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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 (SPA) and indicators factored into districts’ eligibility for DA. Findings show that, among the 535 districts identified for DA, eligibility was driven, in part, by SWD performance for over half of those districts. These 107 districts were most frequently identified for DA based on SWD performance in SPA 4 (Pupil Achievement) alongside 5 (Pupil Engagement). These results highlight intersectional challenges facing SWD—challenges that districts can address through their continuous improvement process.
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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?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Support</th>
<th>Description of Supports Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support for All LEAs and Schools (Level 1)</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiated Assistance (Level 2)</td>
<td>County superintendents, charter authorizers, the California Department of Education (CDE), and the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence (CCEE) provide <strong>differentiated assistance</strong> for LEAs, in the form of individually designed assistance, to address identified performance issues, including significant disparities in performance among student groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive Intervention (Level 3)</td>
<td>The State Superintendent of Public Instruction may require more <strong>intensive interventions</strong> for LEAs with persistent performance issues and a lack of improvement over a specified time period.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

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

### Change Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status Categories</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Increase Significantly</th>
<th>Increase from Prior Year (by 0.5 to less than 3.0 percentage points)</th>
<th>Maintained from Prior Year (declined or increased by less than 0.5 percentage points)</th>
<th>Declined from Prior Year (by 0.5 to less than 3.0 percentage points)</th>
<th>Declined Significantly from Prior Year (by 30 or more percentage points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>2.5% or less in current year</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2.6% to 5.0% in current year</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>5.1% to 10.0% in current year</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>10.1% to 20.0% in current year</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>20.1% or greater in current year</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Priority Area</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority 4: Pupil Achievement</td>
<td>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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 5: Pupil Engagement</td>
<td>Red on graduate rate indicator (Grades 9–12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Red on chronic absence (Grades K–8)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 6: School Climate</td>
<td><strong>Red on suspension rate indicator (Grades K–12)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 8: Outcomes in a Broad Course of Study</td>
<td>Red on college/career indicator (Grades 9–12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Districts Eligible for Differentiated Assistance in 2019

- **333** Districts Identified for Differentiated Assistance in 2019
  - **187** Districts Identified Based on SWD (alone or with other student groups)
    - **114** Districts Identified Based on SWD and Other Student Groups
    - **73** Districts Identified Based on SWD Alone
      - **32** Districts Identified for Differentiated Assistance in 2018
      - **41** Districts Not Identified for Differentiated Assistance in 2019
  - **146** Districts Identified Based on Student Groups Other Than SWD
### Table 4. Districts Qualifying for Differentiated Assistance in 2019 Based on Performance Levels of SWD, Breakdown by Four State Priority Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Priority Areas</th>
<th>4: Pupil Achievement</th>
<th>5: Pupil Engagement</th>
<th>6: School Climate</th>
<th>8: Outcomes in a Broad Course of Study</th>
<th># of Districts</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELA and Math</td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduation Rate or</td>
<td>Suspenison</td>
<td>College and Career Readiness</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chronic Absence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>187</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

All Students

Students with Disabilities

Change (Percentage Points)

Performance Color Levels:
- Red
- Orange
- Yellow
- Green
- Blue
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>K–5</th>
<th>6–8</th>
<th>9–12</th>
<th>K–12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAF/HI</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>49.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OI</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHI</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLD</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLI</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBI</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districtwide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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!
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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 10\textsuperscript{th} and 40\textsuperscript{th} 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.
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?
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.
Policy Recommendations

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
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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

<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>

Inclusion Rates for Students with Disabilities
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