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### Policy Context - Inclusion

#### Accountability
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (1997, 2004) heightened expectations that students with disabilities be educated alongside peers without disabilities
- No Child Left Behind incorporated accountability expectations for the education of these students through teacher and school evaluations
  - i.e. Under ESSA, only students with the most significant cognitive disabilities (1% of student population) are allowed to take alternative assessment

#### Changing Classroom Compositions
- More students with learning disabilities (SWLDs) are spending a majority of their school day in general education classrooms than ever before
  - 1989: 11% of public school SWLDs spent over 80% of instructional time in general education
  - 2015: This number jumped to 68%
- End goal is that all students make yearly academic progress
### Policy Context – Teacher Preparation

#### Educating SWLDs
- Teachers face more responsibility than ever before to facilitate high-quality education in inclusive classrooms for students with and without disabilities.
- As a result, teacher education programs are confronted with increased pressure for producing teachers who are prepared to teach in inclusive classrooms.
- Challenge: Traditionally, preparation for teaching SWDs has been isolated for only candidates receiving a special education credential.

#### Added Licensure Requirements
- Teacher Performance Assessments (TPAs) act as one method of streamlining teacher preparation for traditional certification.
- edTPA – adopted by over 900 programs across 41 states – is a rigorous TPA designed to assess candidates’ readiness to teach.
- edTPA contains subject-specific rubrics and requires candidates to collect data in teaching placements with which to reflect on practice.
# California

## Teacher Performance Expectations

- The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing has set “an expectation that both tasks and rubrics have a focus on teaching students with disabilities placed in the general education classroom” (Sandy, 2016)
- Programs and their candidates are held accountable for meeting these TPEs
- These TPEs go hand-in-hand with preparing for edTPA

## Teacher Performance Assessments

- Programs can use one of three TPAs to assess candidates near the end of their preparation: CalTPA, edTPA, or FAST
- 49 programs use edTPA
- Rubrics include areas where candidates must demonstrate an understanding of teaching students with disabilities and other diverse learners
Our Study

Research Questions

1. Do pre-service teachers perceive themselves as ready to educate SWLDs in general education classrooms?

2. At the time of graduation, do pre-service teachers’ perceptions of various qualities of their training (e.g., coursework, fieldwork, edTPA) link to their perceptions of readiness to educate SWLDs in general education classrooms?

3. Do these related perceptions differ between elementary and secondary pre-service teachers?
Limited Research to Inform Us

Teacher Education for SWLDs

- Teacher education for working with students with and without disabilities is still not well-integrated
- Co-teaching, multiple methods of engagement, and learning tools for students with learning disabilities are new to general education teacher prep
- Expansive literature notes the struggle in shaping dispositions of candidates

Performance Assessments

- Okhremtchouk et al. (2009) and Margolis and Doring (2013) note inconsistency in messaging about edTPA within programs, particularly among cooperating teachers
- Ledwell and Oyler (2016) and Ratner and Kolman (2016) note inconsistency among faculty within programs
- Cohen, Hutt, and Gottlieb (2018) found variation in the implementation and support for edTPA as well as inconsistency in how edTPA was aligned with broader program goals
Study Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of California Teacher Education Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 7 UC campuses used for our study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Excluded two that were undergoing program reorganization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1 campus was used as pilot study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Study 1: 69 preservice teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Study 2: 473 preservice teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 15-20 minute surveys online via Qualtrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demographics of candidates, undergrad GPA, license type, Likert scales for perceptions of program and preparation to work with SWLDs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Pre-service teacher demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Study Sample Percentage</th>
<th>California Percentage*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number of Pre-Service Teachers</strong></td>
<td><strong>473</strong></td>
<td><strong>23,766</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Data provided by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Annual Report Card 2017–18.  
### Outcomes

#### General Support
- Overarching statements of preparation to work in inclusive classrooms
- i.e. “I feel prepared to use IEPs to effectively teach students with disabilities”

#### Instructional strategies
- Specific instructional strategies prior literature notes being important for teaching SWLDs
- i.e. “I feel prepared to model co-teaching in classrooms with students with learning disabilities”
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Program Characteristics

Helpfulness
• Utility of edTPA for becoming a teacher
  • "edTPA helped me become a stronger teacher"

Alignment
• edTPA aligned with other aspects of preparation
  • "My instructors mentioned edTPA in courses"

University Supervisor
• Perceived support from supervisor
  • "My supervisor provided useful feedback on components of edTPA"

Program Coherence
• Program was cohesive in goals and expectations
  • "My program articulates a clear vision of teaching and learning"

Placement
• Placement was in line with candidates’ expectations
  • "Was your student teaching placement consistent with your expectations with regard to students' socioeconomic status"
Analysis

\[ Y_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 B_{ij} + \beta_2 P_{ij} + \beta_3 E_{ij} + \varepsilon_{ij} \]

**Baseline model**

- Y – SWLD scale
- B – Background characteristics of candidates
- P – Characteristics of programs
- E – Elementary credential
- Error – Clustered at the program level
Unobserved variation

- There may be unobservable variables from data that we did not collect that is biasing estimates.
- Considering we are interested in program factors, it is important to control for potential unobserved variables between programs.
  - Similar to multilevel modeling, but accounts for selection into programs (Hoxby, 2000).

Program fixed effects

- Some programs may have a long history of working with schools with established protocols for educating SWLDs.
- It may be the case that these programs' history of working with these particular schools creates a program that is perceived as more coherent, because these long-established partnerships.
- Thus, it may seem like program coherence is predicting readiness for working with SWLDs, but there is a program-level factor- long-established school partnerships- that is predicting readiness and perceptions of coherence.
Results
**RQ 1: Prepared to Provide General Support in Inclusive Classrooms**

*Figure 1.* Preparedness to provide general support in inclusive classrooms from 2018 survey in UC teacher preparation programs.
Figure 2. Preparedness to use instructional practices for SWLDs from 2018 survey in UC teacher preparation programs

- Multisensory techniques
- Audio recording devices
- Reading guides
- Small-group instruction
- Mixed achievement groups
- Whole-group instruction
- Multiple methods of engagement, presentation, and assessment

RQ 1: Prepared to Use Instructional Practices
# Study 1: General Support

## Coherence

- Coherence significant across models
- Candidates who perceived a consistent vision in their program also felt that they had sufficient knowledge of IDEA and preparation for special ed policies at school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate characteristics</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Adequate Preparation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-0.58*</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.25)</td>
<td>(0.30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.34)</td>
<td>(0.41)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.25)</td>
<td>(0.29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other race</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.26)</td>
<td>(0.38)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate GPA</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.29)</td>
<td>(0.34)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent completed a degree beyond Bachelor's</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.31)</td>
<td>(0.36)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent completed Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>0.64*</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.31)</td>
<td>(0.36)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent completed some college</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
<td>(0.37)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended private high school</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.25)</td>
<td>(0.29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualities of Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpfulness of edTPA</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
<td>(0.18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment between edTPA and program</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.24)</td>
<td>(0.28)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program coherence</td>
<td>0.52*</td>
<td>0.60*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.23)</td>
<td>(0.27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement experience</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.24)</td>
<td>(0.23)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University supervisor support</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
<td>(0.14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary credential</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.20)</td>
<td>(0.24)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05
Helpfulness of edTPA

- edTPA helpfulness matters
- Candidates who believed edTPA was helpful in becoming a teacher also felt more prepared to work with SWLDs
- Outcome includes general teaching, lesson planning, supporting LD-specific IEP support, and assessment
Two Associations Emerged

- Candidates who perceived their programs as more coherent tended to feel better prepared to provide general support and use instructional practices suited for SWLDs.
- Candidates who felt stronger support from their university supervisors in their field placement tended to feel better prepared to use instructional practices suited for SWLDs.

Table 3: Estimates of pre-service teachers’ perceptions of preparation and feelings of readiness to educate SWLDs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions of preparation</th>
<th>General Support</th>
<th>Instructional Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placement expectations</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.08)</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University supervisor support</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.09)</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program coherence</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.05)</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever worked with SWLD</td>
<td>0.49*</td>
<td>0.52*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.19)</td>
<td>(0.20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary credential</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.24)</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special education credential</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.34)</td>
<td>(0.34)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpfulness of edTPA</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment between edTPA and program</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.08)</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University supervisor support</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.09)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.30)</td>
<td>(0.30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program FE</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05
Elementary vs. Secondary

**Elementary**
- Same program characteristics were statistically significant when running fully interacted regressions
- These associations grew in magnitude for elementary candidates
- Suggests that main results from study were driven by elementary candidates

**Secondary**
- No program characteristics statistically significant when running fully interacted regressions
- No variable included in the models associated with secondary candidates perceptions of readiness to teach SWLDs
- We gleaned no information as to what is adding to the preparation of secondary candidates
**Discussion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Helpfulness</th>
<th>Program coherence</th>
<th>Secondary candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• In study 1, candidates who believed edTPA was helpful for becoming a teacher tended to feel better prepared to use instructional strategies for SWLDs</td>
<td>• Consistent finding across studies</td>
<td>• Only one association (a control variable) related to secondary candidates perceptions of readiness to support SWLDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Note: UC in pilot study was an early adopter of edTPA, suggesting the program might have been more coherent</td>
<td>• Defined as consistency in goals and expectations</td>
<td>• No program characteristics emerged for secondary candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cohen et al. (2018) note the importance of coherence for completing edTPA</td>
<td>• Thinking about nature of working with SWLDs for secondary teachers...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recommendation: Purposeful planning in programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Findings in the context of edTPA

### Purpose of edTPA

- edTPA and California TPEs purports to outline what teachers should know and be able to do
- To this end, edTPA required internal planning and external collaboration to ensure program is indeed helping candidates pass the assessment
  - Common sets of data, using the same language across program, bring faculty together

### Coherence

- Important to consider that edTPA may have instigated coherence across programs
  - Our findings perhaps support this aim of edTPA (not the assessment directly, per se)
- Coherence is cited as one of the most challenging aspects of edTPA implementation
- Faculty understanding of pillars of teacher education program, having candidates share assignment across courses, having candidates collaborate with other candidates across program
Conclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Survey data, not a true experiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Self-report: All scales are made up of perceptions of candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No classroom data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No information on practices in placement or as licensed teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Next Steps and Future Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Hope to follow up with candidates after initial year of teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ask similar questions about programs, and then additional questions about students in their classrooms and teaching practices for these students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Exploring differences for candidates with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Considering the importance of coherence, more research is needed on the implementation of edTPA across programs and states</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Acknowledgements
Improving Education for California Students Via Professional Development

Aubyn Stahmer
Kelsey Oliver
Patricia Schetter
Achievement Gap Challenge for Students with Disabilities

Graduation rate
Chronic Absenteeism
College/Career (10% prepared)
Mathematics (-119)
English Language Arts (-88.3)

12% of students (725,000) qualify for special education

88% Living in Poverty
75% Foster Care
84% English Language Learners
High Quality Professional Development can Help

Effective use of Evidence-Based Practices (EBP)
Keys to Effective Professional Development
Teachers need content on high incidence disabilities

Conduct basic introductory training for all educators in high incidence disabilities so they understand common strengths and learning needs.
Improve Attitudes & Beliefs about Evidence-Based Practices (EBP) & Inclusion

Focus PD on overcoming unconscious biases and improving understand of cultural, neurological, and environmental causes of challenging behaviors and learning deficits and benefits of inclusion for all students.
Use Effective Professional Development and Adult Learning Practices

- Use data-based needs assessment to choose relevant training. (program review; CA Dashboard; LCAP goals)
- Link training and knowledge to student and educator performance and district/state goals.
- Use evidence-based professional learning practices.
- Use objective data to determine PD effectiveness
  - Include skills based performance indicators
Key Components of High Quality Professional development

- Information Session
- Competency Training
- Implementation Coaching
- Feedback & Reflection
- Systems Support
Key Components of EBP Sustainment

- Ongoing Consultation
- Performance-Based Evaluation
- Professional Learning Communities
- Team-Based Problem Solving
- Data-Based Decision Making
Evidence-Based Practices Must Fit within a Multi-Tiered System of Supports

- MTSS framework recommended by CA
- Provides supports based on unique student needs
- Evidence-based practices are a fundamental component
- Framework can guide PD based on school, staff and student needs
MTSS incorporates EBP at multiple levels.

Essential Component: Multi-Level Prevention System

- **Tier I: Primary Level of Prevention – Instruction/Core Curriculum**
  - 80% of students
- **Tier II: Secondary Level of Prevention - Intervention**
  - 15% of students
- **Tier III: Tertiary Level of Prevention – Intensive Intervention**
  - 3% to 5% of students

Students receive services at all levels, depending on need.
• Tier 3 PD for designated specialist staff
• Ensure training to use interventions with fidelity and to coach others

• PD for all educators in Tier 1 EBP – Universal Design for Learning (UDL); classroom behavior management, social-emotional development strategies.
• Increase use of Tier 1 high quality instruction & universal screening for academic and social-emotional challenges.

• Tier 2 PD for designated staff
• May include intensive reading instruction, social skills groups, increased home-school communications

• Tier 1 PD for all educators in Tier 1 EBP – Universal Design for Learning (UDL); classroom behavior management, social-emotional development strategies.
Leaders Need Training in How to Support Effective Use of Evidence-Based Practices

- Educators cannot sustain new practices without support from leaders at all levels.
- Leaders need training in implementation support practices that are linked to successful ongoing use of effective practices.
- Leaders need to believe in effective education for students with disabilities.
- Train leaders in implementation leadership strategies that promote effective capacity building and successful implementation of new practices.
- Examples:
  - Providing time, funding and resources for high quality PD
  - Focusing on effective practices
  - Rewarding effective implementation
  - Measuring strategy use
  - Linking strategy use to goals and outcomes
Effective Professional Development to Support Students with Disabilities

- Improve attitudes, knowledge and skills across all levels (system, leader, educator)
- Make PD relevant and linked to goals
- Link EBP and PD to state, system, school and educator goals
- Collect data on effectiveness of PD and EBP and link to goal progress and student data
- Train leaders in implementation practices
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Overview

- Goals and methods
- The special education teacher shortage
- The critical problem of attrition
- Recent state investments
- Policy considerations
Goals and Methods

- Provide an update on the status of the shortage
  - CTC data on teacher credentials
- Identify factors that may contribute to attrition
  - Literature review
  - Focus group of special educators
The Need for a Stable, Well-Prepared Special Educator Workforce

- Achievement gaps have grown
- 187 districts/COEs need differentiated assistance based on poor outcomes for students with disabilities
- Special educators with more extensive preparation:
  - Boost achievement for students with disabilities
  - Are better prepared to use a variety of instructional methods
  - Are less likely to turn over
The Shape of the Shortage
Nearly 5,000 New Special Education Teachers Entered the Field Underprepared

Source: California Commission on Teacher Credentialing data dashboard.
Over 1/5 Teachers from Special Education Schools Turn Over

Between 2015-16 and 2016-17:
- 13.4% left the profession or state
- 7.3% moved between schools
Factors That Impact Special Educator Attrition
Underprepared teachers leave at twice the rate of those who are fully prepared.

Intensive preparation and professional learning experiences can help improve both teacher retention and efficacy.

Special education preparation in CA is far less intensive than in other states.
Working Conditions Impact Teacher Attrition

- State law does little to limit high caseloads
- Support from colleagues and administrators impacts special educators’ decisions to remain in the field
Financial Supports Impact Recruitment and Retention

- Special education teachers cite low salaries as a reason for leaving
- Student debt deters candidates from pursuing teaching careers
Recent State Investments
Recent State Investments in the Education Workforce

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Local Solutions Grant Program</td>
<td>$50M (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Residency Grant Program</td>
<td>$75M for teacher residencies ($50M special ed, $25M STEM/bilingual) (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden State Teacher Grant Program</td>
<td>$89.75M (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator Workforce Investment Grant Program</td>
<td>$37.1M (2019)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Comprehensive Policy Approach to Improve Recruitment and Retention

1) Strengthen the pipeline with recruitment incentives for high-retention pathways
2) Improve the quality of and access to preparation
3) Expand and strengthen professional development
4) Improve working conditions for special education teachers
5) Increase compensation
Understanding Teacher Shortages in California
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California is in the midst of a severe special education teacher shortage that threatens the state's ability to meet its education goals for students with disabilities, who often have the greatest needs. This report was authored by the Learning Policy Institute's Analysis and Evaluation Team. The team conducted an analysis of the special education teacher workforce to provide an update on the shortage and its causes. They also explored the factors that may be contributing to special education teacher attrition, based on prior research and the perspectives of current special education teachers in California. We conclude with suggestions for evidence-based policy strategies aimed towards resolving this shortage.
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Overview of Presentation

• Study Methods
• California Context
• Snapshots from Other States
  • Massachusetts
  • New Jersey
  • Florida
• Recommendations
Methods / Data Sources

• Document reviews (legislation, state and local websites, research studies)

• Interviews
  - State Officials (8)
  - Local Officials (6)
  - Researchers (6)
  - Advocates (4)
  - Others (5)

• Analysis meetings
SWDs In California

• In 2018, 64 percent (243 of 386 districts) were identified for failing to meet standards on the basis of poor performance of their SWDs
• California’s 56 percent inclusion rate is dramatically lower than the national average: 63.4 percent
• California SPED teachers’ caseload is 30 students, and the national average is 17
• Two-thirds (5,196) of CA’s first-year special education teachers lacked full credentials in 2017-18
• “No can do” culture
Massachusetts Resource Allocation and District Action Reports (RADAR)

- Compare Spending and Staffing across Districts
- Visualize District Trends over 5 years
- Investigate Staffing Levels, Per Pupil Expenditures, Special Education Enrollment
RADAR Reports Can Show

- Selected comparison districts to view 5-year trends
- SWDs by grade and placements
- Enrollment (by race/ethnicity, gender, ELs, poverty), staffing, and student outcomes
- In- and out-of-district placements
- Students identified for services or moved off services
- How students' placement trajectories change over four years
New Jersey Litigation


• Targeted 76 out of 673 Districts for Support
• NJDOE Least Restrictive Environment Needs Assessment
• Stakeholder Oversight Committee
• Technical Assistance
• Monitoring
New Jersey Technical Assistance

- School Climate
- Placement in LRE
- Universal Design for Learning
- Modified Curriculum and Differentiated Instruction
- Supplemental Services
- Co-teaching Models
- Transportation
Florida Defines Inclusion

• Inclusion means that a student is receiving education in a general education regular class setting, reflecting natural proportions and age-appropriate heterogeneous groups in core academic and elective or special areas within the school community;

• A student with a disability is a valued member of the classroom and school community;

• The teachers and administrators support universal education and have knowledge and support available to enable them to effectively teach all children; and a teacher is provided access to technical assistance in best practices, instructional methods, and supports tailored to the student’s needs based on current research.
Florida’s Best Practice for Inclusive Education (BPIE)

• Once every 3 years, each school district and school shall complete a Best Practices in Inclusive Education (BPIE) assessment with a Florida Inclusion Network (FIN) facilitator and include the results of the BPIE assessment and all planned short-term and long-term improvement efforts in the school district’s exceptional student education policies and procedures.

• BPIE is an internal assessment process designed to facilitate the analysis, implementation, and improvement of inclusive educational practices at the district and school team levels.
Florida’ BPIE Features

• Focus on students’ best interests
• BPIE process is based on local stakeholders reflecting on school and district practices
• The process is supported by a statewide network of BPIE facilitators
• The process results in a plan to improve 3 priority best practices
• The BPIE results for each school must be included in the required School Improvement Plans (SIP)
# Inclusion Rates: Florida, California, and the Nation

## Inclusion Rates for Students with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>US Inclusion Rate</th>
<th>California Inclusion Rate</th>
<th>Florida Inclusion Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the graph, the lines represent the inclusion rates for students with disabilities in the US, California, and Florida over the years 2005 to 2017. The y-axis indicates the percent of students in regular classes for more than 80% of the day.

- **US Inclusion Rate** shows a steady increase from 2005 to 2017, reaching 63.5% in 2017.
- **California Inclusion Rate** also shows an increase, from 50.4% in 2005 to 74.2% in 2017.
- **Florida Inclusion Rate** starts at 54.5% in 2005 and reaches 74.2% in 2017, indicating a significant improvement.
Recommendations

1. Invest in a RADAR-like data system that allows local districts and the public to compare SWD achievement and inclusion rates, resource allocation, staffing, enrollment patterns, and trajectories with other districts.

2. Provide more targeted support to districts most in need of improving the education of SWDs.

3. Implement a BPIE-like system at the school and district level, while also providing the resources and infrastructure essential to successful implementation driven by local priorities.

4. Draw on the experience and expertise of officials and advocates from other states.
Realizing One Integrated System of Care for Children

Ron Powell
Elizabeth Estes
Alex Briscoe
Why Integrated Systems?
Child Behavioral Health

Education

Regional Center

Social Services

Juvenile Justice
Child

Behavorial Health

Education

Social Services

Regional Center

Juvenile Justice
There are Many Doors to Services

- Eligibility Criteria.
- Funding Mechanisms.
- Service Restrictions.
- Data Systems.
- Outcome Expectations.
- Evaluation Criteria.
Services are Often Unavailable

- Inaccessible services.
- Inconsistent availability.
- Lack of access to prevention/early intervention services.
- Children must “Fail First” before they are able to gain access to services.
Our Systems are Broken

• Lack of accountability around common goals.
• Increased costs.
• Cost shifting across agencies.
• Persistent disparities in outcomes.
AB 2083

Interagency Leadership Team
Shared Governance
Shared Fiscal Responsibility
Shared Information
Dispute Resolution
Quality Standards

Interconnected Systems Framework

Noncategorical
Full Continuum from Prevention to Intervention
School-Based
Transdisciplinary Decision-Making
Data-Based Decision-Making
Continuous Quality Improvement
What can be done?
Policy Recommendations

State Cross-System Governance Body
- State
  - Develop cross-system goals.
  - Incentivize local integration of resources.
  - Evaluate state-wide effectiveness of cross-system goal achievement.
  - Provide technical assistance.
  - Promote the creation of a “one-child, one-plan” model.
  - Promote the development of a common data system.

Local Cross-System Governance Body
- Local
  - Evaluate local effectiveness of cross-system goal achievement.
  - Identify and align local outcomes with State goals.
  - Implement cross-system quality improvement.
Policy Recommendations

Minimize Barriers to Service Utilization and Access

• Increase the availability of services that are:
  • School-based.
  • Part of an integrated continuum of services.
  • Aligned behind a common child-focused purpose.

Cross-System Fiscal Responsibility

• Allocate sustainable sources of revenue for early intervention and prevention.
• Authorize revenue sources to be leveraged and pooled to maximize the availability and effectiveness of services.
Policy Recommendations

Cross-System Technical Assistance

- Collective training in evidence-based strategies to ensure shared responsibilities for child outcomes.

Shared Responsibility and Accountability

- Data-sharing agreements.
- Data-based decision-making and identification of barriers.
- Shared outcome data with the community.
Family and Youth Partnership

- Meaningful engagement of family and youth voice in:
  - Policy and program development.
  - Identification of barriers to services.
  - Improvement in access to services.
The Promise of Integrated Systems

- Children are served more effectively when agencies are aligned behind shared goals that are focused on the healthy functioning of the whole child and the family.
Smaller group Q&A and discussion

(1) Teacher Capacity Issues

(2) State-level collaboration and governance
Discuss: “What will it take to systematically integrate these approaches in California?”
Group Shareout