is to advise and assist school districts, county superintendents of schools, and charter schools in achieving the goals in an LCAP. The membership of the CCEE is specified in law and its members include the SSPI, the President of the State Board of Education, and other local officials and stakeholders appointed by the governor and the Legislature.

A local educational agency, or consortium of local educational agencies, are contracted to serve as the fiscal agent for the CCEE. Funds appropriated for the CCEE are apportioned to the fiscal agent. At the direction of the governing board of the CCEE, the fiscal agent will contract with individuals, local educational agencies, or organizations with the expertise, experience, and a record of success in the following areas:

State priority areas:

- Improving the quality of teaching
- Improving the quality of school district and school site leadership
- Successfully addressing the needs of special pupil populations, including, but not limited to, English Learners, pupils eligible to receive a free or reduced-price meal, pupils in foster care, and individuals with exceptional needs.

The SSPI may direct the CCEE to advise and assist a school district, county superintendent of schools, or charter school in any of the following circumstances:
If the school district, county board of education, or a charter school requests the advice and assistance of the CCEE

If the county superintendent of schools of the county in which the school district or charter school is located determines, following the provision of technical assistance as applicable, that the advice and assistance of the CCEE is necessary to help the school district or charter school accomplish the goals described in their LCAP

If the SSPI determines that the advice and assistance of the CCEE is necessary to help the school district, county superintendent of schools, or charter school accomplish the goals set forth in the LCAP.

The SSPI may identify school districts in need of intervention, with the approval of the SBE, if the district meets both of the following criteria:

1) The school district did not improve the outcomes for three or more pupil subgroups in more than one state or local priority in three out of four consecutive school years

2) The CCEE has provided advice and assistance to the school district and makes either of the following findings:
   a. That the school district has failed, or is unable, to implement the recommendations of the CCEE; or
   b. That the inadequate performance of the school district, based upon an evaluation rubric adopted pursuant to Section 52064.5, is either so persistent or acute as to require intervention.

For districts that need intervention, the SSPI may, with the approval of the SBE, do one or more of the following:

1) Make changes to a LCAP adopted by the governing board of the school district

2) Develop and impose a budget revision, in conjunction with revisions to the LCAP, that the SSPI determines would allow the school district to improve the outcomes for all pupil subgroups in regard to state and local priorities

3) Stay or rescind an action, if that action is not required by a local collective bargaining agreement, that would prevent the school district from improving outcomes for all pupil subgroups in regard to state or local priorities

4) Appoint an academic trustee to exercise the powers and authority specified in this section on his or her behalf.

This entire structure of LCAP support, technical assistance, plan evaluation, and potential intervention could also serve to support development and implementation of local improvement plans focusing on SWDs, particularly as LEAs align their activities to improve teaching and learning for SWDs with their LCAPs. California envisions LCAP technical support activities and SSIP improvement activities as mutually supportive elements of the state’s technical assistance structure for LEA improvement plans. This concept will be elaborated in California’s Phase II SSIP submission.
Section 3: Infrastructure Analysis as it Relates to the Capacity for Achieving the SSIP in Conjunction with the LCFF and LCAP

As noted previously, SSIP stakeholders made a consensus recommendation to align the State Performance Plan (SPP) and SSIP activities, whenever possible, to the LEA LCAP requirements and LCFF. Because of the magnitude of the change represented by the LCFF and LCAPs, the SSIP stakeholder group overwhelmingly recommended aligning the SSIP to the structures being developed to implement the LCFF and LCAP. Specifically, the stakeholder group felt that this was an important opportunity to:

- Coordinate improvement efforts between special education and state and federal general education efforts
- Address a variety of activities (e.g. discipline, multi-tiered system of supports, instruction in the common core) that lead to improved outcomes (assessment results) for SWD
- Acknowledge that students who are English Learners, foster youth, and/or eligible for FRPM are significantly represented within special education programs

Governance

Local Educational Agency (LEA): The LEA is at the center of the LCAP. It is the LEA that is responsible for developing, implementing, and evaluating the goals and services provided to achieve necessary outcomes in the eight priority areas:

1) Basic conditions of learning (teacher assignment and qualifications, standards aligned instructional materials, and well maintained school facilities)

2) Implementation of academic content and performance standards

3) Parental involvement (including students with exceptional needs)

4) Pupil achievement (including assessment results)

5) Pupil engagement (attendance, graduation and dropout rates)

6) School climate (suspension and expulsion rates)

7) Extent to which students are involved in a broad course of study

8) Pupil outcomes by subject area (e.g., math, ELA, science, social science, arts, health,
physical education, and other State Board of Education prescribed subjects)

The LEA is responsible for including students with disabilities in the LCAP in general if not explicitly.

The LEA and the SELPA of which it is a part is responsible for ensuring that all students with disabilities receive a free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment as required by state and federal (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act) law and regulations.

If the LEA is a single district SELPA, then the LEA is responsible for establishing an annual budget and service plan that ensures that the LEA is prepared to address all of the special education and related service needs that may arise for students with all types of disabilities from birth to 22 years of age.

**Stakeholder Recommendation:** To improve LEA capacity to achieve the SIMR, the CDE should support all LEAs to develop goals and services for students with disabilities in LEA local plans.

**County Office of Education (COE):** Under the LCAP, the COE is responsible for providing technical assistance and for approving the LCAP developed by each LEA in their county. The COE is also responsible for reviewing progress using state rubrics to determine if LEAs need assistance related to meeting progress goals and metrics.

If the COE provides direct services to students, including students with disabilities, then it would be responsible for developing, implementing, and evaluating an LCAP for its direct services. The COE LCAP is reviewed by the CDE and is subject to the same criteria used for evaluating LEA LCAPs.

Also, as a direct service provider to students with Individualized Education Program (IEPs), the COE is responsible for ensuring that all students served receive a free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment and to implement the requirements of the IDEA as spelled out in state and federal law and regulations.

**Stakeholder Recommendation:** To improve LEA capacity to achieve the SIMR, the CDE should seek to disseminate any criteria adopted for the LCAP evaluation rubrics related to students with disabilities.

**Special Education Local Plan Areas (SELPAs):** SELPAs have no specific role outlined in state LCFF and LCAP requirements. In a single district SELPA, the SELPA Director and staff may have a direct role in preparing and implementing the LCAP as it relates to students with disabilities. In multi-district SELPAs, the SELPA may play a number of supportive roles related to planning and implementing the LCAP such as provision of data, identification of evidence based practices and content experts, provision of staff development resources, etc.

Under the governance system in California, the SELPA is key to the development and implementation of local policies and practices, coordination of services within the SELPA and across SELPAs statewide, preparation of the local plans for special education, provision of staff development and training, monitoring the implementation of the local plan, and correction of noncompliance.

**Stakeholder Recommendation:** To improve LEA capacity to achieve the SIMR, the CDE should encourage SELPAs to participate in LEA LCAP evaluation and planning activities.

**The California Department of Education (CDE) and the Special Education Division (SED):** The CDE is administered by the SSPI. The SSPI is an elected official under the constitution of the State of California. As such, the SSPI is the chief state school officer for California, and also serves as the State Board of
Education's (SBE) Executive Officer and Secretary. The CDE administers programs and services under the policy direction of the SBE.

Under the LCFF legislation, the SSPI is responsible for reviewing LCAPs prepared by COEs, for participation in and funding of the CCEE, and for intervening in districts only under specific circumstances with the approval of the SBE.

The SED has rigorous responsibilities for administration and monitoring of services for students with disabilities. The SED is responsible for ensuring that all students with disabilities are located, evaluated, and served. The SED is responsible for ensuring that all students with disabilities are provided a free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment. The SED has broad responsibilities for administering IDEA funds and for general supervision of all requirements under the IDEA.

Stakeholder Recommendation: To improve LEA capacity to achieve the SIMR, the CDE should coordinate the work of all divisions within the CDE to ensure that support for LEAs and COEs provided under the LCFF and federal programs (Title I, Title II, Title III and IDEA, for example) is available as needed and as desired to promote positive outcomes for all students, including students with disabilities.

The California State Board of Education (SBE): The SBE is the K – 12 policy making body for academic standards, curriculum, instructional materials, assessments and accountability. The SBE adopts instructional materials for use in grades kindergarten through eight. The SBE also adopts regulations (Title 5) to implement a wide variety of programs created by the Legislature, such as charter schools and special education. In addition, the SBE has the authority to grant LEA requests for waivers of certain provisions of the California Education Code.

Under the LCFF legislation, the SBE is specifically responsible for:

- Adopting LCAP templates for use by LEAs and COEs
- Adopting evaluation rubrics, including standards for school district and individual school site performance and expectation for improvement in regard to each of the state priorities
- Participating in the CCEE
- Approving LEA intervention proposals made by the SSPI

The SBE is considered the State Education Agency (SEA) under the meaning found in the IDEA. Under the IDEA, the SBE is responsible for making policies and procedures related to all aspects of special education, adopting regulations, and approving the SPP/APR including the SSIP.

Stakeholder Recommendation: To improve LEA capacity to achieve the SIMR, the CDE should support future SBE efforts to address students with disabilities in the LCAP templates and evaluation rubrics.

Fiscal

State Budget Process: Expenditure of funds in California is authorized through the annual Budget Act. Allocations of both federal and state general funds are made in specific items and provisions each year. The
The budget is proposed by the Department of Finance on behalf of the Governor. The budget is introduced and reviewed by committees in both the Senate and Assembly. Typically, the budget specifies the amounts and the purposes for each item. Once the budget is passed and signed, various state agencies use those funds as directed. In California, the budget contains specific items for federal funds in special education and for state general funds in special education. In 2013–14, the budget for education went through a major change in the creation of the LCFF. Funding for a number of categorical education programs was eliminated and combined into the LCFF allocations. Several categorical programs were retained, including special education. While the program was retained in the budget, allocations within the special education items were swept into more generic funding to SELPAs, giving more “local control” to the use of funds than was in place previously. One rationale for retaining a separate identifier for special education funding was to mark a clear line for local maintenance of effort and maintenance of state financial support. However, this has had the unintended impact of reducing the visibility and integration of services for students with disabilities within the LCAP process; it is mentioned as another target group, but funds are considered separate and flow to SELPAs and not to districts directly.

Stakeholder Recommendation: To improve LEA capacity to achieve the SIMR, the CDE should seek to clarify how state and federal special education funds can be used to benefit students with disabilities in the targeted LCFF subgroups.

The California Department of Education (CDE) and the Special Education Division (SED): Based on the annual Budget Act, the CDE calculates three grant awards for each LEA, COE, and charter school to meet the requirements of the LCFF: a base grant (funding based on average daily attendance); a supplemental grant (based on the unduplicated number of students who are EL, low income and/or foster youth); and a concentration grant (for districts with a high percentage of their total enrollment from the target groups). Funds are distributed through the Principal Apportionment Process (see http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/pa/). LEAs are expected to secure independent audits using the new audit guide, as updated to address the LCFF and LCAP.

The CDE also uses the Principal Apportionment Process to allocate state general funds for special education to SELPAs. Amounts for each SELPA are calculated based on the methodology contained in the Education Code and for the purposes identified in the Budget Act. Generally speaking, state general funds are allocated based on the collective K–12 Average Daily Attendance (ADA) of LEAs who are members of the SELPA. These calculations are made by the School Fiscal Services Division and funds are disseminated to current SELPA entities. Annually, the CDE identifies the list of SELPAs and their participating LEAs. (e.g., new SELPAs are formed, LEAs move from one SELPA to another).

The SED is responsible for administration of federal IDEA grant funds. Using methodologies specified in the IDEA, SED calculates and administers grant funds for Section 611 and 619 of the IDEA. Like state general funds, these funds are allocated to SELPAs that are responsible for submitting annual budget and service plans to the SED. Funds are distributed locally in accordance with a local allocation plan adopted through the SELPA governance structure.

Stakeholder Recommendation: To improve LEA capacity to achieve the SIMR, the CDE should convene a workgroup across state and federal programs (e.g., Title I, Title II, Title III and IDEA) to prepare a fiscal resource overview and technical assistance guide related to overlaps and uses of both state and federal funds that would assist LEAs to optimize the use of resources to achieve student outcomes.

Special Education Local Plan Areas (SELPAs): As noted previously, SELPAs have no specific role related to the LCFF and LCAP. Funding for LCFF and LCAP flows directly to the LEA.

In order to receive state general funds for special education, a SELPA must have a local plan, approved by the SBE. All federal eligibility tests are conducted at the LEA level (e.g., maintenance of effort). Special education funds flow through SELPAs to LEAs. There are 39 single district SELPAs that are able to use all of
the funds directly. The 90 multi-district SELPAs prepare an allocation plan each year that identifies how much will be retained at the SELPA level (for staffing, administration, and direct service programs) and how much will flow to each LEA (district, COE, and charter acting as an LEA). The allocation plan is reviewed and approved through the SELPA governance structure. Typically, it is the superintendents of the participating LEAs who, as a group, ratify the funding plan. The funding plan is not submitted to the state. There is no programmatic description of outcomes or services associated with the funding plan. State law does not require discussion or consideration of LCFF or LCAP priorities in SELPA funding plan decisions.

Stakeholder Recommendation: To improve LEA capacity to achieve the SIMR, the CDE should make available technical assistance to SELPAs and LEAs to increase consideration of the use of local resources as a means to improve the outcomes of students with disabilities who are in the LCFF and LCAP target populations.

County Offices of Education (COEs): Generally, the COE is responsible for reviewing and ensuring that all LEA member district A-133 audit findings have been corrected. COEs receive funds for two purposes under the LCFF: 1) as a LEA that provides direct services, and, 2) as a LCAP plan reviewer and technical assistance provider.

Most COEs receive special education funds for direct services. In special education, a COE may provide direct special education services when students with IEPs who are residents of LEAs in the county are referred to the COE by the LEA. Many COEs provide services for infants and toddlers, preschool school age children, juvenile court schools, low incidence, and severe and multiply-disabled students. In low population areas, the county office may take on additional direct service responsibilities on behalf of very small LEAs (e.g., provision of speech, occupational therapy, and physical therapy services).

A COE may also receive funds as the Administrative Unit (AU) of a multi-district SELPA. Of the 90 multi-district SELPAs, 68 are administered through COEs. Staff of these SELPAs are more likely to be involved in the COE LCAP process than staff of other multi-district SELPAs. They are also more likely to be able to advise districts on the use of funds to improve outcomes for students with disabilities.

Stakeholder Recommendation: To improve LEA capacity to achieve the SIMR, the CDE should encourage COE SELPAs to coordinate their work with COE LCAP reviewers and technical assistance providers.

Local Educational Agency (LEA): The LEAs are the recipient of funds for both LCFF and special education. LEAs do not have to demonstrate fiscal eligibility to receive LCFF grants. They are responsible for developing and implementing the LCAP. Section 3: Actions, Services, and Expenditures of the LCAP requires that the LEA explain how funds will be used:

- Part A requires the LEA to complete a table that explains what actions will be performed to meet the goals for ALL pupils and to include planned expenditures for the three periods of the LCAP, the fund source and where these expenditures can be found in the LEA's budget.

- Part B requires the LEA to complete a table that explains what actions will be performed to meet the goals for the targeted populations and to include planned expenditures for the three periods of the LCAP, the fund source, and where these expenditures can be found in the LEA's budget.

- Part C requires the LEA to describe the increase in funds in the LCAP year and how the LEA is expending these increased funds in the LCAP year.
Part D requires the LEA to demonstrate how the services provided in the LCAP year for low income pupils, foster youth, and English learners provide for increased or improved services for these pupils in proportion to the increase in funding provided for such pupils in that year.

Unless the LEA is a single district SELPA, special education funds are provided to LEAs through the SELPA. In order to be eligible to receive federal IDEA funds, the LEA must demonstrate that it has met two fiscal tests: 1) maintenance of effort (budgeted amount must exceed prior year actual expenditures), and, 2) excess cost (spent at least as much in state funds for students with disabilities as to non-disabled students). There is a requirement that LEAs adopt the policies and procedures contained in the SELPA local plan, the local plan is not descriptive in nature, and does not provide goals and activities related to student outcomes.

Stakeholder Recommendation: To improve LEA capacity to achieve the SIMR, the CDE should consider convening a workgroup to explore modification of the SELPA local budget and service plans to address student outcomes.

Data Collection, Measurements, and Reporting

California Department of Education (CDE): The CDE collects data through two primary data sets related to students with disabilities: the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) and the California Special Education Management Information System (CASEMIS). Data from both systems are used to report to the U.S. Department of Education. Data collection and reporting is coordinated across the CDE.

Data managers from:

- Analysis, Measurement, and Accountability Reporting Division
- Assessment Development and Administration Division
- Educational Data Management Division
- Special Education Division
- English Learner Support Division

Meet biweekly to:

- Review current data practices
- Address current department data concerns
- Discuss assessment implementation
- Discuss LEA issues with submission, inaccurate data
- Develop cross division work groups to address issues

LCAP funding is based on data collected through CALPADS regarding overall Average Daily Attendance (ADA) and the ADA of specific target groups. In addition, LCAP legislation refers to specific measures as defining certain priority areas. These include:

Pupil achievement:
Statewide assessments

The Academic Performance Index

Successful completion of courses that satisfy entrance to the University of California and the California State University Systems

Progress toward English proficiency as measured by the California English Language Development Test (CELDT)

The English learner reclassification rate

Passage of an advanced placement examination with a score of 3 or higher

The percentage of pupils who participate in, and demonstrate college preparedness pursuant to, the Early Assessment Program.

Pupil engagement:

School attendance rates

Chronic absenteeism rates

Middle school dropout rates

High school dropout rates

High school graduation rates

School climate:

Pupil suspension rates

Pupil expulsion rates

Other local measures, including surveys of pupils, parents, and teachers on the sense of safety and school connectedness

Generally, data that may be included in the LCAP is also collected and reported as required by state and federal law to the CDE by the LEA. Of the measures listed above, some are calculated by the CDE (e.g., Annual Performance Index) using data reported by the LEA. Other measures may be the same as information calculated and reported by the CDE to the United States Department of Education (e.g., graduation rates, dropout rates). However, districts may have additional data or calculation methods that they use for the purposes of local planning.
Some of the measures related to LCAP priorities are calculated separately for students with disabilities. The CDE also makes calculations for the annual LEA indicator report and for compliance determinations. These calculations correspond to some of the calculations for pupil achievement, pupil engagement, and school climate. Special education indicators are calculated for the accountable LEA. The district, county office, or charter acting as an LEA is responsible for ensuring that a student receives a free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment. This may be at variance with calculations made for LCAP which is based on the LEA that serves the student. The CDE’s SED validates data that has been submitted to the CDE during monitoring visits and as a follow-up to Special Education Self-reviews (SESRs).

**Stakeholder Recommendation:** To improve LEA capacity to achieve the SIMR, the CDE should make it a priority to prepare calculations for each of the measures identified for the LCAP and LCFF targeted subgroups as soon as possible to provide LEAs with information to help them gauge the impact of their improvement activities.

**Stakeholder Recommendation:** To assist LEAs in identifying ways to improve LEA capacity to achieve the SIMR, the CDE could make calculations of measures included in the LCAP priorities of pupil achievement, pupil engagement, and school climate for students with disabilities who are also in the LCFF targeted subgroups.

**Special Education Local Plan Areas (SELPAs):** SELPAs are the entity statutorily responsible for collecting data regarding students with disabilities from each LEA in the SELPA and for certifying that they are reporting valid and reliable data. Section 14 of 30 California Education Code (EC) 56205 (a)(14) requires that SELPAs have in place policies, procedures, and programs related to performance goals and indicators. Previously, this requirement has related to key performance indicators (prior to IDEA reauthorization in 2004) and SPP indicators (2005 to present). With the advent of the LCFF and SSIP, it is probable that SELPAs will need to realign the content of their local plans to address the SIMR and the priority areas in the LCFF and LCAP.

**Stakeholder Recommendation:** To improve LEA capacity to achieve the SIMR, the CDE should convene a workgroup of stakeholders to identify methods for updating SELPA local plans to meet the additional performance goals and indicators embodied in the SSIP and aligned with the LCFF and LCAP priority areas.

**Local Educational Agencies (LEAs):** LEAs are the source of data for both CASEMIS and CALPADS. Some information about students with disabilities is reported in both data bases (e.g., suspension and expulsion). It is a challenge to keep both data bases consistent, as data for CALPADS may be entered at the school site, while CASEMIS data is most often included in the IEP. With the proliferation of electronic IEP systems, data about students with disabilities is usually not part of the regular education data system. While this may pose problems in single district SELPAs, it is compounded in multi-district SELPAs. The CDE provides SELPAs with annual data evaluation reports to identify the extent to which data is consistent between CASEMIS and CALPADS and to correct inconsistencies. This split between data systems creates an additional challenge for districts who wish to review and use data related to students with disabilities in their district level planning.

**Stakeholder Recommendation:** To improve LEA capacity to achieve the SIMR, the CDE should work with the SBE, COEs, LEAs, and charters to clarify responsibilities and methods for including students with disabilities in data related to their local planning.

**Monitoring and Accountability**

**LCAP Evaluation Rubrics:** As discussed previously in the infrastructure section, the SBE is required by the
LCFF legislation to adopt evaluation rubrics for the LCAP by October 2015. As part of the evaluation rubrics, the SBE is to adopt standards for LEA and school site performance, as well as expectations for improvement in each of the state priorities. The rubrics are to assist:

- A school district, county office of education, or charter school in evaluating its strengths, weaknesses, and areas that require improvement

- A county superintendent of schools in identifying school districts and charter schools in need of technical assistance and the specific priorities upon which the technical assistance should be focused; and

- The state Superintendent in identifying school districts in need of intervention.

**LCAP Monitoring:** As mentioned previously, LEAs, COEs, the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence (CCEE), and the CDE all have specific responsibilities outlined in state law for monitoring:

Local Educational Agency (LEA): At the most basic level, the LEA is responsible for monitoring its performance using the rubrics as applied to their LCAP and for making modifications each year.

County Office of Education (COE): The COE is responsible for reviewing the initial and annual updates to the LCAPs. The COE monitors the LEA LCAPs to determine if they can be approved and is responsible to refer or provide technical assistance if the LEA fails to improve pupil achievement across more than one state priority for one or more pupil subgroups.

The California Collaborative for Educational Excellence (CCEE): The purpose of the CCEE is to advise and assist school districts, county superintendents of schools, and charter schools in achieving the goals in an LCAP. The CCEE is designed to provide assistance to LEAs upon request, if the COE determines that the district needs help following assistance by the COE, or if the SSPI determines that an LEA needs help to accomplish the goals set forth in the LCAP. The CCEE may identify that the LEA needs intervention by the SSPI (following the provision of technical assistance) because the district has failed or is unable to implement CCEE recommendations, or that the LEAs inadequate performance is so persistent or acute as to require intervention by the SSPI.

State Superintendent of Public Instruction (SSPI): The SSPI is responsible for approving COE LCAPs, and for interacting with COEs concerning their responsibilities for oversight of LEA LCAPs.

**Intervention by the Superintendent:** For districts that need intervention, the SSPI may, with the approval of the SBE, do one or more of the following:

- Make changes to a LCAP adopted by the governing board of the school district.

- Develop and impose a budget revision, in conjunction with revisions to the LCAP, that the SSPI determines would allow the school district to improve the outcomes for all pupil subgroups in regard to state and local priorities.

- Stay or rescind an action, if that action is not required by a local collective bargaining agreement, that would prevent the school district from improving outcomes for all pupil subgroups in regard to state or local priorities.
· Appoint an academic trustee to exercise the powers and authority specified in this section on his or her behalf.

**Monitoring in Special Education:** The CDE has a system of general supervision in place that is incorporating changes due to Results Driven Accountability (RDA). Currently, the monitoring component of the general supervision system includes:

**Annual Review Processes:** Every year the CDE’s SED conducts the following monitoring activities:

1. **Review of APR Indicators.** The CDE calculates and publishes values for each of the SPP indicators for each LEA. All of the compliance indicators are reviewed through either the Disproportionate Representation Review (Indicators 4b, 9, and 10) or through the Data Informed Noncompliance (Indicators 11, 12, 13). Additionally, any failure to meet compliance or performance targets by an LEA requires that the Indicator be investigated if the district is subject to a Verification Review (VR) or is scheduled for a Special Education Self Review (SESR).

2. **Disproportionate Representation Review.** Districts identified as having disproportionate representation by race and ethnicity in four areas: discipline (Indicator 4b), placements, overall representation (Indicator 9), and representation by disability (Indicator 10). Districts found to have disproportionate representation in any of these areas must complete a review of their policies, procedures, and practices for each area found disproportionate. The CDE provides oversight, makes findings of noncompliance, and ensures correction of any noncompliance.

3. **Data Informed Noncompliance Review.** Districts report data to the CASEMIS twice each year. The CDE’s SED identifies individual cases where dates or data indicate that there is noncompliance related to annual IEP dates, triennial assessments, transition at age three (Indicator 11), timely evaluation (Indicator 12), and the required elements of secondary transition (Indicator 13). Districts are required to review their data, provide correction, and provide a follow-up sample containing no noncompliance.

4. **Compliance Determinations.** Each year, the CDE’s SED makes a compliance determination for each LEA as required by federal IDEA requirements. A LEA may be found to meet requirements, need assistance, need intervention, or need substantial intervention. Specific consequences for needs assistance, needs intervention, and needs substantial intervention are specified in federal regulations.

**Fiscal Eligibility Determination and Monitoring:** Fiscal eligibility is established every year using Maintenance of Effort (MOE) tests specified in federal regulations. Eligibility for funds is established when an LEA can demonstrate that they have budgeted at least as much state and local (or local only) funds for special education as they expended in the most immediate prior fiscal year.

Additional fiscal tests are conducted each year to establish that LEAs are using federal funds as required. LEAs are required to make excess cost calculations at the elementary and secondary levels to ensure that LEAs do not expend federal funds until they can demonstrate that they are spending at least as much in state and local funds on students with disabilities as they are on nondisabled students. Every year, each SELPA and LEA must report on Part B MOE and their entitlement to reduce MOE because of expenditure of funds for Coordinated Early Intervening Services. This data is reported to the CDE, reviewed, and the CDE requires correction as necessary.
Other fiscal tests are included in on-site reviews including appropriate use of funds for staffing, equipment and contracts. Each LEA is required to secure an independent (A-133) audit. The CDE and the COE ensure that every audit finding is tracked and corrected.

**Local Plans for Special Education**: As required in federal law, every LEA must provide assurances that they have policies, procedures, and programs in place that meet state policies that are established under federal IDEA requirements (see 34 CFR 300.201). These requirements are met through the SELPA Local Plan process (see 30 EC 56205[a]). A complete local plan submission was reviewed for each SELPA in 2007, prompted by the release of final regulations for the IDEA reauthorization of 2004. Additionally, SELPAs are required to submit revised policies, procedures, and assurances whenever there is a change to the local plan. These revisions are monitored and approved by CDE staff via a delegation of authority by the SBE. Policies and procedures related to specific SPP indicators or to address a compliance concern are reviewed whenever an LEA is monitored through an SESR or through a Verification Review (VR) process. Noncompliant policies and procedures result in findings of noncompliance and require correction.

Under state law, SELPAs are required to submit an Annual Budget Plan and an Annual Service Plan (30 EC 56205[b][1-2]). These are reviewed by CDE staff, each year, and corrections are made as required.

**Verification Reviews (VR)**: These are conducted annually for districts whose SPP indicators indicate that the district does not meet targets overall for either performance indicators or compliance indicators. The VR is based on a monitoring plan that is developed from parent input, SPP indicator data, and compliance history information. The four primary review activities are student record reviews (focusing on procedural compliance, educational benefit, and IEP implementation); policy and procedure reviews; interviews; and a SELPA governance review. Each VR is customized based on its monitoring plan through the use of the CDE-developed monitoring software that generates customized review protocols, compliance reports, and corrective action plans. The CDE staff, in partnership with district staff, conducts VRs. Follow-up visits of VRs are conducted to ensure 100 percent compliance in a subsequent sample of student records.

**Special Education Self-reviews (SESRs)**: Roughly a quarter of the districts are required to conduct SESRs each year. Coordinated through the SELPA of which a district is a part, SESR is conducted primarily by district staff using the CDE-furnished software and directions. As is done for VR, each district prepares a monitoring plan based on parent input, SPP data, and its compliance history. The monitoring plan is submitted to the CDE for review and approval before the actual review begins. The CDE has provided SESR software that produces customized forms, compliance reports, and corrective action plans. Again, like the VR, SESR consists of multiple types of record reviews, a review of policies and procedures, and a SELPA governance review. Each district submits the data from its software, through the SELPA, to the CDE for review, evaluation, and follow-up. On-site follow-up reviews are conducted in 10 percent of the districts.

**Specialty Reviews**: In addition to SESRs and VRs, the CDE conducts other special reviews as needed. Nonpublic School Reviews. Nonpublic schools and agencies are annually certified and continuously monitored by the CDE according to state and federal law. As required by California state law, on-site reviews are conducted once every three years or more frequently if necessary. The CDE involvement does not end until the nonpublic school is fully compliant, or when the nonpublic school loses its certification status.

1. Significant Disproportionality. The CDE identifies a LEA as having significant disproportionality if it fails calculations related to significant over-identification. Calculations are made in four areas: overall identification by race and ethnicity, identification by disability, by placement, and by rates of suspension and expulsion. LEAs that fail the calculation are directed to use 15 percent of their IDEA funds to provide early intervening services to address the specific issues of disproportionality. Each district is required to assemble a stakeholder group from general and special education, and to conduct compliance and program.
self-reviews that assist the district to identify the root causes of the disproportionality, and to prepare a plan for review by the CDE.

2. Data Reviews. Data verification is a part of every VR and every follow-up to an SESR. When circumstances indicate that there is concern about the reliability or validity of data, a special team is assembled to examine information submitted to CASEMIS by reviewing student records and conducting interviews with key staff. This information is cross tabulated and compared with data also reported in CALPADS and through statewide assessments. These reviews may result in findings of noncompliance and corrective actions and/or provision of technical assistance.

3. Fiscal Reviews. Use of IDEA funds is a component in SESRs and VRs. Special fiscal reviews are conducted when there are persistent findings of fiscal issues in A-133 audits. As with data reviews, a special team is assembled to review fiscal information submitted by the district and to conduct an on-site inquiry into fiscal policies and practices. These reviews may result in findings of noncompliance and corrective actions and/or provision of technical assistance.

4. Critical Incident Reviews. These reviews are the result reports of serious incidents or circumstances at school districts that may be reported to the CDE or in the news media. As with the other special reviews, a special team is assembled to review the issue of concern, and to conduct an on-site inquiry into potential noncompliance. These reviews may result in findings of noncompliance and corrective actions and/or provision of technical assistance.

**Increased Focus on Performance:** The OSEP has initiated a new focus on performance and student outcomes called Results Driven Accountability. The OSEP is increasing use of performance indicators to identify states for monitoring and technical assistance; making state compliance determinations; and adding the SSIP the various modifications to the SSP/APR. These changes come at the same time as the LCFF and LCAP bring a new focus on performance in the eight priority areas for all students, including students with disabilities. These changes also come at a time when the court in the Emma C. consent decree is in the process of evaluating the CDE’s overall system of monitoring as it relates to the Ravenswood Elementary School District. To address the many changes and expectations resulting from these initiatives, the CDE has convened a workgroup consisting of CDE staff and SELPA Directors to reshape the way that LEAs are monitored for special education requirements. The workgroup is addressing the following potential additions and modifications:


   a. Compliance indicators. Continue Data Informed Noncompliance and Disproportionality Indicator Reviews. Conduct needed record reviews through a desk audit of electronic or duplicated student records. Ensure timely correction within one year of identification, including review of a subsequent sample.

   b. Performance indicators. Conduct compliance reviews as appropriate to the indicator, as above. Provide LEAs a self-review guide to assist in the identification of root causes and to suggest evidence based practices. Provide technical assistance and track
progress over three years.

c. Policy and procedure reviews. Identify annualized process for review of policies and procedures. Review and revitalize the annual budget and service plans.

2. Reformulate Fiscal Reviews. Conduct annual fiscal reviews as described previously for all LEAs. Work with the State Controller’s Office to require annual IDEA audits for all districts during the A-133 audits, and incorporate specific fiscal monitoring tests to align to the OSEP expectations and IDEA requirements.

3. Systemic reviews. Replace VRs with systemic reviews intended for districts with intensive and/or repeated needs for monitoring and intervention. The group would develop multiple pathways into systemic reviews:

a. LEAs whose SPP indicators indicate that the district does not meet targets overall for either performance indicators or compliance indicators;

b. LEAs whose annual indicator reviews indicate that they have persistent failure to improve multiple compliance or performance indicators;

c. LEAs identified through the LCAP monitoring process as needing intervention by the SSPI with SBE approval, at the request of the SSPI

Systemic reviews would be customized to the performance and compliance issues in the districts. Teams would be built using state and local special education and general education staff and experts.

4. Add new specialty reviews. The workgroup will consider new specialty reviews including: Infant and Preschool Programs, Provision of Mental Health Services; Individual Indicator Reviews (for LEAs with recurrent failure to improve performance indicators); State Operated Program reviews (e.g., Department of Juvenile Justice); and/or Statewide Program Reviews (e.g., Court and Community Schools).

5. Include Field Experts. Both COEs and SELPAs have existing requirements for monitoring. The workgroup will consider how to notice and train staff and consultants for participation in monitoring reviews.

Stakeholder Recommendation: To improve LEA capacity to achieve the SIMR, the CDE should convene a workgroup of state and local stakeholders representing LEAs, COEs, SELPAs, CCEE, the SBE and the CDE (general education and special education) to develop technical support resources that assist LEAs in maximizing the alignment of monitoring and accountability processes, which could include criteria for identifying needs for assistance; and providing sources of effective technical assistance and supports for improvement.
Technical Assistance

Sources of Technical Assistance (TA): The CDE’s current TA system provides materials and training so that LEAs can meet the various reporting, monitoring, compliance, and performance results that are requirements associated with various programs for general education, and with the IDEA for special education. The two documents attached and noted below provide examples of the various resources that are available as part of the CDE’s Technical Assistance system. These resource listings are not an exhaustive list:

- Improvement Activities Resources – Technical Assistance Contractors Table (See Appendix E).
- Best Practice Resources for Student Discipline and Behavior Intervention (See Appendix F).

The resources in these attachments identify different types of mechanisms for providing supportive information and links. Listed below are some examples of TA resources that are related to the SSIP and organized by the type of mechanism:

- CDE Web hosted links to programmatic materials:
  - California Common Core Standards (CA CCS) Web site at http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/cc/
  - LCFF/LCAP Web site at http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/
  - Special Education Current Issues Web site at http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/ac/
  - English Language Learners Web site at http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/
  - CASEMIS Data Collection Web site at http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/ds/casemis.asp

- CDE Web hosted links to evidence based practices:
CDE Web hosted links to expert led presentations:


- Assessment and Service Level Determination Presentation Web site at Assessment and Service Determination Presentation, October 20, 2011 (WMV; 01:58:49) http://www3.cde.ca.gov/video/specialed/ab114oct2011assessservice.asx

CDE Web hosted links to self-assessment materials:


In addition to the resources available for Technical Assistance (TA) on the CDE Web page; the staff at CDE is a resource for providing direct technical assistance. The TA provided by SED staff is organized by functions that live within specific units of the division as follows:

1. Focused Monitoring and Technical Assistance (FMTA) Units. CDE SED regional consultants provide direct TA to LEAs in assisting with compliance with monitoring requirements found in the IDEA. This can include providing training to LEA, SELPA, and COE staff. Parents are also provided with information regarding state and federal requirements for special education from FMTA units.

2. Assessment, Evaluation, and Support (AES). Staff in this unit provides TA to LEAs in fulfilling reporting requirements associated with state and federal special education law. Staff provides LEAs, SELPAs, and COEs with training and TA on the use of the Special Education Management Information System for reporting student level data.

3. Procedural Safeguards Referral Service (PSRS). Staff in this unit engage with parents, LEA staff, and other interested parties. This unit is responsible for responding to requests for information coming from the Parent Helpline. This unit is also responsible for providing TA to parties who look to file a formal complaint over an alleged lack of compliance with state and federal special education requirements. Additionally, staff assists interested parties in beginning the process of setting up a due process claim with the Office of Administrative Hearings.

4. Policy and Program Services (PPS). Staff in this unit provide technical assistance to
contractors and grantees that provide oversight and create TA for LEAs and parents. PPS also provides direct TA to LEAs on low incidence issues, early childhood special education, and credentialing and highly qualified teacher requirements.

5. Complaints Resolution Unit (CRU). Staff provides direct interaction with parents, advocates, LEAs, and others who are actively involved in a complaint case filed with the state. Depending on the case, additional training and TA is assigned as a corrective action for an identified non-compliance finding for a state or federal special education requirement.

6. Additional sources for direct TA. As stated in the description of the PPS unit, CDE staff manages contracts with TA providers. These contractors are a resource for providing direct TA to LEAs, SELPAs, and COEs. Please see the attached list of grants available through the PPS unit. The following list is an example of contractors that can be used by LEAs.

   a. Aligning and Integrating Special Education Practices (AISEP). Provide TA for IEP development, contractor is developing training modules for California that LEAs can use to train staff, and have developed a Web site providing TA resources that are free to LEAS. Other assistance includes aligning and integrating special education practices that are culturally and linguistically appropriate, and supporting access to, and instruction in, the standards and standards-based IEPs. Contract with WestEd.

   b. California Services for Technical Assistance and Training (CalSTAT). LEAs can contact this provider directly for TA towards achieving improved educational results for special education students. TA approaches are specific to the outcomes that the contracting LEA desires, and can include training, facilitation, coaching, site visit, information, and referrals for expert trainers. TA topics include, but are not limited to, CA CCSS, family engagement, school climate.

   c. Desired Results access Project (DR access). Contractor provides the development of the Desired Results Developmental Profile (DRDP) assessment instrument for assessing infants, toddlers, and preschoolers. They also provide professional development and technical assistance for assessors using the DRDP. This supports young children being included, and having access to the same statewide assessment as their same aged peers. Contract with Napa COE.

   d. Family Empowerment and Disability Council (FEDC). There are 14 Family Empowerment Centers that provide direct TA to parents. These centers are funded through federal grants administered through the CDE. The FECs provide training and information that meets the needs of the parents and guardians of children with disabilities, and work with community-based organizations. FEC training and TA helps parents better understand the nature of their child’s disability, how to communicate effectively with their IEP team, enhance parents’ ability to participate in the IEP process, and advocate for their child in a manner that promotes alternative forms of dispute resolution.
e. Project Raising Educational Achievement for students with Disabilities (Project READ). Contract through a federal grant to reform and improve the system of personal preparation and professional development with the goal of increasing reading achievement and academic outcomes for middle school students in the state. TA provided to the 44 participating sites includes product development (curricular materials/software), training in effective instructional practices, and professional development activities, including coaching.

f. Supporting Inclusive Practices (SIP). Provide TA, resources, and supports so LEAs can use practices that will support a LEAs ability to meet targets and to give students access to instruction in the CA CCSS. Contract with Santa Clara COE.

g. State Performance Plan Technical Assistance Project (SPP TAP). Available to identified Significantly Disproportionate LEAs who are given facilitated assistance in developing a program improvement plan to mitigate disproportionality. TA can consist of, but is not limited to, coaching, direct training, and resource materials.

Other divisions within the CDE provide supports to students with disabilities as well. Attached is a summary by division of supports they have identified for students with disabilities (See Appendix G: Divisions of CDE and How They Serve Students with Disabilities).

Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS): During the August 2014 meeting, SSIP stakeholders studied and analyzed the potential for using tiered levels of intervention to assist LEAs to scale up their systems for bringing about improvements in student outcomes. In particular, they worked with the idea of a MTSS. In this case, it involves using three tiers, or different levels, of supports. The goal is to provide instruction and intervention supports that are designed and implemented through a team approach to data-based planning and problem solving, matched to the learning needs of students. The three tiers can be described as follows:

1. Tier 1. Universal Support/Instruction – Instruction and support designed and differentiated for all students in all settings to ensure mastery of academic standards and universal instructional goals/expectations (may include behavior).

2. Tier 2. Supplemental Intervention/Support – More focused, targeted support/instruction/intervention aligned with academic standards and universal instructional goals/expectations (may include behavior).

3. Tier 3. Intensive Intervention/Support – The most intense intervention based on individual need and aligned with universal curriculum, instruction, and supplemental supports.

Such a system can be adapted to provide increasingly more intense support to account for the increasing level of need to mitigate for a specific issue, such as lack of academic attainment, for a sub-group of a LEAs student population, and it is widely regarded as an effective structure to organize systemic interventions.

In the case of the SSIP, there are abundant Web link resources (examples listed above) that would form a foundation for a Tier 1 level of a multi-tiered framework for intervention/support. There are also sources of
direct TA to LEAs, both CDE staff and contractors, that could be utilized in Tiers 2 and 3 of a multi-tiered system of supports. However, it should be noted that there is a need to enhance the amount and level of resources that would be required in Tier 3.

The SSIP stakeholder group determined that a general education and special education partnership in the provision of technical assistance was also critical to the success of the SSIP. Further, the SSIP stakeholders identified the need to increase the availability of resources and experts to provide intensive, individualized supports to LEAs whose progress indicates the need for specialized supports and assistance.

**Stakeholder Recommendation:** To improve LEA capacity to achieve the SIMR, the CDE should convene a workgroup of state and local general and special education stakeholders to review technical assistance resources and identify ways to: 1) integrate support to LEAs; and, 2) build additional capacity for coordinated, intensive technical assistance.

**Summary of Infrastructure Analysis**

The CDE has conducted extensive analysis of the infrastructure in place in California for serving students with disabilities. SSIP stakeholders were convened over a 14 month period to examine, among other things, the state infrastructure related to serving students with disabilities, including key state initiatives and plans in general education. They identified a number of strengths in the existing infrastructure supporting services for students with disabilities.

**Strengths of the System**

Governance: California’s public education structure for special education involves multiple entities, each with specific responsibilities, supporting the effective provision of services to which SWDs are entitled, with an emphasis on local decision-making and system design, which is most effective and appropriate given the varied contexts and structures of California’s LEAs. This approach is reflected by several system elements:

- SELPAs and their member LEAs develop local plans for the provision of instruction and related services for SWDs in their jurisdiction.

- Local control of plan development enables SELPAs and LEAs to be responsive to the unique needs/issues that are present in their local contexts.

- The SELPA structure creates a system for the provision of technical assistance, professional development, and monitoring to ensure that local issues are resolved and needs addressed, and students appropriately served.

- The state’s educational governance structures provides for multiple levels of oversight through monitoring and support through training and technical assistance, creating a multi-tiered system to ensure that IDEA requirements are met.

**Fiscal:** California’s new LCFF structure balances the need for local decision-making concerning the use of education funding with public accountability, through the development of specific local plans concerning specific use of funds and identification of improvement activities to be implemented, created by local educational leaders with substantial input from the local community.
**Quality Standards**: California has adopted standards of high quality, including student academic standards (e.g., Common Core standards, Next Generation Science Standards); program standards related to Transition, Early Childhood Special Education, Behavior Intervention, School-Family-Community Partnerships, LRE, Response to Intervention, and others; and, teacher preparation and assignment standards to ensure students are served by qualified, well-prepared educators.

**Professional Development**: The state provides professional development resources to LEAs on a multitude of topics and subject areas, enabling LEAs to identify local professional development needs and drawing from those resources to address training requirements for their local contexts. LEAs, SELPAs, and COEs regularly coordinate professional development activities for efficient delivery of training resources.

**Data**: The CDE has developed effective data collection and reporting systems for compiling data reported from COEs, SELPAs, and LEAs; these systems include means to identify data irregularities, allowing for correction of initial data reports, and ensuring greater data quality.

**Technical Assistance**: The CDE provides effective technical assistance through a combination of direct interaction with COE’s, SELPAs, and LEAs, and contracting of other entities that have substantial knowledge and ability to provide targeted technical assistance. To ensure that CDE-based technical assistance is current, efficient, and of high quality, CDE staff communicates within and among divisions on changing conditions, new initiatives, field needs, and new and developing technical assistance resources.

**Accountability and Monitoring**: California implements an accountability and monitoring structure that involves both state and local entities to ensure that SWD are receiving the instruction and related services to which they are entitled. Elements of this structure include:

- California’s compliance monitoring system ensures identification and timely correction of noncompliance through data analysis, direct monitoring of LEA and SELPA practices, and systemic review and response to field inquiries and parent concerns.

- California’s Educational Benefit process for reviewing student IEPs over multiple years ensures that IEP reviews exceed simple verification of compliance with law, but that IEP revisions are effectively designed to support each student’s educational progress.

- The CDE’s ongoing communication with SELPA and LEA staff ensures clarification of current and changing law and policy, discussion and attention to emerging issues, and timely action to resolve concerns about delivery of instruction and services.

**Coordination**
The SSIP stakeholders also assessed how the components of the infrastructure are coordinated. The SSIP stakeholder group pointed out that the primary area in which there is a need to increase coordination is within the CDE. Many federal and state programs function independently, with limited cross consultation or collaboration. As the programmatic needs for data sharing, collaboration, and support increase; so too will the level of coordination between programs at CDE. One such example of this is the ongoing, cross-division work of the PACP. The following summarizes coordination practices discussed by the SSIP stakeholder group:

**Governance**: Currently, a variety of local plans are created by LEAs. Most are reviewed, and approved, by the CDE. There is also coordination between state agencies as regulations call for interagency agreements between CDE and other state agencies that have responsibilities for the provision of related services to
students with disabilities.

**Fiscal:** SED currently coordinates with the Administrative, Finance, Technology and Infrastructure Branch in order to support LEAs with fiscal reporting requirements of IDEA and to allocate state and federal funds for the provision of special education and related services to SELPAs and LEAs.

**Quality Standards:** Quality standards are often a collaborative effort either across divisions and branches within the CDE; between CDE and outside experts/contractors; or between CDE and educational administration and professional organizations. Technical assistance and training in quality standards is most often collaborative as well.

**Professional Development and Technical Assistance:** The CDE provides professional development resources in several ways: through web pages hosted on the CDE website; through contracts with colleges, universities and LEAs, and through opportunities to learn from CDE staff. The CDE also supports local collaboration in professional development through grants and facilitation of communities of practice.

**Data:** The current system allows for coordination by providing follow up analytics and coordination manuals. The SED coordinates with LEAs to crosscheck data CASEMIS and CALPADS. The CDE coordinates data collection and analysis across the department through a cross division Data Managers Data Coordination Meeting.

**Accountability and Monitoring:** Special Education Monitoring is coordinated from the CDE to SELPAs to COEs to LEAs. SELPAs play a key role in supporting districts and for working with CDE to assess and revise monitoring processes. While accountability data is coordinated across the CDE, monitoring processes are very often conducted by program areas.

**Areas for Improvement**

As the work of the stakeholder group narrowed, the group determined that the LCFF and LCAP is the most important organizational infrastructure change in education in California and that the SSIP should be aligned to the LCFF and the LCAP. CDE staff and SSIP stakeholders determined that in order to improve the capacity of LEAs to achieve the SIMR in the context of the LCFF and LCAP, the CDE should:

- Support all LEAs to develop goals and services for students with disabilities in LEA local plans

- Seek to disseminate any criteria adopted for the LCAP evaluation rubrics related to students with disabilities

- Encourage LEAs to include SELPAs as participants in LEA LCAP evaluation and planning activities

- Coordinate the work of all divisions within the CDE to ensure that support for LEAs and COEs provided under the LCFF and federal programs (Title I, Title II, Title III, and IDEA, for example) is available as needed and as desired to promote positive outcomes for all students, including students with disabilities.

- Work at the direction of the SBE to support SBE efforts to address students with disabilities.
disabilities in the LCAP templates and evaluation rubrics.

- Seek to clarify how state and federal special education funds can be used to benefit students with disabilities in the targeted LCFF subgroups.

- Convene a workgroup across state and federal programs (e.g., Title I, Title II, Title III, and IDEA) to prepare a fiscal resource overview and technical assistance guide related to overlaps and uses of both state and federal funds that would assist LEAs to optimize the use of resources to achieve student outcomes.

- Provide technical assistance to SELPAs and LEAs to increase consideration of the use of local resources as a means to improve the outcomes of students with disabilities who are in the LCFF and LCAP target populations.

- Encourage COE SELPAs to coordinate work with COE LCAP reviewers and technical assistance providers.

- To convene a workgroup to explore modification of the local, budget and service plans to address student outcomes in coordination with the LCAP.

- Make it a priority to prepare calculations for each of the measures identified for the LCAP and LCFF targeted subgroups as soon as possible to provide LEAs with information to help them gauge the impact of their improvement activities.

- Make calculations of measures included in the LCAP priorities of pupil achievement, pupil engagement, and school climate for students with disabilities who are also in the LCFF targeted subgroups.

- Convene a workgroup of stakeholders to identify methods for updating SELPA local plans to meet the additional performance goals and indicators embodied in the SSIP.

- Work with the SBE, COEs, LEAs and charters to clarify responsibilities and methods for including students with disabilities in data related to local planning.

- Convene a workgroup of state and local stakeholders representing LEAs, COEs, SELPAs, CCEE, the SBE and the CDE (general education and special education) to maximize the alignment of monitoring and accountability processes, which could include criteria for identifying needs for assistance; and providing resources of effective technical assistance and supports for improvement.
Convene a workgroup of state and local general and special education stakeholders to review technical assistance resources and identify ways to: 1) integrate support to LEAs; and, 2) build additional capacity for coordinated, intensive technical assistance.

**Ongoing Collaboration and Partnerships**: The SED will continue to sponsor regular SSIP stakeholder group meetings (SELPAs, Parent Training and Information Centers, Advisory Commission on Special Education, SBE staff, and SED staff). The CDE will invite additional representatives from COEs (some SELPA representatives are also COEs). The SED will continue to work in cross division groups for data coordination and for plan alignment. Lastly, the SED will offer to participate in any efforts sponsored by the SBE, SSPI, CCEE, or California County Superintendents’ Education Services Association (CCSESA) to address the needs of students with disabilities.

In Phase II, the CDE will report on the results of efforts to improve alignment of the LCFF and special education, identify improvements that have and will continue to be made to the state infrastructure to better support LEAs to implement and scale up evidence-based practices to improve the SIMR.

**Appendix A—State Systemic Improvement Plan Stakeholder Group**

These stakeholders were invited to attend monthly meetings between November 2013 and November 2014. Their primary focus was to provide input to the CDE regarding data analysis, infrastructure analysis, the state identified measurable result, selection of improvement strategies, and the theory of action. A subgroup of these participants met with CDE staff to plan and debrief monthly large group events either in person or through phone conferences.

**Advisory Commission on Special Education**

Gina Plate, Chair  
California State Board of Education Staff  
Beth Rice (*)  
Family Representatives  
Jane Floethe-Ford, Parents Helping Parents (*)  
Kat Lowrance, Rowell Family Empowerment Center  
Kelly Young, Warmline Family Resource Center  
Marta Anchondo, Team of Advocates for Special Kids  
Nora Thomson, MATRIX Family Empowerment and Resource Center

**SELP A Directors**

Alen Houser, Pasadena SELPA (*)  
Anita Ruesterhotz, East San Bernardino County SELPA (*)  
Catherine Conrado, Sonoma SELPA (*)  
Chirs Lohrman, Long Beach SELPA (*)  
Mary Bass, Clovis SELPA (*)  
Nancy Damm, Kings County SELPA (*)  
Sue Balt, Riverside County SELPA (*)  
Michael Jason, Southwest Service Area SELPA (*)

**Contractors**

State Performance Plan Project, Napa COE  
George Triest  
Connie Silva-Broussard  
Desired Results Access Project, Napa County Office of Education  
Patty Salcedo
Steve Lohrer  
WestEd  
Dona Meinders  
Kevin Schaffer  
Seeds of Partnership, Sacramento County Office of Education  
Sharon Holstege  
Robin Ryan  
CalSTAT, Napa County Office of Education  
Marin Brown  
LRE Project, Santa Clara County Office of Education  
Janice Battaglia  
(*) Participant in stakeholder planning and debriefing group  
CDE Staff  

Professional staff members of the Special Education and State Special Schools Divisions of the California Department of Education, 131 in total. The following SED staff were included in the small subgroup to plan and debrief monthly large group events either in person or through phone conferences  
Chris Drouin – Director’s Office  
Renzo Bernales – Director’s Office  
Chris Essmena – Director’s Office  
Meredith Cathcart – Policy and Program Services  
Kristin Wright – Policy and Program Services  
Jim Alford – Policy and Program Services  
Shiyloh Becerril – Assessment, Evaluation and Support  
Kishaun Thornton – Procedural Safeguards Referral Service  
Alison Greenwood – Quality Assurance  
Marco Farias – Nonpublic Schools and Agencies  
Jessica Gray – Nonpublic Schools and Agencies  
Theresa Johansen – FMTA 1  
Hamed Rezawi – FMTA 2  
Matt Hill – FMTA 3  
Donna DeMartini – FMTA 4  
Jack Brimhall – FMTA 5  

The CDE Plan Alignment Committee  
Plan Alignment Committee was established by the Superintendent and the State Board of Education (PAC), was established to identify and to compare and contrast federal and state plans. To guide this work, staff will relied on the federal LEA Plan and additional federal requirements (e.g., Title II and Title III) as a frame of reference to determine the degree of alignment with required federal and state plans (e.g., Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) and LCAP). The work of this committee was reformatted for consideration by the SSIP Stakeholder group.  
Title I  
Kimberly Born (Co-Lead),  
Jeanette Ganahl (Co-Lead),  
Rina DeRose-Swinscoe,  
Janice Morrison,  
Karen Neilsen,  
Lorene Eurele  
Chris Aban,  
Fraco Rozic  
Jen Taylor.
Other Participants

Nancy Brownell - State Board of Education (SBE);
Michelle Magyar – District, School and Innovation Branch Office;
Mary Tribbey - California Comprehensive Center (CACC),
Karen Almquist - School Fiscal Services Division;
Beth Anselmi - Educational Data Management Division;
Marsha Bedwell - Legal Division;
Robert Gomez - Educational Data Management Division;
Noelia Hernandez - English Learner Support Division;
Carolyn Lopes - Charter Schools Division;
Amy Park - Assessment Development and Administration Division;
Juan Sanchez - Professional Learning Support Division;
Stacy Savoca - Educational Data Management Division;
Joshua Strong - Local Agency Systems Support Office (LASSO);
Stephanie Woo - Analysis, Measurement and Accountability Reporting Division
Linda Wyatt - Special Education Division.

Improving Special Education Services (ISES)

The ISES stakeholder group was established to provide input to the Special Education Division in matters pertaining to the State Performance Plan and the Annual Performance Report. The group meets twice each year – June and December. For the FFY 2013 SPP/APR the full ISES group met in December 2013 and June 2014 to review the new requirements related to the SPP and APR (including the SSIP), to examine data about the performance of students with disabilities, and to make recommendations about the revision of baselines and targets as needed in accordance with the requirements of the FFY 2013 SPP/APR. A subset of ISES members was identified to participate in the planning of the SSIP.

Gina Plate - Advisory Commission on Special Education (ACSE)
Matthew Stacy - Advisory Commission on Special Education (ACSE)- Youth Rep
Jerry Panella - Association of California School Administrators (ACSA)
Misty Feusahrens - California Assembly Budget Committee - Education Finance
Marisol Avina - California Assembly Education Committee
Rutschow Amy - California Assembly Republican Fiscal Office
Judith Cohen - California Association of Parent Child Advocates (CAPCA)
Janeth Serrano - California Association of Private Special Education Schools (CAPSES)
Kathy Fuller - California Association of Professors of Special Education (CAPSE)
Joni Clark - California Association of Resource Specialists Plus (CARS+)
Susan Fisher - California Association of School Psychologists (CASP)
Bob Loux - California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC)
Scott Berenson - California Community Colleges System Office (Disabled Students Programs)
Maurice Belote - California Deaf-Blind Services
TiAnne Rios - California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, Juvenile Justice Division
Don Braeger - California Department of Developmental Services, Lead Agency Part C of IDEA, State Coordinator

Various Managers and Staff - California Department of Eduaction, Special Education Division
Fred Balcom - California Department of Education, Special Education Division, State Director
Nancy Grosz Sager - California Department of Education, State Special Schools & Services Division, Deaf Education Office
Scott Kerby - California Department of Education, State Special Schools & Services Division, State Interim Director
Jamicah Bridges - California Department of Mental Health
Barbara Kimmel - California Federation of Teachers
Christina Mills - California Foundation for Independent Living Centers (CFILC)
Rachel Stewart - California Health Incentives Improvement Project (CHIIP)
Julie Redmond - California State Parent Teacher Association (PTA)
Angelo Williams - California School Boards Association (CSBA)
Carol Johnson - California School Employees Association (CSEA) - Paraprofessional Representative
Lynn Lorber - California Senate, Education Committee
Cheryl Black - California Senate, Republican Fiscal Caucus
Kim Connor - California Senate, Standing Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review
Anne Davin - California Services for Technical Assistance and Training (CalSTAT)
Lisa Churchill - Project READ - Special Education Division Contractor
Beth Nishida - California Speech-Language-Hearing Association (CSHA)
Beth Rice - California State Board of Education Staff
Marguita Grenot-Scheyer - California State University, Chancellor Office
KC Walsh - California Teachers Association
Gregg Legutki - California Technology Assistance Project (CTAP)
Anjanette Pelletier - Council for Exceptional Children
Various Managers and Staff - Department of Developmental Services
Lenin Del Castillo - California State Department of Finance
Jillian Kissee - California State Department of Finance
Jeff Powers - Department of Health Services / California Children Services (DHS/CCS)
Linda Ramos - Department of Rehabilitation
Cheryl Adams - Department of Rehabilitation
Patty Salcedo - Desired Results Access Project, Special Education Division Contractor
Valerie Johnson - Diagnostic Center, South
Susan Henderson - Disability Rights Education & Defense Fund (DREDF)
William Tollestrup - Elk Grove USD District Site Representative

Bobbie Coulbourne - Exceptional Parents Unlimited
Vicki Shadd - Glenn County Office of Education - Transition COP Representative
Dian Schneider - H.E.A.R.T.S. Connection FRC
Sue Robb - IRIS-West at Claremont Graduate University, OSEP funded project
Nora Thompson - Matrix Parent Network & Resource Center
Abby McGuire - Orange County Department of Education Early Childhood Special Education
Jane Floethe-Ford - Parents Helping Parents

Sweet Alice Harris - Parents of Watts
Kate Cahill - Riverside County Office of Education
Kat Lowrance - Rowell Family Empowerment of No. CA. (RFENC)
Nikarre Redcoff - Sonoma County SELPA
Richard Kleitman - Special Education Administrators of County Offices (SEACO)
Kathleen Finn - Special Education Early Childhood Administrators Project (SEECAP), Special Education Division Contractor
George Triest - State Performance Plan Facilitated Review Grantee/Napa County Office of Education
Michelle Sexton - State SELPA Director
Connie Withers - State SELPA Director
Juno Duenas - Support for Families of Children with Disabilities
Marta Anchondo - Team of Advocates for Special Kids (TASK)
Brenda Smith - Team of Advocates for Special Kids (TASK) -Orange County
Stephanie Couch - University of California Office of the President (UCOP)
Paul Rosenzweig - University of California, Riverside; SPED Credential Design Team Member
Martha Feinstein - Ventura County Office of Education
Linda Brault - WestEd Beginning Together, California Division for Early Childhood
Virginia Reynolds - WestEd Center for Prevention & Early Intervention
Benitez Debra - WestEd Family Empowerment Disability Council (FEDC)
Special education local plan areas are established in California law to receive funds and to ensure that all state and federal requirements related to students with disabilities are met. Specifically, they are responsible for having policies, procedures and programs in place related to performance goals and indicators and they are responsible for all data reporting related to all of the LEAs within their SELPA. There are 133 SELPAs incorporating over 1,400 LEAs. CDE staff worked with the SELPA Director organization to review the new requirements related to the SPP and APR (including the SSIP), to examine data about the performance of students with disabilities, and to make recommendations about the revision of baselines and targets as needed in accordance with the requirements of the FFY 2013 SPP/APR. A subset of SELPA Directors was identified to participate in the planning of the SSIP. Their input was solicited over a 6 month period of time between May and October of 2014.

Managers’ Cross-Division Data Coordination Workgroup

Meets two times per month to discuss coordination of data collection, data quality, data analysis and reporting issues. During 2013-14, the SED used the group to secure information and data sets about the LCFF and LCAP priority populations. SED also methods and results of new SPP and SSIP indicator baselines and targets.

Veronica Aguila, English Learner Support Division
Keric Ashley, Analysis, Measurement and Accountability Reporting Division
Kelly Bacher, Assessment Development and Administration Division
Fred Balcom, Special Education Division

Shiyloh Becerril, Special Education Division
John Boivin, Assessment Development and Administration Division
Randy Bonnell, Analysis, Measurement and Accountability Reporting Division
Michelle Center, Assessment Development and Administration Division
Joseph Darin, Educational Data Management Division
Chris Drouin, Special Education Division
Sonya Edwards, Educational Data Management Division
Linda Hooper, Assessment Development and Administration Division
Ann Hornbeck, Educational Data Management Division
Jonathan Isler, Analysis, Measurement and Accountability Reporting Division
Cindy Kazanis, Educational Data Management Division
Don Killmer, Assessment Development and Administration Division
Gaye Lauritzen, Assessment Development and Administration Division
Jane Liang, Improvement and Accountability Division
Annette Liccardo, Educational Data Management Division
Michelle Magyar, State Board of Education
Paula Mishima, Educational Data Management Division
Rodney Okamoto, Technology Services Division
Jose Ortega, Educational Data Management Division
Jay Reid, Educational Data Management Division
Lily Roberts, Assessment Development and Administration Division
Jenny Singh, Analysis, Measurement and Accountability Reporting Division
Jessica Valdez, Assessment Development and Administration Division
Elizabeth Wisnia, Educational Data Management Division
Shana Yeary, Educational Data Management Division
Eric Zilbert, Assessment Development and Administration Division

CDE Staff
Professional staff members of the Special Education and State Special Schools Divisions of the California Department of Education, 131 in total.
Appendix B – Infrastructure Evaluation
State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) – December 2013
Small Group Assignments and Notes

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)
Results Driven Accountability (RDA) initiative: Professional Development System

Purpose: To begin a year-long process to meet the new requirements of OSEPs RDA initiative.

Outcomes:

- Review and discuss OSEPs instructions for the 2013-18 State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Review (APR)

- Examine the requirements and suggested approaches to completing the work over the next year.

I. Professional Development (FMTA I)

a. OSEP Requirements: Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the state has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

b. Goal: To increase capacity of the local educational agencies (LEAs) to implement, scale up, and sustain evidence based practices will result in improved student outcomes.

c. Existing Professional Development System:

See California Department of Education, Professional Development Web site at http://www.cde.ca.gov/pd/. Also see the State of California Department of Education, Digital Chalkboard Web site at http://www.cde.ca.gov/eo/in/dc.asp. The BOE is an interactive online environment that offers both easily searchable teaching resources and an online community of teaching professionals. The purpose of the BOE is to allow teachers to connect with colleagues to share a wealth of expertise and best practices.

1. Key Components, Activities, Content that Need to be Included or Considered:

a. Best Practices communicated in a newsletter, such as Special EDge, at: http://www.calstat.org

b. Effective collaboration between general education and special education
c. CDE Listservs at: http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/di/cd/listservs.asp

d. Model Programs and Mentors


f. Question to research: What are existing evidence based practices in the area of professional development?

g. Question to research: What does existing research indicate?

h. Question to research: What are effective training/coaching models?

i. Question to research: What are existing data systems that support student achievement?

j. Teacher training programs, credentialing programs, and beginning teacher support and assessment (BTSA) Web site at: http://www.btsa.ca.gov/

k. Question to research: Should there be increased involvement in professional development, growth, and accountability?

2. Special Education Service Providers:
   a. Teachers (reference: 5 CCR 3064)
      i. General education
      ii. Special education
   b. Administrators
      i. Principals
      ii. Vice Principals
      iii. Other Administrators (Special Education Director)
   c. Paraprofessionals
   d. Other Staff
      i. Transportation
      ii. Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Specialists
      iii. Health Providers
   e. Related Service Providers (reference: 5 CCR 3051 and 3065)
i. Licensed, credentialed, professional organizations (Recreation/Sign Language), Government Entity (Library of Congress-Braille)

3. Service Delivery Institutions
   a. Regional Center
   b. Juvenile Justice
   c. Developmental Centers
d. Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity for Professional Development

1. Selection of evidence-based practices
2. Provision of ongoing training and coaching
3. “FMTA in the Field” On-site visits to provide focused technical assistance in a specific content area and provide resources and references in addition to the site visit.
4. CDE sponsored online e-learning modules on specific content areas
5. Update of CDE Web site to provide content area specific resources and improve navigation
6. Assist with building and using data systems
7. Shift the paradigm to focus on “front-loading” with technical assistance identifying “what works” focus at the local level, identifying strengths rather that data collection at the back end, which focuses on non-compliance.
8. Provide technical support at District/site level implementing systems designed to provide real-time feedback on how students are meeting standards.
9. Provide technical support on how to analyze data and use data to improve outcomes.
10. Improve administrative support so that systems which support evidence based practices are in place
11. Identify program strengths and effective service delivery strategies

e. Recommendation on how to approach the completion of work associated with Professional Development:

1. CDE/SED Staff- Coordination with FMTA 3 (Technical Assistance System), FMTA 5 (General Supervision), and FMTA 2 (Stakeholder Involvement).
2. Other CDE staff coordination with Professional Development Division, State Special Schools, Title I, Data Systems and Collection Division, Finance Division, Curriculum and Instruction Division, Assessment Division, SSPI Educator Excellence Task Force, and SSPI STEM Task Force.
3. Stakeholders: Higher Education, Parents/Parent Organizations, Community Advisory Committee (CAC), Special Education Local Plan Area (SELP A)
4. Other: Advocacy groups, professional organizations, employee unions

II. Technical Assistance (FMTA III)

a. Current TA: Broad Process – Capacity:

1. Listserve (guidance)
2. PSRS Parent Help Line (rich source of data to identify areas of training needed for LEAs)
3. County Monitors
4. TA to field during VRs and subsequent monitoring visits
5. Training for SESR process
6. Web site
7. TA to districts regarding CASEMIS and data based noncompliance submissions
8. On-site LEA training
   a. SESR, CASEMIS data submission
   b. Compliance Complaint Investigation TA

b. Improvement:
   1. Focus on communication (internal and external)
   2. Need a searchable database for easy access to previous guidance letters and memos to the field for both internal and external use
   3. Avoid developing underground regulations
   4. Accessible database (internal and external)
      a. Repository of training materials and best practice guidance
   5. CDE: more assertive, sponsor trainings and guidance to the field to provide focused technical assistance for the LEAs which have not met SPP targets
   6. Areas of expertise identified and defined within the CDE
   7. Attend LEA regional trainings
   8. Define the specialty of monitoring consultants so the level of expertise is honed

c. Theory of Action:
   1. Database available to internal and external stakeholders through a well-designed and easily accessible division Web site
   2. Web based tutorials for various field related databases (CASEMIS, SESR, etc.)
   3. Easy and timely access to information through a real time supported Web site
   4. Consistent and coordinated messaging delivered to the field
   5. Work with technical staff and consultants to develop Web site
      a. Possible IT unit to oversee all development and maintenance of new Web-based information and materials
   6. Work groups with SELPAs
      a. Involvement and support of electronically posted information
7. Provide regionalized training to both consultants and LEAs

8. Conference calls for LEAs to answer questions (Frequently Asked Questions) held either bi-weekly or monthly with a primary facilitator
   a. LEAs to submit questions beforehand for adequate preparation of responses

9. Internal Hot Topics discussed at Division meetings
   a. General information discussed at general session with all SED staff
   b. Provide more time during Division meetings for staff development specific to each unit’s specific function and specialization
III. Connection with Other State Improvement Efforts (FMT A IV)

a. How has California aligned with other improvement initiatives within the state?
   1. Collect information on state initiatives and determine interface(s) with SPP indicator #17.
   2. Develop database to include research results and list resources.
   3. Communicate with other divisions and agencies to identify activities that interface with California initiatives.
      a. For example: General Education, Common Core (Smarter Balanced), English Learner, Title I, DOR initiative, Early Education, and DRDP.
   4. Create timelines for completion
   5. Implement activities and identify staff and other stakeholders. The activities will support the LEAs (TA, professional development).

IV. General Supervision System (FMT A V)

1. What are the requirements and what do we do now?
   a. Each unit operates independently but fits into the whole division.

2. What do we do now?
   a. Data-Based Noncompliance, ABP, ASP, SESR, CASEMIS-valid, MOE

3. How can we streamline and integrate the requirements?
   a. Target the LEAs/SELPAs.
      a. Require most monitoring activities as part of an annual web based application in order to receive IDEA funds (e.g., DBNC, ABP, ASP, SESR).
      a. Include as SESR only key compliance issues related to the monitoring theme.
   a. Validate LEA submissions by on site monitoring.
      a. Provide targeted training for LRE, DAIT, SAIT.
      a. Establish a small group that includes SELPA director(s) to plan-out new general supervision system.
      a. Work smarter, leaner, and tighter in focus.

V. Infrastructure Support (FMT A II)

1. It’s important to assess our stakeholder groups so as to monitor our relationship with them.
   a. Implementing
   b. Operationalizing
2. We need to focus on monitoring the:
   a. What
   b. How
   c. Why
3. More regular education participation will require all encompassing and ongoing professional development for all the different stakeholder groups:
   a. Administration
   b. Teaching staff
   c. Instructional aide staff
   d. Parents/community members
   e. Service providers

4. Community Advisory Committees (CACs) should be consulted since it’s a requirement anyway

5. Current line of infrastructure – how do we monitor? Determine what kinds of information and data the CDE wishes to collect. Documentation should be reviewed to ensure it is following requirements:
   a. Minutes
   b. Surveys
   c. By-laws
   d. How selected
   e. How do documents line up? Single Plan for Student Achievement with LEA Plan with SELPA Plan…check agendas of meeting and policy making decisions and how they arrived at these decisions

6. Monitor credentials of staff (highly qualified)

7. Monitor corrective actions and their sticking power over time. Do LEAs have a pattern of repeated noncompliance that should be addressed?

8. Professional development needs to be verified: law states it needs to be of sufficient intensity and duration to have a lasting impact on student outcomes: documentation like grades, report cards, in addition to drop-out rates, suggest checking them at site levels for selected schools.

9. District staff should be part of creating its own monitoring and improvement plans – more engaged in process of SESR. We could find a meaningful way of incorporating pertinent Title 1 regulations as we monitor. We could form and use focus groups as a component of our stakeholder participation in the verification review. Consumers and representatives of incarceration; resident of a group home, etc. should be involved.
Appendix C – Infrastructure Descriptions and Recommendations

Include the following systems that make up the CA infrastructure; governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability monitoring, for each describe the current strengths of the system, the extent the system is coordinated, and the areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems.

I. Governance

A. Infrastructure Elements

1. CDE (Special Education):

§ The Special Education Division (SED) is responsible for administering the implementation of federal and state laws related to the education of students with disabilities who are 3 to 22 years of age.

§ The SED receives advice and assistance from the Advisory Commission on Special Education (members are appointed by the Governor, the Legislature, and the SBE).

§ Some students who are blind and/or deaf may be served in residential schools operated by the State’s Special Schools Division.

§ The SED monitors, provides updates to regulations as needed and required by changes in legislation and statute, provides TA to SELPA and LEAs, collects and monitors data, distributes federal and state IDEA funds.

§ **State Special Schools Division** Some deaf/blind students are served by state residential special schools which provide oversight and monitoring for the provision of special education and related services.

2. CDE (General Education):

§ The Governor is the Chief Executive Officer for the state of California

§ The Governor, through the Department of Finance, develops and submits a proposed state budget, including outlays for public instruction, to the Legislature which includes fiscal directions for all funds affecting the education of students with disabilities.
§ Fiscal and policy decisions are made by the Legislature and subject to approval from the Governor.
§ The State Board of Education (SBE), as appointed by the Governor, serves as the State Education Agency and policy making body.

§ The State Superintendent of Public Instruction is an elected Constitutional Officer who directs and administers the California Department of Education, the administrative arm of the SBE, and also acts as the Secretary to the SBE.

§ The Special Education Division (SED) is in the Student Support and Special Services branch.

3. Special Education Local Plan Area (SELP A)

§ A SELPA can either be a single district (LEA) or a combination of different types of LEAs which can include elementary districts, high school districts, unified districts, charter school LEAs, and County Offices of Education. These different entities join together to develop and submit a Local Plan for special education. A SELPA must meet minimum size and scope requirements (providing for a continuum of program options) and identify a member as the Administrative Unit (AU). The Local Plan is adopted by each member of the SELPA and must include, at a minimum, all the areas required by the IDEA for LEA programmatic and funding eligibility as required by EC 56205:

   i. Free appropriate public education

   ii. Full educational opportunity

   iii. Child find and referral

   iv. Development, implementation, review, and revision of the individualized education programs (including initial, annual, and triennial assessments)

   v. Least restrictive environment

   vi. Procedural Safeguards

   vii. Annual and Triennial Assessments

   viii. Confidentiality
ix. Transition to Preschool Programs (Part C – Part B) – Transition from Subchapter III (commencing with Section 1431) of Title 20 of the *United States Code* to the preschool program.

x. Children in Private Schools
xi. Compliance Assurances with IDEA, Section 504, and ADA

xii. Description of governance and administration of the plan [EC 56205 (a)(12)(A - E)], including identification of the governing body of a multi-district plan or the individual responsible for administration in a single district plan, and of the elected officials to whom the governing body or individual is responsible. A description of regionalized operations and services listed in EC 56836.23 and direct instructional support provided by program specialists in accordance with EC 56368 to be provided through the plan. Verification that a community advisory committee has been established per EC 56190. Multidistrict plans must (EC 56195.1) in part: a) specify the responsibilities of each participating county office and district governing board in the policymaking process, b) the responsibilities of superintendents of each participating district and county in the implementation of the plan, c) responsibilities of district and county administrators of special education in the coordination and administration of the plan, d) identify roles of the AU and administrator of SELPA and individual LEAs for hiring, supervision, evaluation, discipline; allocation from federal and state funds to SELPA AU and LEAs within SELPA; e) operation of special education programs; f) monitoring the appropriate use of federal, state, and local funds allocated for special education; g) preparation of program and fiscal reports for the SELPA as required by the state; h) copies of joint powers agreement (JPA) as stipulated in EC 56195.1

xiii. Ensure that personnel that provide related services are appropriately and adequately prepared and trained [EC 56058 and 56070; 20 USC 1412(a)(14) and 1413 (a)(3)]

xiv. Performance Goals and Indicators

xv. Participation in district and statewide assessments

xvi. Supplementation of state, local, and other federal funds

xvii. Maintenance of effort

xviii. Public Participation for adoption of policies and procedures

xix. Suspension and expulsion rates

xx. Access to instructional materials for blind students

xxi. Over identification and disproportionate representation by race and ethnicity [20
xxii. Prohibition against mandatory medication use (EC 56040.5)

xxiii. Each local plan must be submitted to the Superintendent and must contain: a) annual budget adopted through public hearing; b) annual service plan adopted through public hearing; c) description of programs for early childhood special education from birth to age 5 [EC 56205 (b)(3)]; d) description of method by which public can address questions and concerns to the governing body; e) dispute resolution process; f) verification that plan was reviewed by the CAC; g) process used to meet requirements of EC 56303; h) process to evaluate placements in nonpublic, nonsectarian schools and that all IEP requirements of students are being met, and description of evaluation to see if pupil is making appropriate educational progress; i) be written in a language that is understandable to the general public.

§ In addition to the provisions listed above, each SELPA shall have written agreements which shall cover, but not be limited to, the following (EC 56195.7):

i. Coordinated identification, referral, and placement system

ii. Procedural Safeguards

iii. Regionalized services to local programs: a) program specialist services; b) personnel development/training for staff, parents, members of CAC; c) evaluation; d) data collection and development of management information systems; e) curriculum development; f) ongoing review of programs, procedures, and mechanism for correcting identified problems; g) process for coordinating services with other local public agencies funded to serve individuals with exceptional needs; h) process for coordinating and providing services to individuals with exceptional needs placed in licensed children’s institutions and foster family homes (commencing with EC 56155); i) process for coordinating and providing services to individuals with exceptional needs placed in juvenile court schools or county community schools (EC 56150); j) budget for special education and related services maintained by SELPA that is open to the public; k) multidistrict SELPAs require a description of policymaking process including description of method used to distribute state and federal funds amongst the LEAs in the SELPA.

4. County Offices of Education

§ County Offices of Education (COE) operate special education programs as appropriate to size and structural organization of the county. COEs also provide a review function and approve LEAs’ Local
Control Accountability Plans (LCAP) per Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) requirements. COEs also monitor teacher assignments and certification. COE must do the following (EC 5614):

1. Submit to the SSPI a countywide plan for special education demonstrating the coordination of all Local Plans and ensuring that all individuals with exceptional needs residing in the county (including those enrolled in alternative educational programs, alternative schools, charter schools, opportunity schools and classes, community day schools operated by school districts, community schools operated by COEs, and juvenile court schools) will have access to appropriate special education programs and related services.

2. Within 45 days, approve or disprove any proposed Local Plan submitted by a district or group of districts within the county or counties.

3. Participate in the state on-site review of the district’s implementation of an approved local plan.

4. Join with districts in the county which elect to submit a plan or plans per EC 56195.19(c).

5. For each SELPA located within the jurisdiction of the COE that has submitted a revised Local Plan per EC 56836.03 (revised local plans/transition guidelines/division of SELPA areas), the COE must comply with EC 48850 (academic achievement of pupils in foster care, homeless children/youth) as it relates to individuals with exceptional needs, by making available to agencies that place children in licensed children’s institutions a copy of the annual service plan adopted per EC 56205(b)(2).

5. Local Educational Agency (School District, COE, Charter LEAs):

§ Develop LCAP addressing direct services. Provide and administer Special Education and Related Services per IDEA requirements as stipulated in Title 5 California Code of Regulations, Chapter 5.1 (Uniform Complaint Procedures), Article 3 (Sections 4620 – 4622):

i. Each LEA shall ensure compliance with applicable state and federal laws and regulations.

ii. Each LEA shall investigate complaints alleging failure to comply with applicable state and federal laws and regulations and/or alleging discrimination.
iii. Each LEA shall seek to resolve those complaints in accordance with the procedures set out in Title 5 of the CCR and in accordance with the policies and procedures of the governing board.

iv. Each LEA shall adopt policies and procedures consistent with 5 CCR 4600–4695 for the investigation and resolution of complaints.

v. Each LEA shall have policies that ensure complainants are protected from retaliation and that the identity of a complainant alleging discrimination remains confidential as appropriate.

vi. School districts and COEs shall submit policies and procedures to the local governing board for adoption.

vii. Each LEA shall include in its policies and procedures the person(s), employee(s), or agency position(s) or unit(s) responsible for receiving complaints, investigating complaints, and ensuring LEA compliance.

viii. Each LEA's policies shall ensure that the staff responsible for compliance and/or investigations shall be knowledgeable about the laws and programs that they are assigned to investigate.

ix. Each LEA may provide a complaint form for those wishing to file a complaint to fill out and file. The form shall be provided for complaints regarding instructional materials, emergency or urgent facilities conditions that pose a threat to the health and safety of pupils or staff, and teacher vacancies or misassignments. A person does not have to use the complaint form furnished by the LEA in order to file a complaint.

§ Each LEA shall annually notify, in writing as applicable, its students, employees, parents or guardians of its students, the district advisory committee, school advisory committees, appropriate private school officials or representatives, and other interested parties of their LEA complaint procedures, including the opportunity to appeal to the CDE.

6. California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

§ The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing is an agency in the Executive Branch of the California State Government. It was
created in 1970 by the Ryan Act and is the oldest of the autonomous state standards boards in the nation. The major purpose of the agency is to serve as a state standards board for educator preparation for the public schools of California, the licensing and credentialing of professional educators in the State, the enforcement of professional practices of educators, and the discipline of credential holders in the State of California. The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing consists of nineteen members, fifteen voting members and four ex-officio, non-voting members. The Governor appoints fourteen voting Commissioners and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction or his/her designee serves as the fifteenth voting Member. The four ex-officio Members are selected one each by the major elements of the California higher education constituency: Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities; Regents of the University of California; California Postsecondary Education Commission; and the California State University. The Governor-appointed Commissioners consist of six classroom teachers, one school administrator, one school board member, one school counselor or services credential holder, one higher education faculty member from an institution for teacher education, and four public members. Governor appointed Commissioners are typically appointed to four-year terms, and serve as volunteers in unpaid positions. The Commission works toward:

I. Educator Quality

- Maintain expectations for educator preparedness and performance that are responsive to the needs of California's diverse student population and promote 21st century teaching and learning.

- Develop, maintain, and promote high quality authentic, consistent educator assessments and examinations that support development and certification of educators who have demonstrated the capacity to be effective practitioners.

- Ensure that credential processing and assignment monitoring activities accurately, effectively, and efficiently identify educators who have met high and rigorous certification standards and who are appropriately assigned.

- Effectively, efficiently, and fairly monitor the fitness of all applicants and credential holders to work with California students.

- Continue to emphasize teaching as a profession and encourage highly talented individuals to enter the education profession.
II. Program Quality and Accountability

- Develop and maintain rigorous, meaningful, and relevant standards that drive program quality and effectiveness for the preparation of the education workforce and are responsive to the needs of California’s diverse student population.

- Effectively and efficiently monitor program implementation and outcomes and hold all approved educator preparation programs to high standards and continuous improvement through the accreditation process.

- Establish and maintain educator preparation, development, and career pathways as a shared responsibility among institutions of higher education, local educational agencies, and state agencies.

- Track current trends and research in learning theory, educator preparation, and certification and disseminate information about high quality programs, models, and outcomes.

III. Communication and Engagement

- Maintain and strengthen working relationships with the Commission’s diverse stakeholder community.

- Continue to refine the coordination between Commissioners and staff in carrying out the Commission’s duties, roles, and responsibilities.

- Contribute to public discourse and inform public opinion about educator, program, and discipline quality and effectiveness.

- Partner with stakeholders in the development and implementation of policy that shapes preparation, certification, development, and discipline of the education workforce.

- Advise the Governor, Legislature, and other policy makers as appropriate regarding issues affecting the quality, preparation, certification, and discipline of the education workforce.

- Collaborate with other government agencies at the local, state, and national levels in support of coherent and effective education policy.
IV. Operational Effectiveness

- Maintain a workplace environment and culture that inspires, supports, and values employees.

- Align human and financial resources with Commission priorities and offer staff opportunities for development to maximize professional engagement and performance.

- Demonstrate professionalism and accountability for high standards of practice in all Commission operations.

- Maintain a clear and accessible Web presence that enables ease of access to information about requirements and best practices in certification, accreditation, educator discipline, and other areas of Commission responsibility.

- Maintain appropriate response times for processing applications, investigating allegations of misconduct, monitoring conditions of Settlement Agreements, and answering inquiries from the field.

- Maintain a culture of continuous improvement by periodically reviewing agency capacity to achieve Commission goals for educator workforce quality, preparation, certification, and discipline.

- Ensure that current regulations, procedures, and initiatives are appropriately streamlined and moving the Commission closer to meeting established goals.

7. Charters Acting as LEAs

§ Charter schools that are deemed to be a LEA must fulfill all requirements that LEAs are subjected to for the provision of special education and related services as stipulated in federal statutes and regulations (EC 47640–46747). A charter school deemed an LEA shall participate as an LEA in a special education plan approved by the SBE and shall be deemed an LEA for the purposes of compliance with federal law (IDEA). A charter school deemed an LEA for purposes of special education shall be permitted to participate in an approved SELPA per EC 56195.1(f).
B. Strengths of System

i. Strength of the system is the state approval of the local plans developed by each SELPA and their member LEAs. This also serves as an example of system coordination.

ii. SELPAs are regional organizations that provide technical assistance, professional development, and monitor local issues and needs.

iii. The state’s current governance structures provides for multiple levels of oversight by monitoring, creating a multi-tiered system for ensuring that IDEA requirements are met.

iv. Local control allows for creativity so that there is responsiveness to the unique needs and issues that are present in some regions of the state that are individual in nature, and at times created by demographic differences.

C. Coordination of Systems

i. Local plans created and approved at the local level are also reviewed and approved by the CDE SED.

ii. Regulations call for the existence of interagency agreements between state agencies and the CDE, having responsibilities for the provision of related services to students with disabilities.

D. Areas of Improvement

i. The current governance system has a potential disconnect in that the entities responsible for funds do not have the authority to enforce corrective actions.

ii. How specific is the monitoring provided by SELPA and their ability to support implementation of a corrective action?

iii. Increase the support that is currently available to individual SELPAs ability to effectively monitor the implementation of the Local Plan vis-à-vis their member LEAs.

iv. Increase capacity, statewide, for the implementation of Local Plans in terms of...
specifying with greater clarity: common definitions, common expectations, integration of other governmental agencies having overlapping or common responsibilities to provide services to students with disabilities, such as law enforcement, courts, probation, homeless youth, foster youth, county health, behavioral health, mental health agencies.
v. Suggestion: CTC’s decisions related to special education staff credentialing should be considered by the CDE or the SBE.

vi. Increase consistent coordinated communication between the SEA, special education, general education, and ensure that information is provided through all levels of the state system.

vii. Foster closer integration of CTC activities and responsibilities as it affects staffing and provision of quality services at the state and local level.

viii. Suggestion: Provide for either the SBE or the CDE to have interaction with the CTC as it relates to implementation of the IDEA.

II. Fiscal

a. Infrastructure Elements

i. Levels of system review

- LCAP – See discussion of LCAP in this document

- Maintenance of Effort – MOE is a requirement based on the amount that an LEA expended in the last year showing that the LEA “Maintained the Effort.” Two sets of comparisons are completed for each fiscal year.

- MOE compliance test

- MOE eligibility

- SELPAs, as an LEA, must also complete the MOE requirement

- Excess Cost – Funds allocated to an LEA under Part B of the IDEA may only be used to pay the excess costs of providing special education and related services to SWD. Excess costs are those that are in excess of the average annual per student expenditure in an LEA during the preceding school year. An LEA must spend at least
the average annual per student expenditure before funds under Part B of the Act are used to pay the excess cost of providing special education and related services.

- Table 8 –IDEA Part B MOE Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervention Services (CEIS) Report
  - Allocation of IDEA 611 and 619 grant funds
  - MOE reduction calculation
CEIS funds expended
Number of students receiving CEIS funds

B. Strengths of the System

- The combination of LCAP requirements and the federal reporting requirements of IDEA provide a thorough programmatic view of how funds are being spent and how LEAs source funds in order to provide for special education and related services.

- LCAP and federal reporting requirements of IDEA cover both general education and SWDs.

C. Coordination of the Systems

- Up until this time, not much as LCAP is a new experience for LEAs in CA.

D. Areas for Improvement

- As SWD are included in more LCAPs the LCAPs themselves may begin to naturally align to the reporting requirements that are part of IDEA.

III. Quality Standards

a. Infrastructure Elements

- Levels of System Review:

  § CDE (Special Education): The CDE has a variety of program quality documents available related to Transition, Early Childhood Special Education, Behavior Intervention (Positive Environment Network of Trainers), CalStat Core Messages: Reading/Literacy, PBIS, Collaboration, Transition, School-Family-Community Partnerships, LRE, RtI, Closing the Achievement Gap.

  § CDE (General Education): The CDE has a number of quality standard documents in place that affect students with IEPs: (whatever the new version of the Essential Programs Components is), new EL guidelines, Safe Schools, Multi-Tiered System of
B. Strengths of the System:
   o Identify **names** of the CDE documents
   o Identify **locations** of the CDE documents
   o Some documents are available on the CDE Web site
   o Available contractor to provide TA in specific areas
   o LRP daily updates (staff)

C. Coordination of the Systems:
   o Collaboration with state agencies
   o Departments- i.e. Western Regional Resource Center
   o Updates provided timely
   o Coordination efforts need to be monitored
   o Identify resources assigning correct monitors to share information
   o Ensure that all documents address and include all students (with or without disability)

D. Areas for Improvement:
   o Increase collaboration with other departments and agencies
   o Updates: Composite of Laws (searchable) (implemented 12/2014)
   o Examples of quality standards from other states
   o Share information about contractors
   o Timelines of documents and information
   o Structure format of document search (alpha, topic, timeliness, etc.)
   o Web and document oversight
   o **All** documents should reference special education population, general ed., etc.
   o Remove old, irrelevant documents

§ SELPA: (List of SELPA developed guidance docs, multicultural guidelines)
§ COE: (List of COE special ed related guidelines, e.g., SEACO Curriculum)
§ LEA: (LEA generated products)
§ Other: Western Association of Schools and Colleges Accreditation Process
IV. Professional Development

a. Infrastructure Elements

- Levels of System Review:

1. CDE (Special Education)
   - Provides professional development options through on-site training and compliance visits by the CDE SED staff.
   - The CDE SED also contracts with outside agencies to provide intensive professional development and training around student discipline, instruction, and SPED compliance. These include: CalSTAT, West Ed, Santa Clara COE, PTI's, FECs and CEDD.
   - Has also held symposiums on aligning annual IEP academic goals to the CCSS. Provides local grants to LEAs for projects that generate PD activities.

2. CDE (General Education)
   - Provides a variety of online resources related to professional growth for teachers, administrators, and school staff in all areas of education, school climate, finance, curriculum, and instruction. Additionally provides seminars and presentations for LEAs on: frameworks, standards, instructional materials, assessment, fiscal guidance, LCAP, and categorical programs.

3. SELPA
   - Can apply to receive grants from the CDE that generate PD activities. Some SELPAs provide extensive professional development options and workshops for LEAs, and parent education partnerships with CAC.

4. County Offices of Education
§ Some of the COEs provide professional development options focused on school improvement initiatives, curriculum, instruction, and student discipline.

5. Local Educational Agencies

§ May provide in-house professional development options for staff on a variety of education topics. Can apply to the CDE for grants that can provide Professional Development activities.

B. Strengths of the Systems (Professional Development)

1. So much independence: school district can determine “this is where we need to focus”; the CDE doesn’t direct PD.

2. We do have COE’s to help with PD delivery. In between the CDE and LEAs.

3. We are a VERY diverse state, attempting to address the unique and diverse needs of the state.

4. Attempt to ensure that all stakeholders are involved: ELD, Title I, parent support.

5. What kind of parent involvement do we have: varies by district, LEA, and district type; some state level parent training options and programs.

6. Strengths: many different options for diverse entities

7. Effective coordination on the general education side to work and coordinate with COEs and deliver to LEAs.

8. Transparency to contact general education staff at the CDE (Web site easier to use on general education side vs. SED); need quick connections to expertise at the CDE SED; not necessarily direct to FMTA consultant.

9. General education organized around easily understood silos; special education not so much.

10. How can FMTA consultants enhance their knowledge of unique issues related to the region they represent? Maybe need special training; expectations and procedures
C. Coordination of the Systems (Professional Development)

1. Challenges: how do you ensure and monitor that it is all working together and coordinated in the delivery process?

2. Microsoft grant in LBUSD to coordinate delivery of professional development.

3. Coordination of professional development for staff within the SED could be strengthened. Tapping into the expertise of the staff at SED.

4. Individuals within the CDE have a great deal of expertise that could be accessed more in PD for staff and LEAs.

5. Making training options and PD more clear on the CDE Web site.

6. Options to allow for cross-training: posting and making professional development calendars visible and available.

7. Providing more information and resource knowledge regarding PD delivery options in California: diagnostic centers; WestEd; CalSTAT; SPP-TAP; COEs (statewide expertise).

8. As we move forward with the SSIP, we need to be cognizant of the unique aspects of LEAs and regions in the state and the background involved in complaints and resolution (understanding the culture and the nature of the particular districts), honoring the relationships that have been built between SED staff and districts (insider and historical knowledge).

D. Areas for Improvement (Professional Development)

1. It would be a key system of support to reestablish a Composite of Laws. It’s very difficult to ensure compliance when researching laws and regulations are so disparate and disjointed. The existing search engine on the CDE Website is difficult unless you already know the code you are seeking. This would help address a PD need for governance and compliance. (Addressed 12/2014)

2. More interactive approaches to the provision of PD.
3. How does LEA decide where and how to spend PD funds?

4. Groups sharing data together and built into PD plans.

5. Delivery systems of PD need to be effective and efficient.

6. The CDE SED could improve guidance to field by training staff and coordinating and expanding delivery of guidance and technical assistance.

7. Access expertise in Diagnostic Centers to provide cross training options for SED staff, and SED staff go with them to provide training options to LEAs.

8. Making grant information and RFP available for all LEAs, providing and disseminating information widely throughout the state.

9. How does the field learn about grant and PD options that are available (internal CDE people and external LEAs)?

10. Ensuring that data collection and receivers of the grants share more. Better coordination of mini-grants to summarize what worked and what did not (e.g. CEIS; ADR; PD; LRE) by providing and disseminating what works to other LEAs. Some way for districts to report out what worked and what did not.

11. Maybe assign FMTA, NPS, and CRU consultants to specific areas of expertise to receive PD and updates, and report back to SED staff: keep staff updated on changes in different areas.

12. Examining how SED staff interacts with and coordinates with COE to provide PD and technical assistance. Strength in providing training at a COE level vs. SELPA or LEA.

13. Within the CDE SED: We don’t understand clearly how FMTAs and NPS work together for compliance and monitoring issues.

14. Training scheduling: Maybe have NPS and FMTA consultants visit LEAs and provide training together.

15. Have NPS, FMTA, and AES staff go on reviews together (verification reviews, SESR
follow ups, training, NPS reviews).

16. This also applies to the coordination of the corrective actions across units within the SED.

17. Have the CDE SED staff go to ACSA, CASBO, and CAPSES conferences to provide PD options for these groups of administrators.

18. Have the CDE staff be more involved with professional organizations such as: ACSA, CASBO, ASCD, CAPSES, etc. (breaking down administrative silos).

19. Our group had a lot of discussion around the divisions between general education, special education, and nonpublic schools: all of these entities need to be coordinated well and work together to deliver improved outcomes for students: the CDE, COEs, SELPAs, LEAs, professional organizations still divided along general education, SPED, and NPS lines.

V. Data

A. Infrastructure Elements

- Levels of System Review

1. CDE: Collects special education student data submitted by LEAs/SELPAs. Data is stored and analyzed (for monitoring purposes and reporting requirements) into the CASEMIS system. Provide training and materials so that LEAs and SELPAs can submit data twice per year.

2. CDE (General Education): Collects student data (including Title I and III data) including, but not limited to, assessment data for school accountability purposes. Data is searchable through the DATAQUEST system.

3. SELPA: Assists LEAs by providing TA and training so that data submitted is accurate. SELPA is responsible for certification and submission to the CDE concerns about data quality and compliance.

4. COE: Provide student level special education data when the COE is responsible for providing special education and related services. Also, provide teacher assignment monitoring data to the CTC.
5. LEA: Responsible for data entry at the school and district site. Responsible for working with software vendors to ensure that data extracts meet the CDE specifications. Must training first-level data entry personnel to ensure consistency and accuracy.

b. Strengths of the System

1. Own System; Flexibility; CASEMIS errors and warnings; DATA Quality; Snapshots; Certification requirements; Support and Technical Assistance; Stakeholders input

2. Data changes; Assessment data; DATAQUEST takes SE out of Silo; SSID; Accommodations

3. Focus on CASEMIS; Pull data can fix before submission; Data integration (when chosen) helps align data; Not all districts use same vendor

4. Can be easier if using a program manager model; Small districts use teacher as model

5. Engaged SELPA Directors; Webinar

6. Fiscal data report, a whole system

c. Coordination of the Systems

1. Follow-up Analytics; Manual Coordination

2. DATAQUEST; Assessment sorting subgroups; crosschecking data

3. Check services

4. Having a master trainer at a district.

d. Areas for Improvement

1. Variation from SELPA to SELPA; DATA governance; Trainings; Not same definitions;
Not same data collection system; Discrepancies; Alignments; Clarification; Quality assistance; Data is old

2. Timelines for reporting; Removing duplicates for SSID; Getting understanding; Keeping up with Technology – TSD; Data two ways; Data in timely manner

3. Early release of software; Multi-District SELPAs vs. Single District; SELPAs based on leadership

4. Data quality; Data culture; Data Governance; Integrity; Quality of data

5. Knowledge of consequences; Graduation rates of CDE

6. Consistent language; consistent definitions; lots of new direction; more and more data points; need to decrease the number; lots of demands on teachers; staff turnover; SED and CALPADS do not talk.

VI. Technical Assistance

A. Infrastructure Elements

1. CDE (both general education and special education)

   • Provides materials, training and technical assistance so that LEAs can meet the various reporting and monitoring compliance and results requirements associated with the IDEA.

   • Provide technical assistance with recent changes in law as shown by workgroups created to ease transitions created by AB 114 (2011) and AB 86 (2013).

   • Provide technical assistance to assist LEAs fulfill reporting and monitoring compliance and results requirements mandated by federal laws and state Education Code. Provide technical assistance on state initiatives such as CCSS, LCAP, policy, preschool, Early Intervention, mental health, English learners, etc.

   • Parent technical assistance and outreach through Procedural Safeguards and Parent Rights
2. SELPA

- Provide member LEAs with training and technical assistance to assist LEAs in fulfilling monitoring compliance and results reporting requirements associated with IDEA.

3. County Offices of Education

- Credentialing authorization, curriculum, fiscal, implement state initiatives, coordination of professional development, programs, classrooms and support for unique populations (i.e. court schools, severe disabilities, infant programs).

4. Local Educational Agencies

- Provide local level with training and technical assistance to assist LEAs in fulfilling monitoring compliance and results reporting requirements associated with IDEA.

- Implementation of initiatives, programs and services under IDEA

- CAC parent

5. Others

- Through contracts technical assistance is provided around parent engagement, assessment, disproportionality, professional development, early childhood, OAH.

B. Strengths of System

1. We communicate within the SED, sending consistent message to the field

2. More technical assistance given
3. Strengthening of field contacts and Technical Assistance

4. Support for districts with on-site visits by CDE staff

5. Commitment by administration to cross-train staff for the overall improvement of results for students and LEAs

6. Strong contractors providing technical assistance

7. Stakeholder input

8. Diversity of staff and partners adds perspective and expertise

9. Coordination across agencies, systems, and divisions

C. Coordination of System(s)

1. We communicate within the SED, sending consistent message to the field

2. More technical assistance given

3. Strengthening of field contacts and TA

4. Support for districts with onsite visits by the CDE staff

5. Commitment by administration to cross-train staff for the overall improvement of results for students and LEAs

6. Strong contractors providing technical assistance

7. Stakeholder input

8. Diversity of staff and partners adds perspective and expertise

9. Coordination across agencies, systems, and divisions
D. Areas for Improvement

1. Improve Statewide consistency

§ Through interpretation and implementation of law, initiatives, policy, and programs

§ By articulating a common vision of the SED work

§ Ensure integration of SED at the beginning of initiatives to promote collaboration and inclusive practices

§ Through uniform and timely communication overall

2. Increase Coordination

§ Coordinate with LCAP focus areas, including highlighting parents of children with disabilities

§ Coordinate with other divisions in the CDE

§ Ensure equitable services for children with disabilities

§ Greater exposure and involvement of the SED staff on initiatives and products being developed so we can be integrated into what is happening

3. Technical Assistance – build and strengthen avenues of communication by:

§ Providing multiple ways to present information and sharing back and forth, that is available to the field (different formats, Webinars posted, where to find)

§ Developing a subscription for the CDE listserv to get notices to multiple audiences; listservs by category or topic to match interests

§ Designing a forum for TA providers to share resources and knowledge (e.g. TTAC, state, local, organizations, contractors)
4. Technical Assistance – build capacity by:

§ Analyzing data and feedback from the field to address the needs of technical assistance

§ Developing a continuous improvement process that includes:

  i. A framework of planning, implementation, evaluation and reevaluation

  ii. State to local – multiple ways of communication – policy informed practice – practice informed policy

§ Updating SED technical assistance guides for different aspects of work in a timely way

§ Providing timely and complete training to staff

§ Developing and disseminating accurate materials and forms to the field in a timely way

VII. Accountability Monitoring

A. Infrastructure Elements

1. Levels of System Review – CDE, Special Education

   • CASEMIS, coupled with CALPADS data collection, is the basis for IDEA reporting and accountability. APR indicators are used to fulfill most requirements of 34 CFR 300.600 for monitoring including: SPP and APR, annual compliance determinations, data identified non-compliance, Disproportionality, Significant Disproportionality. APR indicators are used to select districts for VRs and to form the nucleus of the compliance items reviewed in SESR and VR. The CDE reviews all compliance indicators with every district every year; conducts SESR every four years, and selects VRs each year using combination of indicators from the annual compliance determination. Monitoring includes review of student records, policies and procedures, fiscal, IEP implementation, Educational Benefit reviews, individualized items selected for each district and included in a monitoring plan.
2. CDE General Education

- Assessment and CALPADS data collections and EdFacts reporting form the basis for statewide accountability. API and AYP are used to identify districts for program improvement. Monitoring is conducted annually in various categorical programs (e.g., English Learners)
  - DRDP
  - WEST ED
  - Smarter Balanced
3. SELPA

- Are required to have an agreement in place to review implementation of local plan and correct any deficiencies. May carry this out through a variety of means. Typically review APR and fiscal indicators with LEAs each year as well as DINC, disproportionate representation and significant disproportionality. Provide substantial guidance and assistance in planning and conducting SESRs. May participate in VR reviews.

  § CASEMIS (review and qualitative)
  § Data analysis (certification and submit to State)
  § Complaints and OAH
  § Must participate in VR reviews

4. County Offices of Education

- COE is required by code to participate in on-site reviews. They are responsible for reviewing LCAPs, LEA budgets. May provide assistance through SAIT (School Assistance and Intervention Team) focused on improved student outcomes.

5. Local Educational Agencies

- LEAs participate in accountability through a variety of plans, e.g., Single Plan for Student Achievement; Safe Schools Plan; School Accountability Report Card; Program Improvement documents.

  § LCAP
  § CRU (complaints)
  § OAH (due process)
  § CALSTAT
  § NPS certification review
  § SELPA Governance
  § Interviews (admin, parent, and staff)
  § Data Validation Reviews (DVRs) (Onsite visits)
  § Infant and preschool records
  § DRDP-preschool assessment
§ BSA reviews SESRs and VRs
§ STAR assessment data and testing
§ Ten percent SESR follow up
§ CASEMIS validation (part of VR)

6. Other
   - Annual A-133 audits

B. Strengths of System
   - Parent input
   - Identifies and corrects noncompliance
   - Identifies trends in data
   - Ed Benefit gets results
   - System enables timely submission of APR indicators and SSPI
   - Timely completion of noncompliance
   - Data collection and analysis
   - Accountability
   - Facilitates communication between the CDE and LEAs
   - Provides resources
   - Identifies and corrects noncompliance
   - A plan for change
   - Student level data

C. Coordination of System(s)
   - Cross validation of systems (CASEMIS, CALPADS and IEPS)
   - Data integration
   - IDEA reporting
   - Shares data for Part C lead agencies
   - Bi-monthly Data Managers meeting (coordinates data sources)
   - Smarter Balance workgroup
   - Monthly SELPA meetings
   - Certifying LEA student level data
   - SEACO participation
   - Student level data
D. Areas for Improvement

- Definitional issues (e.g., what is a suspension?)
- Standardizing data gathering systems e.g. CRU, FMTAs, NPS
- Use of SSID for all systems for accountability efficiencies
- Disseminate information to SELPAs and COEs
- Monitoring performance improvement and compliance
- Standardizing tools
- Communication
- Compliance
- DRDP data
- Timely submit accurate and complete data
- Correct data errors
- Increase participation on VRs
- Communication
- Correction of noncompliance
- Accurate data collection of student level data
- Audit plan to coordinate with CDE and OSEP requirements

Identify current state-level improvement plans and initiatives; including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives; and describe the extent that the initiatives are aligned and how they are, or could be, integrated with the SSIP.

a. Local Control and Accountability Plans

1. Required Elements - Eight State Priority Areas

   A. Conditions of Learning:

   i. Basic: degree to which teachers are appropriately assigned pursuant to Education Code section 44258.9, and fully credentialed in the subject areas and for the pupils they are teaching; pupils have access to standards-aligned instructional materials pursuant to Education Code section 60119; and school facilities are maintained in good repair pursuant to Education Code section 17002(d). (Priority 1)

   ii. Implementation of state standards: implementation of academic content and performance standards adopted by the SBE for all pupils, including English learners.
iii. Course access: pupil enrollment in a broad course of study that includes all of the subject areas described in Education Code section 51210 and subdivisions (a) to (i), inclusive, of Section 51220, as applicable. (Priority 7)

iv. Expelled pupils (for county offices of education only): coordination of instruction of expelled pupils pursuant to Education Code section 48926. (Priority 9)

v. Foster youth (for county offices of education only): coordination of services, including working with the county child welfare agency to share information, responding to the needs of the juvenile court system, and ensuring transfer of health and education records. (Priority 10)

B. Pupil Outcomes:

i. Pupil achievement: performance on standardized tests, score on Academic Performance Index, share of pupils that are college and career ready, share of English Learners that become English proficient, English Learner reclassification rate, share of pupils that pass Advanced Placement exams with 3 or higher, share of pupils determined prepared for college by the Early Assessment Program. (Priority 4)

ii. Other pupil outcomes: pupil outcomes in the subject areas described in Education Code section 51210 and subdivisions (a) to (i), inclusive, of Education Code section 51220, as applicable. (Priority 8)

C. Engagement:

i. Parent involvement: efforts to seek parent input in decision making, promotion of parent participation in programs for unduplicated pupils and special need subgroups. (Priority 3)

ii. Pupil engagement: school attendance rates, chronic absenteeism rates, middle school dropout rates, high school dropout rates, high school graduation rates. (Priority 5)

iii. School climate: pupil suspension rates, pupil expulsion rates, other local measures including surveys of pupils, parents and teachers on the sense of safety and school connectedness. (Priority 6)
2. How the LCAP is aligned to the SSIP

- High expectations, narrowing achievement gap for all student subgroups. All eight LCAP state priority areas align with possible SSIP elements (assessment results, discipline and truancy, graduation rates).

3. Extent to which the LCAP is aligned to SSIP 1-5

- All the efforts and activities to improve elements of the LCAP would improve all elements of the SSIP.

4. How alignment could be improved

- Be available to offer ways to align SSIP efforts to "Other Student Outcomes" in LCAP.
- Include students with disabilities as a student subgroup required to be focused on in LCAP. Align other plans with the LCAP, consolidate them, and ensure the SSIP is aligned with the resulting consolidated plan(s).

b. LEA Plan

1. Required Elements

- LEA plans describe the actions that LEAs will take to ensure that they meet certain programmatic requirements, including student academic services designed to increase student achievement and performance, coordination of services, needs assessments, consultations, school choice, supplemental services, and services to homeless students, and others as required. In addition, LEA plans summarize assessment data, school goals, and activities from the Single Plans for Student Achievement developed by the LEAs' schools.

- Needs Assessments:
  - Academic achievement
  - Professional development and hiring
  - School safety

- Descriptions – District Planning
  - District profile
o Local measures of student performance

o Performance Goal 1: Specific actions to improve education practice in reading and math

o Performance Goal 2: All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading, language arts, and mathematics.

o Performance Goal 3: All students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.

o Performance Goal 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug-free, and conducive to learning.

o Performance Goal 5: Planned improvements for high school graduation rates, dropouts, and advanced placement access.

· Additional mandatory Title I descriptions

2. How the LEA Plan is aligned to the SSIP

· Proficiency in reading and math is a large focus. Self-assessment, needs assessment is used.

3. Extent to which the LEA Plan is aligned to SSIP 1-5

· LEA Plan is less focused on accountability to continuous improvement and performance and outcomes, more focused on meeting requirements. The LEA Plan model is more focused on the categorical programs model and less on the block grants model. The LEA Plan does not seem to have as much potential to change practice as much as the LCAP does.

4. How alignment could be improved

· Use LEA Plan Needs Assessments to inform SSIP efforts. Focus on students with disabilities as a subgroup for improvement. Focus less just on meeting IDEA requirements for students with disabilities. Facilitate and streamline coordination of resources and
c. Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA)

1. Required elements

   · Planned improvements in student performance
   · Centralized services for planned improvements in student performance
   · Programs included in this plan
   · School Site Council membership
   · Recommendations and assurances
   · Budget planning tool
   · Single Plan for Student Achievement annual evaluation

2. How the SPSA is Aligned to the SSIP

   · The SPSA is the school site version of the LEA Plan.

3. Extent to which the SPSA is Aligned to SSIP 1-5

   · The SPSA is more specific than the LEAP. This plan and budget does not include special education expenditures.

4. How Alignment could be improved

   · Explicitly include students with disabilities and focus on students with disabilities as a subgroup to improve.
d. Single School District (SSD) Plan

1. Required Elements

   · Designed for use by single school districts, the SSD Plan template combines the elements of the LEA Plan and the SPSA into one single document.

2. How the SSD Plan is aligned to the SSIP

   · (See LEAP and SPSA information.)

3. Extent to which the SSD Plan is aligned to SSIP 1 -5

   · (See LEAP and SPSA information.)

4. How alignment could be improved

   · (See LEAP and SPSA information.)

e. Safe Schools Plan

1. Required Elements

   a. Plan is written and developed by a school site council (SSC) or a safety planning committee.

   b. SSC/Planning Committee consulted with a representative from a law enforcement agency in the writing and development of the Comprehensive School Safety Plan.

   c. The Comprehensive School Safety Plan includes, but is not limited to:

      i. An assessment of the current status of school crime committed on the school campus and at school-related functions.

      ii. An identification of appropriate strategies and programs that provide/maintain a high level of school safety.
d. The SSC/Planning Committee reviewed and addressed, as needed, the school’s procedures for complying with existing laws related to school safety.

e. Policies, procedures and rules regarding child abuse reporting, emergencies, suspension and expulsion, bullying, visitor access, etc.

f. The plan may include clear guidelines for the roles and responsibilities of mental health professionals, community intervention professionals, school counselors, school resource officers, and police officers on campus.

g. The plan may include procedures for responding to the release of a pesticide or other toxic substance from properties located within one-quarter mile of a school.

h. The plan should include verification that the school safety plan was evaluated at least once a year, and revised by March 1 every year.

i. The plan should include documentation that school safety plan was submitted for approval to either the district office or county office of education. Evidence of approval at the district or county level should be included.

j. The plan should include verification that the SSC Planning Committee communicated the school safety plan to the public at a public meeting at the school site.

2. How the Safe Schools Plan is aligned to the SSIP

· It is not very aligned with SSIP. The focus is placed on policies and procedures rather than student performance.

3. Extent to which the Safe Schools Plan is aligned to SSIP 1-5

· None of the efforts/activities to improve elements of the Safe Schools Plan would improve any elements of the SSIP.

4. How alignment could be improved

· Align Safe Schools Plan policies and procedures more with school climate improvement.

· Consider bullying, suspension and expulsion, etc. impact on students with disabilities.
f. Program Improvement Addendum or Plan (Title 1)

1. Required elements

   a. According to provisions in ESEA, the LEA Plan Addendum is required to meet all requirements specified in ESEA Section 1116(c)(7)(A)(i) through (viii):

      i. Address the fundamental teaching and learning needs in the schools of the LEA and the specific academic problems of low-achieving students, including a determination of why the prior LEA Plan failed to bring about increased student achievement.

      ii. Identify actions that have the greatest likelihood of improving the achievement of students in meeting state standards.

      iii. Incorporate scientifically-based research strategies that strengthen the core academic program in schools served by the LEA.

      iv. Include specific, measurable achievement goals and targets for all students and subgroups, addressing all elements of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

      v. Address the professional development needs of the instructional staff. Indicate that the LEA will dedicate not less than 10 percent of the LEA Title I allocation for high quality professional development.

      vi. Identify how technical assistance will be obtained to support implementation of the LEA Plan revisions (e.g., professional development for teachers and administrators, county office support, and work with such organizations as the California School Boards Association, California Teachers Association, Association of California School Administrators, California Federation of Teachers, Parent Teacher Association, institutions of higher education, and public and private organizations).

      vii. Incorporate, as appropriate, learning activities before school, after school, during the summer, and during an extension of the school year.

      viii. Include strategies to promote effective parental involvement in the school.
2. How the Title 1 Plan is aligned to the SSIP

   · The plan is aligned with SIMRs including academic achievement, and parental involvement. This plan includes evidence-based practices.

3. Extent to which the Title I Plan is aligned to SSIP 1-5

   · Goals are mostly aligned, but discipline is not directly addressed by the Title I improvement plan.

4. How alignment can be Improved

   · This is a challenge in that the Title I improvement plan does not apply to all schools. It does, however, include targets for increasing graduation rates, specifically for students with disabilities. The Title I improvement plan also allows schools to seek technical assistance from external sources. This could provide an opportunity to improve alignment with SSIP by ensuring this TA addresses results for students with disabilities.

5. Title II Non-Compliant Teacher Action Plan (Title II Plan)

1. Required Elements

   · Plan lists each non-highly qualified teacher and which activities will occur to make each teacher highly qualified.

   · LEAs with less than 100 percent highly qualified teachers in ESEA core academic subjects for two consecutive years are required to submit an Equitable Distribution Plan (EDP) to the CDE by June 24 of each year.

   · LEAs with less than 100 percent highly qualified teachers in ESEA core academic subjects and that fail to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for three consecutive years shall enter into an agreement with the CDE per the provisions of Section 2141(c) of the ESEA. The agreement consists of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), Budget Agreement and the Non-Compliant Teacher Action Plan. All three documents are required to be submitted to the CDE.

2. How the Title II Plan is aligned to SSIP
Highly qualified teachers are critical for students with disabilities. Teachers who are HQT have a direct impact on a LEAs ability to provide for FAPE in the LRE and assist secondary SWD in earning graduation credits.

3. Extent to which the Title II Plan is aligned to SSIP 1-5

- This plan is aligned with statewide assessment results, discipline, and graduation rates for students with disabilities. This plan is not as broad as the SSIP.

4. How alignment can be Improved

- By creating tighter linkages between HQT and LRE, and increasing graduation rates by increasing SWD ability to earn graduation credits. Provide ongoing professional development in addition to the required certificates.

h. Title III Improvement Plan

1. Required Elements

LEAs that fail to meet their Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAO) submit plans as follows:

- Year 2 LEA: missed one or more AMAOs for two consecutive years—addressed via Improvement Plan Addendum to LEA plan. The Improvement Plan consists of a goal, strategy, action steps, tasks, and budget items.

- Year 4 LEA: missed one or more AMAOs for four consecutive years—addressed via Action Plan on California Accountability and Improvement System

2. How the Title III Improvement Plan is aligned to the SSIP

- Population of students with disabilities exists within ELL population.

3. How alignment can be Improved

- Make data reporting for the SSIP for special education more similar to data reporting for Title III Plan (including students released from Special Education in the data pool for three years).
I. Truancy and Discipline [https://www.pbis.org/](https://www.pbis.org/)

1. Description

   a. The California Department of Education continues to be a resource to Local Educational Agencies to help reduce the rate of truancy and discipline. Programs such as PBIS were established by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) to define, develop, implement, and evaluate a multi-tiered approach to technical assistance that improves the capacity of states, districts and schools to establish, scale-up, and sustain the PBIS framework.

2. How are truancy and discipline programs aligned to the SSIP

   a. CAL-STAT and SPP-TAP contracts
   b. Reporting of discipline in current system
   c. WestEd workshops include discipline
   d. PBIS workshops
   e. Restorative justice
   f. Behavioral Intervention Plans within IEPs
   g. Race to the Top
   h. NPS/A
   i. Verification Reviews
      a. Monitoring plan focused on data for discipline (CASEMIS)
   j. After-school programs
   k. Family frameworks
   l. Title I
   m. SARB

3. Extent to which truancy and discipline programs are aligned with SSIP

   a. All mentioned deal with school climate and safe learning environment.

4. How alignment could be improved
a. Increase professional development for all staff
   i. Behavior management
   ii. Effective IEP development
   iii. Behavioral Intervention Plan/Behavior Support Plan Development
   iv. Parent training on IEP process and behavior
   v.

b. Too many things exist and information is unknown divisionwide and statewide.
   i. Better Web site to address discipline.
   ii. Monitor the SPPI more frequently using data in a more proactive approach, have good data to assist in monitoring.
   iii. Create buy-in from LEA employees to implement research based programs.
   iv. Involve PTIs in training for assessment of students with behavior issues.


1. Description
   a. California’s new State Personnel Development Grant focusing on improving reading achievement and academic performance for middle school students in 44 competitively selected middle school sites.

2. How Project READ is aligned with SSIP
   a. Grant for selected middle schools only; increased reading where implemented for pupil achievement

3. Extent to which Project READ is aligned with SSIP
   a. Improved academic performance

4. How alignment could be improved
   a. Fund statewide (if possible)
b. Expand beyond middle schools application (if grant allows)


1. **Description**

   a. The Common Core is a set of standards in mathematics and English language arts/literacy.

   b. Learning goals outline what a student should know and be able to do at the end of each grade.

   c. The standards were created to ensure that all students graduate from high school with necessary skills to succeed in college, career, and life, regardless of where they live.

2. **How are the CCSS aligned with the SSIP**

   a. Focuses on student academic achievement

   b. Internal training for staff is provided by each LEA

3. **Extent to which the CCSS are aligned with the SSIP**

   a. Will provide a better understanding of a student’s academic level

4. **How alignment can be Improved**

   a. Additional staff training in English-Language Arts and Math for implementation of standards through curriculum and class activities

   b. Professional development on effective instructional strategies and effective IEP academic goals

   c. Collection of integrated data
L. Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)


1. Description

   a. Framework aligns Response to Instruction and Intervention with the CCSS and the systems needed for academic, behavior, and social/emotional success for students.

2. How is MTSS aligned to the SSIP

   a. Districts independently create their own system of support

   b. WestEd trainings are available

3. Extent to which MTSS is aligned with SSIP

   a. Behavior

   b. Academic achievement

   c. Assessment for special education services and related services

   d. School climate

   e. All aspects of the SSIP

4. How alignment could be Improved

   a. Ensure that all LEAs have a system of support

   b. Legislatively mandated support

   c. Increase funding for staff training and professional development on tiered interventions
d. Get California Commission on Teacher Credentialing on board and adjust the credentialing system to include experiences or instruction in MTSS

M. Career Readiness Campaign (http://www.cde.ca.gov/eo/in/cr/index.asp)

1. Description

a. Through this California Career Readiness Initiative, SSPI Tom Torlakson has directed the CDE to proceed with 17 key objectives to support, sustain, and strengthen Career and Technical Education (CTE) in the state.

b. This Initiative builds upon goals outlined in “A Blueprint for Great Schools”

c. A program or study to career pathway and careers

2. How the Career Readiness Campaign is aligned to the SSIP

a. A Framework for Great Schools

b. Limited career technology programs already in existence

3. Extent to which the Career Readiness Campaign is aligned to SSIP

a. Increased graduation

4. How alignment could be improved

a. Expand for all students

b. Create viable programs for transitional planning.

c. Better tracking of post school outcomes with incentives.

d. More funding
e. Increase PTI/FEC role for transition and postsecondary school data

N. **Bullying and Hate Motivated Behavior Prevention** ([http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/ss/se/bullyingprev.asp](http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/ss/se/bullyingprev.asp))

1. **Description**
   
a. One of the CDE initiatives. The link provides resources for parents, administrators, and students on how bullying can be prevented and addressed. Resources include publications, sample policies, and frequently asked questions.

2. **How Bullying Prevention is aligned to the SSIP**
   
a. School training is available statewide

3. **Extent to which Bullying Prevention is aligned to the SSIP**
   
a. School climate and academic achievement

4. **How alignment could be improved**
   
a. More bullying awareness in class
   
b. Develop and make parent training available
   
c. Increase funding for prevention programs
   
d. Increase and/or develop on types and resources of bullying for staff, parents, and students


1. **Description**
   
a. On April 10, 2012, the SSPI Tom Torlakson unveiled a new publication designed to help school districts engage families and communities in their children's education.
2. How the Family Engagement Framework is aligned to the SSIP

   a. WestEd training
   
   b. Family engagement networks
   
   c. PTIs to be responsible for parent input in the monitoring process
   
   d. The CDE monitors PTIs

3. Extent to Which the Family Engagement Framework is Aligned to the SSIP

   a. School climate and academic achievement

4. How alignment could be improved

   a. SED should monitor and communicate effectively within divisions and SELPAs and LEAs that interact with PTIs and FECs
   
   b. More funding
   
   c. Departments and divisions to work more closely for data of PTIs and FECs. Analyze what PTI and FECs do
   
   d. Collect data, etc. to ensure monies are going to assist parents in supporting student achievement.

P. Summer Matters Initiative [http://www.cde.ca.gov/eo/in/summerlearning.asp](http://www.cde.ca.gov/eo/in/summerlearning.asp)

1. Description

   a. The SSPI Tom Torlakson believes summer learning programs play an important role in helping all California children succeed in school and beyond. The goal of this initiative is to achieve one of the goals of the Blueprint for Great Schools:
      
      i. To ensure all California students have access to high quality summer
learning opportunities that support year-round learning and well-being

b. Statewide summer program for students supported by school leadership and community

2. How the Summer Matters Initiative is aligned to the SSIP

a. Increase student achievement

b. Keep students socially and emotionally connected to school and community over summer

3. Extent to which the Summer Matters Initiative aligned to the SSIP

a. Student academic achievement

4. How Alignment Could be Improved

a. Additional marketing to:
   
i. LEAs
   
ii. School sites
   
iii. Parents and students
   
iv. PTIs and FECs
   
v. community

b. Gather current data for California.
# Focus for Improvement: Project READ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Project READ – Raising Academic Achievement in English Language Arts and Literacy for Students with Disabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>California Department of Education (CDE), Special Education Division, has a number of activities designed to support districts in need of improvement (have not met state achievement targets) both overall as well as for specific subgroups such as students with disabilities. The CDE, through a grant from the United States Department of Education (USDOE), Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) has received funding targeting middle school reading. In collaboration with the Napa County Office of Education, this project offers training and technical assistance on reading instruction and intervention to 44 middle schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Assistance to LEAs</td>
<td>Through support from the USDOE State Personnel Development Grant middle school sites are selected based on a statewide rank of “3” or below reflecting status in the lowest 30 percent of school in 2012 Base Academic Performance Index (API). The goals of this project are to increase the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Advanced in English language arts on statewide assessment, decrease the percentage of students scoring Below Basic or Far Below Basic, reach improved outcomes of all student for each significant subgroup including students with disabilities and English Language Learners; and to have at least 20 school staff participate in professional development to increase their skills in teaching struggling readers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>2013-14 state assessment results for English Language Arts has illuminated the high numbers of middle school students with disabilities who are struggling readers. In order for students with disabilities to be college and career ready, it is imperative that students are able to read and write and be proficient at grade-level standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Discussion Questions | • How will this project increase reading proficiency and academic achievement in the Common Core State Standards for students with disabilities as well as increase graduation rates and post school outcomes?  
• How will Project Read support overall CDE efforts to increase student achievement and improve student outcomes?  
• What else should the CDE be doing to increase achievement in English Language Arts and Literacy for all students including students with disabilities? |
### SPP Division Day – Morning Breakout
April 14, 2014

**Discussion questions:**

- How will this project assist reading proficiency and academic achievement in the Common Core State Standards for students with disabilities, as well as increase graduation rates and post school outcomes?
  - Can access CORE curriculum better if reading is improved

- Technical Manuals—can this begin at the middle school level?

- LRE encourages access — (related to first bullet)

- Offer Professional Development to staff

- We can attain assessment results by exit status

- Special Education and general education work together

- Provides students with more individual attention.

- Do you think *Project Read* will enhance overall CDE efforts to improve student outcomes?
  - Increased access to materials targeted to the needs of each district: local control, flexibility

- Support and enhance existing reading programs

- Provides evidence based resources for others

- Parent input

- Sustainable practices over a long period of time
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>• Access to additional supports result in improved outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• What else should the CDE be doing to obtain more specific data related to results for students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Determine what data are already collected by the CDE to increase more specific results for students and literacy for all students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understand data is key to everything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase engagement with community and family groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discussion with CTC and local bargaining unit about varied delivery models</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consistent data (single source)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPP Division Day – Afternoon Breakout  
April 14, 2014  

Discussion questions:  

- How will this project increase reading proficiency and academic achievement in the Common Core State Standards for students with disabilities, as well as increase graduation rates and post school outcomes?  

- By increasing reading skills, assessment results, graduation rates, and post school outcomes should increase CCSS  

- Staff development and collaboration that help students through intervention/prevention prior to middle school  

- How will Project Read support overall CDE efforts to increase student achievement improve student outcomes?  

- Multilevel approach to teaching/training  

- Individualized to unique local needs  

- Ongoing evaluation throughout local cycles  

- Include strategies and intervention  

- Modeling that helps other schools that want to adapt  

- What else should the CDE be doing to increase achievement
in English Language Arts and Literacy for all students including students with disabilities?

- Publicity of results
- Target clients at an earlier age
- Long term student tracking
- Increase parental (guardian/relative/role model/tutor) involvement.
- Compare results to non-Project READ participants.
### Focus for Improvement: Discipline and Truancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Discipline and Truancy: Increasing academic achievement, graduation rates and positive postsecondary outcomes by keeping students in school.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Current CDE initiatives and supported activities seek to increase attendance and reduce absences due to truancy, suspension, and expulsion. These efforts also address dropout prevention and improving school climate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Assistance to LEAs</td>
<td>The Special Education Division (SED) proposes to partner with the Coordinated Student Support and Adult Education Division to identify LEAs whose rates of dropout, truancy, and suspension and expulsion for students with disabilities significantly exceed the rates of general education population. These LEAs would be offered support to identify the root causes of these concerns through creation of LEA-wide teams that would develop a plan based on evidence-based practices. This will lead to increased student participation in school, and improved outcomes in academic achievement, graduation, and postsecondary employment and education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>Research and achievement data support the assertion that chronic absenteeism negatively impacts academic achievement, graduation rates, and postsecondary outcomes. Data also points to students with disabilities having higher rates of suspension and expulsion in many LEAs throughout California.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Discussion Questions | • How could the SED’s support of the CDE department-wide activities for addressing truancy and discipline issues, assist students with disabilities in increasing their academic achievement, graduation rates, and post school outcomes?  

• How would the SED proposal enhance the CDE’s efforts to improve student outcomes?  

• What else could the SED do to keep more students with disabilities coming to and staying in school? |
**Discussion Questions:**

- How could the SED’s support of the CDE department-wide activities for addressing truancy and discipline issues, assist students with disabilities in increasing their academic achievement, graduation rates, and post school outcomes?
  
  - Law enforcement, courts, and social services should triage and collaborate with schools.

- Plan analysis over the years that we do have of CASEMIS suspension/expulsion and general education data to target which districts need additional tech support, funding, and training for the neediest LEAs.

- Work with Special Education Directors to identify solutions.

- Develop assistance to IEP teams.

- Significant Disproportionality—schools can analyze their data on suspension, truancy, chronic absenteeism. Refer to model SARCs, restorative justice Webinars.

- Build more awareness of the issue which has largely been ignored, thus creating an opportunity to identify and develop for improvement.

- Do not look only at SED’s support of the CDE, but also how could the CDE department wide activities support SED’s efforts to increase academic achievement of students with disabilities.

- How would the SED proposal enhance the CDE’s efforts to improve student outcomes?
- By students being in the classroom more, they learn more, will enjoy going to school, and will perform better

- Helps reduce misunderstanding of behavioral issues which allows room for identifying true causes of suspension/expulsion and helps for solutions
Use of disaggregated data to identify and support students where there is a high number of absences/truancy for special education students

- What else could the SED do to keep more students with disabilities coming to and staying in school?

- More school work apprenticeship programs and ties to attendance: non-disciplined required to work.

- Offer CCSS training to teachers in Special Education. Offer CCSS/SE training to general education teachers.

- Identify what issues are keeping students out of school and see if there are ways that some of the issues can be solved.

- Provide professional development to staff statewide focusing on issues related to students with disabilities, behavior intervention, and availability of resources for students and LEAs.

- Other
  - Data collection

- Training

- Identify resources and assistive devices to help students reach the opportunities of learning

SPP Division Day – Afternoon Breakout
April 14, 2014

Discussion Questions:

- How could the SEDs support of the CDE department-wide activities for addressing truancy
and discipline issues, assist students with disabilities in increasing their academic achievement, graduation rates, and post school outcomes?

- SED should conduct collaborative meetings with the CDE

- Not putting SWD in LRE and keeping them included in the school programs while meeting their needs. Also, keeping in mind—kids that attend NPSs should be treated and assisted in their academic goals just as much as those in the public
- Make sure that IEP teams are aware of any attendance or discipline issues, identify causes, and determine support solutions.

- Support schools in implementing school wide positive behavioral intervention systems.

- How would the SED proposal enhance the CDE’s efforts to improve student outcomes?

- More accountability at the school/district level. Find out why the lack of attendance and come up with strategic plans to address those needs.

- School wide positive behavior intervention systems are likely to improve academic outcomes for all students.

- What else could the SED do to keep more students with disabilities coming to and staying in school?

- Incorporate the SARB program and allot more attendance data to the different monitoring programs/technical assistance.

- Offer more programs for various disabling conditions—not cookie cutter/one size fits all programs.

- Interact, activities, and engage with peers.

- Locate as many services on the school site as possible.
possible; including health services, mental health services, and related services
## Focus for Improvement: California Common Core State Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>CA Common Core State Standards (CA CCSS): Increasing the fidelity of implementation of the CA CCSS leading to increased academic achievement for all students.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td>The CA CCSS are kindergarten – 12th grade educational standards for English language arts (ELA) and math that describe what students should know and be able to do in each subject at each grade level. California is among 45 states to adopt the same ELA and math standards. The SED is currently engaged in efforts to provide resources and training materials to support districts in implementing the CA CCSS specifically related to ensuring access to and support for students with disabilities. SED activities are aligned to the Common Core State Standards Systems Implementation Plan for California. <a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/cc/documents/ccsssysimpplanforcaapr13.doc">http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/cc/documents/ccsssysimpplanforcaapr13.doc</a> As such, the SED is engaged in:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Providing Web-based resources and technical assistance to local education agencies (LEAs) in transitioning from California’s previous academic standards to the CA CCSS including training in IEP academic goals to the CA CCSS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Creating and facilitating a Community of Practice to assist LEAs in the training and professional development of staff related to instructing and supporting students with significant cognitive disabilities in the CA CCSS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Assistance to LEAs</td>
<td>Once assessment and reporting data on CA CCSS aligned statewide assessments is available CDE, SED proposes to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify LEAs needing improvement in meeting State Performance Plan (SPP) indicator targets for student achievement on ELA and math assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop an analysis tool that identified how LEAs would assess the degree and fidelity of their implementation of the CCSS related to educating SWD and the practices associated with supporting them. This would include IEP goal alignment to the CA CCSS, and professional development activities provided for staff related to IEP goal writing, and evidence based instructional practices for teaching the CA CCSS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• As a result of the self-assessment, LEAs would develop and implement an improvement plan leading to increased academic achievement for all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>There is concern that the increased rigor of the CA CCSS will further widen the achievement SWD. Thus, it is imperative that teachers and educational staff in LEAs are prepared to meet the needs of diverse learners including SWD. There will be districts that will not meet either the academic performance indicators in the SPP, or graduation rates and postsecondary outcome targets for the state, and will benefit from access to additional resources, technical assistance, and training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion Questions</td>
<td>How does the CDE’s support and current activities related to the implementation of the CA CCSS ensure SWD have access to the CA CCSS and increased academic achievement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How would the SED proposal enhance CDE’s efforts to improve student outcomes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What else should the SED do to increase academic achievement for students with disabilities in the CA CCSS?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comments from April 14 meeting | SPP Division Day – Morning Breakout  
April 14, 2014  
Discussion Questions: |
|                      | How does the CDE’s support and current activities related to the implementation of the CA CCSS ensure SWD have access to the CA CCSS and increased academic achievement? |
|                      | Information dissemination                                                                                                                                                                           |
|                      | Work with professors on the Higher Education system to ensure that they focus on current practices of special education                                                                                      |
|                      | General Education teachers should have access to accommodations for each standard                                                                                                                                 |
|                      | The continuity of the CCSS would seem to cross the boundaries of Special Education which will help post school outcomes for our students                                                                |
|                      | Webpage—this is a local LEA focus                                                                                                                                                                    |
|                      | A required plan would be a simple solution and also something both the parent and student can follow                                                                                                 |
and/or take with them to other schools

- How would the SED proposal enhance CDE’s efforts to improve student outcomes?

  - We need to look at family issues—attendance, discipline, suspension/expulsion, violence—before we go on.

  - Aligning general education with special education to improve outcomes

Field training on available resources to all educators—District, Charter, NPS
- It seems like there is going to be a need for a lot of outreach or technical assistance to LEAs and more funding, of course, to provide it.

- I like the idea of the self-assessment—will help districts to focus on goals for special education students.

- If using achievement data aligned to AYP/NCLB benchmark, all districts “do not meet” target.

- Better to develop our improvement/growth process of identification.

- What else should the SED do to increase academic achievement for students with disabilities in the CA CCSS?

  - Support District and SELPA efforts.

  - Field Test—Planning, implementation, assessment.

  - Have more of a role in implementation and technical assistance that is meaningful to educators.

  - Provide more direct professional development opportunities for the field.

  - Make sure core is aligned for learning style of SWD.

  - General education and special education should work collaboratively to ensure that special education students have the supports they need to succeed.

  - Linkage with LCAP—this is already underway and focuses on eight areas state priorities. CCSS is a state priority.
SPP Division Day – Afternoon Breakout  
April 14, 2014  

Discussion Questions:  

- How does the CDE’s support and current activities related to the implementation of the CA CCSS ensure SWD have access to the CA CCSS and increased academic achievement?  

  - Provide information at the trainings/parent and staff meetings as consultants go out on VR/SESRs  

  - Develop assessment tool to ID areas of weakness that need improvement—close alignment with IEP goals
IT provides professional development, more accurate assessment, and more reliable data

- Training material, Web site, guides, Community Of Practice work, and symposia
- Increase activities in regards to transition of students from school to work
- Provide avenue for Questions and Answers and provide a speaker forum to answer questions and give resources where they might seek assistance in this new effort
- The appropriate definition of achievement would create success for both the student and the state. I would look at actual student attainment and get away from the vocabulary (i.e. “Community of practice”)
- Reduce paperwork for more time to teach
- Simplify/rework IEP format
- Include SED staff on meetings/workgroups with the divisions that are included in implementing the common core. SED staff can then be a part of a group within the SED to see how the information can be tailored and disseminated to the SED population
- UDL—teacher prep at Institutions of Higher Education

How would the SED proposal enhance the CDE’s efforts to improve student outcomes?

- Build in the UDL principles
- Use special education and regular education to come up with some MTSS
- Webinars to assist staff implement practice testing for students
Follow-up and evaluation

Provide bridges to the CA CCSS and allow more access to things in the general education environment

Stop saying we are measuring assessments; Instead say we are measuring academic achievement as measured by assessment

Paradigm shift: along with graduation rates, dropout rates, and truancy. Start considering LRE (how much time students spend in the general education classroom),
teacher observations, interim assessments, formative assessments, and other

- Tracking data results in information gained to proceed with improvements

- CDE would be pro-active in meeting the community’s needs as well as student needs in more areas than just academic achievement (increase in graduation rates/decrease in suspension and expulsion)

- Student outcome attainment needs to be aligned with BDA under item 17. Use the prior to measure the latter

- Measure student outcomes after they leave school —that’s what a post school outcome is

- Align areas of CC with special education needs.

- What else should the SED do to increase academic achievement for students with disabilities in the CCSS?

  - Ensure that all stakeholder groups, including parents, have some knowledge of standards and instruction in both regular education and special education. All need at least a cursory understanding of CCSS, etc.

  - Join with other divisions that use and collect follow-up surveys, particularly be surveying before graduation, especially Workability students, concerning what was/is helpful for them to be successful in the workplace and in Workability

  - More career skills training for employment

  - Ensure that modifications ad adaptors are carefully and rigorously adhered to

  - Keep discussions open with the field and
stakeholders (to learn what is working and what is not)

• Offer resources that can be used from the bottom up (teacher/parents) and the top down (administrators).

• Include special education teachers in review and discussion of common core activities

Define math and English language arts standards to be attainable by special education students—conjoin CTE and common core in workability
- Write in general standard for flexibility in teaching

- Emphasis on Universal Design to identify learning styles and supports

- Develop a good marketing (PR) plan to reduce anxiety about how/why CCSS is a benefit not something to be feared and resisted
### Tomato

**Focus for Improvement: Multi-Tiered System of Supports**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>California Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS): A Framework for Supporting the Achievement of All Students in the CA Common Core State Standards.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>MTSS, an evolution of California’s RTI², is a framework that utilizes a tiered systems approach to instruction by ensuring all students receive high quality instruction and academic and behavioral support in their Least Restrictive Environment (LRE). This approach relies on the assumption that general education will meet the needs of most students and through a data-driven and targeted system of supports, the exceptional needs of those students who require additional supports will be met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Assistance to LEAs</td>
<td>The California Department of Education (CDE), Special Education Division (SED), would develop a menu of supports for Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) including tools and resources, for LEAs that do not meet the expected academic performance outcomes for students with disabilities and State Performance Plan indicators for Least Restrictive Environment. Some possible supports might include: in depth examination of LEA placement and performance data, review and evaluation of Individualized Education Program placement decision-making, promising models for instruction and support for students with disabilities in all types of educational service settings, and technical assistance provider partnerships. LEAs in need of improvement would be expected to assemble a district wide, multi-disciplinary team to assess and address LEA practices through development and implementation of an LEA-wide plan, which could include an MTSS framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>There are a high number of LEAs that do not meet either the expected academic performance or LRE indicators in the SPP. Research supports implementation of a tiered instructional framework of support has proven successful in increasing academic achievement for all students (Hughes and Dexter, 2011).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion Questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  - How might the CDE’s support for MTSS in California also assist students with disabilities in increasing their academic achievement, graduation rates and post- school outcomes?  
  - How would the SED proposal support and enhance the CDE’s Common Core implementation utilizing a MTSS framework?  
  - What should the SED’s role be in promoting MTSS?  |

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments from April 14 meeting</th>
<th>Considerations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ø Establish a common understanding of what MTSS is for the state, for districts and for schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ø Greater statewide support for PBIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ø Credentialing barriers must be addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Credentials not set up to support all kids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Pre-service training essential (Credentialing program alignment to pedagogy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ø Professional development needed for current teachers in the field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ø Greater acceptance and training for Universal Design for Learning (UDL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Connect importance to both instruction and assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ø Public campaign/proper and wide spread messaging from the CDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Importance of collaborative messaging from general education and special education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Connect to Common Core Standards and assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ø Do not make it another “cart before the horse” initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Plan, adopt and develop resource materials before public campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ø Make MTSS more tangible and less theoretical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Focus on real district/school examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ø Need broad teacher buy-in and training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø Create parent friendly messaging and get parent buy in before implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø Have a clear delineation between MTSS and RTI²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø Train CDE staff and provide them access to materials empowering them to be well versed in explaining MTSS for purposes of technical assistance to districts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø Create statewide professional development and tools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Focus for Improvement: English Language Development Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>English Language Development (ELD) for dual-identified students (English Learners who have IEPs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td>CA ELD Standards align to the California Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and address English language and literacy skills English learners need in key content areas. The goal of the CA ELD Standards is to ensure that English learners acquire full proficiency in English as rapidly and effectively as possible and attain parity with native speakers of English. English Learners who are also identified as students with special needs, no matter what their placement is, require ELD instruction and access to CA CCSS in such a way that they improve their English while gaining access to core subjects. The CDE, SED proposes to identify districts whose population of students with disabilities who are EL is a higher percentage rate than their general education EL population and whose percentage of students identified as Proficient and Advanced on statewide tests are below the statewide SPP target. These districts would be offered assistance to support a self-review of their policies, procedures, and practices for identifying EL students, for developing appropriate IEP goals and to analyze their instructional service delivery practices. The CDE, SED would partner with the EL Division to support district wide teams to plan and implement systemic changes, consistent with the EL standards to support improved outcomes for dually-identified students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale</strong></td>
<td>With approximately 1.3 million English learners in California public schools and approximately 30 percent of them also with IEP. There are districts with as much as 77 percent of their special education population comprised of ELs. A large number of districts do not meet their Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for their EL population. This rate of achievement is even lower for dual-identified students. Coherent effort and collaboration is needed between EL and Special Ed staff at the state, LEA, and school level to ensure dual-identified students receive their ELD, Special Academic Instruction (SAI) concurrently from qualified staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Discussion Questions** | • How would the CDE’s support for English Learner services assist students with disabilities to increase their assessment results, graduation rates and/or post school outcomes?  
• How would the SED proposal enhance CDE’s efforts to improve student outcomes? |
• What other things should the SED do to achieve more specific results?
Comments from April 14 meeting
SPP Division Day – Afternoon Breakout
April 14, 2014
Discussion Questions:

- How can the CDE SED support for ELD services assist students with disabilities in increasing academic achievement, graduation rates and post school outcomes?
  
  - Provide assistance to special education and EL staff and families
  
  - Not having silos in CDE and LEAs
  
  - Concern that we still use the CELDT and it has five levels vs. three that are proposed in the new ELD standards
  
  - Better assessments to distinguish students’ needs due to being EL and/or due to disability
  
  - Common language and common thought
  
  - More cross-work and co-op between different departments
  
- How might the California ELD Standards support students with disabilities in accessing Common Core State Standards in English Language Arts and Literacy?
  
  - A lot has been done with ELD development but a lot still needs to be done
  
  - All special education teachers need to be trained in Common Core State Standards
  
  - Local control funding and accountability program and duel-identified students need more attention
| • One participant’s observation was that high school general education classes are not accessible to special education students due to student’s limited English skills |
| • Other (No comments noted) |
## Focus for Improvement: Family Engagement Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Family Engagement: Increasing student achievement through enhanced efforts to engage families.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>The CDE recognizes the important role family engagement plays in student achievement and positive post-school outcomes. These efforts include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Family Engagement Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Parent/Family - Parents/Family and Community, Engaging Families in RTI², and others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The SED proposes to partner with Title 1 and Title 3 to develop guidance for family engagement across programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The SED would utilize the parent involvement survey to identify districts whose rates of family engagement are significantly low and student outcomes are in need of improvement. These districts would be offered supports to identify the root causes of these concerns through a district-wide team and would develop a plan of evidence-based practices leading to increased parent school collaboration improved outcomes in assessment, graduation and post-secondary employment and education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>There are a number of districts that do not meet Indicator 8 in the SPP and there are legal citations for parent involvement requirements across the CDE programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion Questions</td>
<td>• How would the CDE’s support for addressing family engagement issues assist students with disabilities to increase their assessment results, graduation rates and/or post school outcomes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How would the SED proposal enhance CDE’s efforts to improve student outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What types of supports could the CDE provide districts to increase family engagement for students with disabilities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How could the SED partner with other programs to support family engagement “across the rows”?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix E – Improvement Activities Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CDE Resource or Initiative</th>
<th>Resource Description</th>
<th>Web link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smarter Balanced Digital Library</td>
<td>Provides online, professional development learning opportunities relative to formative assessment strategies, practices, resources and tools, for educators to use in the classroom and tailor instruction to meet the education needs of students to achieve the CCSS in English Language Arts/Literacy and Mathematics</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sa/diglib.asp">http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sa/diglib.asp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smarter Balanced Assessment System</td>
<td>Designed to measure all students’ progress toward college and career readiness in English language arts and mathematics in grade 3 through nine and grade eleven. All students, including students with disabilities, English Language Learners (ELLs), and ELLs with disabilities, are held to the same expectations for participation and performance on state assessments. Specifically, all students enrolled in grades 3-8 and 11 are required to participate in the Smarter Balanced assessment</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sa/">http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sa/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Chalkboard (formerly Brokers of Expertise)</td>
<td>Developed for LEAs to share online tools that are effective with the goal of providing a new level of online connectivity and cohesion across all educator categories and in all regions of California’s education system. The desired outcome is to build educators’ capacity level in using technology while at the</td>
<td><a href="https://www.mydigitalchalkboard.org/">https://www.mydigitalchalkboard.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Start Personnel Development</td>
<td>Provides professional development training to those individuals teaching and working with infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. The online courses provide the foundational knowledge and basic skills early intervention personnel need to serve SWD and their families. The content and learning outcomes are grounded in the comprehensive, evidence-based core curriculum.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ceitan-earlystart.org/training/">http://www.ceitan-earlystart.org/training/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Learning Opportunities Web site</td>
<td>The intention is to develop a statewide infrastructure for professional learning that supports educator/administrator communities and school improvement efforts.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/pd/te/ce/prodev07intro.asp">http://www.cde.ca.gov/pd/te/ce/prodev07intro.asp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS)</td>
<td>A longitudinal student-level data system used to maintain individual-level data including student demographics, course data, discipline, assessments, staff assignments, and other data for state and federal reporting. The Special Education Division (SED) uses the CALPADS data to make calculations related to disproportionality, graduation, and dropouts.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sp/cl/">http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sp/cl/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDE Resource or Initiative</td>
<td>Resource Description</td>
<td>Web link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR)</td>
<td>The STAR database program looks at how well schools and students are performing. The STAR included four tests until 2013-14: the California Standards Tests, the California Modified Assessment, the California Alternate Performance Assessment, and the Standards-based Tests in Spanish. The SED uses the STAR data to make calculations related to the assessment benchmarks, accountability, and Adequate Yearly Progress. The STAR tests in English Language Arts and Mathematics have been replaced with the Smarter Balanced tests in 2014-2015.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sr/">http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sr/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Accountability Progress Reporting System (APR)</td>
<td>A statewide accountability system mandated by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 which requires each state to ensure that all schools and districts make Adequate Yearly Progress. The SED uses the APR data reports, which includes the Academic Performance Index reports, the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) reports, and the Program Improvement reports, to determine educational benefit for students with disabilities.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ar/">http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ar/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DataQuest</td>
<td>An online, dynamic system that provides reports about California’s schools and school districts. It contains a wide variety of information including school performance indicators, student and staff demographics, expulsion, suspension, and truancy information, and a variety of test results. Data are presented so that users can easily compare schools, districts, and counties.</td>
<td><a href="http://data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/">http://data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP)</td>
<td>The CAASPP is California's new statewide student assessment system established January 1, 2014. The Special Education Division in the CDE will use the CAASPP assessment reports to determine educational benefit for students with disabilities.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ca/">http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ca/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Services for Technical Assistance and Training (CalSTAT)</td>
<td>CalSTAT is a special project of the Special Education Division. CalSTAT supports and develops partnerships with schools and families by providing training, technical assistance, and resources to both special education and general education. Activities</td>
<td><a href="http://www.calstat.org/spdgises.html">http://www.calstat.org/spdgises.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in this contract support special education improvement strategies including training in the Common Core and the transition to the new assessments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDE Resource or Initiative</td>
<td>Resource Description</td>
<td>Web link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving Special Education Services</td>
<td>The California Department of Education combined the members of the two former planning groups and created the Improving Special Education Services (ISES) stakeholder group. Approximately two meetings are held per year for the ISES to learn about and discuss SPDG updates as well as the SSIP. Bi-annually this broad based, selected, stakeholder group meets to review progress on state indicators, initiatives, and activities while making recommendations to the CDE.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.calstat.org/spdgises.html">http://www.calstat.org/spdgises.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG)</td>
<td>In 2012, California was awarded a five-year, $10,000,000 federal grant to improve outcomes for students. The new SPDG supports the teaching of reading by using evidence-based professional development for school staff of middle school students with disabilities. This support will take place in 44 competitively selected middle school sites in &quot;high need&quot; districts in California.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.calstat.org/sig.html">http://www.calstat.org/sig.html</a> <a href="http://caspdg.org/">http://caspdg.org/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| State Improvement Grant | The SIG supports improving special education services in numerous areas:  
- Quality and number of teachers and other personnel who work with students with disabilities  
- Coordination of services for students with disabilities  
- Behavioral supports available for students with disabilities  
- Academic outcomes, especially in the area of literacy  
- Participation of parents and family members  
- Collection and dissemination of data | http://www.calstat.org/sig.html |
<p>| Project Read | The purpose of Project READ, a unique, collaborative, evidence-based project targeting personnel development (PD), is to increase the reading achievement and academic outcomes of middle school students with disabilities from low-performing middle schools throughout | <a href="http://www.calstat.org/projectread.html">http://www.calstat.org/projectread.html</a> |
| Quality Assurance Process | Resources to improve educational outcomes for students with disabilities while ensuring compliance with state and federal laws and regulations. | <a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/qa/">http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/qa/</a> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CDE Resource or Initiative</th>
<th>Resource Description</th>
<th>Web link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CDE Services and Resources Website</strong></td>
<td>This Web site contains information on programs and services available to students with disabilities, including publications, training and technical assistance opportunities, and recruitment resources and materials. It also constitutes public reporting, data awareness, and data utilization for best practice efforts and is part of the obligation for the general supervision system under IDEA.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/sr/#srinf">http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/sr/#srinf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training and Technical Assistance Collaborative (TTAC)</strong></td>
<td>Composed of members from the federal, state, and local levels that share information on training efforts to increase the capacity of early childhood educators working with the special needs of SWD in a variety of service systems. A key mission of the collaborative is to build relationships and nurturing trust among TTA leaders in support of coordination and collaboration in planning and implementing early childhood/early intervention training and technical assistance activities.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wested.org/project/training-and-technical-assistance-collaborative/">http://www.wested.org/project/training-and-technical-assistance-collaborative/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Working Together for Inclusion and Belonging</strong></td>
<td>Collaboration among early childhood educator providers. The group combined efforts to offer technical assistance, professional development, other resources that address inclusive practice, promotion of healthy social-emotional development, and prevention of challenging behavior in early childhood, after-school, and in other education settings.</td>
<td><a href="http://cainclusion.org/">http://cainclusion.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foster Youth Services Programs</strong></td>
<td>Provide support services to foster children who suffer the traumatic effects of displacement from family and schools and multiple placements in foster care. Ensure that health and school records are obtained to establish appropriate placements and coordinate instruction, counseling, tutoring, mentoring, vocational training, emancipation services, training for independent living, and other related services. FYS programs increase the stability of placements for foster children and youth. These services are designed to improve the students’ educational performance and personal achievement, directly benefiting them as well as providing long-range cost savings to the state.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/pf/fy/">http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/pf/fy/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDE Resource or Initiative</td>
<td>Resource Description</td>
<td>Web link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The Education Liaison Model | The Education Liaison Model is a comprehensive interagency program to support social workers in obtaining appropriate educational services for children in the foster care system. It is a research-based program that is designed to support the goals of the California Child Welfare Redesign as well as AB 490 and:  
• Places education liaisons in the offices of County Departments of Children and Family Services  
• Provides ongoing training and support to social workers in identifying educational barriers to learning and fashioning effective solutions  
• Provides training and technical assistance to the education liaisons so they have expertise to resolve a wide-range of complex educational problems brought to them by social workers. | [http://www.mhas-la.org/Ed%20Liaison%20Model-Main.pdf](http://www.mhas-la.org/Ed%20Liaison%20Model-Main.pdf) |
| CDE Resiliency and Youth Development Web Page | Resources supporting individual and community resilience including:  
• Fostering Resilience in Children  
• Resiliency: What We Have Learned  
• Resilience and Youth Development Module (RYDM)  
• Turning the Corner: From Risk to | [http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/ym/resiliencyandyd.asp](http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/ym/resiliencyandyd.asp) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homeless Children and Youth Education</th>
<th>Resources to assist youth who lack a fixed, regular, and adequate residence.</th>
<th><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/hs/cy/">http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/hs/cy/</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title III Language Instruction for Limited English Proficiency Students</td>
<td>Information and resources about the education of LEP students through the Title III federal program. The purpose of the program is to ensure that all LEP students, referred to as English learners in California, attain English proficiency, develop high levels of academic attainment in English, and meet the same challenging state academic standards as all other students.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/t3/lep.asp">http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/t3/lep.asp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDE Resource or Initiative</td>
<td>Resource Description</td>
<td>Web link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRPM Data 2012-13 Unduplicated Student Poverty Data</td>
<td>Downloadable data files pertaining to students eligible for Free or Reduced Price Meals (FRPM). The certified data in this file reflect the unduplicated counts and percentages of students eligible for Free Meals under the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) and the unduplicated counts and percentages of students eligible for Free or Reduced Price Meals (FRPM) under the NSLP.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/sd/filessp1213.asp">http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/sd/filessp1213.asp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Learners and Foster Youth Under the LCFF - FAQ</td>
<td>Frequently asked questions and answers regarding the Local Control Funding Formula as it pertains to English Learners and Foster Youth.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/lg/aa/lc/lcfffaq.asp#EL">http://www.cde.ca.gov/lg/aa/lc/lcfffaq.asp#EL</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I, Part A Low Income Students</td>
<td>Title I, Part A federal funds help to meet the educational needs of low-achieving students in California's highest-poverty schools. Funds are used to support effective, research-based educational strategies that close the achievement gap between high- and low-performing students, and enable the students to meet the state's challenging academic standards. Title I-funded schools are either targeted assistance schools or school wide program schools.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/sw/t1/titleparta.asp">http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/sw/t1/titleparta.asp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I School wide Programs per NCLB</td>
<td>In general, a Title I school may operate as a school wide program only if a minimum of 40 percent of the students in the school, or residing in the attendance area served by the school, are from low-income families. The emphasis in school wide program schools is on serving all students, improving all structures that support student learning, and combining all resources, as allowed, to achieve a common goal. School wide programs maximize the impact of Title I.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/sw/rt/">http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/sw/rt/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDE English Learners Web page</td>
<td>There are many programs and services to help students who do not speak, read, write, or understand English well. There are programs for students, parents, and immigrants. The overall goal of these programs is to improve the English language skills of students. The CDE helps to support EL programs in California.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/">http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDE External English Learner Information Sources</td>
<td>Links to English learner information outside the California Department of Education Web site.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/outsidelinksel.asp">http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/outsidelinksel.asp</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
- 7/1/2016
- Page 222 of 257
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CDE Resource or Initiative</th>
<th>Resource Description</th>
<th>Web link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDE FAQ for English Learners Resources</td>
<td>Frequently Asked Questions regarding English learners in California and appropriate teacher authorizations and links to Web sites with information about developing programs for linguistically and culturally diverse students.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/">http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California English Language Development Test (CELDT)</td>
<td>Students in kindergarten through grade twelve whose home language is not English are required by law to be assessed in English language proficiency (ELP). In California, the ELP assessment is the CELDT.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/el/">http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/el/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English Language Development Standards</strong></td>
<td>The CA ELD Standards Implementation Plan identifies major phases and activities in the implementation of the CA ELD Standards throughout California’s educational system. The plan describes the philosophy of and strategies for the successful integration of the CA ELD Standards that align to the California Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and literacy in History/Social Studies, Science and Technical Subjects (CA CCSS for ELA/Literacy) to address English language and literacy skills English learners need in key content areas. The goal is to serve as a guide of the major steps in the development, adoption, and implementation of the CA ELD Standards for local educational agencies and county offices of education.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/eldstandards.asp">http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/eldstandards.asp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English Learner Compliance Monitoring</strong></td>
<td>Provides evaluation and technical assistance to LEAs to ensure that English learners acquire full proficiency in English as rapidly and effectively as possible, and that English learners meet state standards for academic achievement.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/cr/elmonthome.asp">http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/cr/elmonthome.asp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Core State Standards</td>
<td>Educational standards describe what students should know and be able to do in each subject in each grade. In California, the State Board of Education decides on the standards for all students, from kindergarten through high school. Since 2010, a number of states across the nation have adopted the same standards for English and math. These standards are called the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). Having the same standards helps all students get a good education, even if they change schools.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/cc/index.asp">http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/cc/index.asp</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
or move to a different state. Teachers, parents, and education experts designed the standards to prepare students for success in college and the workplace.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CDE Resource or Initiative</th>
<th>Resource Description</th>
<th>Web link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Common Core Resources for Special Education</strong></td>
<td>This Web site offers resources and guidelines for administrators, teachers, parents, and stakeholders on what the CCSS and the new tests will mean for California students in the Special Education community.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/cc/">http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/cc/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content Standards</strong></td>
<td>Content standards were designed to encourage the highest achievement of every student, by defining the knowledge, concepts, and skills that students should acquire at each grade level.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/st/ss/index.asp">http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/st/ss/index.asp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Quality Commission (formerly known as the Curriculum Development &amp; Supplemental Materials Commission)</strong></td>
<td>The Instructional Quality Commission (IQC), formerly called the Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission, is an advisory body to the California State Board of Education (SBE) on matters related to curriculum, instructional materials, and content standards in accordance with California <em>Education Code</em> Section 33530-33540.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/cc/cd/index.asp">http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/cc/cd/index.asp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clearinghouse for Multilingual Documents</strong></td>
<td>A secure database to assist local educational agency (LEA) staff in locating parental notification documents translated into non-English languages. State and federal laws place expectations upon schools to translate notices sent to the parents of English learners. Through the Clearinghouse, schools can download translated notices for free and modify them to suit local needs. This service helps schools to save time, money, and work efforts. The Clearinghouse is intended for use by schools and districts. If parents want to obtain translations of a school notification, they should contact their child’s school.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/pf/cm/">http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/pf/cm/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CDE SBAC Digital Library</strong></td>
<td>The Smarter Balanced Assessment System has three components: the Summative Assessments, designed for accountability purposes; Interim Assessments, designed to support teaching and learning throughout the year; and the Digital Library, designed to support classroom-based formative assessment processes. The Smarter Balanced Assessment Graphic (PDF) displays the relationship between these components, the Common Core State</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sa/diglib.asp">http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sa/diglib.asp</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standards, and college and career readiness.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CDE Resource or Initiative</th>
<th>Resource Description</th>
<th>Web link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCSS Videos and Archived Presentations</td>
<td>Videos and archived presentations to support the implementation of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS).</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/cc/presentationswebinars.asp">http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/cc/presentationswebinars.asp</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CDE Special Populations Web Page | This page discusses the special populations defined by the federal Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Improvement Act of 2006 (Perkins IV). The CDE follows the Perkins IV mandates to serve special populations and document the achievement of each group to achieve established performance levels. Areas of achievement relate to Career Technical Education program completion, earning twelfth grade diplomas, placement of twelfth graders following program completion, nontraditional program enrollment, and nontraditional career program completion. Special Population includes:  
  - Individuals with disabilities  
  - Individuals from economically disadvantaged families, including foster children  
  - Individuals preparing for nontraditional training and employment  
  - Single parents, including single pregnant women  
  - Displaced homemakers  
  - Individuals with other barriers to educational achievement, including individuals with limited English proficiency | [http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/ct/pk/pops.asp](http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/ct/pk/pops.asp) |
| State Performance Plan Technical Assistance (SPP-TA) Project | The State Performance Plan Technical Assistance Project (SPP-TAP) is funded by the California Department of Education (CDE) through a contract with the Napa County Office of Education (NCOE). The overall purpose of the project is to provide a system of technical assistance for local | [https://spptap.org/](https://spptap.org/) |
| educational agencies (LEAs) working to address performance and compliance problems relating to disproportionality and significant disproportionality. |  |
Appendix F – Best Practice Resources for Student Discipline and Behavior Intervention

CalSTAT
http://www.calstat.org/
California Services for Technical Assistance and Training is a special project of the California Department of Education, Special Education Division, located at Napa County Office of Education.

Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports
https://www.pbis.org/
(OSEP TA Center)
This is a comprehensive site with several resources.

PBIS World
http://www.pbisworld.com/
This is an interactive site, that assumes you have a structure in place. What is neat is that it describes action based on specific behavior, recommending specific practices (interventions).

PBIS Apps
https://www.pbisapps.org/Pages/Default.aspx
Software to assist district in collecting, organizing, and analyzing student discipline data.

RTI Action Network
http://www.rtinetwork.org/learn/behavior-supports
RTI Action Network
http://www.rtinetwork.org/learn/behavior-supports/schoolwidebehavior
(from the National Center on Learning Disabilities)

Florida Department of Education
http://flpdb.fmhi.usf.edu
/ pdfs/Response%20to%20Intervention%20for%20Behavior%20Technical%20Assistance_UPATED_01
Technical assistance paper on response to intervention for behavior.

Responsive Classrooms
http://www.responsiveclassroom.org

State of Washington: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
http://www.k12.wa.us/SpecialEd/Families/pubdocs/bestpractices.pdf


Dignity in Schools Web site:
http://www.dignityinschools.org
Civil Rights Project: UCLA
http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu

Why We Must Reform School Discipline in California

Instead of correcting students’ behavior and making communities and schools safer, the quick removal methods, such as out-of-school suspension and expulsion, deprive students of the chance to receive the education and help that they need, making it more likely that they will drop out of school, enter the criminal justice system, and place their future options in jeopardy. There is a much better way to hold students accountable and keep schools safe.

http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/ss/se/behaviorialintervention.asp

School Attendance Improvement Handbook (PDF)

The School Attendance Improvement Handbook provides strategies to improve school attendance for teachers and school principals.


Present, Engaged, and Accounted For

This document focuses on the critical importance of addressing chronic absence in the early grades.

http://www.nccp.org/publications/pub_837.html

2012 School Attendance Review Boards Handbook (PDF)

The handbook provides information on establishing a School Attendance Review Board (SARB); identifies behavioral patterns of problem students; gives helpful hints on how to work with students and their parents or guardians; suggests by-laws and standing rules; identifies effective factors for parent and pupil conferences; lists California compulsory attendance and other related laws; and provides sample letters and forms to petition the Probation Department, Office of the District Attorney, and the courts.


In School + On Track – Attorney General’s 2013 Report on California’s Elementary School Truancy and Absenteeism Crisis

This document focuses on the critical importance of addressing truancy in the elementary grades.

https://oag.ca.gov/truancy

Chronic Absence Forum

Research Articles on Student Discipline:

Students’ Success and Juvenile Justice Involvement. Lexington, KY: Council of State Governments Justice Center.


Appendix G: Divisions of the CDE and How They Serve Students with Disabilities

After School Division:

After School Programs Division (ASD) is committed to the inclusion of students with special needs in the programs they fund. To prepare staff to meet the requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and Section 504 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, a multi-year project titled The California Inclusion Project, or CalServe, was conducted in conjunction with the Napa County Office of Education and concluded in August of 2011. The materials are available on the California After School Resource Center (CASRC) Web site and are available to download free of charge. The ASD supports staff in our programs to acquire the knowledge, skills, abilities, and attitudes to be successful in including all students in after school programs.

Nutrition Services Division:

The Nutrition Services Division (NSD) administers guidance to schools, child care programs, and other community programs to provide healthy meals and snacks to all students, which can include accommodating children with special dietary needs. Feeding students with special dietary needs can present program staff with many new challenges as well as rewards. The guidance put forth from U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) regulations in Title 7, Code of Federal Regulations (7 CFR), sections 15.3(b) and 210.10(g), require food substitutions or modifications in the National School Lunch Program and School Breakfast Program for students whose disabilities restrict their diets.

The NSD is responsible for ensuring that Child Nutrition Programs receive the needed technical assistance to interpret, educate, and implement a successful nutrition program. In response to increased inquiries, the California Department of Education (CDE), NSD, developed Management Bulletin USDA-CNP-03-2013, available on the CDE Guidelines for Accommodating Children with Special Dietary Needs in Child Nutrition Programs Web page at [http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/nu/sn/mbcnp072014.asp](http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/nu/sn/mbcnp072014.asp).

For further information, please contact Lori Porter, Child Nutrition Consultant, Southern School Nutrition Programs Unit, by e-mail at lporter@cde.ca.gov or by phone at 916-322-1454.

Services for Administration, Finance, Technology, and Infrastructure Branch

School Facilities and Transportation Services Division:

The School Facilities and Transportation Services Division advises and assists districts in ensuring that the design of school buildings supports the Least Restrictive Environment for students with special needs. California Code of Regulations, Title 5, requires special day classes be dispersed throughout the campus and have classrooms that are at least the same size as classrooms used for general education. CDE has worked closely with stakeholders to develop processes to encourage districts...
to early in the planning process involve County Offices of Education and Special Education Local Planning Areas to consider the need for county run programs.

“A School for Everyone--School Design to Support the Inclusion of Students with Disabilities” provides a number of areas districts and school designers should look at in the design of new schools and the remodeling of existing schools. [https://www.njcdd.org/initiatives/inclusive-education/127-school-is-for-everyone](https://www.njcdd.org/initiatives/inclusive-education/127-school-is-for-everyone)

The Office of School Transportation provides education to school bus trainers. These CDE certified trainers provide direct instruction to bus drivers and the CDE offers a specialized training class on transporting students with medical conditions and other special needs.

**Instruction and Learning Support Branch**

**Career and College Transition Division:**

The California Career Resource Network (CalCRN) program provides free online career exploration and planning resources for students with disabilities that are utilized for Workability and other special education programs to complete required career assessments, and help develop IEPs and Transition Plans. One key resource is the California CareerZone found at: [http://www.cacareerzone.org](http://www.cacareerzone.org). For further information on CalCRN, please contact John Merris-Coots by phone at (916) 324-8151, or by e-mail at jmerris@cde.ca.gov.

The Division also provides a “Disabilities” in the Challenges section of the CA Career Center at [http://www.calcareercenter.org/Home/Content?contentID=243](http://www.calcareercenter.org/Home/Content?contentID=243). These resources help students with disabilities with career and college planning.

Lastly, the CCT Division receives $119 million of federal funds through the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Improvement Act which requires all LEAs to provide special accommodations to any special education student enrolled in a career technical education course with some type of physical or mental disability. For further information on this matter, please contact Dr. Mary Gallet by phone at (916) 445-5723, or by e-mail at mgallet@cde.ca.gov.

**Child Development Division:**

The Child Development Division (CDD) encourages the inclusion of children with disabilities or other special needs in early childhood classrooms. In 2009 CDD published a handbook called *Inclusion Works*. The purpose of this 95 page publication is to help child care providers learn strategies that promote inclusion and a sense of belonging for all children including those with disabilities or other special needs.

The CDD quality improvement funded Web site called [MAP to Inclusion and Belonging](http://www.cainclusion.org/camap/index.html) links to a wealth of resources.
for educators and families with a focus on resources that support the development of persons with disabilities.

An additional CDD resource is the California Inclusion and Behavioral Consultation Network (CIBC) [http://www.cibc-ca.org/](http://www.cibc-ca.org/). This is a network of experienced, local consultants who provide on-site consultation to build the capacity of programs and providers to respond effectively to students with special needs or challenging behaviors. Consultants have knowledge of relationship-based practices and community resources and are skilled in problem-solving issues around inclusion and challenging behaviors.

**Professional Learning Support Division:**

The Professional Learning and Support Division (PLSD) strengthens and deepens educators’ abilities to increase the academic, social, and emotional growth of students with disabilities. The PLSD provides statewide professional learning opportunities, leadership training, and technical support to administrators and teachers through seminars, conferences, online courses, Web sites, publications, research, legislative action, and collaboration with outside agencies on the topics of Common Core State Standards (CCSS), Universal Design for Learning, Response to Instruction and Intervention, and differentiated learning. The CCSS Professional Learning Modules featured on the CDE’s Brokers of Expertise Web site integrate instructional strategies for supporting students with disabilities throughout each of the nine modules.

**English Learner Support Division:**

The Language Policy and Leadership Office and The Migrant Education Program Office conduct on-site and online reviews of local educational agencies (LEAs) to ensure they receive a program of English language development and progress toward meeting their academic goals 1) by reviewing IEP, and 2) ensuring their teachers are prepared and authorized to provide the required services to these students. Part of the scope of the review also encompasses an analysis of practice to ensure that students who are identified in the IEP receive testing accommodations and modifications. Finally, dual identified English Learners with disabilities who met the LEAs reclassification process and criteria are reclassified in a timely manner.

**Curriculum Frameworks and Instructional Materials Division:**

Proudly provides specialized formats of instructional materials in braille, large print, audio, and various file formats.

Curriculum Frameworks contain a chapter on Universal Access.

Publishers of adopted instructional materials must provide digital files so that the state can provide accessible versions.
Repositories such as the National Instructional Materials Access Center (NIMAC) – publishers provide files to be used to convert to accessible digital version depending on the need of the qualified student.; LOUIS - the national repository of files created as braille, large print, and audio for students with vision disabilities; Bookshare; and Learning Ally provide qualified students with digital files needed for access.

**District, School, and Innovation Branch**

The District, School and Innovation Branch promotes programs which improve student achievement. Programs include the state-wide student assessment called the California Measurement of Academic Performance and Progress (CalMAPP), school and district interventions, federally funded educational programs, state and federal accountability, educational data collection and reporting, and charter schools.

The District, School and Innovation Branch is diligently working toward the implementation of the CalMAPP state-wide assessment system. The Smarter Balanced assessment, a CalMAPP assessment for students in grades 3 through 8 and grade 11, provides accessibility to students with disabilities by designing, from the beginning, universal tools, designated supports, and accommodations into the testing experience for all students. CalMAPP will provide computer based testing to allow students with disabilities, including English learner students with disabilities, greater accessibility to test items by providing a broader variety of accommodations and supports that were not previously available through pencil and paper tests.

**Analysis, Measurement and Accountability Reporting Division:**

The mission of Analysis, Measurement, and Accountability Reporting Division (AMARD) is to calculate and publicly report data for a variety of accountability purposes. These data reports are used for state accountability known as the Academic Performance Index (API) and federal accountability known as Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). AMARD also produces data for parents and school communities within the School Accountability Report Card (SARC) and a new School Quality Snapshot (SQS) which highlights a select amount of data in an attractive, visual, two-page format. Data is also produced by AMARD for the general public through DataQuest, a Web page that features multiple types of data by school, district, county, and statewide reports.

**School Quality Snapshots**

In October, AMARD released its second annual release of a school report that will provide parents, teachers, administrators, board members, parent and teacher organizations, site council members, and other educational stakeholders with a snapshot of school data in a format that is easy to read and understand. This two-page report for each school highlights multiple years of data for schools in an attractive, visual format. The 2012–13 School Quality Snapshot (SQS) report graphically displays comparative school, local educational agency (LEA), and state data for various accountability, demographics, and school climate indicators. For those with special needs, the SQS displays the data in a tabular format via the CDE’s Web site that will
allow visual impaired users to utilize a screen reader which will read the data to the user.
State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities
A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

Statement
This document is the third of five sections that constitute Phase I of California’s State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The SSIP is a new requirement of the U.S. Department of Education and serves as the centerpiece for implementation of the Office of Special Education Programs’ (OSEP) initiative entitled “Results Driven Accountability,” which is its effort to focus more on student performance in the overall system of the state’s general supervision of local educational agencies (LEAs). Phase I is intended to provide a detailed analysis of data and state infrastructure that will guide the selection of coherent improvement strategies to increase the state’s capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs to improve measurable results for students with disabilities (SWD). While this section is being presented as an independent document in this item, it is meant to be considered in the context of OSEP’s overall instructions and is best read in concert with the other SSIP sections presented in this item. This section describes the State Identified Measureable Result (SIMR) that California has selected to measure changes in student academic performance over time. Based on OSEP’s instructions for this element, it is aligned to a State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) indicator (Indicator 3), is clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, and is a child-level outcome.

Overview
Stakeholder recommendations developed in the Infrastructure Analysis were of great value to CDE special education staff in identifying the most appropriate measure to serve as California’s SIMR. The recommendation to focus on the LCFF and LCAP to drive improvement efforts in California’s SSIP led to the determination that the state’s SIMR should measure the impact of improvement activities on students targeted by the LCFF and LCAP. Specifically:

- LCFF and LCAP focus on three specific high-needs student groups: 1) English Learners; 2) Students eligible for free and reduced-price meals; and 3) foster youth
- Students with disabilities (SWD) are represented in higher percentages among these groups than in the general student population, so efforts to improve educational outcomes for these groups of students will have a relatively large impact on the performance of SWD
- An effective measure of the effect of California’s SSIP will be changes in performance of SWD who are also part of one or more of the student groups targeted by the LCFF and LCAP

Based on these findings, CDE staff and SSIP stakeholders concluded that the most appropriate measure to serve as California’s SIMR will be the number of students who are SWD and also English Learners, eligible for free and reduced-price meals, and/or foster youth who score proficient or above on California’s statewide assessments. This SIMR was identified as the most closely related to the improvement strategies and activities identified in California’s SSIP, and meets OSEP’s criteria for a state’s SIMR.
As described in the Data Analysis and Infrastructure Analysis Sections, special education division (SED) staff met with stakeholders and staff from other program divisions within the California Department of Education (CDE) to review student and LEA performance data and the elements of California’s education infrastructure to determine the most effective means to improve the academic performance of SWD. Additionally, due to the statewide emphasis on these subgroups, this performance data is considered the most appropriate data to be used to serve as California’s SIMR, to measure current student performance, and changes in student performance over the years in which this SSIP is to be implemented. However, California considered several potential measures for its SIMR, including:

- The frequency of suspensions and expulsions: The state’s goal would be to reduce the number of these discipline events, thereby increasing students’ access to instruction in the core curriculum.
- Graduation rate: The state’s goal would be to increase graduation rates, a student-level measure that would indicate improved outcomes for SWDs.
- Scores on statewide academic assessments: The state’s goal would be to improve the performance of SWDs on these assessments over time, another measure that would clearly indicate improved outcomes for SWDs.

In analyzing the viability of each of these potential SIMRs, the CDE staff and stakeholders reached the following conclusions:

- Suspensions and Expulsions: As evidenced in both special education and general education data, LEAs in California have been reducing the number of suspensions and expulsions over the last several years based on the premise that more class time will improve student performance. The stakeholders in the SSIP group felt that this trend was something that should anchor the SSIP. However, over time and through interaction with the Office of Special Education Programs and their technical assistance centers, it was made clear that suspension and expulsions were not acceptable measures to report to OSEP for a SIMR, and that the CDE should consider alternatives. Based on information provided by OSEP, the CDE determined that the only options for a SIMR were graduation and assessment.
- Graduation rates: Based on an analysis of the LEAs in California, approximately 500 LEAs serve elementary students only and thus do not have graduates. Therefore scaling up of the SSIP with graduation as a SIMR would prove problematic.
- Scores on statewide assessments: Based on OSEP’s requirements, the CDE staff and stakeholders concluded that among potential SIMRs California considered, only student statewide assessment results was a viable option. This was confirmed by the frequently asked questions (FAQs) disseminated to the states by the IDEA Data Center on December 1, 2014:

As discussed above, the SIMR must be a child-level, measurable result that improves child outcomes. The “compliance indicators” measure compliance but do not measure child outcomes. This includes the compliance indicators under Part C (1, 7, and 8) and Part B (9, 10, 11, 12, and 13). In addition, there are some “results indicators” that are not appropriate to use as a SIMR, since the indicators do not measure improvement in child outcomes.

Topics that would not be acceptable, stand-alone SIMRs include those related to the following results indicators:
For Part C:
Indicator 2–natural environments
Therefore, California narrowed its selection of a SIMR for SWD to student results on statewide assessments, specifically, the number of students who score proficient or above on those assessments. Further, based on the SSIP infrastructure analysis and California’s selection of improvement strategies that focus on English Learners (ELs), students in poverty, and foster youth, California has selected its SIMR to be measured by proficiency results for the subgroups of special education students who are also ELs; low-income, defined by student’s eligibility for free and reduced-price meals (FRPM); and foster youths. As noted in previous sections, these selected subgroups of students are also those used to generate the supplemental and concentration grants for LEA funding, and are the student subgroups that are the state’s funding focus.

Because California has chosen to improve the assessment proficiency scores for the subgroups noted above, (thereby aligning the SSIP and the states funding focus), the SSIP federal fiscal year (FFY) 2013 baseline data and targets are different from the statewide baseline data and targets for Indicator 3 of the SPP/APR.

These selected subgroups include approximately 60 percent of the special education population in California. Also, the data analysis conducted by the CDE demonstrated that poverty seemed to be the strongest negative correlate with assessment scores. Similarly, assessment results for ELs and foster youth tend to fall below assessment outcomes for other students. Therefore, by targeting improvement strategies for this population, California can anticipate an increase in student proficiency on the statewide assessment represented in Indicator 3.

The specific formula California intends to use for its SIMR is as follows:

Number of EL SWD proficient or above on statewide assessments  
+ number of SWD eligible for FRPM proficient or above on statewide assessments  
+ number of SWD in foster care proficient or above on statewide assessments  

(All EL SWD + All SWD eligible for FRPM + All SWD in foster care)

This single result is a child-level indicator that will likely have a strong impact on Indicator 3. The CDE staff and stakeholders involved in this process are confident that improved results for this subgroup of students will effectively influence improved proficiency levels on statewide assessments for all students with disabilities in California.
Improvement Plan (SSIP). The SSIP is a new requirement of the U.S. Department of Education and serves as the centerpiece for implementation of the Office of Special Education Programs’ (OSEP) initiative entitled “Results Driven Accountability,” which is its effort to focus more on student performance in the overall system of the state’s general supervision of local educational agencies (LEAs). Phase I is intended to provide a detailed analysis of data and state infrastructure that will guide the selection of coherent improvement strategies to increase the State’s capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs to improve measureable results for students with disabilities. While this section is being presented as an independent document in this item, it is meant to be considered in the context of OSEP’s overall instructions and is best read in concert with the other SSIP sections presented in this item. California’s “Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies” explains how the improvement strategies were selected, the logic and alignment with general education strategies, and how the strategies will improve the state infrastructure to support LEA implementation of effective, evidence-based practices to improve delivery of instruction and other supports, leading to the improved academic performance of their students.

Overview

Stakeholder perspective and expertise was critical to California’s selection of the improvement strategies to be incorporated in the state’s SSIP. Staff from general education divisions in the California Department of Education (CDE) informed SSIP stakeholders and CDE special education staff about current state general education initiatives that support all students, and others that focus on the specific student groups that are targeted by the LCFF and LCAP. This allowed SSIP stakeholders to identify an array of student support services that California makes available to LEAs, all of which can support the improved student outcomes that are to be measured by the state’s SIMR. In reviewing these supports, stakeholders identified themes under which the supports could be organized, which resulted in the identification of three general strategies for improvement with the potential to positively impact student performance statewide:

- Student engagement (supported by increased time in class through reduced absences)
- Student discipline (decrease suspensions and expulsions)
- Access to, and instruction in, the California Common Core State Standards

Internal and external stakeholders assisted in identifying specific support initiatives and activities that address these areas and are accessible to LEAs. In total, these supports provide a menu of resources from which LEAs can select to address their local goals and foci for improvement.

In addition to identifying the state’s general improvement strategies and specific support resources, stakeholders provided input concerning the best approach for California to take in establishing a structure for the implementation of its support strategies. Stakeholders noted that differences in local contexts and needs would require the ability for LEAs to self-select the support resources most appropriate to their current conditions. The CDE staff added that the support structure should allow for increasing state involvement in LEA improvement activities in those cases in which student performance was not improving at an acceptable pace. This combination of characteristics needed for an effective statewide structure to support LEA improvement led the CDE staff to propose a multi-tiered support structure, at which the first level would provide an array of resources from which LEAs would self-select those that best met their current needs, and subsequent levels would involve increasing state support to LEAs in creating their local improvement plans. The highest level of this support structure would involve state intervention through direct involvement in LEA improvement planning activities.

Once California set the focus of its SSIP on LCFF and LCAP-related activities, the stakeholders and CDE staff analyzed the alignment between the state’s three selected improvement strategies and the state’s criteria for LCAP contents, the eight LCAP priority areas. This analysis identified a strong connection between the SSIP strategies and LCAP priority areas, confirming that SSIP improvement activities will be supportive of LCAP priorities, and that consequently the state’s SSIP design will effectively support the
outcomes that the LCAP intends, which will result in the improved performance of California’s SWD, as will be measured by the SIMR.

Given California’s selection of its coherent improvement strategies, its scale-up phase may not resemble that of some other states. Rather than having a limited number of improvement activities that begin in a few LEAs and eventually expand to statewide implementation, California intends to implement its first phase of improvement activities statewide from the start, in the form of providing the first level of its multi-tiered improvement strategy structure. The scale-up will involve building the higher levels of the state’s support structure so that they are in place when LEAs that do not meet improvement goals are identified for more substantial state involvement in developing local improvement activities. More detail regarding how the CDE will interact with LEAs in all tiers of the support structure will be provided in California’s Phase II SSIP submission.

Process and Outcomes

The California Department of Education (CDE) completed its process for selecting coherent improvement strategies following a thorough data analysis, analysis of statewide infrastructure, and selection of the state identified measurable result (SIMR). This environmental scan began with current CDE level initiatives being implemented, then was expanded to include all the state level education initiatives. These CDE initiatives, described in the analysis of state infrastructure section, included middle school reading (Project READ); English Learner state standards; family engagement; implementation of the California Common Core State Standards (CA CCSS); suspension and expulsion; and improved implementation of least restrictive environment (LRE) placements. This expanded statewide scan incorporated a review of the local control funding formula (LCFF) and local control accountability plan (LCAP). The SSIP stakeholders examined these initiatives to determine the efficacy as improvement strategies. Through this analysis, the CDE staff and SSIP stakeholders determined that several of these initiatives were limited in potential to fully scale up as coherent improvement strategies. Therefore, the coherent improvement strategies selected to improve the state infrastructure, support LEA implementation, and ultimately increase the capacity of LEAs to improve performance on statewide assessments are student:

- Engagement (supported by increased time in class through reduced absences)
- Discipline (decrease suspensions and expulsions)
- Access to, and instruction in, the CA CCSS.

The SSIP stakeholders selected these strategies because they were confident that these will be most effective in increasing the capacity of LEAs to support students with disabilities (SWD) in improving their academic performance. The SSIP stakeholders also noted that these strategies are most closely linked with the identified root causes for lower SWD performance: lack of attendance; overreliance on suspensions and expulsions; and inadequate access to the CA CCSS and effective instruction.

Moreover, the SSIP stakeholders advised the CDE, Special Education Division (SED), to pay special attention to the needs of students who, in addition to having individualized education programs (IEPs), are also students who are eligible for free and reduced price meals, students who are English Learners (ELs), and students who are foster youth. These student subgroups have historically underperformed relative to the general student population, and are targeted for additional funding support through the LCFF, and for additional instructional support and services through the LCAP. In light of the subgroup overlap that occurs between students with disabilities and ELs (23 percent of ELs are also students with disabilities), socioeconomically disadvantaged students (14 percent of students in poverty are also students with disabilities), and foster youth (33 percent of foster youth are also students with disabilities), it is important to recognize how supports and services might work in a complementary, coordinated manner to improve performance for all students, particularly these identified subgroups. While the selected coherent improvement strategies will provide supports to improve the performance of all students, implementation
will include a specific focus on the three student subgroups targeted by the LCFF, and the SWDs that represent a large portion of these subgroups. (See additional references, page 15.)

Rationale Supporting the Coherent Improvement Strategies

Student Engagement: Improved Attendance

The CDE selected student engagement supported by increased time in class through reduced absences as one of the coherent improvement strategies because research shows that increased time in class leads to student progress. In the 2008 report *Present, Engaged and Accounted For*, authors Chang and Romero concluded that chronic early absence adversely affects academic success for students showing the negative consequence of spending less time on task. The following quote from *Present, Engaged, and Accounted For: The Critical Importance of Addressing Chronic Absence in the Early Grades*, captures the intent of increasing student engagement as a coherent improvement strategy.

> Going to school regularly in the early years is especially critical for children from families living in poverty, who are less likely to have the resources to help children make up for lost time in the classroom.  *(page 3, 2008)*

Student Discipline: Reduced Suspensions and Expulsions.

Student discipline (decreased suspensions and expulsions) was selected to address student behavior and student academic performance based on the data analysis that showed a strong negative correlation (Pearson’s r = -.86) between suspensions and expulsions. In addition, new research in the December 2014 issue of the *American Sociological Review*, students attending schools with high suspension rates have lower test scores, even if they are not the students being suspended. This analysis and supporting research indicated that using other disciplinary methods besides suspension and expulsion for student misbehavior would be an intervention that would strengthen student success. This strategy is similar to student engagement; keeping students in school improves student outcomes. The SSIP stakeholder group believed that overuse of suspensions and expulsions is one of the critical areas to address as suspensions and expulsions directly affect student achievement. Focusing on student discipline as a coherent improvement strategy will include both raising awareness of the benefits of reducing these measures, and providing LEAs resources to address this issue.

Access to, and Instruction in, the California Common Core State Standards (CA CCSS):

The third selected coherent improvement strategy is improved access to, and instruction in, the CA CCSS. The implementation of the CA CCSS has statewide implications, based on public policy to approve these standards for use with all students, including SWD. There are two components to this strategy. The first component is access for SWD to the general education curriculum and education with their same-aged peers. Research indicates that ensuring access for SWD to the same standards and quality of instruction as their general education peers positively correlates with increased achievement for SWDs. By providing LEAs with resources and guidance to improve such access for SWDs, the CDE will provide effective assistance toward this end (See page 6). The second component is improving the quality of instruction that is provided to SWDs. The CDE will support this strategy by providing LEAs with guidance and resources on effective instructional strategies and structures such as Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and Multi-tiered System of Supports (MTSS). (See Evidence-Based Practices, Coherent Implementation Strategy: Access, pages 6–8.)

The SSIP stakeholders recommended the selection of these specific strategies because they strongly believed that focus on student engagement; discipline; and access to, and instruction in, the CA CCSS as coherent improvement strategies will lead to measurable improvement in academic performance and proficiency on statewide assessments for SWD. In addition, the SSIP stakeholders recommended that these
comprehensive improvement strategies be deployed in a flexible, district-specific way. SSIP stakeholders had observed that California has a diverse population, system of local control, and differences in LEA sizes and grade ranges, thus a “one-size-fits-all” solution would not be appropriate. Any improvement strategies would need to be flexible enough to allow LEAs to implement local improvement plans to support achieving performance goals. The coherent improvement strategies selected provide the necessary flexibility to effectively apply to California LEAs’ diverse circumstances.

Evidence-Based Practices Supporting the Coherent Improvement Strategies

As part of the infrastructure analysis and the selection of the coherent improvement strategies, the SSIP stakeholders conducted a process of identifying evidence-based practices that support the coherent improvement strategies. In selecting the improvement strategies, the CDE and its stakeholders identified evidence based practices that would be useful under each of the coherent improvement strategies selected to be part of the SSIP below:

- Student engagement
- Student discipline
- Access, to and instruction in, the CA State Standards and the CCSS

There are numerous views on what constitutes an “evidence-based practice.” From the most conservative standpoint, an evidence-based practice is a strategy, intervention, or activity that has undergone randomized controlled trials or studies that are well-designed and implemented to show effectiveness in a school setting or classroom, and is peer-reviewed. The research supports that the activity was effective in producing positive outcomes for students. A more practical view of the term was espoused in Identifying Educational Practices Supported by Rigorous Evidence: A Guide to the Selection of Evidence-Based Practices (Regional Resource Center Program, 2015: http://www.rrcprogram.org/cms2/images/_rrcpdata/documents/EBP_RRCP16Apr14.pdf) In examining potential effective strategies, the SSIP stakeholders accessed this valuable resource, which provided the following definition:

… evidence-based practices means delivering services to students (clients) in ways that integrate (a) best available evidence from data, research, and evaluation; (b) professional wisdom gained from experience; and (c) contextual knowledge of the particular classroom, school, district, or state that might impact the design or implementation.

While many of the practices considered and discussed below meet the more conservative definition of “evidence-based practice,” all meet the more practical definition provided above.

Evidence-based Practices

The tables below contain examples of evidence-based practices supporting each of the coherent improvement strategies. The SSIP stakeholder group reviewed each of these practices, describing the alignment of the evidence-based practices to a coherent improvement strategy and providing a rationale for why the evidence-based practice was considered an evidence-based practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence-based Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coherent Improvement Strategy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Engagement:</strong> Pertains to issues such as: school attendance rates, chronic absenteeism rates, middle school dropout rates, high school dropout rates, and high school graduations rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources and Links</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ALAS study found potentially positive effects on both staying in school and on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ALAS met the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ALAS met the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) evidence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evidence-based Practices

**Coherent Improvement Strategy**

**Student Engagement**: Pertains to issues such as: school attendance rates, chronic absenteeism rates, middle school dropout rates, high school dropout rates, and high school graduations rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources and Links</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>progressing in school at the end of the intervention (ninth grade). <a href="http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/interventionreport.aspx?sid=22">http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/interventionreport.aspx?sid=22</a></td>
<td>standards. This study included 94 high-risk Latino students entering seventh grade in one urban junior high school in California. The study examined the program’s effects on whether students stayed in school and progressed in school. These outcomes were measured at the end of the intervention (ninth grade) and two years after the intervention had ended (11th grade).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Present, Engaged, and Accounted For**

This document focuses on the critical importance of addressing chronic absence in the early grades. [http://www.nccp.org/publications/pub_837.html](http://www.nccp.org/publications/pub_837.html)

**School Attendance Improvement Handbook**


The purpose of this handbook is to provide resources and strategies that address approaches to improve student attendance for LEAs. This handbook contains activities that have been validated as having positive results. The authors provide data from the United States Department of Education, and studies conducted at the local level, to validate the inclusion of the practices and models selected to improve attendance.
**Evidence-based Practices**

**Coherent Improvement Strategy**

**Student Discipline:** Pertains to issues such as: Pupil suspension rates; pupil expulsion rates; other local measures including surveys of pupils, parents, and teachers on the sense of safety and school connectedness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources and Links</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS)**  
OSEP Technical Assistance Center  
http://www.pbis.org/ | Gives schools capacity-building information and technical assistance for identifying, adapting, and sustaining effective school-wide disciplinary practices. The site provides research-based information about PBIS in schools at the primary, secondary, and tertiary levels; within communities; and in families. |
| **Reducing Behavior Problems in the Elementary School Classroom**  
What Works Clearing House Webinar  
http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/multimedia.aspx?sid=1 | The guide provides five recommended evidence-based practices (EBPs) to help elementary school educators and school and district administrators develop and implement effective prevention and intervention strategies, supported by research studies that promote positive student behavior. Produced by the National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, under contract with the What Works Clearinghouse. |
| **How We Can Fix School Discipline Toolkit**  
Community Toolkit  
http://fixschooldiscipline.org/community-toolkit/ | The **How We Can Fix School Discipline Toolkit** is a step-by-step guide to working together to change harsh discipline rules. More than two decades of research has confirmed that out-of-school suspensions do not improve student behavior and, in fact, often exacerbate it. The Web site links a resource base to EBPs.  
(http://fixschooldiscipline.org/research/) |

---

**Evidence-based Practices**

**Coherent Improvement Strategy**

**Access to, and instruction in, the California State Standards and the Common Core**

**State Standards:** Pertains to issues such as: access to general education curriculum, education with same aged peers, participation in the school community, quality instruction in the state standards, and highly qualified teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources and Links</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Quality Schooling Framework (QSF)**  
http://www.cde.ca.gov/qsf/ | The Quality Schooling Framework (QSF) is the California educator’s destination for |

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence-based Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coherent Improvement Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to, and instruction in, the California State Standards and the Common Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Standards:</strong> Pertains to issues such as: access to general education curriculum, education with same aged peers, participation in the school community, quality instruction in the state standards, and highly qualified teachers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources and Links</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Center on Universal Design For Learning, <a href="http://www.udlcenter.org/aboutudl/udlevidence">http://www.udlcenter.org/aboutudl/udlevidence</a></td>
<td>Timely tools and practices that are EBPs, across ten priority areas, to guide effective planning and instructional decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Applied Special Technology (CAST) UDL professional learning</td>
<td>Universal Design for Learning (UDL) draws from a variety of research including the fields of neuroscience, the learning sciences, and cognitive psychology. It is deeply rooted in concepts such as the Zone of Proximal Development; scaffolding; mentors; and modeling; as well as the foundational works of Piaget, Vygotsky, Bruner, Ross, Wood, and Bloom, who espoused similar principles for understanding individual differences and the pedagogies required for addressing them. This Web page provides multiple EBPs, supported by research, to guide instructional practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS): A framework that aligns Response to Instruction and Intervention with the Common Core State Standards and the systems necessary for academic, behavior, and social success. <a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/mtssdiffinstr.asp">http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/mtssdiffinstr.asp</a></td>
<td>These resources, posted on the CDE Web site, include the following modules addressing MTSS, instructional practices, and interventions in kindergarten through twelfth grade contexts. Annotations help locate needed information quickly. MTSS Core Component Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence-based Practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coherent Improvement Strategy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to, and instruction in, the California State Standards and the Common Core State Standards:</strong> Pertains to issues such as: access to general education curriculum, education with same aged peers, participation in the school community, quality instruction in the state standards, and highly qualified teachers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources and Links</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. MTSS Professional Learning Module Web site <a href="https://www.mydigitalchalkboard.org/portal/default/Content/Viewer/Content?action=2&amp;scId=509627">https://www.mydigitalchalkboard.org/portal/default/Content/Viewer/Content?action=2&amp;scId=509627</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This work is supported by the following research based policy briefs:


| The CDE Web site offers resources for the California State Standards and the Common Core State Standards. This site offers resources and guidelines on what the CCSS and the new tests will mean for California students in the Special Education Community. [http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/cc/](http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/cc/) | Educational standards describe what students should know and be able to do in each subject in each grade. In California, the State Board of Education decides on the standards for all students, from kindergarten through high school. Since 2010, 45 states have adopted the same standards for English and math. These standards are called the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). Having the same standards helps all students receive a good education, even if they change schools or move to a different state. Teachers, parents, and education experts designed the standards to prepare students for success in college and the workplace. This Web site contains references to many EBPs. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Engagement Framework</th>
<th>The Family Engagement Framework is intended to provide guidance to educators, districts, schools, families, and communities as they plan, implement, and evaluate strategies across multiple programs for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A CDE developed toolkit providing district activities, implementation rubrics, and tools for communicating with families. <a href="http://www.wested.org/online_pubs">http://www.wested.org/online_pubs</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Effective family engagement to support student achievement and close the academic achievement gap. The toolkit contains a review of the literature that provides a research base for EBPs included in the toolkit.

### Improvement of the State Infrastructure Through a Tiered System of Supports

The SSIP stakeholders recommended that a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) be used as a framework for meeting the needs of all students. They also recommended that a tiered, MTSS model would serve as an effective framework for delivering improvement strategies to LEAs. In response to this recommendation and recognizing the need for a flexible delivery system, the SED is proposing the use of a tiered system of supports to implement the coherent improvement strategies (student engagement; discipline; and access to, and instruction in, the CA State Standards and the California CCSS) as a statewide structure for the SSIP.

#### Figure 1: Tiered System of Supports

Figure 1 is a graphic depicting the components of the tiered system of supports designed (based on a MTSS framework) to implement the coherent improvement strategies for the SSIP, at the same time supporting the LEAs in implementing local plans and goals.

The tiered system would focus on supports and resources for each of the coherent improvement strategies: student engagement (increased time in class through reduced absences); discipline (reduced discipline events); and access to, and instruction in, the CA State Standards and the CCSS, as described previously:

**Tier I: Core Assistance.** Foundational key effective and evidence-based resources are available for all LEAs to access to support meeting identified goals and priorities at the local level.

**Selection of LEAs:** All LEAs may avail themselves of the resources available in Tier I. CDE staff and
technical assistance facilitators can recommend resources and tools to LEAs.

**Supports:** All resources of effective and evidence-based practices and resources for professional development, training, and technical assistance to inform LEAs practices are available.

**Tier II: Enhanced Assistance:** Provides resources for LEAs who self-select or are in need of technical assistance. At this tier, LEAs will be given technical assistance and resources for program improvement. They will also receive technical assistance from CDE staff, identified facilitators, and CDE contractors.

**Selection of LEAs:** LEAs can self-refer to Tier II or be offered technical assistance by the SED due to multi-year failure to meet SIMR targets; or be referred for assistance by SELPAs or County Offices of Education (COEs).

**Supports:** LEAs are offered technical assistance for improvement and tools to help identify effective remedies to local challenges. These are offered through technical assistance facilitators, contractors, and CDE staff. In addition, all effective and evidence-based practices, professional development, training, and technical assistance resources to inform LEA practices from Tier I are available.

**Tier III: Focused Assistance:** This activity provides assistance directly to LEAs who are identified as not meeting the APR targets and compliance items. Tier III requires an on-site visit from the CDE. LEAs in this tier will be assisted in a program improvement process which takes the LEA through a set of planned activities implemented for the purpose of resolving problems. The program improvement process entails a data and root cause analysis, identification of focus areas, an action plan, and a plan for implementation and sustainability.

**Selection of LEAs:** LEAs are identified by the CDE due to continuing inability to meet targets after obtaining Tier II assistance; identified through SED compliance determinations as needing intervention or substantial intervention; or at the request of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction (SSPI).

**Supports:** On-site visits by the CDE staff to conduct program improvement activities involving data and root cause analysis, identification of focus areas, development of action plans, and plans for implementation and sustainability. Some technical assistance facilitators or contractors may be used to support the process. In addition, all Tier I resources of effective and evidence-based practices and resources for professional development, training, and technical assistance to inform LEA practices continue to be available.
The flexibility of the SSIP through the tiered approach, based on a MTSS framework, supports LEAs in implementing the SSIP coherent improvement strategies as special education resources and supports match other initiatives LEAs are required to accomplish. As described in the Analysis of State Infrastructure section, these CDE initiatives seek to provide LEAs access to resources and supports for setting goals for improvement and implementation of SSIP strategies. This is a logical and prudent way of maximizing efforts to support the success of students, especially students with disabilities, and can be supported by the strategies identified for the SSIP.

**Potential Alignment of the State Systemic Improvement Plan Coherent Improvement Strategies with Local Control Accountability Plan Priorities**

The following table shows the potential alignment of the eight Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP) priority areas with the selected coherent improvement strategies for the SSIP: student engagement; discipline; and access to, and quality instruction in, the CA State Standards and the CCSS. These strategies support LEAs in meeting goals and implementing the coherent improvement strategies. All students are more successful when interventions, supports, and services are in place and LEAs are implementing evidence-based practices to improve outcomes for students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LCAP Priorities</th>
<th>SSIP Coherent Improvement Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority 1: Basic</strong>&lt;br&gt;The degree to which teachers are appropriately assigned and fully credentialed in the subject areas and for the pupils they are teaching; pupils have access to standards-aligned instructional materials</td>
<td>Improvement Strategies:&lt;br&gt;Access to, and instruction in, the CA State Standards and the CCSS&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;The SED will offer technical assistance, support, and monitor LEAs in hiring highly qualified teachers. In addition, recruitment of teachers is supported through the TEACH California Web site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority 2: Implementation of State Standards</strong>&lt;br&gt;Implementation of academic content and performance standards adopted by the State Board of Education for all pupils, including English Learners</td>
<td>Improvement Strategies:&lt;br&gt;In partnership with other CDE divisions, the SED will provide professional development training, online modules, and Web resources to support LEAs in providing standards-aligned instructional materials, training on the development of standards-based IEPs, and aligning to the LCAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority 3: Parent Involvement</strong>&lt;br&gt;Efforts to seek parent input in decision-making and promotion of parent participation in programs for unduplicated pupils and special-needs subgroups</td>
<td>Improvement Strategies:&lt;br&gt;- Access to, and instruction in, the CA State Standards and the CCSS; student engagement (increased time in class through reduced absences)&lt;br&gt;- Student discipline (decreased suspensions and expulsions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 4: Pupil Achievement</td>
<td>Improvement Strategies:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance on standardized tests; score on Academic Performance Index; share of pupils who are college and career ready; share of English Learners that become English proficient; English Learner reclassification rate; share of pupils who pass Advanced Placement exams with a score of three or higher; share of pupils determined to be prepared for college by the Early Assessment Program</td>
<td>Access to, and instruction in, the CA State Standards and the CCSS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In partnership with other CDE divisions, the SED will provide professional development training, online modules, and Web resources to support LEAs in providing standards-aligned instructional materials, training on the development of standards-based IEPs, and aligning to the LCAP</td>
<td>• Student engagement (increased time in class through reduced absences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student discipline (decreased suspensions and expulsions)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority 5: Pupil Engagement</th>
<th>Improvement Strategies:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School attendance rates, chronic absenteeism rates, middle school dropout rates, high school dropout rates, high school graduation rates</td>
<td>Access to, and instruction in, the CA State Standards and the CCSS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student engagement (increased time in class through reduced absences) and discipline (decreased discipline events)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority 6: School Climate</th>
<th>Improvement Strategies:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pupil suspension rates, pupil expulsion rates, other local measures including surveys of pupils, parents, and teachers on the sense of safety and school connectedness</td>
<td>In partnership with other CDE divisions, the SED will provide professional development and Web resources related to school attendance (pupil engagement) and suspension and expulsion rates (school climate). The SED will partner with other CDE divisions and state agencies to align SED activities with general education activities and initiatives aligned to the LCAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources and training addressing pupil engagement and school climate also supports student access to, and instruction in, the CA State Standards and the CCSS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority 7: Course Access</th>
<th>Improvement Strategies:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pupil enrollment in a broad course of study</td>
<td>Access to, and instruction in, the CA State Standards and the CCSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that includes all of the subject areas.</td>
<td>Standards and the CCSS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LCAP Priorities | SSIP Coherent Improvement Strategies
---|---
Priority 8: Other Pupil Outcomes | In partnership with other CDE divisions, the SED will provide professional development training, online modules, and Web resources to support LEAs in providing standards-aligned instructional materials, training on the development of standards-based IEPs, and aligning to the LCAP
Pupil outcomes in the subject areas | The SED will also provide resources to support courses and subject matter frameworks, especially supports for LEAs addressing secondary transition and requiring a course of study for transitioning students

**Implementation and Scale-up**

In preparing for Phase II of the SSIP, the CDE is actively building the state’s capacity to support LEAs in the implementation of evidence-based practices and resources that will lead to measurable improvement in the SIMR.

Phase I has addressed the data analysis; the analysis of state infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity; the SIMR; the selection of coherent improvement strategies; and the theory of action. Currently, the CDE is laying the foundation to build the state’s capacity to support LEAs in implementing and scaling-up evidence-based practices. Phase II will detail steps that will align and leverage improvement plans and initiatives in the state. The Phase II submission will specify how California will support the LEAs in the use and implementation of evidence-based practices to support student success. Lastly, the CDE is developing the evaluation process specifically outlining short-term and long-term objectives to measure the implementation of the SSIP and its impact to assist LEAs in meeting the SIMR.

**Additional References**

- *The Invisible Achievement Gap, Education Outcomes of Students in Foster Care in California’s Public Schools*, PART ONE, by Vanessa X. Barrat, Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning at WestEd, located at [http://www.stuartfoundation.org/docs/default-document-library/the-invisible-achievement-gap-report.pdf?sfvrsn=2](http://www.stuartfoundation.org/docs/default-document-library/the-invisible-achievement-gap-report.pdf?sfvrsn=2)


Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

California SSIP Theory of Action

Infrastructural Development

(a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
(b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
(c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
(d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

(a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
(b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
(c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

Evaluation

(a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
(b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
(c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
(d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State’s progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.
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