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# Introduction

**Instructions**

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State’s systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State’s General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

## Intro - Indicator Data

**Executive Summary**

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 2020-21, instructions were drawn from several sources:  
• California’s 2019-20 Compliance Determination letter and Response Table (June 2021)  
• General Instructions for the SPP/APR  
• SPP/APR Part B Indicator Measurement Table  
In June 2021, the OSEP determined California’s compliance determination was "needs assistance" in implementing the requirements of Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Based on this compliance determination California accessed services provided by the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), including cross-state collaboratives offered on Results Driven Accountability and systems alignment. Based on that support and technical assistance, California is implementing a tiered system of support to its local education agencies (LEAs) who do not meet targets and experience slippage from previous year in assessments, compliance, and other student outcomes. California is also requiring the use of evidence-based practices with its contractors who provide technical assistance to LEAs and expanding Communities of Practice for student outcomes.

**Additional information related to data collection and reporting**

**Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year**

1,600

**General Supervision System:**

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

CDE's General Supervision System is comprised of the following components that function together to meet IDEA Part B requirements.   
  
Data  
CDE has a number of databases for all students that are used in the system of general supervision. CDE’s statewide longitudinal student-level data system is the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System. Parent input data are collected through CALPADS and parent survey through a contract with the Sacramento County Office of Education.   
  
SPP (Performance Reports)  
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 LEAs for review and determination of monitoring activities, identification of statewide and local needs, and provision of technical assistance and professional development. The SPP/APR and related calculations serve as the basis for public reporting of LEAs indicators, LEA annual compliance determinations, and identification of LEAs with significant disproportionality.  
  
Improvement  
CDE makes findings upon identifying LEA noncompliance with a state and federal law or regulation. A finding contains the state’s conclusion that the LEA is noncompliant, the citation of the statute or regulation, and a description of the evidence or occurrence supporting the conclusion of noncompliance.   
Every finding of noncompliance includes a corrective action and all student-level findings of noncompliance require corrective action. All findings of noncompliance require the CDE staff pull additional records and demonstrate that there is a compliance rate of 100 percent for each item as outlined in the 09-02 OSEP memo.  
Corrective actions may be standardized through software, data-based noncompliance, or, they may be individually crafted based on the unique circumstances, as the in the case of NPS reviews, due process hearings and complaints.  
  
Dispute Resolution  
CDE investigates allegations of violations of state and federal Special Education law. Complaint investigators in the Complaints Resolution Unit review initial complaint files and open investigations to address allegations. CDE contracts with the OAH to complete all mediation and due process hearings in accordance with the IDEA.   
CDE additionally provides funds to LEAs through the SELPAs to develop and test procedures, materials, and training to support alternate dispute resolution.  
Implementation of Policies and Procedures  
CDE has procedures in place to review state and federal statutes and regulations and to ensure that state policies and procedures are consistent with the requirements of the IDEA. Additionally, CDE ensures that SELPA, LEAs, 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.  
  
Fiscal Management  
CDE ensures LEAs are properly using Part B funds in accordance with IDEA requirements through the annual financial data processes in the following ways, but not limited to; annual budget and service plan reviews, review of Maintenance of Effort (MOE), expenditure reports, and audits.  
  
Integrated Monitoring Activities  
CDE uses a focused monitoring approach under a tiered monitoring framework. CDE’s framework aligns monitoring activities to the priority areas and ensures the activities address those requirements most closely related to improving educational and functional outcomes.  
Those LEAs whose data do not indicate concerns in the priority areas reflected in the SPP Indicators or other indicators identified as a priority by the CDE will continue to receive universal monitoring. Universal monitoring includes the annual collection and analysis of the LEA’s data by the CDE, as well as general support through the LEA’s access to the State’s resources.  
  
Targeted monitoring is for LEAs that need moderate level support. There are three different selection criteria that may result in the CDE identifying an LEA for targeted monitoring: (1) indicators that identify compliance difficulties; (2) disproportionality; and (3) indicators that identify performance difficulties. LEAs that do not meet specified targets in these particular areas will be identified for additional monitoring. Similarly, there are three different selection criteria that may result in the CDE identifying an LEA for intensive monitoring: (1) due to outcomes for students ages 6 through 21; (2) due to outcomes for children with disabilities ages 3 through 5; and (3) identification for Significant Disproportionality.  
  
Annual Determinations under the IDEA  
  
The Section 616(a)(1)(C)(i) of the IDEA and implementing regulations in Title 34 Code of Federal Regulations Section 300.600(d) require states to make determinations of each LEA that provides Special Education and related services. With the advent of Results Driven Accountability (RDA), the CDE is using all indicators, (compliance and performance) to make annual determinations. The determinations are the result of examining data regarding the local district’s performance and classifying each into the following determinations: Meets requirements, Needs assistance, Needs intervention, and Needs substantial intervention.  
Non-Public School reviews  
The CDE, SED, Nonpublic Schools Unit (NPSU), certifies, monitors, and evaluates nonpublic schools’ (NPS’) compliance with federal and state laws and regulations. NPSs are private schools, certified by the CDE, that function as third-party service providers by entering into a master contract agreement with a LEA or SELPA. An NPS certification allows private schools to contract with LEAs and receive special education funding to provide academic instruction and special education related services to students under the IDEA.  
   
Pursuant to California Education Code (EC) Section 56366.1(a), an entity that seeks certification as an NPS shall file an application with the CDE using the CDE’s application forms. Each applicant must submit the CDE’s application for NPS certification and complete the Validation Review/On-site Review (VR/OSR) process prior to a NPS certification being issued. A relocating NPS is processed as a new NPS and must participate in the VR/OSR process. A certified NPS must renew their certification annually by completing the renewal process.   
  
Pursuant to EC 56366.1(e)(1), each NPS is placed on a three-year monitoring cycle. Descriptions of the monitoring protocols are provided below:  
  
NPS Self-review: Approximately one third of the NPSs are selected for a Self-review (SR) each year. The purpose of the SR is for the NPS to monitor their facilities, educational environment, and the quality of their educational and behavioral program. This includes the teaching staff, the credentials authorizing service, the standards-based core curriculum being employed, and the standards-focused instructional materials used by the NPS.   
  
On-site Review: Approximately one third of the NPSs are selected for an On-site Review (OSR) each year. The purpose of the OSR is for the CDE to review the NPS’s facilities, the educational environment, and the quality of the educational program.  
  
Follow up Visit: Approximately one third of NPSs are selected for a Follow up Visit (FV) each year. The purpose of the FV is to monitor the NPS facilities, the educational environment, and the quality of the educational program at an existing NPS. The FV includes verifying staff credentials, licenses, and educational documentation, and reviewing the NPS’s behavioral programs. This process addresses areas of concern and provides technical assistance as needed. The FV is a required monitoring process as stated in EC 56366.1(j)(3). The FV is completed every three years pursuant to EC 56366.1(j)(1).  
  
Formal complaints regarding NPS certification or health/safety concerns are managed by the NPSU.

**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.**

From 2016 the OSEP’s determination for California was Needs Assistance pursuant to section 616(e) (1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. 300.604 (a). The CDE has continued to seek technical assistance from OSEP-funded TA centers including the DASY Center, NCSI, and the IDEA Data Center (IDC). The CDE attended the Improving Data, Improving Outcomes Conference hosted by the DASY Center. As a result, the CDE worked to improve LRE for students with disabilities, which included reviewing and strengthening data collection and data quality for the Part B Least Restrictive Environment Indicator (B5). The CDE also joined two Cross-State Collaboratives hosted by the NCSI: Systems Alignment and Results Based Accountability. The CDE participated in IDC webinars, emails and virtual conferences. These resources have proven valuable to ensure that compliance data for Disproportionality (B9), Early Childhood Transitions (B12) and Post-School Transitions Plans (B13) shows improvement and accountability.   
  
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 LEA and SELPA to ensure the provision of FAPE.  
• Review and verify CALPADS 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:  
• Review of local plans, including budget and service agreements.  
• Review of waiver requests.  
• Conducting Comprehensive Reviews, and follow up monitoring visits.  
• Monitoring the corrective actions that are the result of complaint investigations and due process hearings.  
• Provide technical assistance to LEAs and SELPAs to increase compliance and 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.  
• Review and completion of other general supervision activities including, Performance Indicator Reviews, Data Identified Noncompliance Reviews, and Disproportionality Reviews.

**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 children with disabilities.**

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:  
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. 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.  
  
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.  
More information may be accessed at the Smarter Balanced Assessment System Web site at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sa/ and the Smarter Balanced Digital Library at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sa/diglib.asp.  
  
California System of Support (CASOS)  
Digital Chalkboard (formerly 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 Digital Chalkboard Web site, with the support of the K-12 High Speed Network, for LEAs 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 are effective in the classroom. The Digital Chalkboard 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 CCSS, and accessible to all students. The Digital Chalkboard 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 The Digital Chalkboard, online resources may be accessed at https://www.mydigitalchalkboard.org/.  
  
Early Start Comprehensive System of Personnel Development: Early Start Personnel Development, under the California Early Intervention Technical Assistance Network (CEITAN), 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 the Early Start Institute, a Web-based, multi-media learning management environment. The online courses provide the foundational knowledge and basic skills early intervention personnel need to build their capacity to improve outcomes for children and families in Early Start. 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.ceitan-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/te/ce/prodev07intro.asp.

**Broad Stakeholder Input:**

**The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State’s targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State’s Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).**

The CDE and SED management collaborate with the stakeholders listed below:  
  
The State Interagency Coordinating Council on Early Intervention: The State Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) on Early Intervention provides advice and assistance to the Department of Developmental Services. Members of the ICC are appointed by the Governor. The council is comprised of parents of children with disabilities, early intervention service providers, health care professionals, state agency representatives, and others interested in early intervention. The ICC meets four times a year and encourages a family-centered approach, family-professional partnerships, and interagency collaboration, while providing a forum for public input.  
  
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. Its mission is to provide an environment for building relationships and nurturing trust among leaders in support of coordination and collaboration in the planning and implementation of early intervention training and technical assistance activities. By providing a forum for cross-agency and cross-disciplinary discussion and resource sharing, TTAC promotes the mindful integration of specific core values into the delivery of early child care, education, and early intervention focusing on increasing child and family outcomes.  
  
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:  
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 CALPADS 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 CALPADS 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 2021, the SED Director reported to the ACSE on the OSEP's new priorities for the SPP/APR.  
  
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 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.  
  
2. SELPA – The Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) Administrators organization assists CDE in the development and implementation through a collaborative feedback loop. The CDE regularly solicits input from the SELPA administrators’ group and SELPA serves on several CDE work groups.   
The CDE also presented the proposed new targets, data analysis, and improvement strategies to ACSE in October 2021 to solicit feedback and public comment. The CDE also presented the proposed new targets and how the SPP/APR fits into the Statewide System of Support to the SBE in September 2021, November 2021, and January 2022 and received public comment and support.   
  
The SED has sought to actively involve the ACSE, the SBE liaison, and the SBE staff in the development of the FFY 2020 SPP/APR. 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.  
  
The SPP/APR was approved by the SBE in January 2022.

**Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)**

YES

**Number of Parent Members:**

10

**Parent Members Engagement:**

**Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

Commencing in August 2019 through June 2021, the CDE commenced a series of stakeholder meetings to establish targets for the new six-year cycle of the SPP. These meetings were held over a two-year period and were designed to reach out and engage stakeholders from various backgrounds - educators, parents, school administrators, policy advisors, school psychologists, Family Empowerment Centers, early education, advocacy groups, and state advisory board members.   
  
Prior to this the SED reached out to more than 100 statewide and local organizations, including several local and statewide parent and family organizations, parent center staff, and members of the state advisory panel and advisory committees and issued invitations to the SPP stakeholder group.   
  
The the individual parents from local and statewide parent and family organizations, parent center staff, and members of the state advisory panel and advisory committees, belonged to a stakeholder committee that were led by SED staff that gave detailed presentations to inform the stakeholders in the history and data trends to make informed recommendations. The presentations included how each indicator is defined, measured, and calculated. An in-depth history of statewide results over the last five years and how California compares to similar states, along with data forecasting to evaluate progress.

**Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:**

**The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.**

The CDE reached out to stakeholders from various backgrounds – educators, parents, school administrators, policy advisors, school psychologists, Family Empowerment Centers, Parent Teacher Associations, and Parent Training and Information Centers. The CDE worked specifically with parent organizations to create a diverse stakeholder group to foster varied and comprehensive conversations on how to support improvement strategies to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.   
  
The Covid-19 pandemic created unique challenges that the CDE had to overcome in order to conduct the stakeholder meetings. All of the stakeholder meetings were virtual since local and State public health guidelines discouraged large indoor gatherings. These virtual meetings gave the opportunity for more parents and parent organizations to attend, as it allowed more freedom in how and when to attend. The small discussion groups in the stakeholder meetings fostered thorough conversations with parents on what supports, new and continued, were effective in improving outcomes for children with disabilities. Theses conversations were supported through data informed decisions and conversations with educators, LEA administrators, and school staff.   
  
The parents in the stakeholder meetings recommended other methods for the CDE to employ to continue to diversify the stakeholder group which CDE plans to implement in the coming year.

**Soliciting Public Input:**

**The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

The CDE started soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress through a series of public stakeholder meetings. The CDE held several public stakeholder meetings over the course of FFY2020 followed up with feedback reports and surveys to collect and consolidate public input.   
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 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.  
  
2. SELPA – The Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) Administrators organization assists CDE in the development and implementation through a collaborative feedback loop. The CDE regularly solicits input from the SELPA administrators’ group and SELPA serves on several CDE work groups.   
The CDE also presented the proposed new targets, data analysis, and improvement strategies to ACSE in October 2021 to solicit feedback and public comment. The CDE also presented the proposed new targets and how the SPP/APR fits into the Statewide System of Support to the SBE in September 2021, November 2021, and January 2022 and received public comment and support.   
  
The SED has sought to actively involve the ACSE, the SBE liaison, and the SBE staff in the development of the FFY 2020 SPP/APR. 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.

**Making Results Available to the Public:**

**The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.**

The SED made the results of the target setting, data analysis, improvement strategies, and progress to the public through the use of email listserv’s, surveys, and public ACSE and SBE meetings.   
Throughout the FFY2020 year, CDE made the stakeholder recommendations available through various mechanisms including posting the final targets on the CDE website which can be found here, under item 4: https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr21/agenda202109.asp.

**Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 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 2019 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/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2019 APR in 2021, is available.**

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/.  
District Level Special Education Annual Performance Report Measures are posted at http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/ds/leadatarpts.asp.  
  
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.  
  
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.  
  
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 LEAs that are significantly disproportionate.  
  
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.   
  
DataQuest/Dashboard  
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.  
In 2017, the CDE launched the Dashboard, which is the visual platform used to publicly report California school and LEA accountability. The Dashboard can be accessed here: https://www.caschooldashboard.org/.  
California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP)  
  
The CAASPP is California's statewide student assessment system established January 1, 2014. The SED will use the CAASPP assessment reports to determine educational benefit for children with disabilities. For the 2020-21 school year, 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 Science Test (CAST) 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 three through eight and eleven.

## Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2020 and 2021 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2021 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 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, 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.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

California has reported 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.

## Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2020 and 2021 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 24, 2021 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, 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.  
  
The Department imposed Specific Conditions on the State's IDEA Part B grant award each year from FFY 1997 through FFY 2021 related to the provision of special education and related services to eligible youth in adult correctional facilities

## Intro - Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2021 and 2022 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2022 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 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, 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

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

**Measurement**

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

## 1 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data[[1]](#footnote-2)**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 77.02% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% |
| Data | 65.00% | 65.52% | 65.01% | 66.30% | 67.7%[[2]](#footnote-3) |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 75.00% | 75.50% | 76.00% | 77.00% | 78.00% | 79.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The CDE and SED management collaborate with the stakeholders listed below:  
  
The State Interagency Coordinating Council on Early Intervention: The State Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) on Early Intervention provides advice and assistance to the Department of Developmental Services. Members of the ICC are appointed by the Governor. The council is comprised of parents of children with disabilities, early intervention service providers, health care professionals, state agency representatives, and others interested in early intervention. The ICC meets four times a year and encourages a family-centered approach, family-professional partnerships, and interagency collaboration, while providing a forum for public input.  
  
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. Its mission is to provide an environment for building relationships and nurturing trust among leaders in support of coordination and collaboration in the planning and implementation of early intervention training and technical assistance activities. By providing a forum for cross-agency and cross-disciplinary discussion and resource sharing, TTAC promotes the mindful integration of specific core values into the delivery of early child care, education, and early intervention focusing on increasing child and family outcomes.  
  
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:  
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 CALPADS 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 CALPADS 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 2021, the SED Director reported to the ACSE on the OSEP's new priorities for the SPP/APR.  
  
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 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.  
  
2. SELPA – The Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) Administrators organization assists CDE in the development and implementation through a collaborative feedback loop. The CDE regularly solicits input from the SELPA administrators’ group and SELPA serves on several CDE work groups.   
The CDE also presented the proposed new targets, data analysis, and improvement strategies to ACSE in October 2021 to solicit feedback and public comment. The CDE also presented the proposed new targets and how the SPP/APR fits into the Statewide System of Support to the SBE in September 2021, November 2021, and January 2022 and received public comment and support.   
  
The SED has sought to actively involve the ACSE, the SBE liaison, and the SBE staff in the development of the FFY 2020 SPP/APR. 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.  
  
The SPP/APR was approved by the SBE in January 2022.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 38,756 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) | 5,907 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 436 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 5,223 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma** | **Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 38,756 | 50,322 | 67.7%[[3]](#footnote-4) | 75.00% | 77.02% | N/A | N/A |

**Graduation Conditions**

**Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.**

The graduation requirements are the same for both students with and without disabilities. The state of California according to Education Code (EC) 51225.3 has specified a minimum set of courses to meet state requirements to graduate from high school and receive a diploma. The governing boards of local education agencies have the authority to supplement the state minimum requirements at the local level. EC 51225.3 states that all pupils receiving a diploma of graduation from a California high school must have completed all of the following courses, while in grades nine to twelve, inclusive:   
- Three courses in English  
-Two courses in mathematics, including one year of Algebra I (EC 51224.5)  
-Two courses in science, including biology and physical sciences  
-Three courses in social studies, including United States history and geography; world history, culture, and geography; a one-semester course in American government and civics, and a one-semester course in economics  
-One course in visual or performing arts, foreign language, or career technical education  
-Two courses in physical education, unless the pupil has been exempted pursuant to the provisions of EC 51241

**Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Baseline Justification: Due to OSEPs change to the calculation and data source for Indicator 1, California has updated the baseline.

## 1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 1 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.  
  
The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 1 - Required Actions

# Indicator 2: Drop Out

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

**Measurement**

OPTION 1:

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target.

With the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, States may use either option 1 or 2. States using Option 2 must provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

OPTION 1:

**Use 618 exiting data** for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023**, States must report data using Option 1 (i.e., the same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA). Option 2 will not be available beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

## 2 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2013 | 15.72% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 13.72% | 12.72% | 11.72% | 10.72% | 9.72% |
| Data | 14.46% | 13.76% | 11.36% | 11.24% | 15.41% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target <= | 11.00% | 10.00% | 9.00% | 8.00% | 7.00% | 6.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The CDE and SED management collaborate with the stakeholders listed below:  
  
The State Interagency Coordinating Council on Early Intervention: The State Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) on Early Intervention provides advice and assistance to the Department of Developmental Services. Members of the ICC are appointed by the Governor. The council is comprised of parents of children with disabilities, early intervention service providers, health care professionals, state agency representatives, and others interested in early intervention. The ICC meets four times a year and encourages a family-centered approach, family-professional partnerships, and interagency collaboration, while providing a forum for public input.  
  
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. Its mission is to provide an environment for building relationships and nurturing trust among leaders in support of coordination and collaboration in the planning and implementation of early intervention training and technical assistance activities. By providing a forum for cross-agency and cross-disciplinary discussion and resource sharing, TTAC promotes the mindful integration of specific core values into the delivery of early child care, education, and early intervention focusing on increasing child and family outcomes.  
  
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:  
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 CALPADS 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 CALPADS 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 2021, the SED Director reported to the ACSE on the OSEP's new priorities for the SPP/APR.  
  
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 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.  
  
2. SELPA – The Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) Administrators organization assists CDE in the development and implementation through a collaborative feedback loop. The CDE regularly solicits input from the SELPA administrators’ group and SELPA serves on several CDE work groups.   
The CDE also presented the proposed new targets, data analysis, and improvement strategies to ACSE in October 2021 to solicit feedback and public comment. The CDE also presented the proposed new targets and how the SPP/APR fits into the Statewide System of Support to the SBE in September 2021, November 2021, and January 2022 and received public comment and support.   
  
The SED has sought to actively involve the ACSE, the SBE liaison, and the SBE staff in the development of the FFY 2020 SPP/APR. 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.  
  
The SPP/APR was approved by the SBE in January 2022.

**Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator**

Option 1

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 38,756 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) | 5,907 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 436 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 5,223 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out** | **Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5,223 | 50,322 | 15.41% | 11.00% | 10.38% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth**

Students are considered dropouts if they were enrolled at the start of the reporting period but were not enrolled at the end of the reporting period and did not exit special education through any of the other means. This includes runaways, GED recipients, expulsions, status unknown, students who moved but are not known to be continuing in another educational program, and other exiters from special education.

**Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)**

NO

**If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.**

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 2 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 2 - Required Actions

# Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

3A. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

**Measurement**

A. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 18.59% |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 20.15% |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 33.09% |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 19.55% |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 20.14% |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 31.88% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The CDE and SED management collaborate with the stakeholders listed below:  
  
The State Interagency Coordinating Council on Early Intervention: The State Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) on Early Intervention provides advice and assistance to the Department of Developmental Services. Members of the ICC are appointed by the Governor. The council is comprised of parents of children with disabilities, early intervention service providers, health care professionals, state agency representatives, and others interested in early intervention. The ICC meets four times a year and encourages a family-centered approach, family-professional partnerships, and interagency collaboration, while providing a forum for public input.  
  
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. Its mission is to provide an environment for building relationships and nurturing trust among leaders in support of coordination and collaboration in the planning and implementation of early intervention training and technical assistance activities. By providing a forum for cross-agency and cross-disciplinary discussion and resource sharing, TTAC promotes the mindful integration of specific core values into the delivery of early child care, education, and early intervention focusing on increasing child and family outcomes.  
  
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:  
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 CALPADS 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 CALPADS 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 2021, the SED Director reported to the ACSE on the OSEP's new priorities for the SPP/APR.  
  
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 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.  
  
2. SELPA – The Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) Administrators organization assists CDE in the development and implementation through a collaborative feedback loop. The CDE regularly solicits input from the SELPA administrators’ group and SELPA serves on several CDE work groups.   
The CDE also presented the proposed new targets, data analysis, and improvement strategies to ACSE in October 2021 to solicit feedback and public comment. The CDE also presented the proposed new targets and how the SPP/APR fits into the Statewide System of Support to the SBE in September 2021, November 2021, and January 2022 and received public comment and support.   
  
The SED has sought to actively involve the ACSE, the SBE liaison, and the SBE staff in the development of the FFY 2020 SPP/APR. 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.  
  
The SPP/APR was approved by the SBE in January 2022.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

**Date:**

03/30/2022

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs\* | 60,034 | 61,628 | 57,349 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | 4,558 | 4,451 | 13,294 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | 4,903 | 6,420 | 4,323 |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 1,701 | 1,547 | 1,360 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

03/30/2022

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs\* | 60,036 | 61,627 | 57,351 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | 6,419 | 4,368 | 12,347 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | 3,631 | 6,516 | 4,600 |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 1,685 | 1,527 | 1,336 |

\*The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 11,162 | 60,034 |  | 95.00% | 18.59% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 12,418 | 61,628 |  | 95.00% | 20.15% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 18,977 | 57,349 |  | 95.00% | 33.09% | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 11,735 | 60,036 |  | 95.00% | 19.55% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 12,411 | 61,627 |  | 95.00% | 20.14% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 18,283 | 57,351 |  | 95.00% | 31.88% | N/A | N/A |

**Regulatory Information**

**The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]**

**Public Reporting Information**

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

https://caaspp-elpac.cde.ca.gov/caaspp/AdditionalResources

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Baseline Justification: Due to OSEPs change to the calculation and data source for Indicator 3, California has updated the baseline.  
  
Covid Impact  
The U.S. Department of Education issued guidance on assessment, accountability, and reporting requirements in a letter dated February 22, 2021 and was signed by the Assistant Education Secretary Delegate Ian Rosenblum. This policy letter stated, “It is urgent to understand the impact of COVID-19 on learning. We know, however, that some schools and school districts may face circumstances in which they are not able to safely administer statewide summative assessments this spring using their standard practices. Certainly, we do not believe that if there are places where students are unable to attend school safely in person because of the pandemic that they should be brought into school buildings for the sole purpose of taking a test.”  
This offered States flexibility in the administration of statewide assessments. On February 24, 2021 the State Board of Education voted to seek federal flexibility for assessments. These flexibilities allowed the CDE, schools, and districts to administer assessments in an organized and safe way. While these flexibilities allowed the CDE to administer a limited version of statewide assessments, there was still an impact to the completeness, validity, and reliability for the assessment data.   
The data collection was specifically impacted by COVID-19 in several ways; first, there was a steep decrease in the rate of student participation due to health and safety concerns. Second, the drop-in participation resulted in an artificial representation of proficiency rates. Third, the alternate assessment could not be administered remotely so many SWDs were not able to take the assessment. Finally, the testing window was extended through July 30, 2021, which is outside the APR reporting timeframe. The CDE took steps to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection by taking advantage of the federal flexibilities and by setting up a COVID-19 Assessment FAQ webpage which listed the 2020-21 Spring Summative Assessment Administration Flexibility Guidelines and answered over 65 questions.

## 3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3A - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020 and OSEP accepts that revision.  
  
The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.  
  
The State provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps the State has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.  
  
The State did not provide a Web link demonstrating that the State reported publicly on the participation of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported the number of children with disabilities participating in regular assessments who were provided accommodations (that did not result in an invalid score) in order to participate in those assessments at the State, district and school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) is noncompliance.

## 3A - Required Actions

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2022 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2020, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) for FFY 2021.

# Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

**Measurement**

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3B - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 17.95% |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 11.39% |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 16.82% |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 17.35% |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 5.84% |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 5.66% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 15.00% | 15.00% | 15.00% | 16.00% | 17.00% | 18.00% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 12.00% | 12.00% | 12.00% | 13.00% | 14.00% | 15.00% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 14.00% | 14.00% | 14.00% | 15.00% | 16.00% | 17.00% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 15.00% | 15.00% | 15.00% | 16.00% | 17.00% | 18.00% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 8.00% | 8.00% | 8.00% | 9.00% | 10.00% | 11.00% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 8.00% | 8.00% | 8.00% | 9.00% | 10.00% | 11.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The CDE and SED management collaborate with the stakeholders listed below:  
  
The State Interagency Coordinating Council on Early Intervention: The State Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) on Early Intervention provides advice and assistance to the Department of Developmental Services. Members of the ICC are appointed by the Governor. The council is comprised of parents of children with disabilities, early intervention service providers, health care professionals, state agency representatives, and others interested in early intervention. The ICC meets four times a year and encourages a family-centered approach, family-professional partnerships, and interagency collaboration, while providing a forum for public input.  
  
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. Its mission is to provide an environment for building relationships and nurturing trust among leaders in support of coordination and collaboration in the planning and implementation of early intervention training and technical assistance activities. By providing a forum for cross-agency and cross-disciplinary discussion and resource sharing, TTAC promotes the mindful integration of specific core values into the delivery of early child care, education, and early intervention focusing on increasing child and family outcomes.  
  
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:  
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 CALPADS 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 CALPADS 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 2021, the SED Director reported to the ACSE on the OSEP's new priorities for the SPP/APR.  
  
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 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.  
  
2. SELPA – The Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) Administrators organization assists CDE in the development and implementation through a collaborative feedback loop. The CDE regularly solicits input from the SELPA administrators’ group and SELPA serves on several CDE work groups.   
The CDE also presented the proposed new targets, data analysis, and improvement strategies to ACSE in October 2021 to solicit feedback and public comment. The CDE also presented the proposed new targets and how the SPP/APR fits into the Statewide System of Support to the SBE in September 2021, November 2021, and January 2022 and received public comment and support.   
  
The SED has sought to actively involve the ACSE, the SBE liaison, and the SBE staff in the development of the FFY 2020 SPP/APR. 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.  
  
The SPP/APR was approved by the SBE in January 2022.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment | 9,461 | 10,871 | 17,617 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 1,252 | 836 | 2,495 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 446 | 402 | 469 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment | 10,050 | 10,884 | 16,947 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 1,489 | 502 | 851 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 255 | 134 | 109 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 1,698 | 9,461 |  | 15.00% | 17.95% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 1,238 | 10,871 |  | 12.00% | 11.39% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 2,964 | 17,617 |  | 14.00% | 16.82% | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 1,744 | 10,050 |  | 15.00% | 17.35% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 636 | 10,884 |  | 8.00% | 5.84% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 960 | 16,947 |  | 8.00% | 5.66% | N/A | N/A |

**Regulatory Information**

**The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]**

**Public Reporting Information**

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

https://caaspp-elpac.cde.ca.gov/caaspp/DashViewReportSB?ps=true&lstTestYear=2021&lstTestType=B&lstGroup=2&lstSubGroup=128&lstGrade=13&lstSchoolType=A&lstCounty=00&lstDistrict=00000&lstSchool=0000000&lstFocus=a

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Baseline justification: Due to OSEPs change to the calculation and data source for Indicator 3, California has updated the baseline.  
  
Covid Impact  
The U.S. Department of Education issued guidance on assessment, accountability, and reporting requirements in a letter dated February 22, 2021 and was signed by the Assistant Education Secretary Delegate Ian Rosenblum. This policy letter stated, “It is urgent to understand the impact of COVID-19 on learning. We know, however, that some schools and school districts may face circumstances in which they are not able to safely administer statewide summative assessments this spring using their standard practices. Certainly, we do not believe that if there are places where students are unable to attend school safely in person because of the pandemic that they should be brought into school buildings for the sole purpose of taking a test.”  
This offered States flexibility in the administration of statewide assessments. On February 24, 2021 the State Board of Education voted to seek federal flexibility for assessments. These flexibilities allowed the CDE, schools, and districts to administer assessments in an organized and safe way. While these flexibilities allowed the CDE to administer a limited version of statewide assessments, there was still an impact to the completeness, validity, and reliability for the assessment data.   
The data collection was specifically impacted by COVID-19 in several ways; first, there was a steep decrease in the rate of student participation due to health and safety concerns. Second, the drop-in participation resulted in an artificial representation of proficiency rates. Third, the alternate assessment could not be administered remotely so many SWDs were not able to take the assessment. Finally, the testing window was extended through July 30, 2021, which is outside the APR reporting timeframe. The CDE took steps to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection by taking advantage of the federal flexibilities and by setting up a COVID-19 Assessment FAQ webpage which listed the 2020-21 Spring Summative Assessment Administration Flexibility Guidelines and answered over 65 questions.

## 3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3B - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.  
  
The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.  
  
The State provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps the State has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

## 3B - Required Actions

# Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

**Measurement**

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time

of testing.

## 3C - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 12.93% |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 11.12% |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 16.25% |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 5.82% |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 14.34% |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 10.78% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 15.00% | 15.00% | 15.00% | 16.00% | 17.00% | 18.00% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 10.00% | 10.00% | 10.00% | 11.00% | 12.00% | 13.00% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 14.00% | 14.00% | 14.00% | 15.00% | 16.00% | 17.00% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 7.00% | 7.00% | 7.00% | 8.00% | 9.00% | 10.00% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 8.00% | 8.00% | 8.00% | 9.00% | 10.00% | 14.50% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 6.00% | 6.00% | 6.00% | 7.00% | 8.00% | 11.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The CDE and SED management collaborate with the stakeholders listed below:  
  
The State Interagency Coordinating Council on Early Intervention: The State Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) on Early Intervention provides advice and assistance to the Department of Developmental Services. Members of the ICC are appointed by the Governor. The council is comprised of parents of children with disabilities, early intervention service providers, health care professionals, state agency representatives, and others interested in early intervention. The ICC meets four times a year and encourages a family-centered approach, family-professional partnerships, and interagency collaboration, while providing a forum for public input.  
  
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. Its mission is to provide an environment for building relationships and nurturing trust among leaders in support of coordination and collaboration in the planning and implementation of early intervention training and technical assistance activities. By providing a forum for cross-agency and cross-disciplinary discussion and resource sharing, TTAC promotes the mindful integration of specific core values into the delivery of early child care, education, and early intervention focusing on increasing child and family outcomes.  
  
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:  
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 CALPADS 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 CALPADS 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 2021, the SED Director reported to the ACSE on the OSEP's new priorities for the SPP/APR.  
  
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 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.  
  
2. SELPA – The Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) Administrators organization assists CDE in the development and implementation through a collaborative feedback loop. The CDE regularly solicits input from the SELPA administrators’ group and SELPA serves on several CDE work groups.   
The CDE also presented the proposed new targets, data analysis, and improvement strategies to ACSE in October 2021 to solicit feedback and public comment. The CDE also presented the proposed new targets and how the SPP/APR fits into the Statewide System of Support to the SBE in September 2021, November 2021, and January 2022 and received public comment and support.   
  
The SED has sought to actively involve the ACSE, the SBE liaison, and the SBE staff in the development of the FFY 2020 SPP/APR. 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.  
  
The SPP/APR was approved by the SBE in January 2022.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment | 1,701 | 1,547 | 1,360 |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient | 220 | 172 | 221 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment | 1,685 | 1,527 | 1,336 |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient | 98 | 219 | 144 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 220 | 1,701 |  | 15.00% | 12.93% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 172 | 1,547 |  | 10.00% | 11.12% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 221 | 1,360 |  | 14.00% | 16.25% | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 98 | 1,685 |  | 7.00% | 5.82% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 219 | 1,527 |  | 8.00% | 14.34% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 144 | 1,336 |  | 6.00% | 10.78% | N/A | N/A |

**Regulatory Information**

**The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]**

**Public Reporting Information**

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

https://caaspp-elpac.cde.ca.gov/caaspp/DashViewReportCAA?ps=true&lstTestYear=2021&lstTestType=A&lstGroup=1&lstSubGroup=1&lstSchoolType=A&lstGrade=13&lstCounty=00&lstDistrict=00000&lstSchool=0000000

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Baseline Justification: Due to OSEPs change to the calculation and data source for Indicator 3, California has updated the baseline.   
  
Covid Impact  
The U.S. Department of Education issued guidance on assessment, accountability, and reporting requirements in a letter dated February 22, 2021 and was signed by the Assistant Education Secretary Delegate Ian Rosenblum. This policy letter stated, “It is urgent to understand the impact of COVID-19 on learning. We know, however, that some schools and school districts may face circumstances in which they are not able to safely administer statewide summative assessments this spring using their standard practices. Certainly, we do not believe that if there are places where students are unable to attend school safely in person because of the pandemic that they should be brought into school buildings for the sole purpose of taking a test.”  
This offered States flexibility in the administration of statewide assessments. On February 24, 2021 the State Board of Education voted to seek federal flexibility for assessments. These flexibilities allowed the CDE, schools, and districts to administer assessments in an organized and safe way. While these flexibilities allowed the CDE to administer a limited version of statewide assessments, there was still an impact to the completeness, validity, and reliability for the assessment data.   
The data collection was specifically impacted by COVID-19 in several ways; first, there was a steep decrease in the rate of student participation due to health and safety concerns. Second, the drop-in participation resulted in an artificial representation of proficiency rates. Third, the alternate assessment could not be administered remotely so many SWDs were not able to take the assessment. Finally, the testing window was extended through July 30, 2021, which is outside the APR reporting timeframe. The CDE took steps to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection by taking advantage of the federal flexibilities and by setting up a COVID-19 Assessment FAQ webpage which listed the 2020-21 Spring Summative Assessment Administration Flexibility Guidelines and answered over 65 questions.

## 3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3C - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.  
  
The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.  
  
The State provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps the State has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

## 3C - Required Actions

# Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

3D. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

**Measurement**

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3D - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 23.53 |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 35.98 |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 42.42 |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 18.52 |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 24.98 |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 28.69 |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A <= | Grade 4 | 31.00 | 31.00 | 31.00 | 30.00 | 29.00 | 23.00 |
| Reading | B <= | Grade 8 | 37.00 | 37.00 | 37.00 | 36.00 | 35.00 | 34.00 |
| Reading | C <= | Grade HS | 42.00 | 42.00 | 42.00 | 41.00 | 40.00 | 39.00 |
| Math | A <= | Grade 4 | 25.00 | 25.00 | 25.00 | 24.00 | 23.00 | 18.00 |
| Math | B <= | Grade 8 | 29.00 | 29.00 | 29.00 | 28.00 | 27.00 | 24.00 |
| Math | C <= | Grade HS | 27.00 | 27.00 | 27.00 | 26.00 | 25.00 | 24.00 |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The CDE and SED management collaborate with the stakeholders listed below:  
  
The State Interagency Coordinating Council on Early Intervention: The State Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) on Early Intervention provides advice and assistance to the Department of Developmental Services. Members of the ICC are appointed by the Governor. The council is comprised of parents of children with disabilities, early intervention service providers, health care professionals, state agency representatives, and others interested in early intervention. The ICC meets four times a year and encourages a family-centered approach, family-professional partnerships, and interagency collaboration, while providing a forum for public input.  
  
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. Its mission is to provide an environment for building relationships and nurturing trust among leaders in support of coordination and collaboration in the planning and implementation of early intervention training and technical assistance activities. By providing a forum for cross-agency and cross-disciplinary discussion and resource sharing, TTAC promotes the mindful integration of specific core values into the delivery of early child care, education, and early intervention focusing on increasing child and family outcomes.  
  
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:  
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 CALPADS 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 CALPADS 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 2021, the SED Director reported to the ACSE on the OSEP's new priorities for the SPP/APR.  
  
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 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.  
  
2. SELPA – The Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) Administrators organization assists CDE in the development and implementation through a collaborative feedback loop. The CDE regularly solicits input from the SELPA administrators’ group and SELPA serves on several CDE work groups.   
The CDE also presented the proposed new targets, data analysis, and improvement strategies to ACSE in October 2021 to solicit feedback and public comment. The CDE also presented the proposed new targets and how the SPP/APR fits into the Statewide System of Support to the SBE in September 2021, November 2021, and January 2022 and received public comment and support.   
  
The SED has sought to actively involve the ACSE, the SBE liaison, and the SBE staff in the development of the FFY 2020 SPP/APR. 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.  
  
The SPP/APR was approved by the SBE in January 2022.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 82,496 | 98,300 | 207,141 |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 9,461 | 10,871 | 17,617 |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 33,748 | 46,101 | 122,187 |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 473 | 466 | 532 |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 1,252 | 836 | 2,495 |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 446 | 402 | 469 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 87,805 | 97,840 | 199,962 |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 10,050 | 10,884 | 16,947 |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 31,229 | 30,005 | 68,584 |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 272 | 151 | 116 |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 1,489 | 502 | 851 |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 255 | 134 | 109 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards** | **Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 17.95% | 41.48% |  | 31.00 | 23.53 | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 11.39% | 47.37% |  | 37.00 | 35.98 | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 16.82% | 59.24% |  | 42.00 | 42.42 | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards** | **Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 17.35% | 35.88% |  | 25.00 | 18.52 | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 5.84% | 30.82% |  | 29.00 | 24.98 | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 5.66% | 34.36% |  | 27.00 | 28.69 | N/A | N/A |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Baseline Justification: Due to OSEPs change to the calculation and data source for Indicator 3, California has updated the baseline.   
  
Covid Impact  
The U.S. Department of Education issued guidance on assessment, accountability, and reporting requirements in a letter dated February 22, 2021 and was signed by the Assistant Education Secretary Delegate Ian Rosenblum. This policy letter stated, “It is urgent to understand the impact of COVID-19 on learning. We know, however, that some schools and school districts may face circumstances in which they are not able to safely administer statewide summative assessments this spring using their standard practices. Certainly, we do not believe that if there are places where students are unable to attend school safely in person because of the pandemic that they should be brought into school buildings for the sole purpose of taking a test.”  
This offered States flexibility in the administration of statewide assessments. On February 24, 2021 the State Board of Education voted to seek federal flexibility for assessments. These flexibilities allowed the CDE, schools, and districts to administer assessments in an organized and safe way. While these flexibilities allowed the CDE to administer a limited version of statewide assessments, there was still an impact to the completeness, validity, and reliability for the assessment data.   
The data collection was specifically impacted by COVID-19 in several ways; first, there was a steep decrease in the rate of student participation due to health and safety concerns. Second, the drop-in participation resulted in an artificial representation of proficiency rates. Third, the alternate assessment could not be administered remotely so many SWDs were not able to take the assessment. Finally, the testing window was extended through July 30, 2021, which is outside the APR reporting timeframe. The CDE took steps to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection by taking advantage of the federal flexibilities and by setting up a COVID-19 Assessment FAQ webpage which listed the 2020-21 Spring Summative Assessment Administration Flexibility Guidelines and answered over 65 questions.

## 3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3D - OSEP Response

The State has established the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that baseline.  
  
The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.  
  
The State provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps the State has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

## 3D - Required Actions

# Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

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

**Data Source**

State discipline data, including State’s analysis of State’s Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

**Measurement**

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

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State’s examination must include one of the following comparisons:

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n and/or cell size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its 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 such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, 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.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 4A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 17.90% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 10.00% | 10.00% | 10.00% | 10.00% | 10.00% |
| Data | 2.32% | 3.22% | 3.67% | 1.41% | 2.52% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target <= | 3.00% | 2.80% | 2.60% | 2.40% | 2.20% | 2.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The CDE and SED management collaborate with the stakeholders listed below:  
  
The State Interagency Coordinating Council on Early Intervention: The State Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) on Early Intervention provides advice and assistance to the Department of Developmental Services. Members of the ICC are appointed by the Governor. The council is comprised of parents of children with disabilities, early intervention service providers, health care professionals, state agency representatives, and others interested in early intervention. The ICC meets four times a year and encourages a family-centered approach, family-professional partnerships, and interagency collaboration, while providing a forum for public input.  
  
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. Its mission is to provide an environment for building relationships and nurturing trust among leaders in support of coordination and collaboration in the planning and implementation of early intervention training and technical assistance activities. By providing a forum for cross-agency and cross-disciplinary discussion and resource sharing, TTAC promotes the mindful integration of specific core values into the delivery of early child care, education, and early intervention focusing on increasing child and family outcomes.  
  
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:  
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 CALPADS 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 CALPADS 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 2021, the SED Director reported to the ACSE on the OSEP's new priorities for the SPP/APR.  
  
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 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.  
  
2. SELPA – The Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) Administrators organization assists CDE in the development and implementation through a collaborative feedback loop. The CDE regularly solicits input from the SELPA administrators’ group and SELPA serves on several CDE work groups.   
The CDE also presented the proposed new targets, data analysis, and improvement strategies to ACSE in October 2021 to solicit feedback and public comment. The CDE also presented the proposed new targets and how the SPP/APR fits into the Statewide System of Support to the SBE in September 2021, November 2021, and January 2022 and received public comment and support.   
  
The SED has sought to actively involve the ACSE, the SBE liaison, and the SBE staff in the development of the FFY 2020 SPP/APR. 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.  
  
The SPP/APR was approved by the SBE in January 2022.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

111

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy** | **Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 8 | 1,565 | 2.52% | 3.00% | 0.51% | Met target | No Slippage |

**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

**State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology**

To be included in the significant discrepancy calculation, districts must meet the State's minimum n-size. The current n-size is at least 20 students in the denominator and at least 10 students in the numerator, this excluded 111 districts. 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 in accordance with 34 CFR §300.170(b). For this indicator, federal instructions require that the state report data for the year before the reporting year. The data reported here is from 2019–20.  
  
California requires all districts with significant discrepancy to go through a review of policies, practices and procedures. CDE staff review files from each district identified as having significant discrepancy using a compliance instrument to test compliance of each student file or policy document for 39 items. The purpose of this review is ensure that districts are properly developing and implementing IEPs, use positive behavioral interventions and supports, and include procedural safeguards as outlined in 34 C.F.R. 300.170 (b). Each instance of noncompliance is required to be corrected and the CDE requires the district to revise their policies and procedures to comply with IDEA. Copies of the compliance instrument can be made available at the request of OSEP.   
  
In California, a significant discrepancy is defined as having a rate of suspension and expulsion greater than the statewide bar. For FFY 2020, the statewide bar for the number of students with disabilities suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days was 2.76 percent. The statewide bar is calculated as the state rate (.76%) plus 2 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 non-compliant 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.  
For FFY 2020, 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 300.170(b); and (2) has corrected each individual case of Evidence of Review of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Covid Impact  
The data for the suspension and expulsion rates of indicator 4 are lag year data. The Governor of California issued a stay at home order on March 19, 2020, this immediately shut down schools across the state. The statewide school closure impacted the data for this indicator by truncating the school year and impugned the completeness and reliability of this data. The significant decreases seen in indicator 4 illustrate the impact Covid-19 had on discipline as schools shifted to distance learning for the last three months of the school year as students were removed from traditional classrooms. Disciplinary actions dramatically decreased across the state when students were removed from physical spaces. The CDE took steps to mitigate the impact on the data collection by issuing guidance to LEAs on the requirement to continue to implement the requirements of IDEA during the school site closures. The CDE established a web page for information and guidance related to Covid-19 on the CDE website at https://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/he/hn/coronavirus.asp.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 data)**

**Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.**

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 as outlined in 34 CFR 300.170 (b). In 2020-21, 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 updated data.  
-A follow-up review and reporting is required of districts that have previously corrected noncompliance 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 300.170 (b); 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)

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4A - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 4A - Required Actions

# Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Compliance Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

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

**Data Source**

State discipline data, including State’s analysis of State’s Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

**Measurement**

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

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State’s examination must include one of the following comparisons:

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs in which policies, procedures or practices 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.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, 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.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

## 4B - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2009 | 4.30% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 5.74% | 2.78% | 6.34% | 4.86% | 4.08% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

111

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity** | **Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements** | **Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 90 | 23 | 1,565 | 4.08% | 0% | 1.47% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology**

To be included in the significant discrepancy calculation, districts must meet the State's minimum n-size. The current minimum n-size is at least 20 students in the denominator and at least 10 student in the numerator, this excluded 111 districts. 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 instructions require that the state report data for the year before the reporting year. The data reported here is from 2019–20.  
  
California requires all districts with significant discrepancy to go through a review of policies, practices and procedures. CDE staff review files from each district identified as having significant discrepancy using a compliance instrument to test compliance of each student file or policy document for 39 items. The purpose of this review is ensure that districts are properly developing and implementing IEPs, use positive behavioral interventions and supports, and include procedural safeguards as outlined in 34 C.F.R. 300.170 (b). Each instance of noncompliance is required to be corrected and the CDE requires the district to revise their policies and procedures to comply with IDEA.  
  
Copies of the compliance instrument can be made available at the request of OSEP.   
  
In California, a significant discrepancy is defined as having a rate of suspension and expulsion greater than the statewide bar. For FFY 2020, the statewide bar for the number of students with disabilities suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days was 2.76 percent. This was the percentage that was used to identify districts in the target data calculation above.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Covid Impact  
The data for the suspension and expulsion rates of indicator 4 are lag year data. The Governor of California issued a stay at home order on March 19, 2020, this immediately shut down schools across the state. The statewide school closure impacted the data for this indicator by truncating the school year and impugned the completeness and reliability of this data. The significant decreases seen in indicator 4 illustrate the impact Covid-19 had on discipline as schools shifted to distance learning for the last three months of the school year as students were removed from traditional classrooms. Disciplinary actions dramatically decreased across the state when students were removed from physical spaces. The CDE took steps to mitigate the impact on the data collection by issuing guidance to LEAs on the requirement to continue to implement the requirements of IDEA during the school site closures. The CDE established a web page for information and guidance related to Covid-19 on the CDE website at https://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/he/hn/coronavirus.asp.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 data)**

**Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.**

Districts identified as having a significant discrepancy in any ethnicity were 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 as outlined in 34 CFR 300.170 (b).   
  
In 2020-21, 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 updated data.  
-A follow-up review and reporting is required of districts that have previously corrected noncompliance related to this indicator (ProngII). This is to ensure that LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.  
  
The CDE continues 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 300.170 (b); and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

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

**If YES, select one of the following:**

The State DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

**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*.***

Districts identified as having a significant discrepancy in any ethnicity were 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 as outlined in 34 CFR 300.170 (b). In 2020-21, 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 updated data.  
-A follow-up review and reporting is required of districts that have previously corrected noncompliance related to this indicator (Prong II). This is to ensure that LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.  
  
The CDE continues 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 300.170 (b); 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 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 134 | 134 |  | 0 |

**FFY 2019 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 were 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. The CDE required revision of policy, practices, and procedures when noncompliance is identified.   
  
In 2020—21, verification of correction of student and district level non compliance 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 ensured correction using the standard identified in OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02): (1) correctly implemented the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR 300.170 (b) ; 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**

The CDE ensured LEA policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 through a review of each individual case of noncompliance identified.  
  
If a LEA was identified as Disproportionate they were selected for a review of policies, procedures, and practices including student level compliance data. If during the review the LEA was found noncompliant in any area related to the development and implementation of IEPs and procedural safeguards. The CDE issued required Corrective Actions, the LEA must submit evidence of correction within 60 days.  
  
If a LEA had a student level finding of noncompliance, it must submit evidence that it corrected the noncompliance at the student level. In the instance a LEA was found noncompliant in the area of “when a student with a disability has been removed from his or her current placement for 10 school days in the same school year, during any subsequent days of removal, did the public agency provide services”. The LEA must provide evidence the student was provided all IEP services beginning on the eleventh day of suspension or expulsion. The LEA reconvened the IEP team and provide evidence that the public agency was included and services by the public agency were considered.  
  
If a LEA had a finding of noncompliance within the policies and procedures the LEA provided evidence that it corrected the policies and procedures to be compliant with state and federal law, notified staff and administrators of the policies and procedures change, and conducted in-service training for staff and administrators.  
  
After the initial submission of evidence the LEA was required to submit a subsequent data report (Prong II) to ensure the implementation of the corrective action. The CDE required subsequent data reviews until the LEA is 100% compliant. This guarantees each finding of noncompliance is corrected every year and the systemic noncompliance have been corrected.  
  
The CDE ensured correction of all 134 findings using the standard identified in OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02): (1) correctly implemented the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR 300.170 (b) ; 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 Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2019 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 2020 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 2019, although its FFY 2019 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 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

Please see the description included in the FFY2020 submission

## 4B - OSEP Response

## 4B- Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2020 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 2021 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 2020, although its FFY 2020 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 2020.

# Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 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))

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

**Measurement**

A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)]times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.*

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6.Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

## 5 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| A | 2020 | Target >= | 49.20% | 50.20% | 51.20% | 52.20% | 53.20% |
| A | 59.47% | Data | 54.07% | 54.92% | 56.10% | 56.88% | 58.38% |
| B | 2020 | Target <= | 24.60% | 23.60% | 22.60% | 21.60% | 20.60% |
| B | 18.22% | Data | 21.54% | 20.70% | 19.82% | 19.54% | 18.21% |
| C | 2020 | Target <= | 4.40% | 4.20% | 4.00% | 3.80% | 3.60% |
| C | 3.00% | Data | 3.63% | 3.56% | 3.40% | 3.10% | 3.19% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 58.00% | 60.00% | 62.00% | 64.00% | 67.00% | 70.00% |
| Target B <= | 19.50% | 18.00% | 16.50% | 15.00% | 13.50% | 12.00% |
| Target C <= | 3.40% | 3.20% | 3.00% | 2.80% | 2.60% | 2.40% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The CDE and SED management collaborate with the stakeholders listed below:  
  
The State Interagency Coordinating Council on Early Intervention: The State Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) on Early Intervention provides advice and assistance to the Department of Developmental Services. Members of the ICC are appointed by the Governor. The council is comprised of parents of children with disabilities, early intervention service providers, health care professionals, state agency representatives, and others interested in early intervention. The ICC meets four times a year and encourages a family-centered approach, family-professional partnerships, and interagency collaboration, while providing a forum for public input.  
  
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. Its mission is to provide an environment for building relationships and nurturing trust among leaders in support of coordination and collaboration in the planning and implementation of early intervention training and technical assistance activities. By providing a forum for cross-agency and cross-disciplinary discussion and resource sharing, TTAC promotes the mindful integration of specific core values into the delivery of early child care, education, and early intervention focusing on increasing child and family outcomes.  
  
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:  
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 CALPADS 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 CALPADS 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 2021, the SED Director reported to the ACSE on the OSEP's new priorities for the SPP/APR.  
  
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 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.  
  
2. SELPA – The Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) Administrators organization assists CDE in the development and implementation through a collaborative feedback loop. The CDE regularly solicits input from the SELPA administrators’ group and SELPA serves on several CDE work groups.   
The CDE also presented the proposed new targets, data analysis, and improvement strategies to ACSE in October 2021 to solicit feedback and public comment. The CDE also presented the proposed new targets and how the SPP/APR fits into the Statewide System of Support to the SBE in September 2021, November 2021, and January 2022 and received public comment and support.   
  
The SED has sought to actively involve the ACSE, the SBE liaison, and the SBE staff in the development of the FFY 2020 SPP/APR. 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.  
  
The SPP/APR was approved by the SBE in January 2022.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 | 711,071 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 422,872 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 129,546 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools | 18,742 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities | 643 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements | 1,929 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Education Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 422,872 | 711,071 | 58.38% | 58.00% | 59.47% | N/A | N/A |
| B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 129,546 | 711,071 | 18.21% | 19.50% | 18.22% | N/A | N/A |
| C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3] | 21,314 | 711,071 | 3.19% | 3.40% | 3.00% | N/A | N/A |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Baseline Justification; Due to the changes in the measurement table that add 5-year old’s in kindergarten to this data source, California has updated the baseline for this indicator.

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State did not revise the baseline for this indicator, as required due to the change in the data source. The State must revise its baseline using data from FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

California is resetting the baseline using FFY2020 data. For FFY2019, it was optional to make the change regarding 5 year-old's in Kindergarten, California did not take the option. The change is mandatory starting with FFY2020, California has now made that change in methodology and data source.

## 5 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.  
  
The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 5 - Required Actions

# Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program 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.

C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

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

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

**Measurement**

A. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.*

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (*e.g.*, 75-85%).Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under IDEA section 618, explain.

## 6 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data – 6A, 6B**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| **A** | Target >= | 32.90% | 33.90% | 34.90% | 35.90% | 38.90% |
| **A** | Data | 44.13% | 45.19% | 37.32% | 36.58% | 34.46% |
| **B** | Target <= | 34.40% | 33.40% | 32.40% | 31.40% | 30.40% |
| **B** | Data | 31.45% | 29.86% | 33.81% | 33.84% | 35.76% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The CDE and SED management collaborate with the stakeholders listed below:  
  
The State Interagency Coordinating Council on Early Intervention: The State Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) on Early Intervention provides advice and assistance to the Department of Developmental Services. Members of the ICC are appointed by the Governor. The council is comprised of parents of children with disabilities, early intervention service providers, health care professionals, state agency representatives, and others interested in early intervention. The ICC meets four times a year and encourages a family-centered approach, family-professional partnerships, and interagency collaboration, while providing a forum for public input.  
  
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. Its mission is to provide an environment for building relationships and nurturing trust among leaders in support of coordination and collaboration in the planning and implementation of early intervention training and technical assistance activities. By providing a forum for cross-agency and cross-disciplinary discussion and resource sharing, TTAC promotes the mindful integration of specific core values into the delivery of early child care, education, and early intervention focusing on increasing child and family outcomes.  
  
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:  
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 CALPADS 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 CALPADS 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 2021, the SED Director reported to the ACSE on the OSEP's new priorities for the SPP/APR.  
  
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 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.  
  
2. SELPA – The Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) Administrators organization assists CDE in the development and implementation through a collaborative feedback loop. The CDE regularly solicits input from the SELPA administrators’ group and SELPA serves on several CDE work groups.   
The CDE also presented the proposed new targets, data analysis, and improvement strategies to ACSE in October 2021 to solicit feedback and public comment. The CDE also presented the proposed new targets and how the SPP/APR fits into the Statewide System of Support to the SBE in September 2021, November 2021, and January 2022 and received public comment and support.   
  
The SED has sought to actively involve the ACSE, the SBE liaison, and the SBE staff in the development of the FFY 2020 SPP/APR. 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.  
  
The SPP/APR was approved by the SBE in January 2022.

**Targets**

**Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.**

Inclusive Targets

**Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.**

Target Range not used

Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

| **Part** | **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | 2020 | 29.26% |
| **B** | 2020 | 38.78% |
| **C** | 2020 | 5.72% |

**Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 39.00% | 41.00% | 43.00% | 45.00% | 47.00% | 49.00% |
| Target B <= | 33.00% | 31.00% | 29.00% | 27.00% | 25.00% | 23.00% |

**Inclusive Targets – 6C**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target C <= | 3.50% | 3.50% | 3.50% | 3.50% | 3.50% | 3.40% |

**Prepopulated Data**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

**Date:**

07/07/2021

| **Description** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **3 through 5 - Total** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total number of children with IEPs | 14,103 | 25,482 | 22,527 | 62,112 |
| 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 | 2,239 | 6,469 | 9,464 | 18,172 |
| b1. Number of children attending separate special education class | 6,150 | 9,985 | 6,552 | 22,687 |
| b2. Number of children attending separate school | 503 | 837 | 55 | 1,395 |
| b3. Number of children attending residential facility | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| c1**.** Numberof children receiving special education and related services in the home | 1,765 | 1,344 | 443 | 3,552 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5**

| **Preschool Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program | 18,172 | 62,112 | 34.46% | 39.00% | 29.26% | N/A | N/A |
| B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility | 24,087 | 62,112 | 35.76% | 33.00% | 38.78% | N/A | N/A |
| C. Home | 3,552 | 62,112 |  | 3.50% | 5.72% | N/A | N/A |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Baseline Justification: Due to the changes in the measurement table that remove 5-year old’s in kindergarten from this data source, California has updated the baseline for this indicator.

## 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State did not revise the baseline for this indicator, as required due to the change in the data source. The State must revise its baseline using data from FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

California did not take the option to exclude 5 year old kindergarteners from Indicator 6 in the FFY19 APR, therefore the data source did not change. California has reset the baseline for the FFY2020 APR in alignment with the mandatory changes starting in FFY2020.

## 6 - OSEP Response

OSEP’s response to the State’s FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission required the State to revise its baseline for this indicator using FFY 2019 data due to the change to the data source for this indicator. The State reported it did not transition to exclude five-year-olds in Kindergarten in its FFY 2019 (SY 19-20) data, but did so in its FFY 2020 (SY 20-21) data when the change in reporting requirements for the section 618 data collection became permanent. The State reported it revised its baseline using FFY 2020 data.   
  
The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.   
  
The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 6 - Required Actions

# Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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))

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

Outcomes:

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.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

**Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:**

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

**Measurement for Summary Statement 1:** Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

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

**Measurement for Summary Statement 2**: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.” If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

## 7 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| A1 | 2020 | Target >= | 72.70% | 82.20% | 83.20% | 84.20% | 85.20% |
| A1 | 70.95% | Data | 67.63% | 82.24% | 76.71% | 76.04% | 79.46% |
| A2 | 2020 | Target >= | 82.10% | 78.50% | 79.50% | 80.50% | 81.50% |
| A2 | 67.97% | Data | 72.52% | 78.53% | 77.59% | 76.65% | 76.82% |
| B1 | 2020 | Target >= | 70.00% | 79.70% | 80.70% | 81.70% | 82.70% |
| B1 | 69.46% | Data | 68.68% | 79.73% | 76.06% | 75.18% | 78.12% |
| B2 | 2020 | Target >= | 82.50% | 77.57% | 78.57% | 79.57% | 80.50% |
| B2 | 65.74% | Data | 71.24% | 77.57% | 76.70% | 76.23% | 76.38% |
| C1 | 2020 | Target >= | 75.00% | 73.70% | 74.70% | 75.70% | 76.70% |
| C1 | 73.68% | Data | 68.72% | 73.72% | 75.34% | 75.40% | 79.41% |
| C2 | 2020 | Target >= | 79.00% | 76.45% | 77.45% | 78.45% | 79.45% |
| C2 | 69.32% | Data | 70.47% | 76.45% | 77.02% | 76.74% | 77.79% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A1 >= | 76.00% | 77.00% | 78.00% | 79.00% | 80.00% | 81.00% |
| Target A2 >= | 76.00% | 77.00% | 78.00% | 79.00% | 80.00% | 81.00% |
| Target B1 >= | 76.00% | 77.00% | 78.00% | 79.00% | 80.00% | 81.00% |
| Target B2 >= | 76.00% | 77.00% | 78.00% | 79.00% | 80.00% | 81.00% |
| Target C1 >= | 76.00% | 77.00% | 78.00% | 79.00% | 80.00% | 81.00% |
| Target C2 >= | 76.00% | 77.00% | 78.00% | 79.00% | 80.00% | 81.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The CDE and SED management collaborate with the stakeholders listed below:  
  
The State Interagency Coordinating Council on Early Intervention: The State Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) on Early Intervention provides advice and assistance to the Department of Developmental Services. Members of the ICC are appointed by the Governor. The council is comprised of parents of children with disabilities, early intervention service providers, health care professionals, state agency representatives, and others interested in early intervention. The ICC meets four times a year and encourages a family-centered approach, family-professional partnerships, and interagency collaboration, while providing a forum for public input.  
  
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. Its mission is to provide an environment for building relationships and nurturing trust among leaders in support of coordination and collaboration in the planning and implementation of early intervention training and technical assistance activities. By providing a forum for cross-agency and cross-disciplinary discussion and resource sharing, TTAC promotes the mindful integration of specific core values into the delivery of early child care, education, and early intervention focusing on increasing child and family outcomes.  
  
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:  
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 CALPADS 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 CALPADS 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 2021, the SED Director reported to the ACSE on the OSEP's new priorities for the SPP/APR.  
  
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 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.  
  
2. SELPA – The Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) Administrators organization assists CDE in the development and implementation through a collaborative feedback loop. The CDE regularly solicits input from the SELPA administrators’ group and SELPA serves on several CDE work groups.   
The CDE also presented the proposed new targets, data analysis, and improvement strategies to ACSE in October 2021 to solicit feedback and public comment. The CDE also presented the proposed new targets and how the SPP/APR fits into the Statewide System of Support to the SBE in September 2021, November 2021, and January 2022 and received public comment and support.   
  
The SED has sought to actively involve the ACSE, the SBE liaison, and the SBE staff in the development of the FFY 2020 SPP/APR. 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.  
  
The SPP/APR was approved by the SBE in January 2022.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed**

16,266

**Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)**

| **Outcome A Progress Category** | **Number of children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 382 | 2.41% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 1,893 | 11.92% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 2,813 | 17.71% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 2,744 | 17.28% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 8,051 | 50.69% |

| **Outcome A** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A1. Of those children who entered or exited the 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. *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 5,557 | 7,832 | 79.46% | 76.00% | 70.95% | N/A | N/A |
| 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. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 10,795 | 15,883 | 76.82% | 76.00% | 67.97% | N/A | N/A |

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

| **Outcome B Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 218 | 1.43% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 2,145 | 14.10% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 2,847 | 18.72% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 2,528 | 16.62% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 7,470 | 49.12% |

| **Outcome B** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| B1. Of those children who entered or exited the 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. *Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 5,375 | 7,738 | 78.12% | 76.00% | 69.46% | N/A | N/A |
| 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. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 9,998 | 15,208 | 76.38% | 76.00% | 65.74% | N/A | N/A |

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

| **Outcome C Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 437 | 2.81% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 1,418 | 9.13% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 2,910 | 18.74% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 2,283 | 14.70% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 8,482 | 54.62% |

| **Outcome C** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.  *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 5,193 | 7,048 | 79.41% | 76.00% | 73.68% | N/A | N/A |
| 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.  *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 10,765 | 15,530 | 77.79% | 76.00% | 69.32% | N/A | N/A |

**Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)**

YES

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | NO |

**Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)**

NO

**If no, provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.”**

In California, a sample of children is used to define "comparable to same-aged peers" for Indicator 7. This sample of same-aged peers refers to a total sample of children ages birth to 5 enrolled in both CDE Early Education and Support Division programs and infants, toddlers, and preschoolers with disabilities enrolled in CDE, SED Part C (early intervention) or Section 619 (preschool) programs that were assessed on the DRDP in Spring 2021. California identifies same aged peers as children without IEPs ages 3 to 5 who are enrolled in an early childhood program sponsored by the State Education Agency or Local Educational Agency.

**List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.**

In California, local education agencies provide DRDP (2015) assessment data to the California Department of Education, Special Education Division for all 3, 4, and 5-year-old children with IEPs each fall and spring. The data from these assessments is used to fulfill the OSEP requirements for Indicator 7. The DRDP (2015) is a developmental continuum for children birth through five years of age and is comprised of developmental indicators representing important areas of learning and development for young children along which children’s skills are measured.  
  
In each of the OSEP Outcomes, DRDP data is used to establish “entry” and “exit” scores for every child by comparing the child’s DRDP data at the time of entry into preschool special education services to the data at exit from preschool special education. The steps in this process are:  
  
-DRDP (2015) data are compiled to create a single longitudinal data set.   
-This data is reviewed to identify an 'entry' assessment for every child.  
-The CDE, SED reviews the DRDP (2015) data in CALPADS to identify children who have exited preschool special education. The most recent DRDP assessment is used as the 'exit' assessment.   
- 'Entry' and 'exit' DRDP assessments are paired and extracted for the Indicator 7 analyses.   
  
For each outcome, the DRDP assessment results determine the extent to which the child’s behaviors and skills are comparable to age expectations. A child's rating is determined to be "within age expectations" if their rating is 1.2 standard deviations below the mean and up. A child's rating is determined to be "close to age expectation" if the rating is between 1.3 and 2.0 standard deviations below the mean for same-age peers. Finally, the child's rating is determined to be "not at age expectations" if the rating is located more than 2 standard deviations below the mean. Once each rating has been categorized into at, close, or not at age expectations, each child’s DRDP “entry” and “exit” data is used to provide an overall summary of progress, determined by comparing each child’s level of functioning and individual progress to a sample of same-aged peers, described below. The child’s progress is then recorded relative to progress expected for children the same age and assigned to the appropriate Progress Category. Using the OSEP Progress Category tabulations, results are calculated for each OSEP outcome and summary statement using OSEP's formulas for calculating these results.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Baseline Justification: Some of the measurements used to collect data were changed for this indicator during FY2020-21, due to this change the state has updated the baseline.

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 7 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, but OSEP cannot accept that revision because the State did not provide an explanation for the revision.   
  
The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, but OSEP cannot accept those targets because OSEP cannot determine whether the State’s end targets for FFY 2025 reflect improvement over the State’s baseline data, given that the State's revised baseline cannot be accepted.

## 7 - Required Actions

If the State chooses to revise its baseline, using data from FFY 2020, the State must provide the required explanation for the baseline revision in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.  
  
The State did not provide targets, as required by the measurement table. The State must provide the required targets for FFY 2020 through FFY 2025 in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

# Indicator 8: Parent involvement

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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))

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

*Sampling****of parents from whom response is requested****is allowed.* *When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

Include in the State’s analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023,** when reporting the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

## 8 - Indicator Data

| **Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? | NO |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The CDE and SED management collaborate with the stakeholders listed below:  
  
The State Interagency Coordinating Council on Early Intervention: The State Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) on Early Intervention provides advice and assistance to the Department of Developmental Services. Members of the ICC are appointed by the Governor. The council is comprised of parents of children with disabilities, early intervention service providers, health care professionals, state agency representatives, and others interested in early intervention. The ICC meets four times a year and encourages a family-centered approach, family-professional partnerships, and interagency collaboration, while providing a forum for public input.  
  
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. Its mission is to provide an environment for building relationships and nurturing trust among leaders in support of coordination and collaboration in the planning and implementation of early intervention training and technical assistance activities. By providing a forum for cross-agency and cross-disciplinary discussion and resource sharing, TTAC promotes the mindful integration of specific core values into the delivery of early child care, education, and early intervention focusing on increasing child and family outcomes.  
  
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:  
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 CALPADS 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 CALPADS 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 2021, the SED Director reported to the ACSE on the OSEP's new priorities for the SPP/APR.  
  
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 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.  
  
2. SELPA – The Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) Administrators organization assists CDE in the development and implementation through a collaborative feedback loop. The CDE regularly solicits input from the SELPA administrators’ group and SELPA serves on several CDE work groups.   
The CDE also presented the proposed new targets, data analysis, and improvement strategies to ACSE in October 2021 to solicit feedback and public comment. The CDE also presented the proposed new targets and how the SPP/APR fits into the Statewide System of Support to the SBE in September 2021, November 2021, and January 2022 and received public comment and support.   
  
The SED has sought to actively involve the ACSE, the SBE liaison, and the SBE staff in the development of the FFY 2020 SPP/APR. 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.  
  
The SPP/APR was approved by the SBE in January 2022.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 69.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 90.00% | 91.00% | 92.00% | 93.00% | 94.00% |
| Data | 93.76% | 99.42% | 99.56% | 99.57% | 99.60% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 95.00% | 95.50% | 96.00% | 96.50% | 97.00% | 97.50% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities** | **Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities** | | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 809,199 | | 812,059 | 99.60% | 95.00% | 99.65% | Met target | No Slippage |

**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 parent in California during the IEP process. It is expected that all California students ages 3-22 will have at least one IEP per year.

**The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.**

812,059

**Percentage of respondent parents**

100.00%

**Response Rate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Response Rate | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.**

As seen above, California over the last two years has had a 100% response rate. As this is a required question asked of every parent during the IEP process, California will continue to monitor the data to ensure the 100% response rate continues.

**Describe the analysis** **of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.**

Nonresponse bias was analyzed by comparing responses for racial/ethnic populations. As California has a 100% response rate and the responding parents are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, this suggests that there is very limited nonresponse bias.

**Include in the State’s analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.**

The race/ethnicity of respondent parents were representative of the race/ethnicity of children receiving special education services.   
  
Federal ethnicity of respondents  
American Indian/Alaskan Native....0.65%  
Asian....6.39%  
African American...7.0%  
Hispanic...58.65%  
Multi-ethnic/Two or More races...5.14%  
Pacific Islander...0.33%  
White...21.83%  
  
Federal ethnicity of Special Education Students  
American Indian/Alaskan Native....0.64%  
Asian....6.39%  
African American...7.34%  
Hispanic...58.41%  
Multi-ethnic/Two or More races...5.25%  
Pacific Islander...0.34%  
White...21.63%

**The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)**

YES

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

**Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).**

During the statewide stakeholder meetings, stakeholders recommended that representativeness be set to +/-3%.

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | NO |

| **Survey Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was a survey used? | NO |
| If yes, provide a copy of the survey. |  |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 8 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 8 - Required Actions

# Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**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))

**Data Source**

State’s analysis, based on State’s Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Measurement**

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

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 9 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 0.27% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 2.57% | 0.88% | 1.60% | 2.06% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services** | **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification** | **Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 19 | 4 | 1,469 | 2.06% | 0% | 0.27% | N/A | N/A |

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).**

The California Department of Education (CDE) is responsible under Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA 2004), for conducting monitoring activities based on district data submitted through the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS). Specifically, the CDE must identify districts that have disproportionate representation in special education based on race and ethnicity. When a local educational agency (LEA) is found to have disproportionate representation, the state is required, in Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulations 300.600(d), to monitor and ensure that district policies, procedures, and practices are compliant, do not lead to inappropriate identification, and comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of individualized education program, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.  
  
In order to better align the disproportionality process with the Significant Disproportionality guidelines issued by the federal Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), the CDE is made changes to the calculation methodologies for Indicators 4, 9, and 10 and adding least restrictive environment (LRE) to disproportionality. These changes were effective for the data 2016–17 data year using the December 2016 CASEMIS data.   
  
The elements of all four indicators will use the Risk Ratio (see below) maximum of 3.0 to determine disproportionality with the following exceptions:  
   
-If the numerator is less than 10 and the number of students in the race/ethnicity General Education group (denominator) is less than 20, then no calculation is done.   
-If the numerator is less than 10 or the denominator is less than 20, then the Alternate Risk Ratio is used instead of the Risk Ratio.  
  
Disproportionality is a one year calculation.

**Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.**

In FFY 2020, California identified 4 districts with non-compliant 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. The CDE conducts a file review of each LEA identified. The instrument can be found here:  
  
Review Instruments  
https://www3.cde.ca.gov/exfiles/downloadurl.aspx?pid=173&dc=ab89a89f271c4ae19b  
https://www3.cde.ca.gov/exfiles/downloadurl.aspx?pid=173&dc=db4e72b486f844d3bc

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 29 | 29 |  | 0 |

**FFY 2019 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 were required to review and revise their policies (if district has noncompliance), procedures and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs and procedural safeguards. The CDE required revision of policy, practices, and procedures when noncompliance is identified.   
  
In 2020—21, 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 updated data.  
-A 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 ensured correction using the standard identified in OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02): (1) correctly implemented 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**

The CDE ensured LEA policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 through a review of each individual case of noncompliance identified.  
  
If a LEA was identified as Disproportionate they were selected for a review of policies, procedures, and practices including student level compliance data. If during the review the LEA is found noncompliant in any area related to the development and implementation of IEPs and procedural safeguards. The CDE issued required Corrective Actions, the LEA must submit evidence of correction within 60 days.  
  
If a LEA had a student level finding of noncompliance, it must submit evidence that it corrected the noncompliance at the student level. In the instance a LEA is found noncompliant in the area of “making the determination of eligibility, did the IEP team draw upon a variety of sources of information, such as test, teacher recommendations and parent input”. The LEA must provide evidence that an IEP was completed where, in making a determination of eligibility, the IEP team drew upon a variety of sources of information, such as test, teacher recommendations, and parent input.  
  
If a LEA had a finding of noncompliance within the policies and procedures the LEA must provide evidence that it corrected the policies and procedures to be compliant with state and federal law, notified staff and administrators of the policies and procedures change, and conducted in-service training for staff and administrators.  
  
After the initial submission of evidence the LEA was required to submit a subsequent data report (Prong II) to ensure the implementation of the corrective action. The CDE required subsequent data reviews until the LEA is 100% compliant. This guarantees each finding of noncompliance is corrected every year and the systemic noncompliance have been corrected.  
  
The CDE ensured correction of all 24 findings using the standard identified in OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02): (1) correctly implemented 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 Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that the 29 districts identified in FFY 2019 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. §§ 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 2020 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 2019, although its FFY 2019 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 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

California has reported the correction of noncompliance identified in FFY2019.

## 9 - OSEP Response

OSEP cannot determine whether the data are valid and reliable for this indicator because it is not clear whether the State included the required information in its definition of disproportionate representation. In the definition, the State indicated, “Disproportionality is a one year calculation.” Because of the State’s use of the term “disproportionality,” it is not clear whether the State is referring to disproportionate representation, as required under this indicator, rather than significant disproportionality.  
  
The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, but OSEP cannot accept that revision because OSEP cannot determine whether the State's data are valid and reliable.  
  
The State did not demonstrate that the LEAs corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 because there is a discrepancy in the number of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019. Specifically, the State reported 29 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 in its FFY 2019 SPP/APR; however, in its FFY 2020 SPP/APR the State reported it corrected all 24 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 within one year. Therefore, OSEP is unable to determine how many findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 were verified as corrected within one year.

## 9 - Required Actions

In the State’s FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must specify whether the number of years of data used in the calculation applies to the State’s definition of disproportionate representation.  
  
Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that the 4 districts identified in FFY 2020 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. §§ 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 2021 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 2020, although its FFY 2020 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 2020.  
  
The State must also demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that the 29 districts identified in FFY 2019 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019: (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 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

# Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**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))

**Data Source**

State’s analysis, based on State’s Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Measurement**

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

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2020, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 10 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 5.99% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.73% | 17.14% | 27.76% | 9.91% | 14.11% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories** | **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification** | **Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 252 | 88 | 1,469 | 14.11% | 0% | 5.99% | N/A | N/A |

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).**

The California Department of Education (CDE) is responsible under Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA 2004), for conducting monitoring activities based on district data submitted through the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS). Specifically, the CDE must identify districts that have disproportionate representation in special education based on race and ethnicity. When a local educational agency (LEA) is found to have disproportionate representation, the state is required, in Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulations 300.600(d), to monitor and ensure that district policies, procedures, and practices are compliant, do not lead to inappropriate identification, and comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of individualized education program, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.  
  
In order to better align the disproportionality process with the Significant Disproportionality guidelines issued by the federal Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), the CDE made changes to the calculation methodologies for Indicators 4, 9, and 10 and added least restrictive environment (LRE) to disproportionality. These changes are effective for the data 2016–17 data year using the December 2016 CASEMIS data.  
  
The elements of all four indicators will use the Risk Ratio (see below) maximum of 3.0 to determine disproportionality with the following exceptions:  
  
-If the numerator is less than 10 and the number of students in the race/ethnicity General Education group (denominator) is less than 20, then no calculation is done  
-If the numerator is less than 10 or the denominator is less than 20, then the Alternate Risk Ratio (see below) is used instead of the Risk Ratio.  
  
Disproportionality is a one year calculation.

**Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.**

In FFY 2020, California identified 88 districts with non compliant 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. The CDE conducts a file review of each LEA identified. The instrument can be found here:  
  
Review Instruments  
https://www3.cde.ca.gov/exfiles/downloadurl.aspx?pid=173&dc=ab89a89f271c4ae19b  
https://www3.cde.ca.gov/exfiles/downloadurl.aspx?pid=173&dc=db4e72b486f844d3bc

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 436 | 436 |  | 0 |

**FFY 2019 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 were required to review and revise their policies (if district has noncompliance), procedures and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs and procedural safeguards. The CDE required revision of policy, practices, and procedures when noncompliance is identified.   
  
In 2020—21, 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 updated data.  
-A 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 ensured correction using the standard identified in OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02): (1) correctly implemented 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**

The CDE ensured LEA policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 through a review of each individual case of noncompliance identified.  
  
If a LEA was identified as Disproportionate they were selected for a review of policies, procedures, and practices including student level compliance data. If during the review the LEA is found noncompliant in any area related to the development and implementation of IEPs and procedural safeguards. The CDE issued required Corrective Actions, the LEA must submit evidence of correction within 60 days.  
  
If a LEA has a student level finding of noncompliance, it must submit evidence that it has corrected the noncompliance at the student level. In the instance a LEA was found noncompliant in the area of “making the determination of eligibility, did the IEP team draw upon a variety of sources of information, such as test, teacher recommendations and parent input”. The LEA must provide evidence that an IEP was completed where, in making a determination of eligibility, the IEP team drew upon a variety of sources of information, such as test, teacher recommendations, and parent input.  
  
If a LEA had a finding of noncompliance within the policies and procedures the LEA must provide evidence that it corrected the policies and procedures to be compliant with state and federal law, notified staff and administrators of the policies and procedures change, and conducted in-service training for staff and administrators.  
  
After the initial submission of evidence the LEA was required to submit a subsequent data report (Prong II) to ensure the implementation of the corrective action. The CDE required subsequent data reviews until the LEA is 100% compliant. This guarantees each finding of noncompliance is corrected every year and the systemic noncompliance have been corrected.  
  
The CDE ensured correction of all 436 findings using the standard identified in OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02): (1) correctly implemented 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 Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that the 161 districts identified in FFY 2019 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 C.F.R. §§ 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 2020 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 2019, although its FFY 2019 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 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

California has reported correction of all noncompliance for FFY2019.

## 10 - OSEP Response

OSEP cannot determine whether the data are valid and reliable for this indicator because it is not clear whether the State included the required information in its definition of disproportionate representation. In the definition, the State indicated, “Disproportionality is a one year calculation.” Because of the State’s use of the term “disproportionality,” it is not clear whether the State is referring to disproportionate representation, as required under this indicator, rather than significant disproportionality.  
  
The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, but OSEP cannot accept that revision because OSEP cannot determine whether the State's data are valid and reliable.

## 10 - Required Actions

In the State’s FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must specify whether the number of years of data used in the calculation applies to the State’s definition of disproportionate representation.  
  
Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that the 88 districts identified in FFY 2020 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification [is/are] in compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. §§ 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 2021 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 2020, although its FFY 2020 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 2020.

# Indicator 11: Child Find

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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.

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

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State’s timeline for initial evaluations.

**Measurement**

a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.

b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

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.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

**Instructions**

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child’s previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 11 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 81.47% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 98.76% | 98.46% | 97.86% | 96.17% | 96.22% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received** | **(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 66,490 | 64,907 | 96.22% | 100% | 97.62% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)**

1,583

**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.**

There are 5 delay reasons collected: Parent did not make child available, official school break of 5 days or more, transfer, late without cause, and other (example: mediation agreement or natural disaster.  
  
Days Late...Count...Percent  
61-90...945...59.7%  
91-120...313...19.7%  
121-150...137...8.6%  
151+...188...11.9%

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used:**

The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted

**What is the State’s timeline for initial evaluations? If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b).**

According to Education Code Section 56043(f): "An individualized education program required as a result of an assessment of a pupil shall be developed within a total time not to exceed 60 calendar days, not counting days between the pupil's regular school sessions, terms, or days of school vacation in excess of five school days, from the date of receipt of the parent's or guardian's written consent for assessment, unless the parent or guardian agrees in writing to an extension, pursuant to Section 56344".

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

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 CALPADS end of year submission. The CALPADS is a longitudinal student data reporting and retrieval system designed to accept and validate student level data submitted to the CDE. The CALPADS is one of many tools used to support the CDE's valid and reliable data efforts.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3,632 | 3,632 |  | 0 |

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

In 2020–21, 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 updated data.  
-A 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 ensured the correction of all 3,632 findings using the standard identified in OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02): (1) correctly implemented the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR 300.301 ; 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**

The CDE ensured LEA policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 through a review of each individual case of noncompliance identified.  
  
If a LEA was identified with data identified non-compliance they were selected for a review of policies, procedures, and practices including student level compliance data. If during the review the LEA is found noncompliant. The CDE issued required Corrective Actions, the LEA must submit evidence of correction within 60 days.  
  
If a LEA had a student level finding of noncompliance, it must submit evidence that it corrected the noncompliance at the student level. In the instance a LEA did not evaluate a child within 60 days of receiving parental consent, the LEA must submit evidence that it held an evaluation, albeit late.  
  
After the initial submission of evidence the LEA was required to submit a subsequent data report (Prong II) to ensure the implementation of the corrective action. The CDE required subsequent data reviews until the LEA is 100% compliant. This guarantees each finding of noncompliance is corrected every year and the systemic noncompliance has been corrected.  
  
The CDE ensured the correction of all 3,632 findings using the standard identified in OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02): (1) correctly implemented the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR 300.301 ; 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 Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 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 2020 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 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

California has reported corrections of noncompliance for FFY2019.

## 11 - OSEP Response

## 11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 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 2021 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 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

# Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priorit**y: 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))

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.

b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.

c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.

e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.

f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday through a State’s policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

**Instructions**

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 12 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 69.19% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 85.78% | 95.39% | 95.16% | 89.70% | 87.63% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination. | 14,784 |
| b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday. | 1,371 |
| c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. | 8,199 |
| 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. | 1,924 |
| e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays. | 195 |
| f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday through a State’s policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option. |  |

| **Measure** | **Numerator (c)** | **Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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. | 8,199 | 11,294 | 87.63% | 100% | 72.60% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

California has noted an increase in the number of children with disabilities missing the required Part C to Part B transition timeline. California believes this is due to delays in assessment due to pandemic health concerns. California is committed to improving the transition of children from IDEA Part C to Part B and recognizes the need for improvement. The CDE has partnered with the California Department of Developmental Services, which administers the Part C program, to provide more information to the field about the importance of timelines and need for a seamless transition for these children. This increased need in technical assistance has been noted by the State Legislature and increased funding is being proposed to support this work.

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

3,095

**Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.**

There were 3,095 children in (a), but not included in b, c, d, or e. The table, attached, depicts the range of days beyond the third birthday for those children. Reasons cited for delays included: late referrals (before third birthday, but with insufficient time to complete the assessment), lack of staff, ineffective tracking system, no IEP in place before third birthday, student illness, and failure to keep appointments. Please see the table below.  
  
Days Late...Count...Percent  
1-14...585...18.9%  
15-30...516...16.7%  
31-60...753...24.5%  
61-90...447...14.5%  
91-180...542...17.6%  
180+...237...7.6%

**Attach PDF table (optional)**

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

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 CALPADS end of year submission and from the California Department of Developmental Services. The CALPADS is California's student longitudinal data reporting and retrieval system designed to accept and validate student level data submitted to the CDE. The CALPADS is one of many tools used to support the CDE’s valid and reliable data efforts.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1,388 | 1,388 |  | 0 |

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

In 2020–21, 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 updated data.  
-A 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 the correction of all 1,388 findings using the standard identified in OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02): (1)correctly implemented the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR 300.124 ; 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**

The CDE ensured LEA policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 through a review of each individual case of noncompliance identified.   
  
If a LEA was identified with data identified non-compliance they were selected for a review of policies, procedures, and practices including student level compliance data. If during the review the LEA is found noncompliant. The CDE issued required Corrective Actions, the LEA must submit evidence of correction within 60 days.  
  
If a LEA had a student level finding of noncompliance, it must submit evidence that it corrected the noncompliance at the student level. In the instance a LEA did not develop and implement an IEP by a child's third birthday, the LEA must submit evidence that it developed and implemented an IEP, albeit late.  
  
After the initial submission of evidence the LEA was required to submit a subsequent data report (Prong II) to ensure the implementation of the corrective action. The CDE required subsequent data reviews until the LEA is 100% compliant. This guarantees each finding of noncompliance is corrected every year and the systemic noncompliance has been corrected.  
  
The CDE ensured the correction of all 1,388 findings 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 300.124 ; 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 Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 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 2020 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 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

California has reported correction of noncompliance for FFY2019.

## 12 - OSEP Response

## 12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 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 2021 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 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

# Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective 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 that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP 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))

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

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 that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

**Instructions**

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 13 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2009 | 72.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 99.59% | 99.79% | 99.78% | 99.42% | 96.35% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition** | **Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 182,406 | 191,336 | 96.35% | 100% | 95.33% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

The CDE is concerned with the decrease of youth with disabilities that have IEPs that do not contain secondary transition elements. Slippage is due to normal year to year fluctuation. The CDE is working with LEAs to provide additional technical assistance and guidance to ensure IEP teams are meeting secondary transition timelines. CDE has informed each LEA that they are out of compliance and will need to hold those IEPs and include all the necessary transition elements.

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

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 CALPADS end of year submission and from the California Department of Developmental Services. The CALPADS is California's student longitudinal data reporting and retrieval system designed to accept and validate student level data submitted to the CDE. The CALPADS is one of many tools used to support the CDE’s valid and reliable data efforts.

| **Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Do the State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16? | NO |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6,815 | 6,815 |  | 0 |

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

In 2020–21, 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 updated data.  
-A 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 the correction of all 6,815 findings using the standard identified in OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02): (1) correctly implemented the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR 300.320(b) and 34 CFR 300.321 (b) ; 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**

The CDE ensured LEA policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 through a review of each individual case of noncompliance identified.  
  
If a LEA was identified with data identified non-compliance they were selected for a review of policies, procedures, and practices including student level compliance data. If during the review the LEA is found noncompliant. The CDE issued required Corrective Actions, the LEA must submit evidence of correction within 60 days.  
  
If a LEA had a student level finding of noncompliance, it must submit evidence that it corrected the noncompliance at the student level. In the instance a LEA did not include appropriate measurable postsecondary goals in a students IEP, the LEA must submit evidence that it has corrected the noncompliance.  
  
After the initial submission of evidence the LEA was required to submit a subsequent data report (Prong II) to ensure the implementation of the corrective action. The CDE required subsequent data reviews until the LEA is 100% compliant. This guarantees each finding of noncompliance is corrected every year and the systemic noncompliance has been corrected.  
  
The CDE ensured the correction of all 6,815 findings using the standard identified in OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02): (1) correctly implemented the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR 300.320(b) and 34 CFR 300.321 (b) ; 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 Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 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 2020 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 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

California has reported the correction of noncompliance for FFY2019.

## 13 - OSEP Response

## 13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 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 2021 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 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

# Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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))

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling****of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school****is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Collect data by September 2021 on students who left school during 2019-2020, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2019-2020 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

**I. *Definitions***

*Enrolled in higher education* as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

*Competitive employment* as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment”:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

*Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training* as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

*Some other employment* as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

**II. *Data Reporting***

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;

2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);

3. 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);

4. 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).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

**III. *Reporting on the Measures/Indicators***

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due Feb. 1, 2023,** when reporting the extent to which the demographics of respondents are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

## 14 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| A | 2013 | Target >= | 52.30% | 52.30% | 53.30% | 54.30% | 55.30% |
| A | 52.30% | Data | 52.26% | 48.87% | 53.97% | 54.78% | 56.67% |
| B | 2013 | Target >= | 72.40% | 72.40% | 73.40% | 74.40% | 75.40% |
| B | 72.40% | Data | 75.46% | 72.65% | 77.60% | 70.65% | 75.94% |
| C | 2013 | Target >= | 81.00% | 81.00% | 82.00% | 83.00% | 84.00% |
| C | 81.00% | Data | 83.16% | 81.72% | 85.56% | 89.33% | 94.11% |

**FFY 2020 Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 55.00% | 56.00% | 57.00% | 58.00% | 59.00% | 60.00% |
| Target B >= | 75.00% | 76.50% | 78.00% | 79.50% | 81.00% | 82.50% |
| Target C >= | 87.00% | 87.50% | 88.00% | 88.50% | 89.00% | 89.50% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The CDE and SED management collaborate with the stakeholders listed below:  
  
The State Interagency Coordinating Council on Early Intervention: The State Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) on Early Intervention provides advice and assistance to the Department of Developmental Services. Members of the ICC are appointed by the Governor. The council is comprised of parents of children with disabilities, early intervention service providers, health care professionals, state agency representatives, and others interested in early intervention. The ICC meets four times a year and encourages a family-centered approach, family-professional partnerships, and interagency collaboration, while providing a forum for public input.  
  
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. Its mission is to provide an environment for building relationships and nurturing trust among leaders in support of coordination and collaboration in the planning and implementation of early intervention training and technical assistance activities. By providing a forum for cross-agency and cross-disciplinary discussion and resource sharing, TTAC promotes the mindful integration of specific core values into the delivery of early child care, education, and early intervention focusing on increasing child and family outcomes.  
  
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:  
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 CALPADS 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 CALPADS 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 2021, the SED Director reported to the ACSE on the OSEP's new priorities for the SPP/APR.  
  
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 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.  
  
2. SELPA – The Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) Administrators organization assists CDE in the development and implementation through a collaborative feedback loop. The CDE regularly solicits input from the SELPA administrators’ group and SELPA serves on several CDE work groups.   
The CDE also presented the proposed new targets, data analysis, and improvement strategies to ACSE in October 2021 to solicit feedback and public comment. The CDE also presented the proposed new targets and how the SPP/APR fits into the Statewide System of Support to the SBE in September 2021, November 2021, and January 2022 and received public comment and support.   
  
The SED has sought to actively involve the ACSE, the SBE liaison, and the SBE staff in the development of the FFY 2020 SPP/APR. 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.  
  
The SPP/APR was approved by the SBE in January 2022.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census | 37,494 |
| Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school | 23,753 |
| Response Rate | 63.35% |
| 1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school | 11,079 |
| 2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school | 5,612 |
| 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) | 1,760 |
| 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). | 2,662 |

| **Measure** | **Number of respondent youth** | **Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Enrolled in higher education (1) | 11,079 | 23,753 | 56.67% | 55.00% | 46.64% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2) | 16,691 | 23,753 | 75.94% | 75.00% | 70.27% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| 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) | 21,113 | 23,753 | 94.11% | 87.00% | 88.89% | Met target | No Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **A** | Students with disabilities have faced similar difficulties as their same aged peers during the Covid-19 pandemic. Many students are choosing to delay enrolling in higher education courses during this time. The CDE is monitoring this data and hopes to see this data raise back to pre-Covid levels. |
| **B** | Students with disabilities have faced similar difficulties as their same aged peers during the Covid-19 pandemic. Many students are choosing to delay enrolling in higher education courses as well as finding it harder to find competitive employment during this time. The CDE is monitoring this data and hopes to see this data raise back to pre-Covid levels. |

**Please select the reporting option your State is using:**

Option 2: Report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

**Response Rate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Response Rate | 60.90% | 63.35% |

**Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.**

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

**Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.**

While a survey regarding the activities of students after exiting from high school is not generally seen as a topic that would result in nonresponse bias (NRB), NRB can still occur for several reasons. California’s LEAs extensive outreach prior to survey distribution via mail, telephone and email is specifically designed to counter this type of NRB. Furthermore, since the use of multiple mediums has been shown to increase survey response rates and prevent NRB, LEAs reach out in a variety of formats including mail, paper, email, and text. California LEAs survey is collected in several phases over the course of several weeks with multiple reminders to non-responsive exiters about the importance of completing the survey. While it’s not always possible to completely eliminate the effects of NRB, it’s possible to minimize the effects by using a smart survey design and distribution methodology. Lastly, California LEAs extensively communicate about the importance and confidentiality of the survey with exited students as per recommended practice in NRB avoidance, which is clearly reflected in our 63.3% response rate.

**Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.**

The CDE is working closely with LEAs and adult transition programs to reach more students to learn about their postsecondary outcomes. To this end, California is currently exploring the feasibility of a Preschool to Workforce data system to track outcomes (https://cadatasystem.wested.org/). Additionally, CDE is currently exploring funding options to access the National Student Clearinghouse data for more current information about post-secondary school outcomes. CDE hopes that these efforts will help ensure the response group of future APRs are representative of the demographics of youth no longer in secondary school in future submissions of the APR.  
  
Disability...Percent of Respondents...Percent of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left  
Autism...11.4%...15.4%  
Deaf-Blindness...0.01%...0.01%  
Emotional Disturbance...5.3%...3.3%  
Hearing Impairment...1.9%...1.6%  
Multiple Disabilities...0.5%...0.9%  
Intellectual Disabilities...4.4%...5.0%  
Other Health Impairment...16.9%...13.8%  
Orthopedic Impairment...1.1%...1.0%  
Specific Learning Disability...55.5%...36.2%  
Speech or Language Impairment...1.8%...21.8%  
Traumatic Brain Injury...0.4%...0.2%  
Visual Impairment...0.6%...0.3%

**The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)**

NO

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

The CDE is working closely with LEAs and adult transition programs to reach more students to learn about their postsecondary outcomes. To this end, California is currently exploring the feasibility of a Preschool to Workforce data system to track outcomes (https://cadatasystem.wested.org/). Additionally, CDE is currently exploring funding options to access the National Student Clearinghouse data for more current information about post-secondary school outcomes. CDE hopes that these efforts will help ensure the response group of future APRs are representative of the demographics of youth no longer in secondary school in future submissions of the APR.

**Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).**

During the statewide stakeholder meetings, stakeholders recommended that representativeness be set to +/-3%.

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | NO |
| **Survey Question** | **Yes / No** |
| Was a survey used? | NO |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

During the SPP/APR clarification period OSEP had a question as to how California collects the data for this indicator. The CDE does not use sampling for this indicator, nor does the CDE issue a survey directly to students to collect this data. The data for this indicator is collected through the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS), which is the statewide longitudinal data system. Postsecondary Status is collected during the end of year CALPADS collection. LEAs are required to submit LEA data as to the status of students with disabilities who have exited secondary education in the prior academic year. CALPADS has several data checks built in to ensure the data submitted is valid and reliable. It is the LEAs decision on how they collect this data. Many LEAs issue a LEA designed paper survey. Some LEAs rely on other methods such as phone calls, emails, and social media. The CDE does not dictate to LEAs how they collect this data, only how it is submitted to CDE.

## 14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2020 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

California has reported whether the FFY2020 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and what actions the State is taking to address this issue.

## 14 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 14 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2021 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

# Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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))

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/03/2021 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 669 |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/03/2021 | 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 66 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The CDE and SED management collaborate with the stakeholders listed below:  
  
The State Interagency Coordinating Council on Early Intervention: The State Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) on Early Intervention provides advice and assistance to the Department of Developmental Services. Members of the ICC are appointed by the Governor. The council is comprised of parents of children with disabilities, early intervention service providers, health care professionals, state agency representatives, and others interested in early intervention. The ICC meets four times a year and encourages a family-centered approach, family-professional partnerships, and interagency collaboration, while providing a forum for public input.  
  
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. Its mission is to provide an environment for building relationships and nurturing trust among leaders in support of coordination and collaboration in the planning and implementation of early intervention training and technical assistance activities. By providing a forum for cross-agency and cross-disciplinary discussion and resource sharing, TTAC promotes the mindful integration of specific core values into the delivery of early child care, education, and early intervention focusing on increasing child and family outcomes.  
  
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:  
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 CALPADS 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 CALPADS 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 2021, the SED Director reported to the ACSE on the OSEP's new priorities for the SPP/APR.  
  
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 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.  
  
2. SELPA – The Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) Administrators organization assists CDE in the development and implementation through a collaborative feedback loop. The CDE regularly solicits input from the SELPA administrators’ group and SELPA serves on several CDE work groups.   
The CDE also presented the proposed new targets, data analysis, and improvement strategies to ACSE in October 2021 to solicit feedback and public comment. The CDE also presented the proposed new targets and how the SPP/APR fits into the Statewide System of Support to the SBE in September 2021, November 2021, and January 2022 and received public comment and support.   
  
The SED has sought to actively involve the ACSE, the SBE liaison, and the SBE staff in the development of the FFY 2020 SPP/APR. 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.  
  
The SPP/APR was approved by the SBE in January 2022.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 9.87% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 57.00% | 58.00% | 59.00% | 60.00% | 61.00% |
| Data | 32.18% | 31.24% | 24.15% | 21.92% | 25.93% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 40.00% | 41.00% | 42.00% | 43.00% | 44.00% | 45.00% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements** | **3.1 Number of resolutions sessions** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 66 | 669 | 25.93% | 40.00% | 9.87% | N/A | N/A |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Baseline Justification: The Office of Administrative Hearings changed a programmatic definition which changed how the data was collected for this indicator, therefore California has updated the baseline.  
  
Covid Impact  
The traditional way the Office of Administrative Hearings conducted resolution sessions was impacted by Covid-19, this also impacted the data completeness, validity and reliability. Covid-19 specifically impacted the state’s ability to collect this data because a number of sessions had to be delayed or held via web conference or teleconference because in-person hearings were postponed indefinitely. The state tried to mitigate the impact of Covid-19 on the data collection by offering resolution sessions to be held virtually as well as offering more services electronically.

## 15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 15 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.  
  
The State provided targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.  
  
The State provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps the State has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

## 15 - Required Actions

# Indicator 16: Mediation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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))

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1) times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 16 - Indicator Data

**Select yes to use target ranges**

Target Range not used

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/03/2021 | 2.1 Mediations held | 1,681 |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/03/2021 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 302 |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/03/2021 | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | 14 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The CDE and SED management collaborate with the stakeholders listed below:  
  
The State Interagency Coordinating Council on Early Intervention: The State Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) on Early Intervention provides advice and assistance to the Department of Developmental Services. Members of the ICC are appointed by the Governor. The council is comprised of parents of children with disabilities, early intervention service providers, health care professionals, state agency representatives, and others interested in early intervention. The ICC meets four times a year and encourages a family-centered approach, family-professional partnerships, and interagency collaboration, while providing a forum for public input.  
  
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. Its mission is to provide an environment for building relationships and nurturing trust among leaders in support of coordination and collaboration in the planning and implementation of early intervention training and technical assistance activities. By providing a forum for cross-agency and cross-disciplinary discussion and resource sharing, TTAC promotes the mindful integration of specific core values into the delivery of early child care, education, and early intervention focusing on increasing child and family outcomes.  
  
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:  
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 CALPADS 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 CALPADS 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 2021, the SED Director reported to the ACSE on the OSEP's new priorities for the SPP/APR.  
  
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 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.  
  
2. SELPA – The Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) Administrators organization assists CDE in the development and implementation through a collaborative feedback loop. The CDE regularly solicits input from the SELPA administrators’ group and SELPA serves on several CDE work groups.   
The CDE also presented the proposed new targets, data analysis, and improvement strategies to ACSE in October 2021 to solicit feedback and public comment. The CDE also presented the proposed new targets and how the SPP/APR fits into the Statewide System of Support to the SBE in September 2021, November 2021, and January 2022 and received public comment and support.   
  
The SED has sought to actively involve the ACSE, the SBE liaison, and the SBE staff in the development of the FFY 2020 SPP/APR. 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.  
  
The SPP/APR was approved by the SBE in January 2022.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 18.80% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 57.00% | 58.00% | 59.00% | 60.00% | 61.00% |
| Data | 60.06% | 54.75% | 57.90% | 62.14% | 53.19% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 65.00% | 66.00% | 67.00% | 68.00% | 69.00% | 70.00% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints** | **2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints** | **2.1 Number of mediations held** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 302 | 14 | 1,681 | 53.19% | 65.00% | 18.80% | N/A | N/A |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Baseline Justification: The Office of Administrative Hearings changed a programmatic definition which changed how the data was collected for this indicator, therefore California has updated the baseline.  
  
Covid Impact  
The traditional way the Office of Administrative Hearings conducted mediations was impacted by Covid-19, this also impacted the data completeness, validity and reliability. Covid-19 specifically impacted the state’s ability to collect this data because a number of sessions had to be delayed or held via web conference or teleconference because in-person hearings were postponed indefinitely. The state tried to mitigate the impact of Covid-19 on the data collection by offering resolution sessions to be held virtually as well as offering more services electronically.

## 16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 16 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.  
  
The State provided targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.  
  
The State provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps the State has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

## 16 - Required Actions

# Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** General Supervision

The State’s SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

**Measurement**

The State’s SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

**Instructions**

**Baseline Data*:*** The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

**Targets*:*** In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State’s FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State’s baseline data.

**Updated Data:** In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2, 2022, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State’s targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

*Phase I: Analysis:*

- Data Analysis;

- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;

- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;

- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and

- Theory of Action.

*Phase II: Plan* (which, is in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;

- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and

- Evaluation.

*Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation* (which, is in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

**Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP**

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

***Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation***

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State’s last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2021). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

## 17 - Indicator Data

**Section A: Data Analysis**

**What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?**

California’s State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) addresses plans for improving outcomes for students with disabilities (SWD). California’s State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR) is the performance of all SWD who took the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress in both English Language Arts and Mathematics. California’s SSIP is focused on creating systemic and sustainable changes, including necessary alignment in statewide accountability and improvement structures like the State System of Support (SSOS) to improve outcomes for SWD.

**Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (*e.g.*, a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)**

NO

**Is the State’s theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Please provide a link to the current theory of action.**

https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/mar17item01.doc. (This downloads a Word document)  
attachment 4.

**Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, describe how evaluation data support the** **decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.**

California’s SSIP continues to be a critical driver of change, resulting in special education and SWD being meaningfully represented and addressed in the overall statewide system of accountability and support. Developed in 2013, prior to the launch of California’s new accountability system, the California Department of Education (CDE) hypothesized in the SSIP that by leveraging the intersectionality of SWD with the new Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) weighted student groups (students who are Foster Youth, English Language Learners, and/or socio-economically disadvantaged), all students would benefit. By aligning and integrating special education activities and technical assistance (TA) to the larger system of support for local educational agency (LEAs), it would lead to coherency among services for SWD and improve outcomes.  
  
The comprehensive improvement efforts initiated by LEAs are outlined in their local control and accountability plans (LCAPs). The TOA for California’s SSIP hypothesized that if California required each LEA to establish a comprehensive improvement plan and developed instructions to ensure that the plan included appropriate improvement activities for SWD, then each LEA would create an improvement plan that included evidence-based strategies and goals targeting high-needs students, including SWD, which would result in increased access to instruction for SWD and improved academic outcomes accordingly. Since phase III, California progressed toward ensuring that LCAPs include and address performance of SWD, including the passage of legislation (Assembly Bill 1808, Chapter 32, Statutes of 2018) to ensure the integration of LEA efforts to improve outcomes for SWD and the LCAP specifically.  
California has made significant progress in building a SSOS that effectively assists LEAs to design and implement effective improvement strategies for SWD. Indeed, a robust LCAP that meaningfully includes supports for SWD is a critical component of improving student outcomes. The comprehensive system of technical assistance available through the SSOS will now include access to evidence-based practices to effectively serve SWD.   
  
The SSOS seeks to support LEA efforts to implement the improvement strategies outlined in their LCAPs and monitor intended improvement. California is now in year six of creating a coordinated and coherent state structure to ensure that LEAs receive the assistance necessary to address disparities in student outcomes. California’s SSIP is focused on creating systemic and sustainable changes, including necessary alignment in statewide accountability and improvement structures like the SSOS to improve outcomes for SWD.

**Progress toward the SiMR**

**Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages)*.***

**Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2016 | 14.50% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target>= | 14.00% | 14.00% | 15.00% | 16.00% | 17.00% | 18.00% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the assessment** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 23,279 | 177,767 |  | 14.00% | 13.10% | Did not meet target | N/A |

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.**

The data for California's SSIP comes from the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress in both English Language Arts and Mathematics from the FFY 2020 school year.

**Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR**.

The data for the SiMR is collected through the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress database. The data is then analyzed and compiled by the CDE for the annual EdFacts data submission.

**Optional: Has the State collected additional data *(i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey)* that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)**

**Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

YES

**If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State’s ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.**

The 2019–2020 and 2020–2021 school years presented unprecedented challenges for communities, educators, students, and parents. The schooling experience was disrupted and different than any other year due to the impacts of the novel coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic. The collection of evidence regarding student academic performance was no exception in this disruption. Although the federal testing requirement was waived for the 2019–2020 school year, for the 2020–2021 school year, the U.S. Department of Education (ED) informed states that they were required to administer statewide academic assessments in English language arts literacy (ELA), mathematics, and science as well as the English language proficiency assessments. Furthermore, states were required to report the assessment results to parents, educators, and the public about student performance. With these requirements, however, the ED provided states several flexibilities to support the administration of assessments:  
  
• Administering a shortened version of statewide assessments,   
• Offering remote administration, where feasible, and   
• Extending the testing window to the greatest extent practicable.  
  
The California State Board of Education (SBE) and California Department of Education (CDE) took full advantage of all the flexibilities offered, recognizing the challenges local education agencies (LEAs) faced in administering the state assessment during the pandemic. While the CDE made available all assessments within California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) and supported LEAs in the administration of these assessments, the SBE and CDE recognized that for some LEAs, administration of the designated state assessments could prove an insurmountable challenge. This was true because most districts were in remote learning until well into the spring; many students lacked computers with secure browsers that would allow remote administration of the test, and many more experienced problems with bandwidth that made testing remotely infeasible. Therefore, to maximize the collection of evidence of student performance, LEAs that could not viably administer the CAASPP were required to administer local assessments that met specific criteria approved by the SBE during the March 2021 meeting. The SBE required that local assessments must meet the following criteria:  
• Aligned with California Common Core State Standards for ELA and mathematics.  
• Available to assess students in grades three through eight and grade eleven.  
• Uniformly administered across a grade level, grade span, school, or district.  
• LEAs must provide results that can be reported to parents/guardians and educators about individual students, and to the public by school and by district, disaggregated by student subgroup.   
• LEAs are required to report their local assessment results on the School Accountability Report Card.

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

**Please provide a link to the State’s current evaluation plan.**

https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr16/agenda201603.asp, Item 20. Attachment 1 and 2.

**Is the State’s evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:**

Equity, Disproportionality and Design: Preventing Disproportionality in Our Schools  
As a Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) content lead within the SSOS, San Diego South County SELPA through the “Equity, Disproportionality and Design: Preventing Disproportionality in Our Schools” (ED&D) program is focused on building capacity in other SELPAs to lead a movement towards effective solutions for improving equity and decreasing disproportionality. As highlighted in the FFY 2018 SSIP, ED&D developed a disproportionality tool, and with continued testing, it has become operational. By putting this tool in the hands of SELPA leads and LEAs, ED&D has continued to build a collaborative knowledge base while assisting SELPA leads and LEAs be proactive around their disproportionality data and how it impacts SWD outcomes. Since the last report, ED&D has expanded the data tool to include training for SELPA leadership about student-centered data use. These trainings are offered monthly and are now available not only to SELPA leaders, but also LEA directors. The trainings have three focuses: interpreting risk ratio scores using person-to-person language, sharing data efficiently and regularly, and identifying data ethics. The ED&D team is committed to using appropriate techniques to measure the impact of their work on California school systems. Their measurement approach includes the use of surveys, collection of personal stories, process metrics, and interviews with training participants by the external evaluator about their use of ED&D tools.  
  
Open Access Project  
The Placer County SELPA Open Access project serves as a SELPA content lead within the SSOS focused on improving outcomes for SWD by providing students with access to quality curriculum and participation and active engagement with learning in inclusive settings by eliminating barriers to learning. The Open Access Project supports integrated planning and learning for all students while promoting equity and inclusion. The project focuses on optimizing teaching to ensure all students have access to rigorous standards using an equity lens to support teaching and learning where the students are at through intentional instructional planning.  
  
California Autism Professional Training and Information Network  
Marin County SELPA, in partnership with the California Autism Professional Training and Information Network (CAPTAIN), serves as the SELPA content lead within the SSOS to build SELPA capacity across the state to support the implementation of Evidence-Based Practices for Autism.  
  
SELPA System Improvement Leads  
The SELPA System Improvement Leads (SILs) are charged with building the foundational knowledge and capacity in systems improvement processes for SELPA across the state. The SIL project continues to develop its hub for continuous improvement resources. The improvement data center (IDC) is one key aspect of the hub and provides: data visualizations for six years of SPP indicator data, access to annual performance reports, and analytic tools. As each year’s annual performance report data is released, the SIL project updates the IDC, enabling SELPAs, LEAs and County Office of Education (COE) administrators to identify patterns, trends, and trajectories in their special education data.  
  
Imperial County SELPA  
The Imperial County SELPA strives to continuously directly impact systems and indirectly improve student outcomes, by assisting SELPAs, their COEs & LEAs, as related to needs associated with their English Learner (EL) and SWD populations. The website has received upwards of 6,000 unique visits and views. These views have resulted in positive outcomes, whereby use of the various resources have been reported by SELPAs, COEs, LEAs, California regional EL specialists, as well as institutes of higher education. The Imperial County SELPA content-lead team has continued to be capacity builders, facilitators and connectors within the SSOS to improve outcomes for ELs. To further support SELPAs, COEs and their LEAs need for resources during 2020–21 school year, the Imperial County SELPA expanded their website, to include an array of Infographics and Padlets, amongst other resources. For further information related to these resources, please visit the Imperial County SELPA Content Lead website at https://www.icoe.org/selpa/el-swd. For more information regarding their ‘Statewide Impact’, please refer to their website to identify where capacity has been built at https://www.icoe.org/selpa/el-swd/statewide-impact.

**Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.**

Equity, Disproportionality and Design: Preventing Disproportionality in Our Schools  
The ED&D team is discussing different ways to meet the challenge of measuring student level outcomes, while also focusing on building capacity for good data use and the implementation of MTSS to prevent disproportionality. Since the last report, ED&D has collected comprehensive survey data from LEAs all over California about disproportionality awareness, practices that contribute to disproportionality, and practices that reduce disproportionality. ED&D will use data in two ways. First, they will use the data to inform and develop more services for promoting equity in schools. Second, ED&D will share the results with CDE and the SELPAs as a way to improve collective awareness and inspire collective action.  
  
Open Access Project  
The Open Access Project spent 60 hours in 16 SELPAs building capacity through the Support of Implementation practices of Universal Design Learning (UDL), Assistive Technology (AT) and Augmentative or Alternate Communication (AAC). The project dedicated 282 hours in implementation training sequences for 16 SELPAs including UDL Immersion, UDL-AT Immersion, Digital Tools and Assistive Technologies, Student Planning & Quality AT Practices, Deep Dive with Student Access Planning, AAC Foundations and AAC Implementation. The Open Access Team dedicated another 119 hours of dedicated coaching to build the capacity of the regional SELPA Lead teams in each of the training sequences.   
  
The Open Access Project produced a plethora of best practice guides and classroom resources and tools that are universally available to implementers around the state as each region continues to build capacity. In the last 12 months, the Open Access Website has had 4,439 unique users and 11,112 sessions. The Access to Distance Learning site saw more than 3000 unique users over 4700 sessions. Open Access hosted 352.5 hours of training with 806 participants. In these sessions, Open Access presents material with the Lead SELPAs supporting the presentation and receiving coaching in a model which will have the SELPAs participate first as participants, then as supported presenters with targeted coaching and support and finally as the lead presenters with additional coaching and support. The process allows the lead agencies to develop confidence in the content while demonstrating the required skills to become regional experts who will continue to build capacity independently after the third year.   
  
The Lead SELPAs may continue to participate in a Professional Learning Network with the leads around the state after the third year. The implementation of AT, AAC and UDL to promote access for ALL students is a fundamental element of equity for all students. In effect, the educator meets the learner exactly where they are and scaffolds the educational process based on the strengths and needs of the student.  
  
California Autism Professional Training and Information Network  
Marin County SELPA and CAPTAIN have continued to work in the 17 regions throughout the state, each having a SELPA Director, Regional Implementation Lead and now the new addition of an appointed interdisciplinary implementation team who are knowledgeable in autism and the science of implementation to build sustainable and scalable capacity systems for Evidence-based Practices (EBPs) for autism. The CAPTAIN Cadre members continue to implement trainings on EBPs using fidelity measures for effective adult education/training practices. Each training is accompanied by an established pre- and post-assessment of knowledge to determine the effectiveness of the trainer at conveying the core components to the training participants. Marin County SELPA and CAPTAIN is in the process of developing the remaining 18 out of 28 trainings on EBPs for autism, which include pre- and post- training knowledge assessments. All 10 of the previous EBP trainings are posted on the CAPTAIN website and the remaining 18 trainings (and the previous 10 trainings) will be available through a newly designed data system that will be available to the public at no cost in the Spring of 2022. From July 1, 2020 through June 30, 2021, the website has recorded 13,000 Users in 23,000 sessions. Especially useful were the resources to support students with autism and their return to in-person school with 4,733 access points.  
  
SELPA System Improvement Leads  
The SIL project continues to grow their direct technical assistance to the field. Their statewide team of 12 improvement facilitators build the improvement capacity of SELPAs and LEAs by providing coaching on self-identified problems of practice. Current LEA improvement projects include: increasing the use of data to inform special education program decisions, decreasing the rate of student placement in non-public schools, increasing the use of universal reading screeners, and improving the IEP meeting supports to families.   
The SIL project utilized a series of knowledge, skill, and satisfaction surveys which assessed satisfaction, quality, and relevance of services, trainings, and other opportunities for educators. Participants reported high levels of satisfaction with both the facilitator and the content presented in the training modules. Over 90 percent of respondents indicated they agreed or strongly agreed that trainers demonstrated expertise in the subject matter, were responsive to participants’ questions, were sensitive to the diversity of participants and used appropriate training strategies. Over 90 percent of respondents indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed that the training was well organized, included a good mix of learning activities and that the amount of time for the training was appropriate for the content provided.   
Lastly, over 95 percent of respondents indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed that their understanding of topics covered in training increased and that their training experience was highly valuable. Based on this feedback SIL continues to move forward with the virtual meetings and training sessions. Participant feedback consistently highlights the value of coaching support during and after training sessions. As a result, the SIL project has integrated facilitated breakout sessions, office hours, and follow up coaching sessions into the overall training model.   
  
Imperial County SELPA  
Imperial County SELPA continues to provide support to SELPAs through targeted and detailed workshops and modules as well as collaborative conversations and connections. Imperial County SELPA will continue to develop statewide and professional learning communities (PLC). The Imperial County SELPA is in a position to provide targeted support and detailed resources to meet the unique needs of each PLC. During the 2020–21 school year to date, there are a total of 9 SELPAs, COEs and their respective LEAs working together in distinct PLCs to further their regional initiatives to produce improved outcomes for ELs with disabilities. During the pandemic the ability to use virtual conferencing methods has enable the Imperial County SELPA to continue to connect and facilitate conversations related to various topics surrounding the needs of English learners with disabilities. Technical assistance has been provided to SELPAs, COEs, and staff from LEAs across the state of California. In relation to professional development opportunities, the Imperial County SELPA has provided training and support to just over 7,200 practitioners in the field with topics ranging from pre-referral, referral, assessment, tiers of support & interventions, IEP development, instructional design, planning and alignment of ELD standards and CA Common Core state standards, as well as addressing hot-topics such as language vs. disability, exit of students from special education due to mis-identification as a student with a disability and reclassification from English leaner status of students with disabilities.

**Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe each new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved*.***

Equity, Disproportionality and Design: Preventing Disproportionality in Our Schools  
The ED&D team is working on three infrastructure improvements. First, they hired an Executive Consultant whose primary responsibility is to design services for SELPAs that focus on instructional improvement to reduce disproportionality. Second, ED&D is formatting training content about preventing disproportionality into new fifteen-minute lessons. They are testing these lessons with SELPAs and LEAs during monthly meetings. Once fully developed, ED&D will scale the impact of their services by providing the materials to SELPAs and LEAs. And third, ED&D is identifying three levels of technical assistance, provisionally called Level 1 (universal), Level 2 (structured), and Level 3 (targeted). Each level will have supports and services for promoting equity that meets the needs of their audience, ranging from receiving regular emails and resources to active participation in designing future services.   
  
SELPA System Improvement Leads  
In the past year, the SIL has worked collaboratively within California’s SSOS to build the capacity of SELPAs, COEs, and LEAs with a common goal to improve outcomes for SWD. The SIL team provided 90 high quality in-person and virtual trainings from July 2020 through June 2021 for 4,549 educators. Participants came from 131 LEAs/SELPAs and more than 90% of respondents rated the trainers as highly knowledgeable. We took great effort to ensure the virtual learning opportunities met the needs of participants during these unprecedented times and participants agreed with over 95% stating their online learning needs were met. These trainings focused on the following topics: continuous improvement, root cause analysis, data quality, data use, high leverage and evidence-based practices. New resources include: Root Cause Analysis Inquiry Guide, High Leverage Practices Guide, Improvement Science in a Minute web modules, and the annual release of the State Performance Plan Indicator Guide. These resources are all available at systemimprovement.org.  
   
As California’s special education monitoring processes continue to shift from a compliance focus to a continuous improvement approach, SELPA and LEA leaders have the opportunity to leverage monitoring processes to reveal inequities in their systems and affect real sustainable improvement. To do so, leadership teams must engage in deep, thoughtful, and multi-faceted root cause analysis. In FFY 2020, The SIL team developed a root cause analysis training series to equip leadership teams with tools, resources, and protocols to engage in meaningful root cause analysis. The three-part training series was run three times and SIL provided follow up office hours and consultation to teams as needed.   
  
Imperial County SELPA  
The Imperial County SELPA conducted virtual training around the CDE published California Practitioners’ Guide for Educating English Learners with Disabilities throughout the 2020–21 school year. To include professional development sessions available to practitioners statewide, as well as professional development tailored to meet the needs of county offices, SELPAs and their respective LEAs. These tailor-made series of professional development were based on the unique needs of the COE/SELPA/LEA as derived from staff surveys and/or consultative collaborative dialogue session with the Imperial County SELPA Improving Outcomes for ELs with Disabilities content-lead team. To date, there are 21 archived, pre-recorded training modules which can be found on the Imperial County SELPA website at https://www.icoe.org/selpa/el-swd/training-modules ranging from topics related to UDL for ELs with Disabilities during remote and in-person learning, pre-referral strategies, culturally & linguistically appropriate assessment of ELs who may be eligible as a student with a disability, and development of the IEP for ELs with disabilities. To date, these archived training events have received 3,491 views. Based on survey data, 98% of participants who attended the professional development events have indicated it met and/or exceeded their expectations; 80% of participants agreed/strongly agreed that they learned skills they could immediately use.

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

Equity, Disproportionality and Design: Preventing Disproportionality in Our Schools  
Moving forward ED&D will continue to use the three guiding tenets of the project: awareness, action, and scale. At the heart of the ED&D project is the community-based design model. By taking this collaborative approach, ED&D continues to establish cross-functional teams that approach Disproportionality and SWD outcomes through the three guiding tenets. ED&D looks to further strengthen the relationship between SELPA leads, COEs, industry partners and stakeholders to help build and define its community-based design model. Recognizing the impact COVID-19 has had on SELPAs and LEAs and the unique challenges they face, ED&D utilized a virtual platform and continued their support for SELPAs and LEAs through online networking, professional development collaboration, and created a toolkit checklist for inclusive distance learning planning. Since the last report, ED&D is increasingly focused on scaling deliverables to reach more SELPAs and LEAs in California by developing and implementing intentional outreach and marketing procedures (introductions, regular follow-up, resource sharing, developing relationships). They are refining their technical assistance by segmenting their audience into three levels of service: universal, structured, and targeted. Further, ED&D are producing multimedia content to expand options for their audience to receive information. These options include in-person trainings, virtual trainings, blog posts, social media posts, and podcasts.  
  
Open Access Project  
Open Access is currently developing 30 regional hubs around the state. When each SELPA Lead completes their 3-year cycle, they will be in a position to serve the SELPAs, COEs, and LEAs in their region to build their capacity in UDL, AT or AAC. The regional leads will be connected to the base materials and resources, the Open Access website and a professional learning network of their peers as they continue to build on the work of the project.  
  
California Autism Professional Training and Information Network  
CAPTAIN will continue to provide implementation coaching to build the capacity of the SELPA Director, Regional Implementation Lead and their SELPA Autism Implementation Team for each of the 17 CAPTAIN regions in California to develop the necessary system to sustain the work of this grant. CAPTAIN will base the technical assistance on the Active Implementation Frameworks using resources and tools developed by the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN) and State Implementation and Scaling-up of Evidence-based Practices (SISEP) Center to ensure sufficient attention is given to stabilization, sustainability, scaling, and efficiency. CAPTAIN will incorporate the following principles:   
• Systems are the central focus of support for effective use of practices  
• Practices selected are based on local need and fit  
• Aligns initiative and leverages resources to meet coherent goals  
• Iterative cycles of data to guide improvement  
• Uses of bi-directional feedback loops  
• Follows a stage-based approach to change  
  
Conduct activities in each of the 17 CAPTAIN regions in California that lead to the development of an autism program demonstration site using the principles of Implementation Science focusing especially on the initial stages of Exploration and Installation and possible initial implementation for some regions.   
Continue to develop the CAPTAIN data system to support the fidelity of high-quality training and implementation coaching of evidence-based practices for autism that supports data driven decision-making.  
  
SELPA System Improvement Leads  
Looking toward the next reporting cycle, the SIL project will continue its direct support to SELPAs, COEs, and LEAs. In addition to providing support to individual improvement efforts, SIL will serve as a hub for a Networked Improvement Community in FFY 2021. This network will bring together teams across the state with a common aim of improving the quality of IEPs for students with disabilities. SIL will provide advanced data analysis, coaching support, and access to research-based change ideas to all teams participating in the network. Key learnings will be shared out with the field to allow for spread of these strategies. SIL will also continue to develop the IDC and provide access to data tools that allow for analysis of current special education data including disaggregating to the student level. These reports will be a powerful complement to the existing historical data displays on the IDC, empowering leaders to engage in ongoing analysis of their special education data. The SIL team is committed to walking alongside teams as they tackle their most pressing challenges and will continue to scale up support across the state in service of improving outcomes for students with disabilities.   
  
Imperial County SELPA  
Moving forward the Imperial County SELPAs Improving Outcomes for English Learners with Disabilities content-lead project will continue to be focused on assisting CDE with dissemination of the California Practitioners’ Guide for Educating English Learners with Disabilities. Our primary charge will to further build the capacity of SELPAs statewide and that of their respective COEs & LEAs in the implementation of best practices related to serving ELs with disabilities. Through this project, the Imperial County SELPA provides professional development and technical assistance to further the implementation of equitable and inclusive services in establishing a pathway to success for ELs with disabilities while facilitating connections between the systems improvement work. The project will continue to support a multidisciplinary team approach as an instrumental feature in the appropriate identification of services that address the unique language and learning needs of ELs with disabilities. Throughout the project the Imperial County SELPA team has encouraged the cross-collaboration of multidisciplinary teams to participate in both professional development offerings, and PLC development to ensure that expertise from both English learner division staff and special educators leverage each other’s knowledge and skills in addressing the varied needs of English learners with disabilities and collectively commit to improving outcomes for all English learners with disabilities. For more information visit our website at https://www.icoe.org/selpa/el-swd.

**List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:**

The Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Pathway Certification for Schools  
  
The Supporting Inclusive Practices (SIP) Project

**Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.**

California Multi-Tiered System of Support  
California Multi-Tiered System of Support (CA MTSS) is a systemic, continuous-improvement framework designed to provide effective technical assistance for districts and schools to address every student’s academic, behavioral, and socio-emotional needs in the most inclusive and equitable learning environment. Driven by policies and practice, strong leadership, family and community engagement, staff collaboration, and data-driven decision-making, CA MTSS helps districts and schools increase attendance, prevent dropouts, lower disciplinary rates, improve school climate, and boost academic performance.  
   
CA MTSS aligns with numerous state, regional, county, district, school, family, and community resources to provide a unified educational framework that is universally designed and differentiated to meet individual needs. The framework contains three levels or tiers: 1) universal support for all students, 2) supplemental services for students who require more academic or behavioral assistance and 3) individualized help for those with the most significant needs.  
  
Co-leading this effort is the Orange County Department of Education (OCDE), Butte County Office of Education and the University of California, Los Angeles Center for the Transformation of Schools (UCLA-CTS). This collaborative effort involving a state design and advisory team has created a pilot program to implement a school culture/climate training based on the CA MTSS framework. This work hopes to expand upon restorative approaches, positive behavior intervention, as well as support social and emotional learning, and minimize the use of emergency interventions. The OCDE created an online certification course, the CA MTSS Pathway Certification for Schools, to build knowledge of the CA MTSS and make explicit and meaningful connections to the participant’s work as an educator in order to provide more inclusive and equitable learning environments for ALL students and families.  
  
Supporting Inclusive Practices  
The Supporting Inclusive Practices (SIP) Project is an existing TA provider that works within the SSOS, working with the special education resource leads to build capacity across the state to assist LEAs. The SIP project supports LEAs to increase access to general education settings with research and evidence-based practices, targeted training, and TA related to supporting SWD in the least restrictive environment (LRE). The project is administered by two COEs, one in northern and one in southern California to ensure statewide coverage. The SIP project outcomes include shifting attitudes toward inclusion, equity, and access, implementation of inclusive practices, utilizing UDL as a curricular framework, using evidence-based inclusive teaching practices, and moving key statewide SPP indicators associated with student classroom inclusion and achievement.  
  
The El Dorado County Superintendent of Schools (EDCSS), in partnership with the Riverside County Superintendent of Schools (RCSS), has been contracted to support grantee LEAs identified by the CDE - Special Education Division (SED) in increasing inclusion and performance indicators outlined in the SPP, specifically indicators 3, 5, 6, and 7 for students ages three through 21.   
  
Support during the 2020–21 school year was provided to grantees in a three-tiered system. Tier I includes provision of no cost professional development offered in-person and virtually open to any school community across the state. Tier II includes direct technical assistance to grantees provided at the county, SELPA, district, and individual site levels. Tier III consists of technical assistance to school communities and partner organizations beyond those entities identified as grantees and based on CDE-SED referrals for support. Technical assistance for inclusion and achievement for 2020–21 was impacted by the global pandemic and significantly limited in-person meetings and events. As such, the majority of technical assistance was provided virtually and tailored to the unique needs of each grantee. This included:  
• Support with implementation of grantee-selected, district- and site- based initiatives and focus areas (e.g., UDL, co-teaching, LRE)  
• Webinars and conferences  
• Access to virtual resources via the SIP website and social media  
• SIP Spring Institute  
• Direct, individualized support in moving through the phases of the SIP Blueprint

**Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.**

California Multi-Tiered System of Support  
The OCDE created an online certification course, the CA MTSS Pathway Certification for Schools, to build knowledge of the CA MTSS and make explicit and meaningful connections to the participant’s work as an educator in order to provide more inclusive and equitable learning environments for ALL students and families.  
  
Course Learning Objectives:  
• Deepen understanding of the What, Why, and How of CA MTSS  
• Discover resources to support implementation of CA MTSS in the work as educators, support inclusive and equitable learning environments, and engage students and families in the community  
• Collaborate with other educators to share practices that support the academic, behavioral, and social-emotional success of all students  
• Determine CA MTSS/LCAP alignment to support working with students in order to enhance and implement LCAP and school site goals and services   
  
This is a self-paced, asynchronous course designed to be completed individually, with a colleague, or school team. The course is recommended to complete in a 12-18-month period.   
  
To obtain the CA MTSS Pathway Certification:  
• Section 1: Get Started CA MTSS  
• Sections 2 - 4: Foundations of CA MTSS - What, Why, and How  
• Sections 5 - 10: Role-Specific Pathways (Teacher, Administrator, School Counselor, School Psychologist, Paraeducator, and Coach)  
• Section 11: Reflection and Call to Action  
  
Within each module, learners engage in lessons, discussions, and activities related to the above-mentioned topics. Each level builds upon the previous level and each section has a series of Reflections and BADGE Activities. Reflections are optional while all BADGE Activities are required in order to advance to the next activity. Some BADGE Activities provide a choice on how to complete the activity. Even though there is a choice, the submission of the activity is required.  
  
Via coaching and the CA MTSS Pathway Certification for Schools course, learning opportunities to support the enhancement of school conditions and climate are provided. Each role-specific pathway of the course allows educators to make connections to their role in order to provide a continuum of support to meet the academic, behavioral, social-emotional, and mental health needs of students and create a positive school climate. Specific evidence-based practices include:  
• Continuous improvement via Implementation Science and Improvement Science  
• Social-emotional learning to support social-emotional competencies  
• Restorative Practices  
• Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports  
• Universal Design for Learning  
• Culturally Linguistically Relevant and Responsive Teaching  
• Trauma informed practices  
  
In addition, School Leadership Teams (SLTs) develop short-term plans (approximately 9-weeks in length) aimed at addressing issues surrounding their schools’ identity and/or vision for readiness. The 14 school sites in Phase 2A engaged in their third and fourth PDSA (Plan, Do, Study, Act) cycles in 2020–21 and are working toward addressing their problem of practice. Coaches meet virtually with the principal every week to do a check in and provide leadership assistance in implementing their plan.   
  
Lastly, each Region or COE has formed a Community of Practice (COP) for the purpose of providing ongoing technical assistance and support for LEAs who have completed the CA MTSS training series as they continue to scale up and sustain their work with CA MTSS implementation. Members engage in joint activities and discussions, help each other, learn from each other and share information. COPs are hosted in person or online (e.g., via Zoom) or combination option. Each COP identifies one of the CA MTSS Domains or Features to further explore and share practices around.  
  
Supporting Inclusive Practices  
The EDCSS and RCSS continues to assist and support LEAs to successfully align programs to the SPP and APR indicators by identifying evidence-based practice programs, supporting LEAs at on-site (when permissible due to the pandemic) and virtual meetings with improvement processes, supporting with networking, and arranging site visits with LEAs to tour and learn about best practices and programs. The EDCSS and RCSS has worked to stay abreast of the latest research and evidence-based practices that support students in inclusive settings via readings of peer-reviewed research, membership/participation in professional organizations (e.g., American Speech-Language Hearing Association, Association of California School Administrators), conference attendance and participation in other professional development opportunities to obtain the most current information on inclusive practices.  
  
The EDCSS and RCSS, created materials for use in presentations, webinars, and professional development activities (see www.sipinclusion.org for a list of events for 2020–21). The subcontractors are chosen, based on demonstrated outcomes and expertise in building, implementing, sustaining, and scaling up inclusive practices. Training topics vary based on the needs of participating LEAs. Materials are available to LEAs in the form of electronic PDF format, depending upon the objectives and content of each presentation or training activity (e.g., webinars are recorded and archived). The EDCSS and RCSS has engaged subcontractors to assist LEAs in improvement process activities and provide training and technical assistance. The EDCSS and RCSS coordinated, prepared, facilitated and created the following webinars and events:  
• Epoch Training Courses  
• Paraeducator Series  
• Equity by Design: Conference in a Box  
• Equity by Design (Part 2)  
• From Surviving to Thriving  
• Antiracism and UDL  
  
A hallmark of the SIP project is the team’s ability to address a range of technical assistance needs related to inclusion, equity, and achievement, as well as to pivot and prioritize based on the CDE’s needs in support of its varied school communities. These skills were tapped during the pandemic more than ever.  
  
The CDE reached out to the SIP team at the start of the 2020–21 school year with a request for statewide support in the area of family engagement. Not wanting to make assumptions about the needs of our diverse families throughout the state, the SIP team convened the first ever Family Engagement Network meetings on October 5, 2020, December 17, 2020, and February 23, 2021. The purpose of the meetings was to gather together stakeholders already engaged in the work to support families, share resources, and gain a better understanding of current perspectives and needs in order to then support them in response. Participants have included individuals from the CDE, Family Empowerment Centers, Parent Training and Information Centers, SELPAs, LEAs, Seeds of Partnership, and other community partners. The participants were unanimous in their desire to continue and scale the Network to also include representation from Community Advisory Committees, CDE partners in Educational Services, and parents going into the 2021–22 contract year.   
  
In addition to establishing the Network, the SIP team partnered with RCSS’s Leadership, Innovation, and Outreach unit to host (2) four-part series “From Surviving to Thriving” with Dr. Michele Borba. The series was the highest attended of all offerings and included free books for the first 1,000 registrants. The series focused on the top qualities of a thriver and offered applicable tips for families and educators to apply immediately in their own homes and classrooms.

**Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.**

California Multi-Tiered System of Support  
Multiple measures assess the sites’ ability to improve their school culture/climate based on the California Multi-Tiered System of Support framework and show positive student outcomes over time.  
• Schoolwide Implementation Tool (SIT) – self-assessment used by School Leadership Teams to examine the current status in addressing the four domains necessary for schools to improve their climate and cultures.   
  
• SWIFT-Fidelity Integrity Assessment (FIA) – self-assessment used by School Leadership Teams to examine the current status of school-wide practices that have been demonstrated through research to provide a basis for successfully including all students who live in the school community.  
  
• A survey that gathers sites’ feedback on coaching/technical assistance quality, relevance and usefulness and how much the technical assistance they received impacted their confidence or efficacy to implement the envisioned changes, access resources needed to make the changes envisioned and build capacity to transform and sustain.   
  
• LEA Self-Assessment (LEASA) – a self-assessment for LEA/District Leadership Teams to examine the current status of systemic practices that have been consistently demonstrated through research to be the components of effective district systems.   
  
• Reports of school sites’ progress in fostering positive school climate and conditions, improving pupil-teacher relationships, increasing pupil engagement, and promoting alternative discipline practices.  
  
Supporting Inclusive Practices  
Quantitative methods involved gathering key indicator data from the CDE for the 44 grantees that have been involved in the SIP project over the past five years. The SIP team keeps data received from the CDE each project year, adding new data to a master data file.  
  
The first analysis examined key indicator measures 5a, 5b, and 5c over the past five years for the grantees that have participated in the project each year. For each year the participating grantees in the dataset are unique (different) based upon two factors; first, the grantee LEAs that participated in the project for a given year, and second, the grantee LEAs for which we have state indicator data for that year. Trend analysis indicates that data related to LRE trended on average in the desired direction for all SIP grantees. This is a remarkable finding, especially when considering the porous nature of state collected indicator data and that we are not in this analysis comparing the same grantee LEAs over time, but rather a unique set of participating grantee LEAs for each year. We see that indicator 5a increases from 53.85% to 55.15% for grantees. For 5b we see a desired decline from 19.71% to 15.24%. For 5c we see a desired decline from 4.78% to 1.97%.  
  
Our analysis at this point has examined different SIP participating grantees for which we have data over time and in comparison, to state target and performance. Now we examine the same SIP participating grantees over time to see the nature and magnitude of change on key indicators.   
  
First, we look at indicator 5a and change based upon time an LEA has spent in the project. For the 5 grantees for which we have data that have also been part of the project for 5 years, we observe a 18.92% increase in measure 5a. This is a dramatic and positive result for the grantees that have been in the project for 5 years. It should be highlighted that between 2015 and 2020, these grantees have increased their 5a measure nearly 20%. For those grantees in the project 3 or 4 years for which we have data (total N=20 LEAs) we see just over a 2% increase in measure 5a.  
  
Next, we examine indicator 5b and look at change based upon time a grantee has spent in the project. For the 5 grantees for which we have data that have also been part of the project for 5 years, we observe a 10.84% decrease in measure 5b. This is a dramatic and positive result for the grantees that have been in the project for 5 years. Between 2015 and 2020, these grantees have decreased their 5b measure just over 10%. For those grantees in the project 3 or 4 years for which we have data (total N=20 LEAs) we see between a 6.6 and 7.4% decrease in measure 5b.   
  
Technical assistance is provided to SIP grantees based on their unique school communities and contexts. As such, support is offered in a variety of ways and via a tiered system. Tier I level support is accessible to anyone throughout the state (and more broadly when provided virtually/online). Tier I level support includes access to synchronous and asynchronous professional learning events, access to resources posted on the SIP website, and social media postings and interactions. Tier II level supports are specific to SIP grantees and individualized to take school communities from their current state to their desired state. This support includes professional learning tailored to grantee needs, meeting with leadership teams to move through the stages of the SIP Blueprint for Inclusion, collaboration to develop or refine strategic plans, and support with creating infrastructure to ensure equitable and inclusive environments and systems for learners to grow and succeed.

**Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.**

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

California Multi-Tiered System of Support  
Next steps will follow the project timeline set by the Executive Leadership Team:  
• OCDE, Interim Chief Academic Officer and Associate Superintendent, Christine Olmstead, Ed.D.  
• Butte COE, Director of CA Rural CA MTSS, Rindy Devoll  
• UCLA-CTS, Director, Joseph Bishop, Ph.D.  
  
Years: 2018–2019; 2019–2020.   
Deliverables:  
• Co-develop theory of action & five-year plan to be submitted  
• Co-develop curriculum framework, website, and training modules  
• Conduct an analysis of the statewide discipline, school climate, and chronic absenteeism data patterns  
• Identify districts in need of support  
Years: 2019–2020; 2020–2021  
Deliverables:  
• Select and help train lead educators on curriculum  
Years:2019–2020; 2020–2021  
Deliverables:  
• Provide technical support as needed to regional training cohorts   
Years: 2020–2023  
Deliverables:   
• Identify pilot sites for testing out curriculum  
• Provide technical assistance to educators and districts as needed  
Years: 2018–2023  
Deliverables:   
• Lead case studies research  
• Partner with evaluation research entity  
• Partner on cost-benefit analysis  
• Co-author final report and recommendations  
• Support awareness with state policy audiences  
The CA MTSS Pathway Certification course will be evaluated using the completion data and the artifacts submitted by the 14 schools in Phase 2A and the 22 schools in Phase 2B. All sites are expected to completed the course by June 2023.   
  
Coaching and technical assistance will continue to be provided to the Phase 2A and 2B schools as needed through June 2023.   
  
Communities of Practice (COPs) will also continue to meet in order to provide ongoing technical assistance and support for LEAs who have completed the CA MTSS training series as they continue to scale up and sustain their work with CA MTSS implementation.   
  
Implementation data that will be collected in 2021-22 from the Phase 2A and 2B schools is anticipated to show:  
• Progress at the school level towards addressing the four domains necessary for schools to improve their climate and cultures as measured by the Schoolwide Implementation Tool (SIT)  
• Progress at the school level towards implementing school-wide practices that have been demonstrated through research to provide a basis for successfully including all students who live in the school community as measured by the SWIFT-Fidelity Integrity Assessment (FIA)  
• Site Leadership Teams will report to have the confidence or efficacy to implement the envisioned changes, access resources needed to make the changes envisioned and build capacity to transform and sustain   
• Progress at the LEA level towards sustainable systemic practices that have been consistently demonstrated through research to be the components of effective district systems as measured by the LEA Self-Assessment (LEASA)  
• Reports of school sites’ progress in fostering positive school climate and conditions, improving pupil-teacher relationships, increasing pupil engagement, and promoting alternative discipline practices along with how efforts will be sustained after the grant period ends  
  
Growth in the above areas are expected to lead to positive student outcomes over time which includes, rates of suspension or expulsion, incidents of bullying or harassment, discipline referrals, referrals to Special Education, chronic absenteeism, graduation rates, dropout rates, measures of pupil academic achievement in ELA and Math, as well as positive school climate/ perceptions of school climate.  
  
Supporting Inclusive Practices  
The SIP project, as a collaborative effort between RCSS and EDCSS, has demonstrated a significant impact on school communities’ abilities to move from their current to their desired states with the most progress noted when participating for more than two years. This is reflective of the research on improvement science and diffusion of innovations that reveals real change begins to occur in three to five years and when provided with ongoing support.   
  
In June 2021 AB 130 was passed that includes $15 million from the General Fund to scale up the SIP project through June 2026. This additional, state-supported funding will allow for inclusion of more LEAs as grantees, increased Tier II support with increased team capacity, and reflects the Education Committee’s investment in inclusion and equity for all students.   
  
The following is a list of recommendations for the project going forward:  
• Allow for SIP participation in cohorts of no fewer than five years  
• Continue to provide opportunities for virtual and in-person event participation  
• Focus efforts specifically at the preschool level through all tiered levels of support  
• Examine data collection systems with respect to data quality and allow for access to current versus lag data  
• Continue to build and scale collective teacher efficacy with respect to educating and including students with disabilities and their families

**Section C: Stakeholder Engagement**

Description of Stakeholder Input

The CDE and SED management collaborate with the stakeholders listed below:  
  
The State Interagency Coordinating Council on Early Intervention: The State Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) on Early Intervention provides advice and assistance to the Department of Developmental Services. Members of the ICC are appointed by the Governor. The council is comprised of parents of children with disabilities, early intervention service providers, health care professionals, state agency representatives, and others interested in early intervention. The ICC meets four times a year and encourages a family-centered approach, family-professional partnerships, and interagency collaboration, while providing a forum for public input.  
  
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. Its mission is to provide an environment for building relationships and nurturing trust among leaders in support of coordination and collaboration in the planning and implementation of early intervention training and technical assistance activities. By providing a forum for cross-agency and cross-disciplinary discussion and resource sharing, TTAC promotes the mindful integration of specific core values into the delivery of early child care, education, and early intervention focusing on increasing child and family outcomes.  
  
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:  
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 CALPADS 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 CALPADS 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 2021, the SED Director reported to the ACSE on the OSEP's new priorities for the SPP/APR.  
  
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 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.  
  
2. SELPA – The Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) Administrators organization assists CDE in the development and implementation through a collaborative feedback loop. The CDE regularly solicits input from the SELPA administrators’ group and SELPA serves on several CDE work groups.   
The CDE also presented the proposed new targets, data analysis, and improvement strategies to ACSE in October 2021 to solicit feedback and public comment. The CDE also presented the proposed new targets and how the SPP/APR fits into the Statewide System of Support to the SBE in September 2021, November 2021, and January 2022 and received public comment and support.   
  
The SED has sought to actively involve the ACSE, the SBE liaison, and the SBE staff in the development of the FFY 2020 SPP/APR. 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.  
  
The SPP/APR was approved by the SBE in January 2022.

In anticipation of the fact that California’s prior SPP/APR would conclude with the 2019–20 program year, the CDE commenced a series of stakeholder meetings to begin discussions and develop recommended targets for the new six-year cycle of the revised SPP. Beginning in August 2019, these meetings were held over a two-year period and were designed to engage stakeholders from various backgrounds - educators, parents, school administrators, policy advisors, school psychologists, Family Empowerment Centers, early education, advocacy groups, and state advisory board members. The CDE leveraged these stakeholders, with their breadth and depth of knowledge, to help inform the development of a new set of rigorous state targets for the next six-year SPP cycle.   
  
During stakeholder meetings, CDE staff thoroughly reviewed the twelve performance indicators. The remaining indicators under the SPP are compliance indicators, with targets set at zero or one hundred percent by OSEP. The twelve performance indicators were partnered with detailed presentations to inform the stakeholders of the history and data trends, and assist them in making informed recommendations. The presentations included an explanation of how each indicator is defined, measured, and calculated; an in-depth history of statewide performance trends over the last five years; and a comparison of how California’s results compare to other states of similar size and demographics, along with data forecasting. These meetings provided time for stakeholders to discuss statewide data, target setting, and how the CDE can provide supports for LEAs to meet more rigorous targets. Following the publication of the revised measurement table, the CDE reconvened the stakeholder group to discuss the changes to key indicators, including assessment, school age least restrictive environment, preschool least restrictive environment, parent involvement, post school outcomes, and graduation rate, and provided stakeholders with the opportunity to refine their recommendations for these targets in light of the new calculations.

**Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.**

The CDE engaged with a diverse set of stakeholders over the course of the last fiscal year. CDE staff presented the SSIP and the SSOS to stakeholders and informed and updated them on the various implementation strategies and the evidence-based practices used in the SSOS to achieve better outcomes for SWD. The CDE collected feedback from all stakeholders which included proposed new targets, and responses on all aspects of the SSIP. Moving forward the CDE plans to meet with this stakeholder group biannually to be transparent with stakeholders about the work supporting the SSIP and the SSOS as well as to continuously collect feedback to improve efforts.   
  
This targeted engagement with stakeholders was in addition to standard stakeholder engagement opportunities around SSIP implementation, the SSOS, and any other emerging area of critical need. As in prior years, those opportunities included monthly meetings and conference calls with the Statewide SELPA organization, bi-monthly meetings with the Special Education Administrators of County Offices, regular meetings (generally every other month) with the California Advisory Commission on Special Education, and bi-monthly State Board of Education meetings.

**Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)**

NO

**Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.**

There were no specific concerns expressed by stakeholders.

**Additional Implementation Activities**

**List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.**

**Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.**

**Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.**

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).**

## 17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 17 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.  
  
The State provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps the State has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.  
  
The State did not provide an Evaluation Plan. The State must provide a link or narrative description of the current Evaluation Plan.  
  
The State must provide a link or narrative description of the current Theory of Action.

## 17 - Required Actions

The State did not provide an Evaluation Plan. The State must provide a link or narrative description of the current Evaluation Plan in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.  
  
The State must provide a link or narrative description of the current Theory of Action in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

# Certification

**Instructions**

**Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.**

**Certify**

**I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.**

**Select the certifier’s role:**

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

**Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.**

**Name:**

Nora Parella

**Title:**

APR Coordinator

**Email:**

nparella@cde.ca.gov

**Phone:**

916-327-3731

**Submitted on:**

04/28/22 3:47:30 PM

# ED Attachments



1. Prior to the FFY 2020 submission, the State used a different data source to report data under this indicator. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Percentage blurred due to privacy protection [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Percentage blurred due to privacy protection [↑](#footnote-ref-4)