

Performance Indicator Review

State Performance Plan Indicator Improvement Process Packet

2016-17

California Department of Education

Local Educational Agency

Santa Rosa City School High District

Special Education Local Plan Area

Sonoma County

Note: All LEA data needs to be transferred from the LEA's 2015–16 Annual Performance Report found at: <http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/ds/leadatarpts.asp>

Note: Each ? indicates the Local Educational Agency (LEA) must provide a written response. The LEA should only respond to those indicators identified as unmet in the letter accompanying this packet. The final page of this packet is for use on those indicators that continue to be unmet from previous years. Include this page in addition to all responses for each unmet indicator.

Planning Team Participants and Position

(including special education director, general education administrator,
and SELPA representative)

Name	Position	Organization
Sonya Randrup	Coordinator	SRCS
Jorge Wahner	Program Specialist	SRCS
Kelley Dillon	Director	SRCS
John Fischer	Program Specialist	SCOE
Kaesa Enemark	Coordinator	SRCS
Sarah Cranke	Coordinator	SRCS

Date(s) of Planning Team Meetings

12-19-17

1-4-18

1-10-18

1-18-18

State Performance Plan Indicator 1 - Graduation Four Year Rate

Current Performance

Graduation Four Year Rate: According to the LEA's 2015–16 SPPI, the four-year graduation rate was 56% and did not meet the state target rate of 67.5%.

1. Review the data related to the LEA's graduation rates. It is critical each LEA collect, maintain, and submit accurate data. Remember Indicator 1 uses lag year data. Lag year data is not current, but prior year data from 2014–15.

- a. The source of this data is CALPADS which collects data reported by the LEA. Determine if the CALPADS data for the LEA's special education students are reported accurately.
- b. The graduation rates are based on a 4-year adjusted (students moving out or transferring into the LEA) cohort, which represents a standard 4-year high school career, beginning with a student's first time enrollment in the ninth grade.

2. Compare the graduation rates for students in general education with the rates for students who received special education services. If the general education rate exceeds the special education rate, develop some working hypotheses as to the reasons for the difference. Investigate the hypotheses by interviewing students with disabilities who have not graduated with their cohort. Summarize the responses from the interviews.

Sample Graduation Drill Down Activities

1. Review the secondary transition plan for a sample of students who received special education services but did not graduate. Determine if each transition plan contained the required components, such as transition assessments, measurable postsecondary goals, and transition services and activities. Document any interventions made to promote graduation for each student. Detail the results of this review. Determine what strategies, if any, were used to connect students (who later failed to graduate) with programs and/or agencies that support students who are at-risk.

2. Review the transcripts and courses of study for the students who did not graduate to determine if any patterns emerge from the review as to any specific group. Report the results of that review for any group of students with similar transcript history.

3. Describe how transition services were provided to a sample of students who received special education services during the preceding twelve months. If transition services were provided to some students and not others, indicate what those services were and report how the provision of transition services related to the likelihood of a student's graduating.

Summary of Root Causes Interfering with LEA's Ability to Improve this Indicator

- Special Day class placements adversely impact students' access to general education.
- Over identification of Non-diploma track in middle school.
- Lack of systematic interventions for students failing classes (general and special education)
- Disproportionate placement of students in NPS and SCOE programs

Summary of Current Improvement Strategies

Santa Rosa City Schools has shown growth in special education graduation rate from 56% in the 2014/2015 school year to 65.7% in the most recent dashboard release.

- Trauma informed care
- MTSS programs
- Program for Teen-moms at Ridgeway High School
- Cyber High School credit recovery
- Summer School
- SOLL counselors support EL learners
- Elsie Pilot of SDC courses to support graduation requirements.

Improvement Strategies

Description of Planned Strategies	Resources Required (Staff, Training, Curricula, etc.)	Person(s) Responsible	Methods and Standards to Measure Success	Due Date
--	--	----------------------------------	---	-----------------

Begin to implement Evaluation of NPS Placement for appropriateness	Additional Program Manager focused on NPS placements	Special Education Coordinator and Program Manager	Decrease in current and new NPS placements	6-30-2018
Review of SDC non-diploma track placements starting in Middle Schools.	Training on differentiated instruction, co-teaching/pushin support training. ITP trainings.	Program Managers	Reduction in Non-diploma track students. Reduction in Drop-out rate	6-30-2018
Development of COST teams and MTSS (Best Plus) to determine appropriate support/ intervention services for students failing classes.	District wide MTSS trainings. District implementation team/ committee.	Best Plus coordinator, Tier III committee	Increase in number of sites with COST teams. Fewer students failing classes, fewer discipline incidents. Reduction in drop-out rate.	6-30-2018
Explore creation and Development of summer Bridge programs for at-risk 8th graders.	Training staff on concept of summer bridge. Develop Summer Bridge Program. Visit existing programs. Determine curriculum	Site Admin, Program Managers, Summer School principals.	Reduction of students failing classes in 9th grade.	6-30-2018

Establish district and union team to review and develop addition supports/service options for students with disabilities	Staff Training on differentiation, accommodations, and modifications. Increase support and special education staff at	Special Education Coordinator, Alt-ed site admin.	Increase special education grad rate at Alt-ed school.	6-30-2018
--	---	---	--	-----------

State Performance Plan Indicator 2 - Dropout Four Year Rate

Current Performance

Dropout Four Year Rate: According to the LEA's 2015–16 SPPI, the percent of all students in grades nine and higher, and ungraded students thirteen and over, who exited special education by dropping out of its schools was 14.09%, failing to meet the state target rate of **less than 13.72%**.

1. Review the data related to dropout rates for grades 9–12 to determine if the LEA reported students accurately by exit code. If numbers were reported inaccurately, detail how the data was incorrectly gathered or tabulated by exit code. Revise procedures and training to ensure future reports are corrected. Please remember Indicator 2 uses lag year data. Lag year data is not current, but prior year data from 2014–15.
2. Determine if the LEA has an effective procedure to ensure the code for any student previously exited as either “dropped out” or “moved” is changed once the LEA receives a request for records from another school.
3. Compare the dropout rates for students in general education with the rates for students who received special education services. Describe the calculations you used to make that comparison and discuss the findings. If the special education rate exceeds the general education rate, develop some working hypotheses as to the reasons for the difference.

Sample Dropout Drill Down Activities

1. Review the transition plan for each student who received special education services who dropped out. Document any interventions made prior to the student's dropping out and determine if changes to the IEP and/or transition plan including additional services might have resulted in the student's graduating.

2. Determine what process, if any, was used to connect students, who later dropped out of school, with programs and/or agencies that support students who are at-risk for dropping out. Identify the dropout prevention services the LEA currently uses.
3. Review the transcripts and courses of study for the students who have dropped out to determine if any pattern emerges from the review such as specific courses taken, specific grade levels involved, or any other similar pattern prior to their dropping out. Report the results of the review for any group of students with similar transcript history prior to their dropping out.
4. Describe how transition services were provided to each student who received special education services during the twelve months preceding the dropout in the academic year for which numbers indicate an unusually high dropout rate. If transition services were provided to some students and not others, indicate what those services were and report how the provision of transition services correlated to the likelihood of a student's continuing in school.

Summary of Root Causes Interfering with LEA's Ability to Improve this Indicator

Students' lack of access to general education curriculum and over identification of non-diploma track students leads students to devalue education.

- Lack of opportunities to participate in general education courses
- Lack of high interest course options for students with disabilities
- Special Day class placements adversely impact students' access to general education.
- Over identification of students as Non-diploma track.
- Lack of systematic interventions for students failing classes (general and special education)
- Disproportionate placement of students in NPS and SCOE programs

Summary of Current Improvement Strategies

(describe current strategies to improve graduation and dropout rates)

- Trauma informed care
- MTSS programs
- Program for Teen-moms at Ridgeway High School
- Cyber High School credit recovery
- Summer School
- SOLL counselors support EL learners
- Elsie Pilot of SDC courses to support graduation requirements.

- LCAPP goals include increasing student and family engagement through full-service community school model.
- LCAPP goals also includes developing a coherent, rigorous, and relevant teaching and learning program to graduate college and career ready.
- School Climate Transformation Grant, secondary schools are divided into 3 cohorts going through training series on PBIS and Restorative Practices, and are mid way through the rollout.
- Safe School Ambassador Program is available through the school Climate Transformation Grant to all schools and is adopted by 8 of 11 schools so far in the roll out.

Improvement Strategies

Description of Planned Strategies	Resources Required (Staff, Training, Curricula, etc.)	Person(s) Responsible	Methods and Standards to Measure Success	Due Date
Begin to implement Evaluation of NPS Placement for appropriateness	Additional Program Manager focused on NPS placements	Special Education Coordinator and Program Manager	Decrease in current and new NPS placements	6-30-2018
Review of SDC non-diploma track placements starting in Middle Schools.	Training on differentiated instruction, co-teaching/pushin support training. ITP trainings.	Program Managers	Reduction in Non-diploma track students. Reduction in Drop-out rate	6-30-2018

Development of COST teams and MTSS (Best Plus) to determine appropriate support/ intervention services for students failing classes.	District wide MTSS trainings. District implementation team/ committee.	Best Plus coordinator, Tier III committee	Increase in number of sites with COST teams. Fewer students failing classes, fewer discipline incidents. Reduction in drop-out rate.	6-30-2018
Explore creation and Development of summer Bridge programs for at-risk 8th graders.	Training staff on concept of summer bridge. Develop Summer Bridge Program. Visit existing programs. Determine curriculum	Site Admin, Program Managers, Summer School principals.	Reduction of students failing classes in 9th grade.	6-30-2018

State Performance Plan Indicator 3 - Statewide Assessments

Current Performance

Statewide Assessments: According to the LEA's 2015–16 SPPI, the District's Statewide Assessment data is as follows:

English Language Arts Participation Rate:

The percentage of students with disabilities who participated in academic achievement testing to meet the requirements of California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) in English Language Arts(ELA) was 89.9 %, and the target was 95%.

ELA Achievement Rate:

The percentage of students with disabilities who achieved a score of 3 or 4 for ELA was 8.60% and the target was 13.9%.

Mathematics Participation Rate:

The LEA's percentage of students with disabilities who participated in academic achievement testing in math was 89.6%, and the target was 95%.

Mathematics Achievement Rate:

The percentage of students with disabilities who achieved a score of 3 or 4 for math was 4.11%, and the target was 12.00%.

1. Review the data related to the LEA's statewide assessment rates. It is critical each LEA collect, maintain, and submit accurate data. The source of this data is CALPADS which collects data reported by LEAs. Determine if the CALPADS data for the LEA's students in special education are reported accurately.
2. Compare the statewide achievement rates for students in general education with the rates for students who received special education services. If the general education rates exceeds the special education rates, develop some working hypotheses as to the reasons for the difference. Investigate the hypotheses by interviewing staff on how to improve proficiency rates of students who receive special education. Summarize the responses from the interviews.

Sample Statewide Assessment Drill Down Activities

1. Review CALPADS data to ensure students with disabilities' statewide assessment accommodations and modifications are being accurately reported to CAASPP.
2. Inspect the testing resources at each facility to determine if there are access issues that prevent students with disabilities from participating in statewide assessments.
3. Provide evidence the decision-making process involved during IEP development was based on meaningful dialog related to student participation in and accommodations and modifications for statewide assessments.
4. Examine the LEA's policies, procedures, and practices to ensure they enable students with disabilities to be involved in and have access to general education curriculum, materials, and instruction.
5. Describe the extent to which the LEA ensures the specific curriculum is being followed and the curriculum includes content on which student achievement is assessed.
6. Determine the extent to which the LEA uses feedback, such as formative and interim assessments, to determine whether it is accomplishing its academic goals.

Summary of Root Causes Interfering with LEA's Ability to Improve this Indicator

(describe root causes that interfere with meeting statewide assessment rates)

- Teachers have insufficient training in how to evaluate assessment data
- There is not a consistent formative assessment process across the district. It differs from site to site in implementation and use.
- Students are not provided adequate access to general education curriculum.
- Teachers have insufficient training in how to evaluate appropriateness of accommodations
- There is not consistent access to technology.
- The use of common core curriculum in RSP & SDC classes varies by site. This is not providing all students with access to the content being tested.
- Overidentification of non-diploma track students which is causing some students not to take the SBAC

Summary of Current Improvement Strategies

- Improvement of district wireless accessibility at all school sites.
- Increase in number of Chromebooks in special education classrooms.
- The district is adopting new integrated math curriculum which is more reflective of common core standards.

Improvement Strategies

Description of Planned Strategies	Resources Required (Staff, Training, Curricula, etc.)	Person(s) Responsible	Methods and Standards to Measure Success	Due Date

SRCS and SCOE are collaborating to provide training on use of computer based accommodations and knowledge of universal, embedded, and non-embedded accommodations.	SRCS and SCOE staff. Technology (Chromebooks), Google read and write and other software with embedded accommodations	SCOE and SRCS special education staff. Special education teacher.	Increase in student SBAC participation and higher test scores. More accurate reporting in CALPADS	6-30-2018
Continue to Increase access to Chromebooks in RSP & SDC classes.	Chromebooks. Continue budgeting and LCAP support of increasing tech access.	Special Education coordinator. CBO.	Increase in the number of RSP & SDC classes with class sets of Chromebooks .	6-30-2018
Provide Training for teachers on differentiating Common Core curriculum to provide greater access to students with disabilities.	Training on differentiated instruction and co-teaching/pushin support training.	Special Education Coordinator, and Program Managers.	Increase in the number of students in general education classes.	6-30-2018
Increase opportunities for access to general education A-G classes for student through Push-in/ Co-Teaching. Starting with 7th grade CPM	Training on differentiated instruction and co-teaching/pushin support training.	Special Education Coordinator, Site Administrators and Program Managers.	Increase percentage of students in general education classes	6-30-2018

State Performance Plan Indicator 5 - Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)

Current Performance

According to the LEA's 2015–16 SPPI, the average amount of time students aged six through twenty-two years receive special education or related services in settings apart from nondisabled peers did not meet required target for one or more elements of the indicator.

Indicator 5a

The district's percentage of students who spent greater than 80 percent of their time inside the general education classroom was 26.45%, the target was **greater than 49.2%**.

Indicator 5b

The percentage of students who were inside the general education classroom less than 40 percent of the time was 23.27%. The target for this area was **less than 24.6%**.

Indicator 5c

The LEA's percentage of students with disabilities placed in separate schools was 9.06% which is above the state target of **less than 4.4%**.

1. Examine the placement options utilized in the LEA for each disability group. Is there variability in placements for each disability or do you see any instances of all students with the same disability being served in exactly the same setting?
2. Use the same process using placement data by grade. Is the pattern of more restrictive settings seen in some grades but not in others, or is the problem universal?
3. If you have multiple sites for each age group (elementary, middle, high school), examine the placement data by site. Use data from multiple years to determine if IEP team placement decisions are influenced differently in different schools.

Sample Least Restrictive Environment Drill Down Activities

1. Examine the reasons students in more restrictive settings are placed in those settings. Are they placed in self-contained programs because of behavior issues or because of educational need?

2. Describe the staff development that has taken place in the areas of:
 - a. Diverse learners and cultural differences
 - b. Behavior management strategies including functional behavioral assessment and behavior intervention plans
 - c. Instructional strategies such as learning styles
 - d. Collaboration skills
 - e. Accommodations
 - f. Assistive technology
3. Inspect the physical plant at each facility to determine if there are access issues preventing students from participating with their typical peers.
4. Inspect staffing patterns to determine if sufficient supports for general education teachers are available to support an inclusive environment.
5. Provide evidence the decision-making process involved in IEPs was based on meaningful dialog related to the opportunity for placements for students in the LRE.
6. Describe the LEA's policies, procedures, and practices used to determine the education of a child cannot be achieved satisfactorily in the general classroom.
7. What are the impediments to a more inclusive environment for students with disabilities in the LEA? Include only those over which you have some control. Examples include such things as teacher attitude, administrative support, culture of collaboration, and use of assistive technology.

Summary of Root Causes Interfering with LEA's Ability to Improve this Indicator

(describe the root causes that interfere with meeting the target for LRE)

- Disproportionate number of students with Autism and ED in NPS placements
- Lack of continuum of services/ flexibility for LRE (General Ed, RSP, SDC, and NPS/SCOE only)
- Several secondary sites fail to offer a full continuum of services when offering FAPE
- Excessive placement of students at NPSs is universal across SRCS High School District.
- Excessive placement of students in SDC and NPS for Behavioral challenges

Summary of Current Improvement Strategies

(describe current strategies to improve LRE rates)

- Unconscious bias
- Addressing diverse learners
- Museum of tolerance
- BEST Plus implementation
- MTSS
- Restorative Justice
- SOLL Counselors
- District Behaviorist
- All sites have multiple staff trained in PRO-Act.

Improvement Strategies

Description of Planned Strategies (see attached samples)	Resources Required (Staff, Training, Curricula, etc.)	Person(s) Responsible	Methods and Standards to Measure Success	Due Date
Increase opportunities for access to general education A-G classes for student through Push-in/ Co-Teaching. Starting with 7th grade CPM	Training on differentiated instruction and co-teaching/push in support training.	Special Education Coordinator, Site Administrators and Program Managers.	Increase percentage of students in general education classes	6-30-2018
Begin to implement Evaluation of NPS Placement for appropriateness	Additional Program Manager focused on NPS placements	Special Education Coordinator and Program Manager	Decrease in current and new NPS placements	6-30-2018

Review of SDC non-diploma track placements starting in Middle Schools.	Training on differentiated instruction, co-teaching/push in support training. ITP trainings.	Program Managers	Reduction in Non-diploma track students. Reduction in Drop-out rate	6-30-2018
Increase opportunities for collaboration with General Education teachers in A-G classes starting with 7th grade CPM	Training on differentiated instruction and co-teaching/push in support training.	Program Managers, and site administrators.	Decrease in current and new NPS placements.	6-30-2018