

Significant Disproportionality Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services Plan (CCEIS)

The California Department of Education (CDE) has identified certain local educational agencies (LEAs) as significantly disproportionate based on race or ethnicity with respect to the identification of children with disabilities; the identification of children in specific disability categories; the placement of children with disabilities in particular educational settings; or the incidence, duration, and type of disciplinary actions, including suspensions and expulsions.

The purpose of this document is to describe requirements regarding Significant Disproportionality and Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CCEIS). The CCEIS Requirements and Instructions and budget and plan forms are designed to meet federal requirements for the use of CCEIS funds.

Please refer to the Padlet for forms and other information specific to Significant Disproportionality at the following link:

<https://padlet.com/sedmonitoring/1920monitoring>

Federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Requirements (See Title 34 Code of Federal Regulations (34 CFR) section 300.647 Determining significant disproportionality)

Under the Federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Determining significant disproportionality requirements, if a LEA is identified as significantly disproportionate, the LEA must reserve 15 percent of its 611 and 619 IDEA grant funds to address factors contributing to the significant disproportionality (See 34 CFR sections 300.646(c) and (d).) These services are for both students who currently receive special education services and who do not currently receive special education services, but who need additional academic and behavioral supports to succeed in a general education environment. An LEA must develop a CCEIS plan to identify and address the factors contributing to the significant disproportionality in the LEA for the identified category (See 34 CFR section 300.646(d)(1).)

CCEIS activities must:

- Include children not currently identified as needing special education or related services but who need additional academic and behavioral support to succeed in a general education environment
- Address the needs of those student subgroups that were identified as the basis for the LEA's identification as significantly disproportionate, but not exclusively, for those student subgroups
- Focus on instructional activities for children age three through twelfth grade with primary focus on age three through third grade

- Allow expenditures on children ages three through five if an LEA has an established preschool program as part of the educational system
- Focus on academic and behavioral instructional services and professional development
- Occur within the allowable CCEIS budget period (27 months)

(See 34 *CFR* sections 300.646(d)(3) and (4).)

Budget and Allowable Expenditures Information for 2020 (See 34 *CFR* section 300.646(d)(1)(iii).)

The following are required for the development of the CCEIS Budget:

- CCEIS expenses for 2020 must conform to the U.S. Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) IDEA Part B Regulations Significant Disproportionality (Equity in IDEA). For detailed allowable Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services (Comprehensive CEIS), please refer specifically to Questions C-3-1 through C-3-10, pages 19 through 24, on the U.S. Department of Education Web page at <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/memosdcltrs/significant-disproportionality-qa-2-23-17.pdf>.
- Reserve 15 percent of the Fiscal Year 2020–21 IDEA grant funds for CCEIS. (Refer to the OSEP regulations, Questions C-3-6, page 21)
- IDEA funds budgeted for the 2020 CCEIS plan must be exhausted within the 27-month report period: July 1, 2020, through September 30, 2022. Implementation of CCEIS cannot begin until written approval of the CCEIS Plan is provided by the CDE.
- Clarification on appropriate use of CCEIS funds:
 - **Supplement not supplant:** CCEIS funds should only be used to supplement, and not supplant, activities funded with, and implemented utilizing, Part B funds or other federal funds (See 34 *CFR* section 300.266(e).) (Refer to the OSEP regulations, Question C-3-7, Page 21 of 28).
 - **Professional development:** CCEIS professional development events are for preschool through grade twelve personnel who are responsible for students who need additional academic and behavioral supports to succeed in the general education environment. (Refer to the OSEP regulations, Questions C-3-8, page 22)

Personnel who exclusively serve students with individualized education programs (IEPs) cannot be funded using CCEIS funds. However, special education personnel can be included in professional development activities associated with the implementation of CCEIS under certain circumstances. For example, if they do not increase the cost of the professional development, the quality of the professional development does not decrease, and their participation does not lead to the exclusion of personnel who are serving students defined as needing additional support, then special education personnel may be included in professional development.

CCEIS planning process: Support the CCEIS planning process with a clear relationship to the development of the CCEIS Plan. CCEIS funds may be used to hire a CDE-approved technical assistance facilitator to assist with development and the implementation of the CCEIS Plan. To the extent that special education personnel are involved in developing the CCEIS Plan, the LEA may use CCEIS funds to pay for this involvement.

Phase 1

1.1 Leadership Team: List members' names, emails, titles/roles, and responsibilities related to the CCEIS Plan. In small LEAs, there may be a group that covers both the leadership and stakeholder functions. Multiple roles may be assigned to one administrator or team member.

Name	Title/Role	CCEIS Team Responsibility for Development and Implementation of CCEIS Plan	Email
Arianna Mayes	Director of Special Education	Communication and Meetings, implementation	amayes@mvwsd.org
Megan Henderson	Equity Coach	Development of action plan and goals, implementation, site support	mhenderson@mvwsd.org
Acantha Ellard	Special Education Coordinator	Review Timelines & gather documents, implementation, site support	aellard@mvwsd.org
Nadia Pongo	Director of Fiscal Services	Funding Allocations and Budget Information	npongo@mvwsd.org
Swati Dagar	Director of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment	Development of action plan and goals, implementation, and monitoring/on-going support, curriculum and cabinet liaison	sdagar@mvwsd.org
Cathy Baur	Chief Academic Officer	Superintendent designee, Overseer of development of plan, implementation, and support.	cbaur@mvwsd.org

Do the members of this team have decision-making authority? What is the process for LEA approval of this CCEIS plan? Type answer here:

Yes. Key members of the leadership team have decision making authority. The leadership team meets regularly to refine the plan in preparation for approval. The overall process includes

gathering feedback from stakeholders, creation of the plan, input and refinement from the leadership team, and initial approval from Cabinet.

Has your district been previously identified as significantly disproportionate? Yes or No.

No

If your district been previously identified as significantly disproportionate, list previous year(s) of identification (please include indicator(s) and race/ethnicity for each year ie 2018 Indicator 10, White Emotional Disturbance):

n/a

1.2 Stakeholder Group: List members' names, roles, and CCEIS related responsibilities.

Name	Title/Role	CCEIS Team Responsibility for Development and Implementation of CCEIS Plan
Megan Henderson	Cabinet Level – General Education	Input on data analysis, root cause analysis, and finalization of CCEIS plan, & input, ongoing monitoring
Arianna Mayes	Cabinet Level – Special Education	Communication and Meetings, Finalization of CCEIS Plan, & input and Follow-up
Swati Dagar	Director of Curriculum and Assessment(or Similar)	Input on data analysis, root cause analysis and approval, and finalization of CCEIS plan, input and follow-up, provide professional development to principals, coaches, and teachers
Leo Mapagu	SELPA Director	Review and finalization of CCEIS plan, Special Education leadership, SELPA leadership, Technical Assistance Compliance, and Budget Support and Leadership
Amy Lu	Appropriate Grade Level General Education Teacher	Provides input as a general education teacher about the needs of students in the classroom and their interaction with the curriculum. Input on root causes.
Adelina Bonano	Appropriate Grade Level Special Education Teacher	Input on data analysis, root cause analysis, and draft of CCEIS plan, approve finalized plan
Diana Pinto	Parent (diverse representation)	Provide personal experience as a parent to data analysis, root causes, and measurable outcomes
Dr. Ayindé Rudolph	Superintendent	Approval of CCEIS plan, oversight, ongoing monitoring, certifier of all assurances
Claudia Olaciregui	Site Level Administrator	Input on plan and finalization of plan, Student monitoring and site implementation
Terri Lambert	Site Level Administrator	Student monitoring and site implementation
Michelle Williams	Site Level Administrator	Student monitoring and site implementation

Nadia Pongo	Fiscal Services Representative	Funding Allocations and Budget Information
Acantha Ellard	Special Education Administrator	Review Timelines & gather documents
Scott Boding	Parent	Provide experience as a parent to measurable outcomes
Mirian Hernandez	Parent (diverse representation)	Provide personal experience as a parent to data analysis, root causes, and measurable outcomes
Charlotte Christensen	Coach	Provides input based on experience as both a teacher and coach, input on root causes, provides professional development to teachers, and coaches teachers on interventions

Note: Team composition requires a diverse group of parents and community members, including representatives of the identified racial/ethnic category.

Provide the dates the Stakeholder group met and a summary of the work completed by the Stakeholder Group:

On the following dates 3/11/2020, 10/6/2020, 10/21/2020, 10/28/2020, 11/12/2020, 11/17/2020, 12/2/2020 the CCEIS stakeholder groups met to complete the CCEIS process.

As a district wide leadership team, staff looked at suspension data, absenteeism data, and CAASPP scores across schools, ethnicity, english language learners and students with disabilities. Staff developed commonalities and questions to look deeper at the data. Staff participated in activities to challenge core beliefs about student success. This occurred prior to school closure.

On March 11, 2020 the leadership team met to plan out the CCEIS process as an Initial Leadership planning meeting & to complete the Wisconsin. Unfortunately we had leadership staffing changes at the end of the 19-20 school year, and thus had to establish our leadership team in the 20-21 school year.

On October 6, 2020 - The stakeholder group met to review the data presentation that included CAASPP from 18-19, iReady data from 19-20 and 20-21, Literably data from 19-20, identification for special education by ethnicity for 18-19. The team discussed this data and provided anecdotal evidence from their experiences.

On October 21, 2020, the leadership team met to review and update the Wisconsin self assessment. We also completed the Initiative inventory and discussed the practices in our district. We also reviewed our Policies and Practices and discussed the impact of those policies.

On October 28, 2020, the leadership team met to complete the Wisconsin self-assessment and to create a summary of those findings to present to the larger stakeholder group.

On October 28, 2020, the stakeholder group met to discuss the Wisconsin self assessment summary and to complete the root cause analysis process. The team used the Racial Equity Analysis tool as well as anecdotal evidence to analyze our root causes.

On November 12, 2020, the stakeholder group met to follow-up on the root cause analysis process, to review the draft plan and to create SMART measurable outcomes and activities. The team explored action steps for the draft outcomes.

On November 17, 2020, the leadership team met to revise the draft measurable outcomes.

On December 2, 2020, The leadership team met to revise the activities associated with each outcome.

On December 9, 2020, the Stakeholder group met to review the draft plan and make final edits. The plan was approved at this meeting.

1.3 List the activities the LEA has completed to support the development of the CCEIS Plan*:

For technical assistance support: Accessed the SPP-TAP website, communicated and met with CDE FMTA Consultant, and SPP-TAP Director and SELPA Director, met with TA Facilitator, attended CCEIS Spring and Fall Workshops, held Leadership and Stakeholder meetings, attending several Community of Practice Meetings, Self Assessment using the Wisconsin, Policy and Procedures Review, Initiative Inventory, Racial Equity Analysis Tool.

*Communicated with CDE FMTA Consultant and Technical Assistance Facilitator; Participated in virtual Community of Practice (CoP) meetings; Attended CCEIS Workshop Phase 1 and 2; Attended CCEIS Workshop Phase 3 and 4

1.4 Choose Technical Assistance (TA) Facilitator(s)

Name the TA Facilitator(s) and describe current and anticipated services. LEAs are required to contract for a minimum of 10 hours or TA Facilitation for each area of identification. You must supply a copy of the contract or MOU for each TA facilitator. If you are using a non-SPP-TAP TA facilitator you must obtain prior permission from the CDE and supply a copy of the TA facilitator's resume and contract to the FMTA consultant.

Name	Current Service	Anticipated Service
Mildred Browne	10 hours of consultation. Provided input/feedback in regards to writing the 2020 CCEIS Plan. This includes assisting with areas of the plan that needed more information.	Input on Draft CCEIS Plan. Continue to offer support and monitoring of the 2020 CCEIS Plan including completion of the ongoing progress reports.

[Signed Assurance of Compliance](#)

[TA Facilitator Contract](#)

1.5 Gather Relevant Data

List the relevant sources of data that are used to inform decision-making. Are there any additional data sources that would be beneficial but data was not available (e.g., Referral data by teacher, etc.)? (See *State Performance Plan Technical Assistance Project's website*:

<https://spptap.org/significant-disproportionality/sd-ceis-guidance-documents-and-forms/> for additional information.)

To inform practices and decision making, several types of data were collected. The following data points were utilized: disaggregated data by program and ethnicity in the areas of academic achievement, from the MVWSD information system, Powerschool, California CAASPP dashboard and CALPADS.

CAASPP data from 18/19, district iReady diagnostic data from September 2020, district Literably reading data from 19/20, Reclassification data and RFEP academic performance from 18/19, referral for SSTs/SpEd by demographic from 18/19 and 19/20, CA Dashboard data from 18/19, Achievement gaps 18/19 & 19/20

In review of this data, gaps in achievement were noted between subgroups of students. These gaps are described below in section 2.3.

[Data presentation](#)

Phase 2

2.1 Complete a Local Educational Agency (LEA) Initiative Inventory

Enter your LEA initiatives that align or have some areas of integration with the efforts to address disproportionality.

<i>Initiative and Funding Source</i>	Relationship to LCAP and other Initiative Goals/Priorities	Target Group	Leaders and Responsible Staff	Educational Areas: Curriculum and Instruction, Behavior, Family and Community Engagement, Climate, Social-Emotional Learning, Other
English Language Development & Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (MVWSD's language support structure and initiative)	LCAP Goal 2	English Learners	Site leaders and Director of State and Federal, & Strategic Programs	Curriculum & Instruction

RTI-Response to Instruction	LCAP Goal 2	All Students	Site Leaders, Chief of Instruction, and Director of Curriculum & Instruction	Curriculum & Instruction
Co-Teaching at Middle School (MVWSD inclusion program at the Middle School level)	LCAP Goal 1	Students with Disabilities and All students	Site and District Office Admin	Curriculum & Instruction
Community Engagement and Student Support Team (Personnel: School and Community Engagement Facilitators and At-Risk Coordinators)	LCAP Goal 2	All students and Families	Site Leaders and Director of State and Federal, & Strategic Programs	Behavior, Family and Community Engagement, Climate, Social-Emotional Learning

[Initiative Inventory](#)
[LCAP](#)

2.2 Complete a Programmatic Self-Assessment

Identify the programmatic self-assessment tool(s) used and describe process of completion:

The Annotated Checklist for Addressing Racial Ethnic Disproportionality (Wisconsin) provides three checklists that address: 1) district and school resource issues, 2) system policy, procedures, and practice issues at district, school and classroom levels, 3) environmental factors to identify possible root causes of disproportionality. This checklist helps stakeholders analyze racial and ethnic disparities in Special Education, restrictiveness of setting, and discipline. It is also useful in identifying inappropriate policies and practices that may be contributing to the disparities.

The Leadership team used the Annotated Checklist for Addressing Racial Disproportionality in Special Education to assess the district in a variety of areas. Each member provided input and critically analyzed the district's processes on multiple levels. The Leadership team completed the analysis process over two meetings. The stakeholder groups provided narrative, anecdotal input as well.

MVWSD did not feel the need to pull focus groups as we determined we had enough data information from all of the sources we pulled from.

The summary of the Annotated Checklist for Addressing Racial Ethnic Disproportionality (Wisconsin)

Teacher and Staff Training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resources are available to teachers Specific trainings in areas such as intervention or pre-referral strategies are lacking More training is needed for students who are socio-economically disadvantaged or English Learners Most Administrators understand and implement policy and procedures More training needed for all staff on analyzing and using data Training for all staff in inclusion is needed More training is needed for IEP teams on working with families who are socio-economically disadvantaged
Collaboration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers collaborate often More collaboration on target subgroups are needed

Data Collection & Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● All schools have access to data ● District level administrators analyze data ● School personnel aren't diving deep enough into referral data, SpEd data
Special Education Referral and Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Pre-referral disparities exist district wide ● Cultural and race disparities exist in referral data ● High level of referrals due to behavioral concerns ● Student population considered, student comparison exists (parents who are mathematicians, engineers, scientists, etc... vs. other professions) ● Racial disparities in referrals mirror other areas such as behavior concerns ● Interventions and supports are needed to support students prior to referral
IEP Meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reviewed and written with care ● Skilled members are involved ● Parents are involved in general ● Parents are equal team members
Placement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Higher level of hispanic males in more restrictive environment
Parent Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Parent outreach occurs at all sites ● More work is needed to improve explanation of parent rights for Special Education ● Some parents might believe there is racial bias on the part of teachers
Bias	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Some teachers might have bias based on students race ● Some teachers might think that some students are better served in more restrictive placements

2.3 Complete Reflective Data Analysis

Describe the processes used to collect, analyze, and interpret data. Include data sources. Note: The description of findings from this analysis should validate the selected: root causes; measurable outcomes and related activities; target populations; and policies, practices and procedures that are reviewed and revised.

The stakeholder group met and analyzed quantitative data including 18-19 CAASPP ELA and Math figures, iReady benchmarks from 18-19 & 19-20, Special Education referral and identification figures, district wide figures for students broken down by ethnicity and language type for the 18-19 and 19-20 school years. The team provided input that helped leaders understand the qualitative impact.

The overwhelming findings that parents and staff noted were that students who are Hispanic/Latino in the MVWSD district under perform their White and Asian peers anywhere from 50% (iReady 20-21 ELA) to figures such as approximately 100 point difference (SBAC ELA 18-19) where White and Asian students score in the Blue range and Hispanic students perform in the yellow range. Additionally, Hispanic students are more likely to be referred for SSTs and Special Education (internal SST and SpEd Referral analysis 18-19). Our 19-20 Special Education data by ethnicity showed that 53% of students with a disability were Hispanic, while the same group made up only 23% of the total district population. We would expect to see those students identified as students with a disability be much closer to the overall total population percentage. In the 18-19 school year, 74% of students identified under the Specific Learning Disability category were

Hispanic. Lastly, we found that our English Learners are also markedly underperforming their English Only peers (CAASPP, iReady). In 18-19, English Learners scored 156.6 points below their English Only peers on the ELA SBAC.

Qualitative findings included:

- We are not consistently using interventions across the district
- We don't have RtI2 (response to instruction and intervention) consistently across all schools.
- We don't have a systematic intervention process
- Only some students are successfully accessing core instruction or benefitting from our current RTI program.
- At-risk students aren't accessing instruction and getting the help they need to learn the curriculum
- Teachers don't know how to differentiate the curriculum or scaffold to allow access points for all students
- It seems like students who achieve in MVWSD are primarily White or Asian, not Hispanic/Latino
- Staff needs to build a stronger relationship with students
- Teachers have implicit bias towards minority students
- Parents noted that families who don't speak English have a harder time accessing resources from their school
- Teachers don't understand the current SST structure and there are inconsistencies across school sites

The following information was collected from input by the larger stakeholder group. The summary below shows the findings the group shared and discussed:

What does this team define as racially equitable outcomes related to this issue?

- Clearly defined action steps to reduce disproportionality
- Matching percentages of subgroups of SWD with total population
- Action steps or outcomes that are designed specifically to helping students who are Hispanic/Latino and not meeting academic standards
- We would expect to see a lack of disproportionality

Ideas to uncover additional information:

- Consider Preschool information (who attends, who doesn't, differences in performance)
- Survey to understand supports at home (To consider what interventions can be helpful)
- Re-analyze data, school culture, analyzing teacher competency
- Pre-k attendance and why some students do or don't attend?

The team discussed data slides and noted:

Hispanic/Latino Figures District wide:

- 53% of Hispanic/Latino students of all students with a disability
- 53% should be closer to 23% (total population of Hispanic/Latino)

Hispanic/Latino by site:

- Demographics have an important role to play in the data
- Castro: almost all students are Hispanic, makes sense that almost all SWD are Hispanic
- Bubb has a high percentage, but Bubb does have two M/M small group classes
- Mistral has a high percentage of students compared to their total population
- Middle schools are high, they often inherit what happens at the elementary schools

Question: pull numbers of newly identified students as SWD in Middle school

iReady Diagnostic data by Ethnicity for ELA and Math:

- Apparent that Hispanic/latino students are being left behind
- 26% of Hispanic at T1 compared to 75% White, numbers are flipped at T3
- Large gap in scaled score between Hispanic and Asian/white
- Most students who are Hispanic/Latino are performing at this level district wide
- Across multiple assessments

CA Dashboard Data 2019:

- High levels of Orange/Yellow in absenteeism

Question: find out the percentage of Hispanic/Latino in areas like SED, EL, Homeless

- Plan might need to be 2-fold for students who fall into two categories

The team noted the following:

- Recent site PLC meeting noted a need for a system that helps students who start to fall behind, rather than waiting until students are significantly behind
- Disproportionality can occur as early as kindergarten, and it might be helpful for us to look at Kindergarten data
- There are random acts of intervention at sites
- COVID is going to create an even larger gap/need
- Some sites have a What I Need (WIN) program
- Training areas are inconsistently implemented by teachers/staff
- Kid Talk/SST processes aren't streamlined district wide

Ms. Mayes facilitated the team in identifying root causes

The team all provided thoughts and then ranked them by priority as follows:

1) We don't have a structured MTSS system

- We are not consistently using interventions across the district
- We don't have RtI2
- We don't have a systematic intervention process

2) Differentiation isn't strong enough in core instruction and RTI

3) Our ELD program isn't strong enough

- Teachers don't have enough knowledge on language acquisition strategies
- Differentiation isn't strong enough in ELD
- Is our curriculum/program appropriate to develop students' language for EL?

4) Cultural bias exists in our classrooms

Training is needed on all levels for teachers: curricula, interventions, pre-interventions strategies, instructional strategies, supporting the whole student (SEL, behavior, academics)

Training and more outreach is needed for parents to support students in our target groups

For SWD: Communication between teachers and Specialists is limited

Teachers don't have access to individuals with special training to support their instruction

[MVWSD Significant Disproportionality Padlet](#)

2.4 Determine Root Cause(s) Based on Data

Provide the identified Root Cause of disproportionality and describe the Root Cause (including supporting data).

Root causes of disproportionality include an intersection between beliefs and practices.

Root Cause	Description of Root Cause with Supporting Data
Lack of a structured districtwide Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS)	<p>Qualitative Data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● We are not consistently using interventions across the district ● We don't have RtI2 (response to instruction and intervention) consistently across all schools. ● We don't have a systematic intervention process <p>Quantitative Data: Hispanic/Latino in the MVWSD district under perform their White and Asian peers anywhere from 50% (iReady 20-21 ELA) or over 100 points differences on ELA SBAC 18-19</p>
Differentiation isn't robust enough in core instruction and Response To Instruction (RtI)	<p>Qualitative Data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Only some students are successfully accessing core instruction or benefitting from our current RTI program. ● At-risk students aren't accessing instruction and getting the help they need to learn the curriculum ● Teachers don't know how to differentiate the curriculum or scaffold to allow access points for all students <p>Quantitative Data: academic achievement data, SpEd referral data In the 18-19 school year, 74% of students identified under the Specific Learning Disability category were Hispanic</p>
Our English Language Development (ELD) program (Designated and Integrated) lacks structure and alignment district wide	<p>Qualitative Data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Teachers don't have enough knowledge on language acquisition strategies ● Differentiation isn't strong enough in ELD ● Is our curriculum/program appropriate to develop students' language for EL? <p>Quantitative Data: academic achievement of English Learnings compared to English Only, SST referral data, Dashboard data</p>

	In 18-19, English Learners scored 156.6 points below their English Only peers on the ELA SBAC
Cultural bias exists in our classrooms	<p>Qualitative Data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● It seems like students who achieve in MVWSD are primarily White or Asian, not Hispanic/Latino ● Staff needs to build a stronger relationship with students ● Teachers have implicit bias towards minority students <p>Quantitative Data: academic achievement data, SST referral data Hispanic/Latino in the MVWSD district under perform their White and Asian peers anywhere from 50% (iReady 20-21 ELA) or over 100 points differences on ELA SBAC 18-19 Our 19-20 Special Education data by ethnicity showed that 53% of students with a disability were Hispanic, while the same group made up only 23% of the total district population</p>

Phase 3

3.1 Complete Review of Policies, Practices, and Procedures

Guidance: (Upon identification of significant disproportionality, an LEA must) Provide for the annual review and, if appropriate, revision of the policies, practices, and procedures used in identification or placement in particular education settings, including disciplinary removals (to ensure compliance.) 34 *CFR* Section 300.646

Has your LEA completed a review of the related policies, practices, and procedures? Yes or No.

**Yes
(linked
below)**

[Review of Policies, Practices, and Procedures](#)

Has your LEA revised the reviewed policies, practices, or procedures? Yes or No.

No

If any policies, practices, and/or procedures have been revised, document revisions and describe how revisions will be shared (e.g., School Board meeting minutes, posting on LEA website).

No policies have been revised yet. Policies recommended for revision or addition include: SST and pre-referral policy (input to be gathered from Stakeholder meetings), Equity (MVWSD's Equity coach is working on recommendations to the board in this area), and Response to Instruction and Intervention (outcomes from Strategic Planning process can help guide these changes).

3.2a Develop Programmatic Improvement Action Plan

Complete information below for each measurable outcome (cut and paste empty boxes for additional outcomes).

Describe how the budget allocation aligns with the Programmatic Improvement Action Plan. (See *Section 3.2b.*)

Measurable Outcome:

By June of 2022, there will be a 10% reduction in the number of target students not meeting standards as measured by district benchmarking assessments.

Indicator/Element(s):

Indicator 10

Root Cause(s):

Lack of a structured districtwide Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), Differentiation isn't robust enough in core instruction and Response To Instruction (Rtl), Our English Language Development (ELD) program (Designated and Integrated) lacks structure and alignment district wide

Target Population:

Target three of our K-5 Elementary schools based on our criteria of: Criteria for selection of Target students include: Elementary schools with Hispanic student populations of 45% or more, Socio-economically disadvantaged population of 30% or more. 14% or higher of students performing two or more grade levels below in ELA and Math. Three schools were identified that fit those categories: Castro, Mistral, Theuerkauf. Student information was pulled for all three categories at the three sites. To identify 1-2% of the total district population, students were pulled from the Socio-economically disadvantaged first graders as the targeted student population. This subgroup covers students in a range of other categories.

You may wish to duplicate the four shaded boxes below to add additional activities for each measurable outcome.

Activities:

- Small group data monitoring during Rtl (Teachers, Coaches responsible)
- Professional development and ongoing coaching/check-ins (District Office Leaders & Site Leaders, Coaches Experts in the field)
 - Literacy Strategies
 - Supporting students who are Socio economically disadvantaged
 - Anti-bias training
 - Language Acquisition
- Learning Plans (within existing Student Success Plan)-Instructional Coach to create and collaborate with Classroom Teacher on each student's plan

Staff Responsible:

Director of Curriculum and Instruction, Director and Coordinator of Special Education, District Office Leaders, Site Leaders, Coaches, Teachers

Timeline:

By June 2022

Data Sources/Methods for Evaluating Progress:

Trimester District Diagnostic Assessment Reports (iReady, Literably, Writing)
Data from small group instruction (formative assessments, mid modules/unit assessments)
Trimester Review of Student Learning Plans (progress)

Measurable Outcome:

By June 2022, the identified sites will build and utilize a tiered system of support resulting in a 10% reduction in SST referrals.

Indicator/Element(s):

Indicator 10

Root Cause(s):

Lack of a structured districtwide Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), Cultural bias exists in our classrooms

Target Population:

Target three of our K-5 Elementary schools based on our criteria of: Criteria for selection of Target students include: Elementary schools with Hispanic student populations of 45% or more, Socio-economically disadvantaged population of 30% or more. 14% or higher of students performing two or more grade levels below in ELA and Math. Three schools were identified that fit those categories: Castro, Mistral, Theuerkauf. Student information was pulled for all three categories at the three sites. To identify 1-2% of the total district population, students were pulled from the Socio-economically disadvantaged first graders as the targeted student population. This subgroup covers students in a range of other categories.

Activities:

- Create Pre-referral & SST Referral Process (District Office Leaders & Site Leaders, Stakeholder group meetings)
- Edit and Communicate SpEd Referral Process (Special Education District Office Leaders)
- Train Elementary and Middle School Sites on Process (District Office Leaders & Site Leaders)

- Create a tiered system of support for academics (District Office Leaders, Site Leaders)
- Train Elementary and Middle School Sites on tiered system (District Office Leaders)
- Professional Development on strategies within the three tiered system & Differentiated Instruction (District Office Leaders, Site Leaders, Coaches, Identified expert in the field)

Staff Responsible: Director of Curriculum and Instruction, Director and Coordinator of Special Education, Other district office Leaders (Directors, Coordinators, Site Leaders, Coaches, Teachers,

Timeline: June 2022

Data Sources/Methods for Evaluating Progress:

Quarterly Pre-referral and SST Referral data from each site (Uniform document needed)

Frequency of pre-referral meetings at each site and student outcomes after interventions

Note: Information described in the section above will be monitored through quarterly progress reporting

3.2b Complete Budget Forms

Step 1: Download the following documents from the padlet section specific to Significant Disproportionality.

- [2020 Budget Allocation and 2020 Allowable Costs Budget](#)
- [2020 Target Student Population](#)

Step 2: Complete both documents.

Step 3: Save each document with your district's name or initials in the file name.

Phase 4

4.1 Implement Programmatic Improvement Action Plan

List staff responsible for oversight of CCEIS activities (including submission of Progress Report and Quarterly Expenditure Reporting Forms). If these are submitted from different departments (such as business and program), two individuals may be identified.

Staff Name	Reports to Submit (Progress, Budget, or Both)	Email
Swati Dagar	Progress	sdagar@mvwsd.org
Arianna Mayes	Progress and Budget	amayes@mvwsd.org
Acantha Ellard	Progress	aellard@mvwsd.org
Nadia Pongo	Budget	npongo@mvwsd.org

Ayindé Rudolph	Progress and Budget	arudolph@mvwsd.org
----------------	---------------------	--------------------

4.2 Evaluate Effectiveness

Describe process for ongoing collection and analysis of data related to the measurable outcomes outlined in the Programmatic Improvement Action Plan. This includes tracking of target students, sending out feedback surveys, gathering and sharing data with stakeholders, and adapting the action plan based on data.

The leadership and implementation teams will be responsible for collecting, reviewing, and analyzing data on a quarterly basis to make informed decisions and adjust the plan as appropriate. The data points will continue to be drawn from iReady, CAASPP, CALPADS, and the CDE Dashboard. Targeted students will be addressed to gauge the success of the intervention and supports during these convenings.

4.3 Build Supports and Sustainability

Describe the process for adding support for sustainability of CCEIS activities that demonstrate success in reducing disproportionality. Consider LCFF/LCAP, blended funding, grant writing, and other funding sources.

In order to address support for sustainability of the CCEIS activities this plan is aligned elements in our District's Strategic plan (currently in development) as well as with our most recent Board of Trustees Goals. This will support alignment and implementation so that the sites don't have to implement dueling initiatives. For example, one goal in our most recent LCAP is Goal 2: Increase achievement for all students and accelerate learning outcomes for English Language Learners, Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students, and other target groups to close the achievement gap - State priorities 2 and 4 and Strategic Plan Goals 1 and 2 - 26. This Goal directly relates to our first Measurable Outcome in our CCEIS Plan. Our LCAP highlights the need for Teacher Effectiveness through training and coaching. This CCEIS Plan is inline with that initiative. Additionally, our LCAP recognizes the need for a developed Rtl program, while we will continue the current program, the CCEIS plan will enhance this program to best serve the needs of students.

The Leadership team will meet quarterly to review implementation progress and to analyze data. The Leadership team will provide input and feedback to identified sites based on student progress, so that any adjustments can be made in a timely manner.

Additionally, ongoing coaching will be provided in the areas identified in the professional development activities to ensure staff understand how new learnings can be implemented in the classroom. Principals and coaches will understand the expectations and help to support teachers in order to maintain growth once the timeline lapses.

4.5 Complete and Submit CDE Feedback survey

List staff responsible for completing and submitting survey provided by CDE at the end of the CCEIS period.

Staff Name/Title	LEA/Agency	Email
Acantha Ellard/Director of Special Education	Mountain View Whisman School District	amayes@mvwsd.org
Swati Dagar	Mountain View Whisman School District	sdagar@mvwsd.org

Submit the following final documents to the CDE by email to:
IntensiveMonitoring@cde.ca.gov.

Significant Disproportionality CCEIS Plan Form

2020 Budget Allocation and 2020 Allowable Costs Budget Form

2020 Target Student Population Form

Contract or memorandum of understanding for technical assistance

CCEIS Plan signature Form

Prepared by California Department of Education January 2020