Developing Systems to Support Schools to Serve Students with Disabilities in California

PACE Webinar Series on Special Education Webinar 3 of 3 March 10, 2020 1:00 – 2:00 pm



@edpolicyinca



The transition between services are bumpy and can be confusing and burdensome for students and families



Students with Disabilities in the CORE Districts Characteristics, Outcomes and Transitions by Kevin Gee, Carolynne Beno, and Joe Witte



Identifying Young Children for Early Intervention in California by Nancy Hunt



Promoting Successful Transitions for Students with Disabilities by Lauren Lindstrom and Carolynne Beno



The Transition to Preschool for Children with Disabilities by Connie Kasari, Amanda Dimachkie, and Maria Pizzano



Work-based Learning for Students with Disabilities by Fred McFarlane and Mari Guillermo



There is a shortage of prepared educators to teach students with disabilities in California



Increasing Access to Universally Designed Mathematics Classrooms Rachel Lambert



California's Special Education Teacher Shortage Naomi Ondrasek, Desiree Carver-Thomas, Caitlin Scott, and Linda Darling-Hammond



Preparing Teachers to Educate Students With Learning Disabilities Michael Gottfried & Jacob Kirksey



Improving Education for California Students Via Professional Development Aubyn Stahmer, Kelsey Oliver, Patty Schetter

Panelists



Kevin Gee UC Davis



Elizabeth Estes Breaking Barriers



George Farkas UC Irvine



Daniel Humphrey Independent consultant



Ron Powell RJ Powelll Consultants



Beth Gamse Independent consultant

Policy Analysis for California Education

Students with Disabilities & Differentiated Assistance

KEVIN GEE

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS

KAGEE@UCDAVIS.EDU



Students with Disabilities and Differentiated Assistance

Kevin Gee

Under California's System of Support, differentiated assistance (DA) provides supports to eligible districts to boost student group performance levels. This brief describes the districts that were eligible for DA in 2019 based on the performance levels of their students with disabilities (SWD). It also analyzes how SWD performance on State Priority Areas (SPAs) and indicators factored into districts' eligibility for DA. Findings show that, among the 333 districts identified for DA, eligibility was driven, in part, by SWD performance for over half of those districts. These 187 districts were most frequently identified for DA based on SWD performance in SPAs 4 (Pupil Achievement) alongside 5 (Pupil Engagement). These results highlight intersectional challenges facing SWD—challenges that districts can address through their continuous improvement process.

February 2020



Three Key Questions

- 1. What is Differentiated Assistance (DA) and how do districts become eligible for DA?
- 2. How do students with disabilities (SWD) factor into eligibility for DA?
- 3. How does districtwide performance of SWD on key state indicators (e.g., chronic absence) compare to students overall?

Level of Support	Description of Supports Available
Support for All LEAs and Schools (Level 1)	Various state and local agencies provide an array of support resources, tools, and voluntary technical assistance that all LEAs may use to improve student performance at the LEA and school level and narrow disparities among student groups across the LCFF priorities, including recognition for success and the ability to share promising practices.
Differentiated Assistance (Level 2)	County superintendents, charter authorizers, the California Department of Education (CDE), and the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence (CCEE) provide differentiated assistance for LEAs, in the form of individually designed assistance, to address identified performance issues, including significant disparities in performance among student groups.
Intensive Intervention (Level 3)	The State Superintendent of Public Instruction may require more intensive interventions for LEAs with persistent performance issues and a lack of improvement over a specified time period.

Source: https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/sw/t1/csss.asp

The statute describes what differentiated assistance may entail (California *Education Code* Section 52071). Specifically, differentiated assistance is defined to include:

... among other things [emphasis added], any of the following:

- (1) Identification of the school district's strengths and weaknesses in regard to the state priorities . . . , communicated in writing to the school district. This identification shall include a review of effective, evidence-based programs that apply to the school district's goals.
- (2) Assignment of an academic expert or team of academic experts to assist the school district in identifying and implementing effective programs that are designed to improve the outcomes for all pupil subgroups identified pursuant to Section 52052. The county superintendent of schools may also solicit another school district within the county to act as a partner to the school district in need of technical assistance.
- (3) Request that the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence provide advice and assistance to the school district.

Source: https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/nov17item04.doc

There are a set of **indicators** that align with four **State Priority Areas**

State Priority Area	Indicators						
Priority 4: Pupil Achievement	English language arts and math (Grades 3–8, 11)						
Priority 5: Pupil Engagement	Graduation rate indicator (Grades 9–12); or Chronic absence indicator (Grades K–8)						
Priority 6: School Climate	Suspension rate indicator (Grades K–12)						
Priority 8: Outcomes in a Broad Course of Study	College/career indicator (Grades 9–12)						

2

Status

Categories

For each subgroup (e.g., SWD) in a district, performance color codes are assigned based on the **status** and **change** for each indicator. Take **chronic absence** for example:

	Increased significantly from prior year (by 3.0 percentage points or more)	Increased from prior year (by 0.5 to less than 3.0 percentage points)	Maintained from prior year (declined or increased by less than 0.5 percentage points)	Declined from prior year (by 0.5 to less than 3.0 percentage points)	Declined significantly from prior year (by 3.0 or more percentage points)
Very low 2.5% or less in current year	Yellow	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue
Low 2.6% to 5.0% in current year	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green	Blue
Medium 5.1% to 10.0% in current year	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green
High 10.1% to 20.0% in current year	Red	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Yellow
Very high 20.1% or greater in current year	Red	Red	Red	Orange	Yellow

Change Categories

Note: Adapted from the 2018 California School Dashboard Technical Guide (p. 167)



One way a district can be identified for DA is if one or more student groups in a district has a **Red** performance level on an indicator for at least two of these four SPAs.

For example, a district would qualify for DA if its SWD population was **Red** on chronic absence (Priority 5) and **Red** on suspensions (Priority 6).

State Priority Area	Indicators						
Priority 4: Pupil Achievement	Red on both English language arts and math; or Red on English language arts or math and Orange on the other test (Grades 3–8, 11)						
Priority 5: Pupil Engagement	Red on graduate rate indicator (Grades 9–12) Red on chronic absence (Grades K–8)						
Priority 6: School Climate	Red on suspension rate indicator (Grades K–12)						
Priority 8: Outcomes in a Broad Course of Study	Red on college/career indicator (Grades 9–12)						

Figure 1. Districts Eligible for Differentiated Assistance in 2019



Table 4. Districts Qualifying for Differentiated Assistance in 2019 Based on Performance Levels of SWD, Breakdown by Four State Priority Areas

	State Pri	ority Areas			
4: Pupil Achievement	5: Pupil Engagement	6: School Climate	School 8: Outcomes in a Broad Climate Course of Study		Percent
ELA and Math	Graduation Rate or Chronic Absence	Suspension	College and Career Readiness		
				35	18.7
				33	17.7
				30	16.0
				24	12.8
				17	9.1
				14	7.5
				13	7.0
				7	3.7
				5	2.7
				5	2.7
				4	2.1
			Total	187	100

Note. denotes a district was eligible for DA based on the performance of their SWD in that specific priority area.



Change

College & Career Readiness

Chronic Absence



	Chronic Absence									
	K–5	6-8	9–12	K–12						
AUT	18.2	10.9	13.1	16.2						
DEAF/HI	20.5	10.7	20.9	20.8						
ED	32.3	43.3	5.3 53.7 47.1							
НН	16.6	13.7	18.9	17.8						
ID	32.9	23.8	29.8							
MD	58.3	48.0	37.1	49.8						
OI	50.6	42.2	42.6	45.6						
OHI	19.3	20.1	20.1 29.5							
SLD	13.0	14.6	24.9	17.8						
SLI	12.1	9.4	14.3	13.4						
ТВІ	34.1	25.0	31.3	31.1						
VI	22.3	26.5	26.2	25.3						
504	14.7	16.7	25.0	19.5						
CORE Districtwide	11.0	9.6	17.2	17.4						

Summary & Take Aways

- 1. Over half of districts that qualified for DA did so because SWD were **Red** in two or more SPAs.
 - 78 districts (about 25%) qualified solely on their SWD
- 2. When looking at districts who qualified for DA based on SWD, we see common *intersectional performance challenges*:
 - Achievement (ELA/Math) + Engagement (Graduation Rate or Chronic Absence)
 - Engagement (Graduation Rate of Chronic Absence) + College/Career Readiness

Intersectionality

- 1. What are the *root causes* of these intersectional challenges?
- 2. Among a district's SWDs population, *who* is experiencing these challenges?
 - Disability type, gender, race/ethnicity
- 3. What kinds of *evidence-based practices* can districts and schools leverage to address these intersectional challenges?

Thank you!

KEVIN GEE

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS

KAGEE@UCDAVIS.EDU

TWITTER: @KEVINGEE888



Achievement Gaps and Multi-Tiered Systems of Support in California

George Farkas School of Education University of California, Irvine

Many of California's Students Are Struggling Academically

- In 2005, California was ranked 49th in 8th grade reading and 44th in 8th grade math
- By 2019 this had improved so that the state ranked 38th in both 8th grade reading and math
- This performance below the national average is concentrated in low and middle socioeconomic status (SES) districts.
- It is present at kindergarten entry, indicating that Governor Newsom's plan to increase early education spending is well-targeted.
- But by itself, this is unlikely to fully erase the achievement gaps
- This is because important early skills in reading and math are learned in grades 1-3. We need more support for students who struggle with these.

Some Struggling Students Have Disabilities – How Are They Identified?

- The old definition discrepancy between aptitude and achievement has been largely rejected since it denies services to those with low aptitude, among other reasons
- Some districts use processing strengths and weaknesses (PSM) but it has problems – gives little clear guidance about which interventions to use to help the student with reading or math
- Response to Intervention (RTI) at least three tiers of instruction, increasingly individualized. If a student doesn't respond to Tier 2, give them a Tier 3 intervention (which might be special education). In the 2004 reauthorization of IDEA, RTI is permitted to identify LD. Students with LD are those who do not respond positively to an instructional intervention individualized for them.

Are Special Education Services Equitably Distributed in California?

- In California, African American students are 13% of those with an IEP, but only 9% of the population, so they appear to be "overrepresented" in special education.
- But when you compare students with similar needs for academic help (measured by reading or math test scores) we find that nationally, and in California, African American and Latinx students are placed at lower rates than Whites.
- Also, California students (particularly those in the lowest test score decile) are typically placed at lower rates than in the U.S. as a whole.

How Successfully Has RTI Been Implemented?

- RTI was adopted by California in 2006, but there has been no evaluation of its success in the state.
- However, the low national standing of California students in reading and math suggests that it has not been particularly successful.
- The national evaluation of RTI (which included schools in California) showed no positive effects of the program.
- In particular, it showed an absence of positive effects for Tier 2 services.

MTSS and Some Cautionary Tales

- How has the state responded to the difficulties implementing RTI and its likely lack of effectiveness?
- Answer: By telling districts to implement a more extensive and demanding version – Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS)
- In addition to measuring and remediating academic difficulties, teachers and schools are supposed to do the same for behavioral and social-emotional difficulties
- Without added resources and personnel on the ground, teachers are unlikely to successfully implement this.

MTSS and Some Cautionary Tales (cont.)

- This inability to successfully scale up smaller interventions statewide is well known to researchers.
- The most recent issue of a leading journal is entirely devoted to it.
- Cautionary tales of scale up failure include class size reduction, Success for All reading intervention, Tennessee state pre-k, special education and RTI's failure to show positive effects at scale

What Will It Take for MTSS to Support All of California's Students?

- Governor Newsom's early childhood initiative should be helpful, since the achievement gaps are present at kindergarten entry.
- But won't be enough by itself basic reading and math are taught in grades 1-3, and there will still be students below grade level
- We really need additional resources for Tier 2 interventions for students between the 10th and 40th percentiles in reading and math
- One possibility is to have trained and supported paraprofessionals (aides) working with teachers in grades 1-3. Helping with monitoring student progress every 6 weeks and providing Tier 2 instructional assistance to students who need it.

What Will It Take for MTSS to Support All of California's Students? (cont.)

- These extra resources need to be provided directly at the classroom level.
- We should not expect immediate success. Instead plan for an iterative process of continuous improvement that includes data collection out in the districts.

Thank you.



Realizing One Integrated System of Care for Children

Ron Powell Elizabeth Estes Alex Briscoe

Why Integrated Systems?







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?

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.

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.

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.

Promising Policies to Address the Needs of Students with Disabilities: Lessons from Other States

Daniel Humphrey, Beth Gamse, Jeannie Myung, Ben Cottingham

February 7, 2020



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

	Resource Allocation and District Action Reports (RADAR) Reschmerking															
Select a atomic:		_	-													
Ashmunt																
SELECT COMPARISON DIST	RICTS		1.1.1		10.20	a na sa		والمعادين			a la com					
Artist as to the unique tun distance in the star with			2010 Buderin			2017 Realized (MLN)			DEP Lagary MLAS							
fen den dem in lan direkt same). Seine and in select sampation	-	10111-14 11-01010	-	-		-	8	5,50 Dox	-	200 200		1,1,0	-	1		1.00
Apriles - Cyana caracteria a netwo Sargari		her	-					644	Marth-	11.0	Marin.	9.4	Mark.	6.4	Matt	-
Aplantic	- bernet ;	511.041	-	1.000	-	10.0	10		14%	18.0	17.8	915	1115	No.4	-012	-
Befolies .	burnese.	311.500	10.04	1.000	-004	10.0	100.0	100	10%	14.0	46.0		195	56.0	47.6	100
later.	Printer Tables	315,600	176	1.100	10.6	10.0	- 10	101	-	46.0	48.0	1944	***	81.0	41.0	10
Termine .	Suites.	\$14,790	3894	8,000	16.6	10.0	- 64	114	-	16.0	$\mathbf{k}^{*}\mathbf{A}$	+0%	-	144.0	11.0	100
Saltan.	Buffeat.	\$14,805	100	1,000	10.0	10.0		114	428.	44.0	10.0	575	THE	10.0	814	
Adventite .	-	\$17,100	-	1.000	+0.0	10.0	10.0	344	104	94.0	10-5	81%	-	18.0	16.6	344
Lorator.	-	\$14,000	-	1.00	10.0	10.0		494	55%	+1.0	41.6	914	74%	\$7.0	816	494
Served.	Bulleter	\$15,600	-	1.000	16.6	10.0	**	11%	174	-	+7.0		184	50.0	+6.0	. 624
Part Age 1	-	\$15,400	100	1,000	16.0	-	**	ien	-	+**	18.0	47%	-	-	***	214
Forlessult.	(and	\$15,100	. 105	146	16.0	10.0		47%	-	40.0	40.0		17%	54.0	16.0	344
arized	Incident	\$11,790	8/5	1.000	10.4	-	-	444	4100	14.4	40.0	-	-	-	***	- +11







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

Disability Rights New Jersey et al. v. New Jersey Department of Education, et al.

- 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

100.0% 90.0% Percent of Students in regular class >80% of day 80.0% 70.0% 60.0% 50.0% 40.0% 30.0% 20.0% 2005 2007 2009 2011 2013 2015 2017 US Inclusion Rate 54.2% 56.8% 59.4% 61.1% 62.1% 62.7% 63.5% California Inclusion Rate 50.4% 52.3% 52.3% 53.4% 56.1% 51.4% 54.1% -Florida Inclusion Rate 54.5% 60.6% 66.2% 66.4% 70.0% 71.9% 74.2%

Inclusion Rates for Students with Disabilities

California Inclusion Rate Florida Inclusion Rate

Year

PACE

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

Questions?

Resources from PACE Policy Research Panel on Special Education

Thank you for joining us!

Find research on special education in California on the PACE website:

- 13 publications
- 1 summary brief
- 1 infographic
- 3 webinar recordings
- 3 webinar summaries and Q&A