Executive Directors Council Meeting  
May 26, 2016  
8:00 a.m. – 9300 Imperial Highway, Downey, CA 90242 – SELPA Office

I. EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS COUNCIL COMMITTEE MEETING (none)

II. PRELIMINARY ACTIVITIES – 8:00 a.m.
   A. Call to Order
   B. Ordering of the Agenda
   C. Approval of the Minutes
      1. April 21, 2016 Executive Directors Council Meeting

III. COMMUNICATIONS: EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS / SELPA DIRECTOR / PUBLIC

IV. PRESENTATIONS
   A. LAC Charter SELPA Logo

V. HEARINGS
   A. 2016-2017 Annual Budget and Service Plan Public Hearing

VI. REPORTS / STUDY TOPICS
   A. SELPA Fiscal Report
   B. CDE Report
   C. Membership Report
   D. LACOE Special Education Action Plan and LAC SELPA Smart Goals

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS
   A. Approval of Celerity Achernar Charter School for full SELPA membership for the 2016-2017 school year.
   B. Approval of the Request to waive Administrative Fees pursuant to the Allocation Plan for the Soledad Enrichment Action Charter School
   C. Approval of the 2016-2017 Annual Budget and Service Plans for the Los Angeles County Special Education Local Plan Area
   D. Approval of the 2016-2017 Los Angeles County SELPA Meeting Calendars

VIII. CLOSING ITEMS
   A. Compliance Monitoring & LEA Report
   B. Los Angeles County Charter SELPA Executive Director’s Council Meeting Schedule, Establishment of Meeting Times, Future Agenda Items, Follow up

IX. ADJOURNMENT
MINUTES

LOS ANGELES COUNTY CHARTER SELPA
EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS COUNCIL MEETING
9300 IMPERIAL HWY.
DOWNEY, CA 90242
THURSDAY, April 21, 2016

The Executive Directors Council Meeting of the LAC Charter SELPA was held on Thursday, April 21, 2016, at Los Angeles County Office of Education, located at 9300 Imperial Hwy., EC 239, Downey, CA 90242.

PRESENT: Ricardo Mireles (AVANCE), Celesta Deter (CELERITY), Janet Landon (WESTCHESTER) Alan Eskot (OPTIMIST), Rachael Villalobos (SEA), David Calvo (ISLA) and Kelley O’Brien (ISLA)

ABSENT: Zuzy Chavez (JARDIN de la INFANCIA) and Jim Anderson (LACOE)

OTHERS PRESENT: Hector Murrieta, Chief Educational Programs Officer (LACOE), Abby Huang (LACOE), Arjun Kushwaha (LACOE) Damali Thomas (LACOE) and Nana Quarshie (LACOE)

II. PRELIMINARY ACTIVITIES

CALL TO ORDER
Ricardo called the meeting to order at 8:10 a.m.

ORDERING OF AGENDA
No changes

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF January 28, 2016
It was MOVED by Ricardo and SECONDED by Celeste to approve the minutes as presented. No oppositions, no abstentions. Motion CARRIED.

III. COMMUNICATIONS: EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS/SELPA DIRECTOR

Mr. Hector Murrieta, LACOE Chief Educational Programs Officer, was introduced to the Executive Directors’ Council by Ricardo. He welcomed and thanked Mr. Murrieta for taking time to attend the SELPA Executive Council Meeting.

Also present and acknowledged, were the potential members, David Calvo and Kelley O’Brien of the International Studies Language Academy (ISLA) and Rachael Villalobos of Soledad Enrichment Action Charter School (SEA) was also present in the meeting and were introduced.

Executive Directors shared updates on pressing items at their Charter Schools. Ricardo asked if there were updates on the status of the Superintendent’s transition. Mr. Murrieta explained that the Superintendent’s position will officially end June 30, 2016 and his successor will take office May 15, 2016. Hector also made the Council aware that he is up-to-date with happenings of the LAC Charter SELPA through Jim Anderson. He shared he would be working with the LACOE Cabinet to bring matters of the Charter SELPA to them. He made a note to the Council that anytime they need him to be present at the Council meetings they should call his Executive Secretary, Susan Ball, and he will be there.
Arjun thanked Mr. Murrieta for his presence and welcomed Damali Thomas, the newest SELPA Coordinator. She shared her background. The Council discussed and concluded that the Program Council meetings have been beneficial along with SELPA support. However, the Community Advisory Council needed to have active parent participation. AB1369 has been adopted requiring LEAs to screen students for dyslexia. Members should wait for further details.

IV. PRESENTATIONS
Damali shared information about the LAC Charter SELPA website. It would be a primary place for information sharing and would have contact information for the SELPA.

V. HEARINGS (none)

VI. REPORTS/STUDY TOPICS

SELPA Fiscal Report
Abby explained the fiscal report and advised the Council of the extra Grant Award money of $573.00 awarded to each school for administration usage, starting 7/01/15 to 9/30/17. Also, the budget report is due May 6, 2016. Abby reviewed the (Federal Mental Health Money) with the Council. She said the money is restricted and requested that they complete the fiscal report form in the package. Abby also distributed the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act Sub-award Reporting Form; 2015-16 State Local Assistance Entitlements and the 2016-17 Annual Budget Plan due May 6, 2016, including list of reports due dates.

CDE Report
Arjun went over the SSIP Phase 2 Narrative with the Council. The narrative talks about SSIP Alignment with LCFF and LCAP; SSIP Focus; SSIP Plan Elements Infrastructure Development – the LCFF and LCAP; LCAP Electronic Template and Evaluation Rubrics; Support for LRA Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices and lastly Developing Support for Implementing Evidence-based practices.

Membership Report
Charter Staff reviewed the summary report of the review of the ISLA SELPA application. ISLA staff shared information on their Charter Petition and SELPA Application. Members also discussed SEA’s membership status in LAC Charter SELPA for the next academic year. Rachel informed the members that she will need to get more details from her superintendent regarding SEA’s position on same.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation for Conditional Approval of International Studies Language Academy (ISLA) into the LAC Charter SELPA. Based on a review and evaluation of the International Studies Language Academy (ISLA) SELPA Application and as reported to and discussed by the Executive Directors Council, it is recommended the International Studies Language Academy be granted conditional membership into the LAC Charter SELPA for the 2016-2017 School Year conditional upon the Authorization of their Charter Petition by the State Board of Education.

It was MOVED by Ricardo and SECONDED by Alan to approve the recommendation with the conditions noted. No oppositions, no abstentions. Motion CARRIED.

VIII. CLOSING ITEMS

Compliance Monitoring & LEA Report
Council discussed the IEP process and examples were shared. The Executive Directors were requested to complete the form and send to Nana Quarshie, at the LACOE SELPA office, with their concerns.

Los Angeles County Charter SELPA Executive Director’s Council Meeting Schedule,
Establishment of Meeting Times, Future Agenda Items, Follow up
The next meeting will be in EC Room 239, at 8:00 a.m., May 26, 2016.

IX. ADJOURNMENT
It was MOVED by Ricardo and SECONDED by Celesta. The Meeting was adjourned at 10:45 a.m.
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Item IV. Presentations

A. LAC Charter SELPA Logo Development
   1. SELPA staff will present the logo samples for the Executive Directors Council consideration.
Designer's Note: This particular design doesn't work well at reduced size. The logo icon becomes visually indiscernible.
Item V. Hearings

A. Public Hearing on the Annual Budget and Service Plans for the Los Angeles County Special Education Local Plan Area (LAC SELPA)

In compliance with the requirement of Education Code 56205 (b) (1) and (2), the Executive Directors Council is holding a Public Hearing on the LAC SELPA Annual Budget and Service Plans.

The purpose of today’s Public Hearing will be to receive the public’s comment, if any, to the Annual Budget and Service Plans for the LAC SELPA.
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Item VI. Reports / Study Topics

A. SELPA Fiscal Report
   1. Discussion of the distribution of the AB602 funds pursuant to the allocation plan.
   2. Federal Mental Health Expenditures Report – Due July 10
   3. MOE Requirement Reminder
   4. May Revise - Insert
   5. 15-16 Fiscal Reports Deadlines and Due Dates
School Facilities and Proposed “Emergency Repair Revolving Loan Program”

The May Revision includes no statement on the statewide school bond that qualified for the November 2016 ballot. However, it appropriates $100 million in one-time funding to create a revolving loan program to expedite funds to districts with emergency facilities needs that pose health and safety risks that could cause the displacement of students from educational settings. The new bridge loan program is intended to assist districts with insufficient resources to address their health and safety issues. The Governor proposes that the program be administered by the California Department of Education under an expedited review and approval process.

Proposition 39—The California Clean Energy Jobs Act

The May Revision includes an increase of $33.3 million for K-12 education and $4.1 million for community colleges for Proposition 39 energy efficiency projects from the January Budget. For 2016-17, total funding would be $398.8 million for K-12 education and $49.3 million for community colleges.

Teacher Workforce Actions

In response to statewide teacher shortages, the May Revision proposes $10 million in one-time funding for investment grants to be awarded to private and public postsecondary institutions to improve upon or develop four-year integrated teacher credential programs, reducing the time to a preliminary teaching credential by up to three years. Competitive grants of up to $250,000 would be administered by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing and will be awarded with preference to proposals that include partnerships with local community colleges and K-12 LEAs.

Federal Programs

There was a small uptick in funding for some of the major federal education programs. Title I, which supports services to assist low-achieving students enrolled in the highest poverty schools, will receive a $139 million increase, of which $29.1 million is one time. Special education base grants will increase by only $41.4 million, of which $5 million is one time. Migrant education programs, which support services to meet the needs of highly mobile children, receive a $14 million increase, of which half is one-time funding.

Dartboard Factors

The School Services of California, Inc., (SSC) Financial Projection Dartboard factors presented below are developed by SSC with input from independent state agencies and private economic consulting firms based on the latest information available. These factors are provided to assist school agencies in preparing their upcoming budgets and multiyear projections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LCFF Planning Factors</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>SSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory COLA</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.11%</td>
<td>2.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten-Year Treasuries</td>
<td>1.98%</td>
<td>2.05%</td>
<td>2.42%</td>
<td>2.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Consumer Price Index</td>
<td>2.02%</td>
<td>2.15%</td>
<td>2.26%</td>
<td>2.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lottery</td>
<td>Base $140</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td>$140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prop. 20</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

May 2016

Pocket Budget 2016-17

A Summary Analysis of the May Revision Proposal for the 2016-17 State Budget for California’s Schools

Prepared by
The 2016-17 May Revision

The buzz preceding the release of Governor Jerry Brown’s May Revision mainly focused on the fact that state revenue collections in April were well below the level projected in January. While many braced for funding reductions, the May “surprise” was that there were no budget reductions proposed for education. In fact, both ongoing and one-time dollars for education increase slightly from the planned January expenditure levels.

Looking to the future, the Governor is careful to point out that the state’s projections do not assume a recession, but do assume that Proposition 30 temporary taxes expire. Under these assumptions, the state forecasts large deficits, which grow even higher if a recession should develop.

Proposition 98

2014-15 ADJUSTMENT

The May Revision shows that the Proposition 98 guarantee had been underestimated for 2014-15 and that a $463 million increase is due. This results in a revised guarantee for the prior year of $67.2 million compared to $66.7 million estimated in January.

CURRENT-YEAR MINIMUM GUARANTEE AND MAINTENANCE FACTOR

For the current year, the May Revision reflects a decrease in Proposition 98 of $125 million to $69.1 billion, from $69.2 billion in January.

Proposition 98 also requires the state to account for state funding that falls below the long-term target established by Test 2 (i.e., adjustments required by annual changes in per capita personal income). This cumulative shortfall is termed the Maintenance Factor. As of June 30, 2014, the state owed K-14 education approximately $6.4 billion in Maintenance Factor payments. While the Governor’s January Budget anticipated that the $6.4 billion Maintenance Factor would be fully repaid by the end of the current fiscal year, the May Revision now projects that $155 million will remain unpaid on June 30, 2016.

2016-17 MINIMUM GUARANTEE AND NEW MAINTENANCE FACTOR

For 2016-17, the May Revision proposes an increase of $288 million in Proposition 98 funding from the level proposed in January, bringing the minimum funding level to $71.9 billion. Because Proposition 98 would be funded based on Test 3 in 2016-17, the January Governor’s Budget projected that a new Maintenance Factor would be created totaling $548 million in 2016-17. The May Revision revises that amount to $908 million.

Cost-of-Living Adjustment

The statutory cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) is revised downward from 0.47% in January to 0% in May. This reduces funding for categorical programs including Special Education, Child Nutrition, Foster Youth, Preschool, American Indian Education Centers, and American Indian Early Childhood Education.

Local Control Funding Formula

The Governor’s 2016-17 May Revision continues implementation of the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) and provides additional $154 million above the January State Budget proposal.

LCFF TARGET ENTITLEMENTS FOR SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND CHARTER SCHOOLS

The target base grants by grade span for 2016-17 are unchanged from 2015-16 because the statutory COLA is zero:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Span</th>
<th>2016-17 Target Base Grant per Average Daily Attendance (ADA)</th>
<th>2016-17 Adjusted Base Grant per ADA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TK-3</td>
<td>$7,083</td>
<td>$7,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>$7,189</td>
<td>$7,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>$7,403</td>
<td>$7,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>$8,578</td>
<td>$8,801</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School districts and charter schools are entitled to supplemental increases equal to 20% of the adjusted base grant (which includes class-size reduction and career technical education funding) for the percentage of enrolled students who are English learners, eligible for the free and reduced-price meals program, or in foster care (the unduplicated pupil percentage). An additional 50% per-pupil increase is provided as a concentration grant for the percentage of eligible students enrolled beyond 55% of total enrollment.

Bear in mind that the LCFF target entitlement is the full funding level for each local educational agency (LEA), in today’s dollars, that the state intends to provide at some point in the future under the formula. It is not the amount an LEA will receive in 2016-17, which is based on the difference, or “gap,” between the current-year LCFF funding level, the LEA’s target entitlement, and the proportion of the gap that can be funded with the LCFF increase.

LCFF TRANSITION ENTITLEMENTS AND GAP FUNDING

The difference between a district’s or charter school’s current funding and its target entitlement is called the LCFF gap, and it is this gap that is funded with the additional dollars dedicated each year to implementation of the LCFF. For 2016-17, the May Revision proposal calls for $2.979 billion to close more than half (54.84%) of the gap remaining to full implementation of the LCFF.

The lack of a COLA will affect the per-pupil grants used to calculate the LCFF target, but does not directly impact the level of the appropriation for the LCFF gap closure. Rather than the COLA, it is the appropriation, and its corresponding gap closure percentage, which determines revenue growth for most school districts and charter schools. The lack of a COLA will, however, affect the LCFF funding for LEAs that are at their LCFF target.

Pupil transportation and Targeted Instructional Improvement Grants continue as separate add-ons to the LCFF allocations and do not receive a COLA.

Community-Funded School Districts

School districts with property tax revenues that exceed the LCFF levels will continue to retain their

local tax growth, and will receive a lower minimum state aid allocation that is reduced by the ongoing cuts incurred by these districts during the recession. Under the LCFF, these cuts are carried forward into future years for these districts.

County Offices of Education

As of 2014-15, the LCFF for county offices of education (COEs) was fully implemented and, therefore, with no statutory COLA, the basic funding amounts that drive COE LCFF entitlements in 2016-17 will remain unchanged from 2015-16 levels. State funding for COEs in 2016-17 is adjusted in the May Revision to account for changes in ADA.

K-3 Grade Span Adjustment

The K-3 GSA program requirements are unchanged in the May Revision; however, the revised gap funding of $5.84% should be used to measure progress toward the 24:1 target for 2016-17.

One-Time Discretionary Funds

The Governor’s May Revision includes more than $1.4 billion in one-time Proposition 98 funding for school districts, charter schools, and COEs. The funds are unrestricted and the use of the dollars is discretionary. Funding is estimated at $237 per ADA. Consistent with prior-year proposals, the funds provided will offset outstanding mandates and reimbursements.

Special Education

There is no proposed increase in funding in the Governor’s May Revision for special education base programs or special education preschool. The Governor has called for another study regarding special education financing. The Public Policy Institute of California will release its findings in the fall of 2016.

Child Care

The May Revision proposes administrative adjustments from the Governor’s Budget to the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Due date</th>
<th>Reports</th>
<th>Due to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 15, 2015</td>
<td>Excess cost calculation</td>
<td>LACOE-Abby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 31, 2015</td>
<td>MOE report</td>
<td>LACOE-Abby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table 8 report</td>
<td>LACOE-Abby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 10, 2016</td>
<td>Federal Local Assistance-Report 1 for 2015-16</td>
<td>LACOE-GPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal Local Assistance-Report 1 for 2015-16</td>
<td>LACOE-Abby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7/1/2015 to 12/31/2015)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10/1/2015 to 1/30/2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 10, 2016</td>
<td>Federal Local Assistance-Report 2 for 2015-16</td>
<td>LACOE-GPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal Local Assistance-Report 2 for 2015-16</td>
<td>LACOE-Abby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1/1/2016 to 3/30/2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 30, 2016</td>
<td>Annual Budget Plan</td>
<td>LACOE-Abby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2/1/2016 to 5/30/2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal Local Assistance-Report 3 for 2014-15</td>
<td>LACOE-Abby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4/1/2015 to 6/30/2015)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Item VI. Reports / Study Topics

B. CDE Report
   1. Personnel Data Reports - Discussion
   2. Annual Budget and Service Plan Review and Discussion
   3. *The Special Edge Spring 2016 – California's State Systemic Improvement Plan: An Overview*
Certification of Annual Budget Plan  
Fiscal Year 2016–17

1. Check one, as applicable:  
   [  ] Single District  [  ] Multiple District  [x] District/County  

   Special Education Local Plan Area (SELP) Code  
   1951  

   SELPA Name  
   Los Angeles County SELPA  

   Application Date  
   May 26, 2016  

   SELPA Address  
   9300 Imperial Highway  

   SELPA City  
   Downey  

   SELPA Zip code  
   90242-2890  

   Name SELPA Director (Print)  
   Jim Anderson  

   SELPA Director’s Telephone Number  
   (562) 401-5737  

   Date of Governing Board Approval  
   May 26, 2016

2. Certification by Designated Administrative And Fiscal Agency for This Program  
   (Responsible Local Agency/Administrative Unit [RLA/AU])

   RLA/AU Name  
   Los Angeles County Office of Education  

   Name/Title of RLA/AU Superintendent  
   Debra Duardo, M.S.W., Ed.D.  

   RLA/AU Telephone Number  
   (562) 922-6127  

   RLA/AU Street Address  
   9300 Imperial Highway  

   RLA/AU City  
   Downey  

   RLA/AU Zip code  
   90242-2890

Certification of Approval of Annual Budget Plan Pursuant to California Education Code Section 56205(b)

I certify that the Annual Budget Plan was developed according to the SELPA’s local plan governance and policy making process. Notice of this public hearing was posted in each school within the SELPA at least 15 days prior to the hearing.

The Annual Budget Plan was presented for public hearing on May 26th, 2016.

Adopted this 26th day of May, 2016.

Signed: ____________________________________________

RLA/AU Superintendent
Annual Budget Plan
Fiscal Year 2016–17

The Annual Budget Plan shall identify expected expenditures for all items required by this part as listed below. The Standardized Account Code Structure (SACS) codes provide source information from the local educational agency (LEA) reporting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference/Label</th>
<th>Instructions</th>
<th>Estimated Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Funds received in accordance with Chapter 7.2 (commencing with California Education Code [EC] Section 56836) (Special Education Program Funding)</td>
<td>SACS Resource Code 6500 (State), 3300–3499 (Federal) 6512–6535 (General Fund)</td>
<td>2,267,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Administrative costs of the plan</td>
<td>SACS Goal Code 5001 Function 2100</td>
<td>322,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Special Education services to pupils with: (1) severe disabilities, and (2) low-incidence disabilities</td>
<td>SACS Goal Code 5710</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SACS Goal Code 5730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SACS Goal Code 5750</td>
<td>81,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Special education services to pupils with non-severe disabilities</td>
<td>SACS Goal Code 5770</td>
<td>1,020,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Supplemental aids and services to meet the individual needs of pupils placed in regular education classrooms and environments</td>
<td>Any SACS Goal Code with SACS Function Code 1130¹</td>
<td>799,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Regionalized operations and services, and direct instructional support by program specialists in accordance with Article 6 (commencing with Section 56836.23) of Chapter 7.2 (SELPA Program Specialists Funding)</td>
<td>SACS Goal Code 5050</td>
<td>41,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SACS Goal Code 5060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G The use of property taxes allocated to the special education local plan area pursuant to EC Section 2572</td>
<td>Statement is included in Local Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Function Activity Classification can be found [http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr08/mar08item24a6.doc](http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr08/mar08item24a6.doc)
Certification of Annual Service Plan
Fiscal Year 2016–17

1. Check one, as applicable:
   [ ] Single District  [ ] Multiple District  [ x ] District/County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) Code</th>
<th>SELPA Name</th>
<th>Application Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Los Angeles County SELPA</td>
<td>5-26-2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SELPA Address</th>
<th>SELPA City</th>
<th>SELPA Zip code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9300 Imperial Highway</td>
<td>Downey</td>
<td>90242-2890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name SELPA Director (Print)</th>
<th>SELPA Director’s Telephone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jim Anderson</td>
<td>(562) 401-5737</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Certification by Designated Administrative And Fiscal Agency for This Program (Responsible Local Agency [RLA] or Administrative Unit [AU])

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RLA/AU Name</th>
<th>Name/Title of RLA/AU Superintendent (Type)</th>
<th>RLA/AU Telephone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County Office of Education</td>
<td>Debra Duardo M.S.W., Ed.D.</td>
<td>(562) 922-6127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RLA/AU Street Address</th>
<th>RLA/AU City</th>
<th>RLA/AU Zip code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9300 Imperial Highway</td>
<td>Downey</td>
<td>90242-2890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date of Governing Board Approval
May 26, 2016

Certification of Approval of Annual Service Plan Pursuant to California Education Code Section 56205(b)

I certify that the Annual Service Plan was developed according to the SELPA’s local plan governance and policy making process. Notice of this public hearing was posted in each district within the SELPA at least 15 days prior to the hearing.

The Annual Service Plan was presented for public hearing on May 26, 2016.

Adopted this 26th day of May, 2016.

Signed: ____________________________________________
RLA/AU Superintendent

For California Department of Education Use Only

Received by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction: Date: __________ By: ________________________________
## Special Education Service Category Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Special Education Service Category Descriptions</th>
<th>Adopted</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Not Currently Utilized</th>
<th>Compliance Standard (Legal Requirement*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Family training, counseling, and home visits (ages 0–2 only): This service includes: services provided by social workers, psychologists, or other qualified personnel to assist the family in understanding the special needs of the child and enhancing the child’s development. Note: Services provided by specialists (such as medical services, nursing services, occupational therapy, and physical therapy) for a specific function should be coded under the appropriate service category, even if the services were delivered in the home.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>34 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) sections 300.34 (c)(3), 300.226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Medical services (for evaluation only) (ages 0–2 only): Services provided by a licensed physician to determine a child’s developmental status and need for early intervention services.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>34 CFR sections 300.34 (c)(3), 300.226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>Nutrition services (ages 0–2 only): These services include conducting assessments in: nutritional history and dietary intake; anthropometric, biochemical, and clinical variables; feeding skills and feeding problems; and food habits and food preferences.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>34 CFR sections 300.34 (c)(3), 300.226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>Service coordination (ages 0–2 only)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>34 CFR sections 300.34 (c)(3), 300.226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>Special instruction (ages 0-2 only): Special instruction includes: the design of learning environments and activities that promote the child’s acquisition of skills in a variety of developmental areas, including cognitive processes and social interaction; curriculum planning, including the planned interaction of personnel, materials, and time and space, that leads to achieving the outcomes in the child’s individualized family service plan (IFSP); providing families with information, skills, and support related to enhancing the skill development of the child; and working with the child to enhance the child’s development.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>34 CFR sections 300.34 (c)(3), 300.226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>Special education aide in regular development class, childcare center, or family childcare home (ages 0-2 only)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>34 CFR sections 300.34 (c)(3), 300.226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>Respite care services (ages 0-2 only): Through the IFSP process, short-term care given in-home or out-of-home, which temporarily relieves families of the ongoing responsibility for specialized care for child with a disability. (Note: only for infants and toddlers from birth through 2, but under 3.)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>34 CFR sections 300.34 (c)(3), 300.226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>Specialized academic instruction: Adapting, as appropriate to the needs of the child with a disability, the content, methodology, or delivery of instruction to ensure access of the child to the general curriculum, so that he or she can meet the educational standards within the jurisdiction of the public agency that apply to all children.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>34 CFR Section 300.39(b)(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>Intensive individual instruction: IEP Team determination that student requires additional support for all or part of the day to meet his or her IEP goals.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>30 California Education Code (EC) Section 56364</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>Individual and small group instruction: Instruction delivered one-to-one or in a small group as specified in an IEP enabling the individual(s) to participate effectively in the total school program.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 3051; 30 EC Section 56441.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415</td>
<td>Language and speech: Language and speech services provide remedial intervention for eligible individuals with difficulty understanding or using spoken language. The difficulty may result from problems with articulation (excluding abnormal swallowing patterns, if that is the sole assessed disability); abnormal voice quality, pitch, or loudness; fluency; hearing loss; or the acquisition, comprehension, or expression of spoken language. Language deficits or speech patterns resulting from unfamiliarity with the English language and from environmental, economic or cultural factors are not included. Services include specialized instruction and services: monitoring, reviewing, and consultation, and may be direct or indirect, including the use of a speech consultant.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 CCR Section 3051.1; 30 EC Section 56363; 34 CFR sections 300.34 (c)(15), 300.8 (c)(11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>Adapted physical education: Direct physical education services provided by an adapted physical education specialist to pupils who have needs that cannot be adequately satisfied in other physical education programs as indicated by assessment and evaluation of motor skills performance and other areas of need. It may include individually designed developmental activities, games, sports, and rhythms, for strength development and fitness suited to the capabilities, limitations, and interests of individual students with disabilities who may not safely, successfully, or meaningfully engage in unrestricted participation in the vigorous activities of the general or modified physical education program.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 CCR Section 3051.5; 30 EC Section 56363; 34 CFR sections 300.108, 300.39 (b)(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Services will be provided in the school of attendance unless otherwise determined by the individualized education program (IEP) team.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Special Education Service Category Descriptions</th>
<th>Adopted</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Not Currently Utilized</th>
<th>Compliance Standard (Legal Requirement*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>435</td>
<td><strong>Health and nursing–specialized physical health care services:</strong> Specialized physical health care services means those health services prescribed by the child's licensed physician and surgeon, requiring medically related training of the individual who performs the services and which are necessary during the school day to enable the child to attend school (5 CCR Section 3051.12(b)). Specialized physical health care services include but are not limited to suctioning, oxygen administration, catheterization, nebulizer treatments, insulin administration, and glucose testing.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 CCR Section 3051.12; 30 EC sections 56363, 4943.5(d); 34 CFR Section 300.107;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>436</td>
<td><strong>Health and nursing–other services:</strong> This includes services that are provided to individuals with exceptional needs by a qualified individual pursuant to an IEP when a student has health problems which require nursing intervention beyond basic school health services. Services include managing the health problem, consulting with staff, group and individual counseling, making appropriate referrals, and maintaining communication with agencies and health care providers. These services do not include any physician supervised or specialized health care service. IEP required health and nursing services are expected to supplement the regular health services program.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 CCR Section 3051.12; 30 EC Section 56363; 34 CFR Section 300.107;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445</td>
<td><strong>Assistive technology services:</strong> Any specialized training or technical support for the incorporation of assistive devices, adapted computer technology, or specialized media with the educational programs to improve access for students. The term includes a functional analysis of the student's needs for assistive technology; selecting, designing, fitting, customizing, or repairing appropriate devices; coordinating services with assistive technology devices; training or technical assistance for students with a disability, the student's family, individuals providing education or rehabilitation services, and employers.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 CCR Section 3051.16; 30 EC Section 56363; 34 CFR sections 300.6, 300.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td><strong>Occupational therapy:</strong> Occupational Therapy (OT) includes services to improve student's educational performance, postural stability, self-help abilities, sensory processing and organization, environmental adaptation and use of assistive devices, motor planning and coordination, visual perception and integration, social and play abilities, and fine motor abilities. Both direct and indirect services may be provided within the classroom, other educational settings, or the home, in groups or individually, and may include therapeutic techniques to develop abilities, adaptations to the student's environment or curriculum, and consultation and collaboration with other staff and parents. Services are provided, pursuant to an IEP, by a qualified occupational therapist registered with the American Occupational Therapy Certification Board.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 CCR Section 3051.6; 30 EC Section 56363; 34 CFR Section 300.34 (c)(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460</td>
<td><strong>Physical therapy:</strong> These services are provided, pursuant to an IEP, by a registered physical therapist, or physical therapist assistant, when assessment shows a discrepancy between gross motor performance and other educational skills. Physical therapy includes, but is not limited to, motor control and coordination, posture and balance, self-help, functional mobility, accessibility and use of assistive devices. Services may be provided within the classroom, other educational settings or in the home, and may occur in groups or individually. These services may include adaptations to the student's environment and curriculum, selected therapeutic techniques and activities, and consultation and collaborative interventions with staff and parents.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 CCR Section 3051.6; 30 EC Section 56363; 34 CFR Section 300.34 (c)(9); California Business and Professions Code (B&amp;PC) Chapter 5.7 sections 2600–2696; Government Code (GC) Interagency Agreement Chapter 26.5 Section 7575(a)(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td><strong>Individual counseling:</strong> One-to-one counseling, provided by a qualified individual pursuant to an IEP. Counseling may focus on such student aspects as education, career, personal, or be with parents or staff members on learning problems or guidance programs for students. Individual counseling is expected to supplement the regular guidance and counseling program.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 CCR Section 3051.9; 34 CFR Section 300.34(c)(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515</td>
<td><strong>Counseling and guidance:</strong> Counseling in a group setting, provided by a qualified individual pursuant to an IEP. Group counseling is typically social skills development, but may focus on such student aspects as education, career, personal, or be with parents or staff members on learning problems or guidance programs for students. IEP required group counseling is expected to supplement the regular guidance and counseling program. Guidance services include interpersonal, intrapersonal, or family interventions, performed in an individual or group setting by a qualified individual pursuant to an IEP. Specific programs include social skills development, self-esteem building, parent training, and assistance to special education students supervised by staff credentialed to serve special education students. These services are expected to supplement the regular guidance and counseling program.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34 CFR sections 300.24(b)(2), 300.306; 5 CCR Section 3051.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Services will be provided in the school of attendance unless otherwise determined by the individualized education program (IEP) team.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Special Education Service Category Descriptions</th>
<th>Adopted</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Not Currently Utilized</th>
<th>Compliance Standard (Legal Requirement*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td><strong>Parent counseling:</strong> Individual or group counseling provided by a qualified individual pursuant to an IEP to assist the parent(s) of special education students in better understanding and meeting their child’s needs and may include parenting skills or other pertinent issues. IEP required parent counseling is expected to supplement the regular guidance and counseling program.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5 CCR Section 3051.11; 34 CFR Section 300.34(c)(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525</td>
<td><strong>Social work services:</strong> Social work services, provided by a qualified individual pursuant to an IEP, include, but are not limited to, preparing a social or developmental history of a child with a disability, group and individual counseling with the child and family, working with those problems in a child’s living situation (home, school, and community) that affect the child’s adjustment in school, and mobilizing school and community resources to enable the child to learn as effectively as possible in his or her educational program. Social work services are expected to supplement the regular guidance and counseling program.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5 CCR Section 3051.13; 34 CFR Section 300.34(c)(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530</td>
<td><strong>Psychological services:</strong> These services, provided by a credentialed or licensed psychologist pursuant to an IEP, include interpreting assessment results for parents and staff in implementing the IEP, obtaining and interpreting information about child behavior and conditions related to learning, and planning programs of individual and group counseling and guidance services for children and parents. These services may include consulting with other staff in planning school programs to meet the special needs of children as indicated in the IEP. IEP required psychological services are expected to supplement the regular guidance and counseling program.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5 CCR Section 3051.10; 34 CFR Section 300.34 (c)(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535</td>
<td><strong>Behavior intervention services:</strong> A systematic implementation of procedures designed to promote lasting, positive changes in the student's behavior resulting in greater access to a variety of community settings, social contacts, public events, and placement in the least restrictive environment.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5 CCR Section 3001(d); 34 CFR Section 300.34 (c)(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540</td>
<td><strong>Day treatment services:</strong> Structured education, training, and support services to address the student’s mental health needs.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Health &amp; Safety Code, Div.2, Chap.3, Article 1, Section 1502(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545</td>
<td><strong>Residential treatment services:</strong> A 24-hour, out-of-home placement that provides intensive therapeutic services to support the educational program.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Welfare and Institutions Code, Part 2, Chapter 2.5, Art. 1, Section 5671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610</td>
<td><strong>Specialized services for low incidence disabilities:</strong> Low incidence services are defined as those provided to the student population who have orthopedic impairment (OI), visual impairment (VI), who are deaf, hard of hearing (HH), or deaf-blind (DB). Typically, services are provided in education settings by an itinerant teacher or an itinerant teacher/specialist. Consultation is provided to the teacher, staff, and parents as needed. These services must be clearly written in the student’s IEP, including frequency and duration of the services to the student.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5 CCR sections 3051.16, 3051.18; 34 CFR Section 300.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710</td>
<td><strong>Specialized deaf and hard of hearing services:</strong> These services include speech therapy, speech reading, auditory training, and/or instruction in the student’s mode of communication. Rehabilitative and educational services; adapting curricula, methods, and the learning environment; and special consultation to students, parents, teachers, and other school personnel.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5 CCR sections 3051.16, 3051.18; 34 CFR Section 300.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>715</td>
<td><strong>Interpreter services:</strong> Sign language interpretation of spoken language to individuals, whose communication is normally sign language, by a qualified sign language interpreter. This includes conveying information through the sign system of the student or consumer and tutoring students regarding class content through the sign system of the student.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5 CCR Section 3051.16; 34 CFR Section 300.34 (c)(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>720</td>
<td><strong>Audiological services:</strong> These services include measurements of acuity, monitoring amplification, and frequency modulation system use. Consultation services with teachers, parents, or speech pathologists must be identified in the IEP as to reason, frequency, and duration of contact; infrequent contact is considered assistance and would not be included.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5 CCR Section 3051.2; 34 CFR Section 300.34 (c)(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>725</td>
<td><strong>Specialized vision services:</strong> This is a broad category of services provided to students with visual impairments. It includes assessment of functional vision; curriculum modifications necessary to meet the student’s educational needs including Braille, large type, and aural media; instruction in areas of need; concept development and academic skills; communication skills including alternative modes of reading and writing; and social, emotional, career, vocational, and independent living skills. It may include coordination of other personnel providing services to the students such as transcribers, readers, counselors, orientation and mobility specialists, career/vocational staff, and others, and collaboration with the student’s classroom teacher.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5 CCR Section 3030(d); 30 EC Section 56364.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Services will be provided in the school of attendance unless otherwise determined by the Individualized Education Program (IEP) team.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Special Education Service Category Descriptions</th>
<th>Adopted</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Not Currently Utilized</th>
<th>Compliance Standard (Legal Requirement*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>730</td>
<td><strong>Orientation and mobility:</strong> Students with identified visual impairments are trained in body awareness and to understand how to move. Students are trained to develop skills to enable them to travel safely and independently around the school and in the community. It may include consultation services to parents regarding their children requiring such services according to an IEP.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 CCR Section 3051.3; 30 EC Section 56363; 34 CFR Section 300.34 (c)(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>735</td>
<td><strong>Braille transcription:</strong> Any transcription services to convert materials from print to Braille. It may include textbooks, tests, worksheets, or anything necessary for instruction. The transcriber should be qualified in English Braille as well as Nemeth Code (mathematics) and be certified by appropriate agency.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 CCR Section 3051.16; 30 EC Section 56363; 34 CFR Section 300.8 (c)(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>740</td>
<td><strong>Specialized orthopedic services:</strong> Specially designed instruction related to the unique needs of students with orthopedic disabilities, including specialized materials and equipment.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 CCR sections 3030(e), 3051.16; 30 EC Section 56363; 34 CFR Section 300.8 (c)(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>745</td>
<td><strong>Reading services</strong></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 CCR Section 3051.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750</td>
<td><strong>Note taking services:</strong> Any specialized assistance given to the student for the purpose of taking notes when the student is unable to do so independently. This may include, but is not limited to, copies of notes taken by another student or transcription of tape-recorded information from a class or aide designated to take notes. This does not include instruction in the process of learning how to take notes.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 CCR Section 3051.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>755</td>
<td><strong>Transcription services:</strong> Any transcription service to convert materials from print to a mode of communication suitable for the student. This may also include dictation services as it may pertain to textbooks, tests, worksheets, or anything necessary for instruction.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 CCR Section 3051.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>760</td>
<td><strong>Recreation services, includes therapeutic recreation:</strong> Therapeutic recreation and specialized instructional programs designed to assist pupils to become as independent as possible in leisure activities, and when possible and appropriate, facilitate the pupil’s integration into general recreation programs.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 CCR Section 3051.15; 34 CFR Section 300.34 (c)(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>820</td>
<td><strong>College awareness:</strong> College awareness is the result of acts that promote and increase student learning about higher education opportunities, information, and options that are available including, but not limited to, career planning, course prerequisites, admission eligibility, and financial aid.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34 CFR sections 300.39 (b)(5), 300.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>830</td>
<td><strong>Vocational assessment, counseling, guidance, and career assessment:</strong> Organized educational programs that are directly related to the preparation of individuals for paid or unpaid employment, and may include provision for work experience, job coaching, development and/or placement, and situational assessment. This includes career counseling to assist a student in assessing his/her aptitudes, abilities, and interests in order to make realistic career decisions.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 CCR Section 3051.14; 34 CFR sections 300.39 (b)(5), 300.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>840</td>
<td><strong>Career awareness:</strong> Transition services include a provision for self-advocacy, career planning, and career guidance. This also emphasizes the need for coordination between these provisions and the Perkins Act to ensure that students with disabilities in middle schools will be able to access vocational education funds.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 CCR Section 3051.14; 34 CFR sections 300.39 (b)(5), 300.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850</td>
<td><strong>Work experience education:</strong> Work experience education means organized educational programs that are directly related to the preparation of individuals for paid or unpaid employment, or for additional preparation for a career requiring other than a baccalaureate or advanced degree.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 CCR Section 3051.14; 34 CFR sections 300.39 (b)(5), 300.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>855</td>
<td><strong>Job Coaching:</strong> Job coaching is a service that provides assistance and guidance to an employee who may be experiencing difficulty with one or more aspects of the daily job tasks and functions. The service is provided by a job coach who is highly successful, skilled and trained on the job who can determine how the employee that is experiencing difficulty learns best and formulate a training plan to improve job performance.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 CCR Section 3051.14; 34 CFR sections 300.39 (b)(5), 300.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>860</td>
<td><strong>Mentoring:</strong> Mentoring is a sustained coaching relationship between a student and teacher through ongoing involvement. The mentor offers support, guidance, encouragement and assistance as the learner encounters challenges with respect to a particular area such as acquisition of job skills. Mentoring can be either formal, as in planned, structured instruction, or informal that occurs naturally through friendship, counseling, and collegiality in a casual, unplanned way.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 CCR Section 3051.14; 34 CFR sections 300.39 (b)(5), 300.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Special Education Service Category Descriptions</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>Modified</td>
<td>Not Currently Utilized</td>
<td>Compliance Standard (Legal Requirement*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>865</td>
<td><strong>Agency linkages (referral and placement):</strong> Service coordination and case management that facilitates the linkage of individualized education programs under this part and individualized family service plans under part C with individualized service plans under multiple Federal and State programs, such as title I of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (vocational rehabilitation), title XIX of the Social Security Act (Medicaid), and title XVI of the Social Security Act (supplemental security income).</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>30 EC Section 56341.5 (f); 34 CFR Section 300.344 (3)(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>870</td>
<td><strong>Travel training (includes mobility training)</strong></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5 CCR Section 3051.3; 34 CFR sections 300.39 (c)(7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>890</td>
<td><strong>Other transition services:</strong> These services may include program coordination, case management and meetings, and crafting linkages between schools and between schools and postsecondary agencies.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900**</td>
<td><strong>Other special education/related services:</strong> Any other specialized service required for a student with a disability to receive educational benefit.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* B&PC–Business and Professional Codes  
CCR–California Code of Regulations  
CFR–Code of Federal Regulations  
EC–Education Code  
GC–Government Code  

** Use of CASEMIS Code 900 necessitates further explanation. Please list the other special education/related services to be provided as Code 900 on the form ASP-01b: Customized Service Descriptions.
### Annual Service Plan (001)

**Location**
List the site name and type of facility providing services to students enrolled in the LEA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Type Of Facility</th>
<th>CASEMIS Service Codes</th>
<th>(Use of Code 900 requires further explanation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academia Avance Charter 1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>330 415 450 515 535 820 830 840 850 870</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academia Avance Charter 2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>890</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celerity Sirius</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>330 415 450 510 515 535</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jardin de la Infancia</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimist Charter School</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>330 415 510 515 820 830 840 850 890</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westchester Secondary Charter School</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>330 415 450 515 820 830 840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use these codes to identify the type of facility providing services to students ages 6–22:

- **10**–Public Day School
- **11**–Public Residential School
- **15**–Special Education Center/Facility
- **19**–Other Public School/Facilities
- **20**–Continuation School
- **22**–Alternative Work Education Center/Work Study Program
- **24**–Independent Study
- **31**–Community School
- **55**–Charter School (operated by an LEA/District/County Office of Education)
- **56**–Charter School (operating as an LEA)
### Other Facilities (002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type of Facility</th>
<th>CASEMIS Service Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County Jails</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>330 340 350 415 425 435 445 450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>460 510 515 525 530 535 710 720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>820 830 840 850 860 865 870 890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use these codes to identify the type of facility providing services to students ages 6–22:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Facility</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Court School</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Institution or Incarceration Facility</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Instruction</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Facility</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education Program</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonpublic Day School</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonpublic Residential School</td>
<td>71/72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonpublic Agency</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Los Angeles County
Special Education Local Plan Area
(LAC SELPA)

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

The Los Angeles County SELPA hereby gives notice that a Public Hearing will be held as follows:

TOPIC OF HEARING:

The Los Angeles County Special Education Local Plan Area
Annual Budget and Service Plans for 2016-17

Copies of the budget and service plans may be inspected at:

LAC SELPA Office
9300 Imperial Highway, EC-213
Downey, California 90242
(562) 401-5737

After the public hearing, the Executive Directors Council will consider adoption of the Annual Budget and Service Plans for 2016-17

HEARING DATE: Thursday, May 26, 2016
TIME: 8:30 a.m.
LOCATION: Los Angeles County Office of Education
Education Center 239
9300 Imperial Highway, CA 90242

For additional information please contact:
Jim Anderson, SELPA Director
AVISO DE AUDIENCIA PÚBLICA

Por medio de la presente el SELPA de las Escuelas del Tribunal del Condado de Los Ángeles le avisa que se realizará una Audiencia Pública a continuación:

TEMA DE LA AUDIENCIA:

Zona del Plan Local de Educación Especial del Condado de Los Ángeles
Presupuesto Anual y Planes de Servicios para el 2016-17

Copias del presupuesto y planes de servicio podrán ser revisadas en la:

Oficina del SELPA de Escuelas del Tribunal del Condado de Los Ángeles
9300 Imperial Highway, EC-213
Downey, California 90242
(562) 401-5737

Después de la audiencia pública, el Consejo Ejecutivo de Directores tomará en cuenta la adopción del Presupuesto Anual y Planes de Servicios para el 2016-17

FECHA DE LA AUDIENCIA: Jueves, 26 de mayo, 2016
HORA: 8:30 a.m.
LUGAR: Departamento de Educación del Condado de Los Ángeles
Centro de Educación 239
9300 Imperial Highway, Ca 90242

Para más información favor de comunicarse con:
Jim Anderson Director del SELPA

Translated by LACOE-MPSO/kw 5-2016
California’s State Systemic Improvement Plan: an Overview

The vision of a unified system of education in California is becoming reality. The State Board of Education approved on March 9, 2016, a proposal from the California Department of Education (CDE), Special Education Division, to begin aligning special education accountability with general education efforts. Several initiatives helped to create the necessary climate for this unprecedented move: Results Driven Accountability, the Local Control Funding Formula, the work of the California Task Force on Special Education, and the Superintendent of Public Instruction’s Blueprint 2.0. These pages provide some history and context for these various initiatives and explain how special education accountability is contributing to a unified system.

Background
The intents of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) embody one of the most important civil rights accomplishments of the last century. Yet the current century may see the real fruits of this landmark legislation. For more than 40 years, the federal government has given money to states to help them fulfill IDEA’s mandates; for example, giving students with disabilities a free and appropriate public education (FAPE), guiding education through individualized education programs (IEPs), and educating each child in the least restrictive environment (LRE). Time and experience have shown, however, that FAPE, IEPs, and LRE can all be in place, and too many children with disabilities still leave school not prepared for postsecondary education, careers, or adult life.

According to Ruth Ryder, deputy secretary of the U.S. Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), prior to 2014, “Our focus was on ensuring that States meet IDEA program procedural requirements.” This focus attended to such things as honoring timelines and ensuring that IEPs were written. Prompted by the lackluster results of this approach, OSEP initiated a new monitoring system to guide states in their efforts to improve school outcomes for students with disabilities: Results-Driven Accountability (RDA). RDA introduces a new monitoring lens, one that attends to improved school results. “What we focus on is what we improve,” says Ryder.

How Federal Monitoring Works
The federal government gives each state a certain amount of money to support efforts to educate students with disabilities. OSEP monitors the states and their use of this money using specific “indicators.” Each state must have in place “a [state] performance plan [SPP] evaluating the state’s implementation of Part B” and describing how the state will improve such implementation. Each year the state submits to OSEP an annual performance report (APR), which shows its yearly progress relative to these indicators.

With RDA, OSEP eliminated what it saw as indicators that were both burdensome and that reflected a compliance-only ethos. Those that OSEP kept, and on which states will continue to be evaluated, relate to important issues for students with disabilities such as graduation and dropout rates, inclusion in and success on statewide assessments, rates of suspension and expulsion, and the percentage of time students with disabilities are included in general education classrooms. The indicators also address parental involvement, due process, and issues of disproportionate identification for special education services and disability categories for certain ethnic minorities.

New Indicator 17
OSEP also created a new Indicator 17, which specifically embodies the program’s revised focus on student results. The U.S. Secretary of Education announced this indicator in a letter to Chief State School Officers: “Each State will be required to develop a State Systemic Improvement Plan [SSIP]. . . . In developing the SSIP, States must use data to identify gaps in student performance, analyze State systems, and then implement targeted, evidence-based reforms to address the gaps. It is critical for a State to develop the SSIP in a manner that is aligned with the State’s existing improvement initiatives and reform efforts. We expect this focus on results and alignment with other improvement work to drive innovation in the delivery of services to students.”

Indicator 17 is unusual in a number of ways. The SSIP must reflect a thoughtful process of continuous improvement—with resources and supports in place to ensure that schools are using evidence-based practices so that student learning truly does improve. In addition, the SSIP must be informed at every step by data: baseline data to provide a context for improvement, target data to identify goals for improvement, and then updated data to show actual improvement.

The most challenging—and creative—aspect of the plan’s design is the requirement to align it with existing initiatives. At the March 2016 meeting of the California State Board of Education (SBE), Interim State Director of Special Education Chris Drouin said that Indicator 17 creates an “opportunity to take a federally-driven program and align it with a sweeping state initiative.”

Some states are focusing their SSIPs on one specific skill or group of students.
Based on stakeholder input, districts are required to create Local Control Accountability Plans (LCAPs) as part of their budgeting processes. As described by UC Berkeley researchers, “These plans identify goals for improving services and outcomes, name specific actions to reach those goals, and identify the funding sources linked to these programs and strategies. Districts will be held accountable to the goals in their LCAPs.”

As the LCFF was materializing, the SBE and the Special Education Division were participating in the California Statewide Task Force on Special Education. Charged with developing recommendations to reform special education in the state, the group ultimately outlined a vision of one unified, coherent system of education that incorporates special education and that focuses on student need and progress, not disability label or category. During that same period, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction was developing his A Blueprint for Great Schools 2.0 (Blueprint 2.0), which also reflects a vision of coordinated and unified academic and fiscal systems at all levels.

Where Special Education Belongs

Special education dollars were not included in the LCFF’s categorical sweep because of fiscal requirements under IDEA. Yet students with disabilities are more frequently identified in these subgroups than in the general population (see Figure 1). In fact, fully 70 percent of all students with disabilities belong to one or more of these LCFF targeted subgroups. This means that, in order to be effective, LCAP activities will need to focus on the outcomes of students with disabilities.

Aligning Indicator 17—the SSIP—with the LCFF

Given the 70 percent of students with disabilities in the LCFF subgroups, the Special Education Division (the division) determined that these students would be the primary focus of California’s SSIP. Many people...
describes plans for future activities.”

Additional alignment exists between general education and special education reporting requirements as several SPP indicators echo required LCFF data (see chart below).

**SSIP Phase 1**

Phase 1 of the SSIP required state leaders and key stakeholders to select improvement strategies and develop a theory of action, reflecting the best of implementation science and what it has discovered about effecting lasting and constructive change in schools. To inform its efforts, the division convened a special stakeholder group, made up of Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPAs), Parent Training and Information Center staff, OSEP’s state contact and its technical assistance contractor, members of the Advisory Commission on Special Education, CDE contractors, and CDE Special Education Division staff. The resulting Theory of Action displays how the basic elements of the LCFF and LCAP are aligned in the SSIP in the shared focus on high-need students, improvement plans, and accountability structures.

Indicator 17 will be tracked through what is being called the “state-identified measurable result” (SIMR). For this result, California selected “improvements in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics scores on statewide academic assessments of students with disabilities in each of the targeted LCFF subgroups.” The division wanted to—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment of SPP Indicators and LCFF Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Education Indicators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 3: Statewide Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 17: SSIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1: Graduation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 2: Dropout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 4: Discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 8: Parent Involvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

have asked, “What about the other 30 percent?” The answer lies in the larger picture. Sixteen of the OSEP indicators focus specifically on all students with disabilities and special education data. The Special Education Division will continue to track and report on them all and will continue to maintain its responsibilities to monitor compliance with the law—now adding the lens of student progress and results.

Indicator 17 provides California with the opportunity to take a manageable first step toward whole-system alignment through this new focus on improved results, as the SSIP includes students with disabilities as part of the larger system of continuous improvement. “Think of Indicator 17 as an additional lens that serves as an early warning system,” says Kristin Wright, the SBE consultant who addresses special education issues. “We are concerned with increasing school outcomes for all of our students with disabilities, and this activity will help to deepen the technical assistance and support we can provide our LEAs.”

Indicator 17 places students with disabilities squarely within ongoing general education improvement plans. In a memo to the State Board of Education, CDE wrote, “Most of these data indicators are reported as measures of past performance; [Indicator 17] is tied to future work [and]
ing. Member Sue Burr called it “a great service to LEAs,” and Member Nikki Sandoval applauded the division for demonstrating “flexibility and relevance to what is happening now so that we don’t have multiple systems working at the same time.” She further expressed appreciation for “holding off on those targets. We are at an opportune and exciting time.” And Board President Mike Kirst invoked the vision of the California Special Education Task Force by saying, “I am gratified that you have integrated your efforts with the design of the Task Force report.”

**Tiered Technical Assistance**

Phase 2 also involves planning and bringing to scale a tiered system of strategically designed and research-based technical assistance and supports for all districts—those that want to improve their currently successful programs and services and those that the evaluation process ultimately shows need help to meet their measurable targets. The division is creating a robust, tiered system of technical assistance to contribute to the state’s overall system of continuous improvement. Resources will include facilitated communities of practice, guided self-assessment and improvement plans, and guidance toward implementing new programs and evidence-based practices from consultants with proven experience in school leadership and teaching. A basic level of support will be optional and available to all districts, while more intense and involved supports and interventions will be provided only to those districts whose students are not making progress.

As students with disabilities do well and improve their scores on statewide assessments for ELA and math, most school districts will not have to do anything relative to the SSIP. But if the SIMR indicates a pattern of little or no improvement, if student scores worsen overall, or if scores for students with disabilities do not improve, then districts will be given targeted supports to address revealed weaknesses.

It will take time for all aspects of the SSIP to be put in place, and at least two years to identify districts that consistently fall short of SIMR goals. For districts that struggle significantly in their efforts, conditions ultimately may be placed on how they can spend IDEA funds. Once identified, these districts will be required to develop a plan to improve the scores of students with disabilities, with some flexibility in how they design those plans.

The Special Education Division hopes that in these plans school districts will align their improvement activities for students with disabilities to the general improvement activities in their LCAPs. In the ideal approach, school districts will begin to integrate programs and services to improve outcomes for all students—eventually creating a single plan. A coordinated system of technical assistance from CDE, from both general and special education sources, is being developed to make this possible.

**What’s Next?**

While important specifics of Phase 2 are still being sorted out, its focus is clear: improved school results for students with disabilities by helping schools become better places for learning. The division will be giving LEAs data on multiple indicators in addition to the SIMR, which will help them identify areas of need. Any one of the issues highlighted through the indicators, when accurately tracked, often reflects systemic problems that can affect all students. The intent is for this information to guide districts as they refine their improvement strategies, to highlight what they are doing well, and to point to where they may need additional support. The focus of all strategies and practices will be to improve student performance.

### Aligned Supports

Much of what the state is doing to develop the SSIP complements and enhances the larger work of implementing the LCFF and LCAP. The CDE is developing an extensive tiered system of information, supports, and services to help LEAs improve the outcomes of all students. “This kind of coordination of effort within the department is unprecedented,” Drouin says. “This is the most exciting thing I’ve ever seen in my 25 years in the department.”

### Notes

1. Ruth Ryder, Deputy Director of OSEP. PPT presentation. Retrieve from [https://www.cec.spred.org/~/media/Files/CAN%20Documents/CAN%202014/Ruth%20Ryder.pdf](https://www.cec.spred.org/~/media/Files/CAN%20Documents/CAN%202014/Ruth%20Ryder.pdf)
2. Part B of IDEA guides the educational services provided to children ages three through twenty-one; Part C guides services for children birth to age three; Part A lays out the general provisions of the legislation for all children.
4. For a complete list of OSEP indicators, please see [https://osep.grads360.org/services/PDCService.svc/GetPDCDocumentFile?fileId=4606](https://osep.grads360.org/services/PDCService.svc/GetPDCDocumentFile?fileId=4606)
5. Letter from the U.S. Secretary of Education to Chief State School Officers. Retrieved from [http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/osers/osep/cda/050914rda-letter-to-chiefs-final.pdf](http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/osers/osep/cda/050914rda-letter-to-chiefs-final.pdf)
8. Ibid.
12. See the resources on implementation science from the National Implementation Research Network, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. [http://nirn.fpg.unc.edu](http://nirn.fpg.unc.edu)
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Item VI. Reports / Study Topics

C. Membership Report
   1. Celerity Achernar Application – Discussion
   2. International Studies Language Academy (ISLA) - Update
   4. Potential Applicants - Updates
      a. Intellectual Virtues Academy
      b. LA’s Promise Middle School
      c. LA’s Promise High School
      d. Kuma Academy – Orange County
      e. Winton Charter High School – Merced
      f. Esperanza Oxnard Academy – Ventura County
      g. Evergreen Charter School
Los Angeles County Charter SELPA Application Summary Report

Applicant: Celerity Achernar Charter School
Membership Year Applied for: 2016-17

Executive Summary for the Executive Directors Council

LAC Charter SELPA received and reviewed the SELPA Membership application on behalf of Celerity Achernar Charter School (the “Charter School”) for academic year 2016-17. Celerity Achernar is a new charter school (previously known as Celerity Sirius) authorized by Compton Unified School District scheduled to operate from 2016-17 school year. The Charter School is seeking LAC Charter SELPA membership as required.

The Charter School submitted a comprehensive application to the LAC Charter SELPA. Below are the findings of the SELPA review conducted in the month of May 2016. The Charter School exceeds the minimum standards related to all required elements of the SELPA Application. As such, LAC Charter SELPA recommends full membership for the Charter School and that the Executive Directors Council considers this recommendation for approval at its next meeting scheduled for May 26th, 2016.

Application Rationale: Celerity Achernar Charter School would like to join the LAC Charter SELPA for the upcoming 2016-17 school year because of the positive five-year relationship that Celerity Sirius Charter School has enjoyed with the LAC SELPA. As Celerity Sirius prepares its transition to becoming Celerity Achernar, newly authorized by Compton Unified School District, Celerity students, parents and staff would benefit from maintaining the level of support (eg: access to services, administrative staff expertise, risk pool sharing, and lower administrative fees) and continuity that it has received through the LAC SELPA over the past five years. Additionally, Celerity Achernar’s membership would be a benefit to the LAC SELPA by: allowing it to maintain its current total membership number; contributing to the SELPA’s revenue by paying the 11% annual administrative fees; and contributing its experience and expertise in specific special education-related topics.

Application Overview and Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required Elements</td>
<td>Completed application, Charter petition, Audit report, API Scores SARC, Details of credentialed staff, Signed SELPA assurances, CASEMIS pupil Count and Notice of Withdrawal</td>
<td>33 of 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Components</td>
<td>Child find, Gen. Ed program modifications, Referral process, Assessment procedures, IEP development process and suspension and expulsion data</td>
<td>20 of 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Los Angeles County Charter SELPA Application Summary Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Services</td>
<td>DIS Services, SAI, NPS/NPA, Inclusion, Transportation</td>
<td>20 of 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>504, Due process, State complaints, ADA compliance, Service of students, Administration, Professional Development, Process for settling disputes and SELPA LEA Assurances</td>
<td>27 of 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal</td>
<td>Budget, Special education accounting, Audit, CMO Affiliation</td>
<td>53 of 60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Points Possible:** 165  
**Minimum Acceptable points:** 134  
**Total Points Awarded:** 153
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Item VI. Reports / Study Topics

D. LACOE Special Education Action Plan and LAC SELPA Smart Goals
   1. Discussion of the Cross and Joftus Report on Special Education within LACOE and Recommendation #5 to Expand the Charter SELPA.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue #</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>(Page 18) According to leadership of these schools, reasons for leaving LAC Charter include a lack of clarity on fiscal issues, lack of customer service orientation, no clear consistent full-time equivalent contact to support them in dealing with special education issues and concerns, a lack of infrastructure, and non-adherence to the Local Plan policies and procedures.</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target Area:** EP  
**Timeline:** 2015-2016, 2016-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Start Date:</th>
<th>Due Date: 12/30/2016</th>
<th>Complete Date:</th>
<th>Assigned To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SMART Goal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EP - CHIEF ED PROGRAMS OFFICER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(OUTSTANDING) By June 30, 2016, meet with the Governance body of the Charter SELPA to discuss and develop SMART Goals specific to the expansion of the Charter SELPA.

(OUTSTANDING) By August 30, 2016, meet with the Governance body of the Charter SELPA to develop the vision statement for the expansion of the Charter SELPA.

(OUTSTANDING) By December 30, 2016, meet with the Governance body of the Charter SELPA to develop a strategic plan for the expansion of the Charter SELPA.

**Evaluation**
Los Angeles County Office of Education:
Special Education Review

Conducted by Cross & Joftus

Scott Joftus
Alice Parker
Connie Wehmeyer
Catherine Conrado
Martin Cavanaugh
Griff Montgomery
Mary Ann Dewan
Meghan Neary
Amy Cox

May 1, 2015
Executive Summary

The Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) operates special education classes and services for students in County districts, charter schools, and juvenile court and community schools. LACOE is the administrative unit for four Special Education Local Plan Areas (SELPAs), serving 2,617 students in those areas. These figures are drastically reduced from three years ago, when LACOE served six SELPAs and 5,219 students. In March 2015, LACOE engaged Cross & Joftus, a national education consulting firm, to conduct a needs assessment that identifies reasons for declining enrollment, assesses the quality of instruction being provided in LACOE-operated classes, and looks for other areas of strength and challenges in the County’s provision of special education services. Because of LACOE leadership’s concerns with the Division of Special Education, the C&J team focused much of its review on the systemic issues contributing to its declining enrollment, while focusing its review of LACOE’s Department of Special Programs on the programming at the County’s court and community schools.

Based on interviews, focus groups, classroom walkthroughs, surveys of district special education directors, and extant data analysis, the C&J review team concludes that LACOE’s Division of Special Education (DSE) has reached a point of crisis by almost every measure. Since the 2012-13 school year, revenues, student enrollment, and number of participating SELPAs and districts have decreased drastically as districts “take back” programs (see Figures 1 and 2). Additional decreases are likely. LACOE’s Los Angeles Charter SELPA (LAC Charter) is losing two of its nine members this year, although this SELPA does have potential for expansion and increased revenue with careful planning and implementation by LACOE. The largest SELPA continuing to purchase services (Southwest)—representing 75 percent of the division’s remaining student enrollment—is strongly considering a take back for the 2016-17 school year. If the SW SELPA does take back all or most of its programs, DSE would likely become insolvent.

Meanwhile, a vicious cycle has started that will be very difficult to break without bold action by LACOE leadership. Program “take backs” force LACOE to enact “reductions in force” (RIF), which require LACOE to transfer teachers, paraprofessionals, and other staff, and to increase the cost of services for districts continuing to purchase them. The RIFs and resulting transfers create uncertainty and program instability, lower morale, place educators in positions in which they are unqualified or unhappy, reduce accountability, and reduce curricular and instructional supports. As a result, program and instructional quality and student outcomes suffer (see Figures 3 and 4) even as costs increase, further reducing school and district satisfaction with LACOE and increasing the likelihood that they will also take back programs.

---

1 LACOE provided multiple, conflicting reports of student enrollment totals over this time span. These data are from California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) reports.
2 See Methodology section at the end of this report for more information on the data that informed the needs assessment.
3 This figure is based on SELPA-reported enrollment data as CALPADS does not differentiate by SELPA. The enrollment totals reported by SELPAs do not align with the CALPADS data.
Reduced program and instructional quality and increased costs, however, are not the only reason that schools and districts take back programs. According to LACOE administrators, district administrators are frustrated by LACOE’s inability or unwillingness to implement program improvement strategies, engage with customers effectively, or provide budget clarity by charging a “fee for service,” a strategy that could result in higher costs but more transparency for districts.⁴

Districts also take back programs to maintain greater control of the delivery of services and/or instruction and to ensure alignment with the services, instruction, and quality being delivered to their general education students. This rationale is actually difficult to argue with as research suggests, and C&J has found, that schools are less likely to take ownership of students being served by LACOE.

One way in which districts’ lack of ownership for students served by LACOE manifests itself is through the facilities they provide their students with disabilities who are served by LACOE. C&J researchers found the districts’ facilities provided to LACOE to educate their students with disabilities to be of lower quality—often significantly lower quality and sometimes inappropriately so—than those facilities used to educate the districts’ general education students or students with disabilities not educated by LACOE. Moreover, as their needs change, some districts frequently move LACOE classrooms, creating greater uncertainty and instability for LACOE, its educators, and the students served, reducing program quality, and further increasing the likelihood that districts will take back programs.

All these issues taking place in the field are exacerbated by a central office that does not appear prepared to lead change. No vision for how—or whether—LACOE will support districts in improving outcomes for students with disabilities has been communicated. And no goals or metrics for improving programs, the divisions, related divisions (e.g., HR, finance) have been developed, let alone tracked, meaning that staff are not meaningfully held accountable for improved outcomes.

Communication within the central office and with stakeholders (e.g., teachers, district administrators) was consistently cited by those interviewed as a significant problem. Interviewees also consistently described decision making as slow (e.g., most decisions must be approved by a cabinet that meets infrequently) and ineffective (e.g., there is no clear process for non-cabinet members to have items placed on the cabinet agenda or for following up), which adversely affects customer service. Several staff mentioned that they had raised questions with significant policy implications months ago and had not received any feedback, and many staff struggled to answer questions about who would be responsible for changing a given practice, process, or system. As a result, C&J researchers found the culture in LACOE to be bureaucratic rather than entrepreneurial, rule abiding rather than problem solving, and focused on how things have been done in the past rather

⁴ Some districts also believe that they can provide the service at a lower cost, although this seems to derive more from their frustration with how they are billed by LACOE.
than on how they should be.

To address these challenges and remain viable, LACOE leadership must take bold action to transform the way in which DSE delivers services and the quality of those services. LACOE must also transform itself into an entrepreneurial organization focused on outstanding customer service and greatly improved outcomes for students with disabilities. More specifically, LACOE should:

1) Transform LACOE and DSE central office.
2) Create and implement new approaches to delivering special education services.
3) Improve teaching and learning in DSE classrooms.
4) Turn around Central Hall using Barry J. Nidorf as a model.
5) Expand the LAC Charter.

These recommendations—detailed in the recommendations section of this report—will not only ensure that DSE remains viable but also expand its influence and support for districts in ensuring that all students with disabilities receive an outstanding education.
i. Creating short on-line professional learning modules that could be completed from any location.
ii. Establishing a blended learning model for participants that includes on-line, group, and 1:1 supports.
iii. Fostering peer-to-peer supports through PLCs.

e) Engage SELPA and district administrators in the design of an instructional vision and methodology, curriculum, assessment system, and professional development.

4) Turn around Central Juvenile Hall using Barry J. Nidorf Juvenile Hall as a model.

Adopt best practices evident in the Barry J. Nidorf Juvenile Hall to implement a clear instructional program and school wide positive behavior system (PBIS) at Central. Build administrators’ capacity as instructional leaders by requiring all to participate in supporting IEPs alongside the 30-Day Team and school psychologists. Examine ways to engage probation as a partner and encourage an aligned focus on education and positive behavior systems (PBIS and probation’s Behavior Management Program).

Provide special education staff with professional development in the areas of access to Common Core State Standards, Universal Design for Learning and differentiation, student engagement, and RtSA as well as high yield instructional strategies. Administrators should monitor the implementation of these strategies as well as lesson plan development during classroom walkthroughs, giving teachers feedback on instructional delivery and planning. PLCs that include special and general education teachers should be held weekly, utilizing classroom portfolio documents, RtSA information, assessment information, and information about high yield strategies. Administrators can also monitor the effectiveness of PLCs through reviews of teachers’ lesson plans and instructional practice.

5) Expand LAC Charter. The LAC Charter should examine its funding operation in comparison not only with LAUSD but also with the El Dorado Charter, Desert Mountain, and Sonoma County Charter SELPAs to determine whether it is competitive and self-sustaining. Charter schools continue to open and Los Angeles County has a large concentration of potential customers. In order for the LAC Charter to be considered attractive by charter school customers, the LAC Charter must offer high-quality services with the following features:

- Fiscal transparency
- Member authority to steer the practices and future of the LAC Charter
- Professional development in IEP-writing and special education instruction
- Immediate availability of technical support for IEP-related questions and practices, as well as legal issues
- Community Advisory Committee (CAC) support for parents and stakeholders
- Viable website with updated and critical information on policies and procedures
- On-site visits
• Assistance with the procurement of special education services (this element could be a source of expanded employment for LACOE special education service providers via contracts with the LAC Charter school members)

These elements will require a fiscal model that generates funds for the LAC Charter to employ program specialist-type staff. LAC Charter members should be surveyed to determine the scope of needs. If the LAC Charter provides excellent services to its members, the LAC Charter will not have a need to market itself; word-of-mouth will be sufficient.

In regards to current and future charter clients, LACOE needs to honor its governance authorities in the LACOE SELPA and the LAC Charter SELPA local plans, as well as any policies, procedures, and fiscal allocation plans adopted by the respective SELPAs. Without doing so, trust cannot be developed, current members will continue to exit, funding will be unstable, and the likelihood of attracting new charter members will be slim. Allowing members of the SELPA governance councils to self-govern will allow them to make decisions about their future growth, development, and stability.
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Item VII. Recommendations

A. Approval of Celerity Achernar Charter School for full SELPA membership for the 2016-2017 school year.

Based on a review and evaluation of the Celerity Achernar SELPA Application and as reported to and discussed by the Executive Directors Council, it is recommended the Executive Directors Council vote to approve full SELPA membership for the 2016-2017 school year to Celerity Achernar Charter School.
Item VII. Recommendations

B. Approval of the Request to waive Administrative Fees pursuant to the Allocation Plan for the Soledad Enrichment Action Charter School

Discussion on a meeting held with LACOE staff to review the SELPA membership status of the Soledad Enrichment Action Charter School.
Item VII. Recommendations

C. Approval of the 2016-2017 Annual Budget and Service Plans for the Los Angeles County Special Education Local Plan Area
Item VII. Recommendations

D. Approval of the 2016-2017 Los Angeles County SELPA Meeting Calendars
   1. 16-17 LAC SELPA Executive Directors Council Calendar of Meetings
   2. 16-17 LAC SELPA Program Council Calendar of Meetings
   3. 16-17 LAC SELPA CAC Calendar of Meetings
# 2016-2017 Executive Directors Council Calendar of Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| September | 22 | LAC SELPA Office  
9300 Imperial Highway  
Downey, CA 90242 |
| November  | 17 | LAC SELPA Office  
9300 Imperial Highway  
Downey, CA 90242 |
| January   | 26 | LAC SELPA Office  
9300 Imperial Highway  
Downey, CA 90242 |
| March     | 23 | LAC SELPA Office  
9300 Imperial Highway  
Downey, CA 90242 |
| April     | 20 | LAC SELPA Office  
9300 Imperial Highway  
Downey, CA 90242 |
| May       | 25 | LAC SELPA Office  
9300 Imperial Highway  
Downey, CA 90242 |
# 2016-2017 Program Council Calendar of Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| October  | 6    | LAC SELPA Office  
|          |      | 9300 Imperial Highway  
|          |      | Downey, CA 90242    |
| December | 8    | LAC SELPA Office  
|          |      | 9300 Imperial Highway  
|          |      | Downey, CA 90242    |
| February | 9    | LAC SELPA Office  
|          |      | 9300 Imperial Highway  
|          |      | Downey, CA 90242    |
| April    | 6    | LAC SELPA Office  
|          |      | 9300 Imperial Highway  
|          |      | Downey, CA 90242    |
| June     | 8    | LAC SELPA Office  
|          |      | 9300 Imperial Highway  
|          |      | Downey, CA 90242    |
# Los Angeles County  
**Special Education Local Plan Area (LAC SELPA)**

## 2016-2017 Community Advisory Committee Calendar of Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| October  | 6    | LAC SELPA Office  
|          |      | 9300 Imperial Highway  
|          |      | Downey, CA 90242 |
| December | 8    | LAC SELPA Office  
|          |      | 9300 Imperial Highway  
|          |      | Downey, CA 90242 |
| February | 9    | LAC SELPA Office  
|          |      | 9300 Imperial Highway  
|          |      | Downey, CA 90242 |
| April    | 6    | LAC SELPA Office  
|          |      | 9300 Imperial Highway  
|          |      | Downey, CA 90242 |
| June     | 8    | LAC SELPA Office  
|          |      | 9300 Imperial Highway  
|          |      | Downey, CA 90242 |
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Item VIII. Closing Items

A. Compliance Monitoring and LEA Report
Los Angeles County “Charter” SELPA
Compliance Monitoring & LEA Report

District/LEA: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Administrator: ___________________________

Please indicate current operations and/or compliance status in area noted below as it relates to your district or PAU.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Status/Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. IEP Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Instructional Programs and Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. CASEMIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Due Process/Compliance Complaints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Item VIII. Closing Items

B. Los Angeles County Charter SELPA Executive Director’s Council Meeting Schedule, Establishment of Meeting Times, Future Agenda Items, Follow up
Los Angeles County  
Special Education Local Plan Area  
(LAC SELPA)

2015-2016 Executive Directors Council  
Calendar of Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| September     | 24   | Optimist  
6957 North Figueroa Street  
Highland Park, CA 90042 |
| November      | 19   | LAC SELPA Office  
9300 Imperial Highway  
Downey, CA 90242 |
| January       | 28   | LAC SELPA Office  
9300 Imperial Highway  
Downey, CA 90242 |
| March (Rescheduled to April due to Spring Breaks) | 24   | LAC SELPA Office  
9300 Imperial Highway  
Downey, CA 90242 |
| April         | 21   | LAC SELPA Office  
9300 Imperial Highway  
Downey, CA 90242 |
| May           | 26   | LAC SELPA Office  
9300 Imperial Highway  
Downey, CA 90242 |
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