

# Performance Indicator Review

## State Performance Plan Indicator Improvement Process Packet

2016-17

California Department of Education

**Local Educational Agency**

**Santa Rosa Elementary 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 Manager	SRCS
Kelley Dillon	Director C&I	SRCS
John Fischer	Program Specialist	SCOE
Kaesa Enemark	Coordinator	SRCS
Sarah Cranke	Coordinator	SRCS

### Date(s) of Planning Team

12-19-17

1-4-18

1-10-18

1-18-18

## 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 96.79 %, 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 12.35% 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 96.79%, 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 7.90%, 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**

- 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.
- Special Education teachers did not receive adequate training in the new math curriculum.
- Teachers did not receive training on how to use embedded testing supports for the SBAC assessments.
- Student's did not receive access to all of the embedded supports available for testing.

### **Summary of Current Improvement Strategies**

(describe current strategies to improve statewide assessment rates)



- Schools are starting to use formative assessments Lexia, Let's Go Learn and Dibels to track student progress and provide targeted interventions.
- Schools are creating "walk to read" groups to provide targeted reading interventions for students.
- The district is also exploring EDGE intervention software to support students struggling in reading and math.

## Improvement Strategies

<b>Description of Planned Strategies</b>	<b>Resources Required</b> (Staff, Training, Curricula, etc.)	<b>Person(s) Responsible</b>	<b>Methods and Standards to Measure Success</b>	<b>Due Date</b>
Ensure all special education classes have grade level common core curriculum and include special education teachers in curriculum adoptions.	Training on new curriculum and differentiated instruction.	Special Education Coordinator, and Program Managers. SCOE is supporting with differentiated assistance due to red and orange levels on the Dashboard academic indicators.	Increase in the number of students accessing common core curriculum. Improve students' scores on SBAC	6-30-2018
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
Increase opportunities for access to general education classes for student through Push-in/ Co-Teaching.	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 59.43%, 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 27.10%. 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 2.36% 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**

- Limited access to general education opportunities in PE and Electives
- Lack of continuum of services/ flexibility for LRE (General Ed, RSP, SDC, and NPS/SCOE only)
- IEP placement is often determined by school site's available programs not student's individual needs.
- Excessive placement of students in SDC and NPS for Behavioral challenges.

## **Summary of Current Improvement Strategies**

(describe current strategies to improve LRE rates)

- Newer LCAP funded employees endeavor to connect with students and create a safe place to learn and grow at the elementary schools:
  - Elementary School Counselor
  - Teacher on Special Assignment
  - Student Engagement Activity Worker
  - Family Engagement Facility Worker
  - Restorative Specialist
- School Climate Transformation Grant, elementary 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 some schools in the appropriate stage of the roll out.
- The social emotional program, TOOLBOX Tools training is in the early stages of roll out via the School Climate Transformation Grant.

## **Improvement Strategies**



<b>Description of Planned Strategies</b> (see attached samples)	<b>Resources Required</b> (Staff, Training, Curricula, etc.)	<b>Person(s) Responsible</b>	<b>Methods and Standards to Measure Success</b>	<b>Due Date</b>
Train staff to appropriately measure percent of time in general education.	Program managers train teachers at sites	Program Managers	Increase in general education percentage	6-30-2018
Identify gaps in the current MTSS, work to improve the systems.	Observe successful schools and then train in district  View documentation of current systems, and collaborate across pyramids.  School observations and administrator visits with an MTSS focus will be the beginning point.	MTSS support staff	Percent in general education increases	6-30-2018
Create a 2018-19 elementary prep schedule in which special education students attend prep classes with their general education classmates.	Staff to collaborate to create schedule reflecting changes	Curriculum & Instruction w/ feedback from site staff	Percent in general education increases	6-30-2018

