

**CALIFORNIA**  
**State Systemic Improvement**  
**Plan – Indicator Eleven**  
**State Identified Measurable Improvement**  
**Analysis**



**DATA REFERENCE**  
**December 2014**

## Table of Contents

State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR).....	2
Child Outcomes – Social and Emotional.....	2
Indicator 3, Outcome Area A, Summary Statement 1 [3(A-1)].....	2
Social and Emotional .....	2
Theory of Action .....	6
<b>MONITORING DATA</b> .....	7
Comparison by Cohort .....	7
Cohort 1 .....	8
Comparison by Rank.....	9
Rank 1.....	10
Rank 2.....	11
Rank 3.....	12
Sample Size for Indicator Three .....	13
FFY 2011 Ethnicity by Regional Center.....	22
FFY 2012 Ethnicity by Regional Center.....	23
2011 Diagnosis Intellectual Disability (Formerly MR).....	25
DIAGNOSIS.....	25
FFY 2011 & FFY 2012 Diagnosis by Regional Center.....	25
<u>2011 Diagnosis Cerebral Palsy</u> .....	26
2012 Diagnosis Intellectual Disability (Formerly MR).....	27
2012 Diagnosis Cerebral Palsy.....	28
2011 Diagnosis Epilepsy.....	29
2011 Diagnosis Autism .....	30
2012 Diagnosis Autism .....	31
2011 Diagnosis Other Developmental Disability .....	32
2012 Diagnosis Other Developmental Disability .....	33
2011 Diagnosis Down Syndrome.....	34
2012 Diagnosis Down Syndrome.....	35

## State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)

As recommended by the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) task force and approved by Department of Developmental Services (DDS), California intends to improve child outcomes in Social-Emotional development (including social relationships), Outcome A, Statement Summary 1.

DDS and its stakeholders are aiming to achieve improvement by building capacity of the Early Start program to scale up and sustain the use of evidence-based practices. The improvement will be measured by the Early Start Report (ESR) child outcomes data, the Client Master File data, monitoring reports, input from stakeholders, and personnel development.

### Child Outcomes – Social and Emotional Indicator 3, Outcome Area A, Summary Statement 1 [3(A-1)]

**Social and Emotional:** Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships).

**Summary Statement #1:** Of those infants and toddlers who entered early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

Child Outcomes are measured as compared to State designated target measurements. These Outcomes are reported in the Annual Progress Report (APR) submitted to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) each February.


The targets for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2012, July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013, were set in the State Performance Plan in 2005. The plan was updated in 2011. FFY 2013 (current year) will be set at baseline with the submission of the new APR. The target for FFY 2012 for Social Emotional 3(A-1) is:

Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcomes A, **39.8 percent** will substantially increase their rate of growth by the time they turn 3 years of age or exited the program.


In FFY12, California surpassed this measurement by attaining a 43.3 percent performance rating. However, the state fell short of the national average of 67 percent by a full 23.7 percentage points.

**Data Limitations:**

Only children in the program for a minimum of six months, with scores in every category and with an evaluation within six months of program exit are included in the sample for child outcomes, Indicator 3. DDS continues to provide focused technical assistance to regional centers in order to increase the percentage of children who meet these criteria in an effort to increase the accuracy of the story told by the State’s data regarding the children being served in the Regional Centers.



## Summary Statement 1 Social Emotional Outcome Area A Above or Below National Average of 67%



### Indicator 11 - SSIP

According to OSEP’s instructions for Indicator 11 and the FFY 2013-2018 Part C SPP/APR (OMB No. 1820-0578), the State must provide, as part of Phase I of the SSIP, a statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through implementation of the SSIP. This is referred to as the SIMR for Children with Disabilities, and their families. As part of the SiMR, the following additional information must be included to meet the requirements in IDEA section 616(b)(1)(A) and (b)(2)(A):

- provide FFY 2013 baseline data for Indicators C-11 (the SSIP) expressed as a percentage and aligned with the SIMR
- establish “measurable and rigorous” targets for each successive year of the SPP (FFYs 2014 through 2018)
- end target (for FFY 2018) must demonstrate improvement over the FFY 2013 baseline data.
- submit all other components of Phase I of the SSIP

The State must report baseline data and set targets as part of Phase I of the SSIP, which is due on April 1, 2015. The State will be required to report target data in the SPP/APRs for FFYs 2014 through 2018. As has been the case previously, the State may revise its baseline data and adjust targets in a subsequent SPP/APR with appropriate justification.

The State must describe how it will address data quality in the Data Analysis section of Phase I of the SSIP. If the State identifies any concerns about data quality, the description must include how it will address these concerns, and if additional data are needed, what methods and timelines will be applied to collect and analyze those additional data.

The SSIP is to be developed in two phases and then implemented and evaluated in a third phase. These phases cover the new APR reporting period of 2015-2020:

Phase I (FFY 2013 due to OSEP in February 2015) includes:

- Data Analyses
- Identification of the Focus for Improvement
- Description of Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity
- Theory of Action

Phase II (FFY 2014 due to OSEP in February 2016) includes:

- Development of the Multi-year plan which includes:
  - Infrastructure Development
  - Supports for EIS programs/LEAs in Implementing Evidence-based practices
  - Evaluation Plan

Phase III (FFY 2015-18 due to OSEP in February 2017 through February 2020) includes:

- Evaluation of the plan and reporting of progress:
  - Results of the Ongoing evaluation
  - Extent of progress

The above delineation of phases, include two major components:

- Identify coherent improvement strategies that build the capacity of the state system and of Early Start programs/providers in order to improve results for children with disabilities and their families. It includes researching and evaluating solutions that support improvement in the area of focus, which involves identifying evidence-based practices that can make a difference for children and families, and exploring effective practices

related to the SiMR that will need to be scaled up to improve results. This will then be followed by the development of a theory of action.

- Identify and present to OSEP the theory of action. The goal of the theory of action is to illustrate how the implementation of the coherent improvement strategies will demonstrate the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in the Early Start programs, and achieve improvement in the SiMR. General action steps will need to be developed that address challenges by removing barriers, using leverage points and incorporating resources. It also involves defining an outcome statement that showcases the improvement the SSIP State team hopes to show within the SiMR, including both short and long-term outcomes. This closes out Phase I of the SSIP.

## **Theory of Action**

After establishing the SiMR, the next part of the SSIP process focuses on "What shall we do about it?" This part of the process includes searching for and evaluating evidence based solutions that support improvement in the area identified for focus/results and then developing a theory of action. Theory of action could be based on a logic model where components such as inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, and impact are identified and mapped. The theory of action is a description of the general improvement strategies that will need to be carried out and the outcomes that will need to be met to achieve the SiMR identified by stakeholders and approved by the State. For the theory of action, the State will develop a graphic that shows the relationship between the action steps/strategies/interventions proposed and the intended outcomes that the State expects to achieve over a multi-year period.

As explained by OSEP:

It is permissible to include only the SiMR in the Theory of Action. The Theory of Action should be an "If-Then" statement, graphically portrayed in the State's SSIP, that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs or EIS programs, and achieve improvement in the SiMR for children with disabilities.

There will not be a prescribed form for the theory of action. The new federal web-based reporting platform, GRADS 360, will allow for the State's theory of action graphic to be uploaded online. Resource materials for development of the theory of action are available through the Regional Resource Centers (RRCs) or the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA) to assist in the design of their Theory of Action.

This work will close out Phase I of the SSIP and begin Phase II, developing the Plan for Improvement.

## MONITORING DATA

DDS conducts on-site program monitoring on a three year cycle, and reviews a random selection of records during the Part C on-site review.

### Comparison by Cohort

DDS performs monitoring activities on site at each of the 21 regional centers. The monitoring visits are scheduled on a three year rotation, with seven regional centers being visited each year.

Each year has a balanced combination of the regional centers by performance, population, area within the state, and whether the RC is located in a rural or an urban setting.

Regional Center	Area of Coverage
Cohort 1	
1) San Andreas Regional Center	North & Central Valley: Urban/Rural
2) San Gabriel Pomona Regional Center	South: Urban
3) North Los Angeles County Regional Center	South: Urban/Rural
4) Tri-Counties Regional Center	South & Central Valley: Urban/Rural
5) South Central Los Angeles Regional Center	South: Urban
6) Golden Gate Regional Center	North: Urban
7) Redwood Coast Regional Center	North: Rural
Cohort 2	
1) Inland Regional Center	South: Urban/Rural
2) Westside Regional Center	South: Urban
3) Regional Center of the East Bay	North: Urban
4) Central Valley Regional Center	Central Valley: Urban /Rural
5) Frank D Lanterman Regional Center	South: Urban
6) Far Northern Regional Center	North: Rural
7) Harbor Regional Center	South: Urban
Cohort 3	
1) Regional Center of Orange County	South: Urban
2) Valley Mountain Regional Center	North: Urban/Rural
3) San Diego Regional Center	South: Urban/Rural
4) North Bay Regional Center	North: Rural
5) East Los Angeles Regional Center	South: Urban
6) Kern Regional Center	Central Valley: Rural
7) Alta California Regional Center	North: Urban/Rural

### Cohort 1

Regional Center	Area of Coverage	State Ranking	Child Count
Cohort 1			
1) San Andreas Regional Center	North & Central Valley: Urban/Rural	Rank 3	Lg Pop
2) San Gabriel Pomona Regional Center	South: Urban	Rank 2	Median
3) North Los Angeles County Regional Center	South: Urban/Rural	Rank 2	Lg Pop
4) Tri-Counties Regional Center	South & Central Valley: Urban/Rural	Rank 1	Lg Pop
5) South Central Los Angeles Regional Center	South: Urban	Rank 1	Median
6) Golden Gate Regional Center	North: Urban	Rank 3	Sm Pop
7) Redwood Coast Regional Center	North: Rural	Rank 3	Sm Pop

### Cohort 2

Regional Center	Area of Coverage	State Ranking	Child Count
Cohort 2			
1) Inland Regional Center	South: Urban/Rural	Rank 1	Lg Pop
2) Westside Regional Center	South: Urban	Rank 3	Sm Pop
3) Regional Center of the East Bay	North: Urban	Rank 2	Median
4) Central Valley Regional Center	Central Valley: Urban /Rural	Rank 1	Lg Pop
5) Frank D Lanterman Regional Center	South: Urban	Rank 2	Median
6) Far Northern Regional Center	North: Rural	Rank 1	Sm Pop
7) Harbor Regional Center	South: Urban	Rank 2	Median

### Cohort 3

Regional Center	Area of Coverage	State Ranking	Child Count
Cohort 3			
1) Regional Center of Orange County	South: Urban	Rank 2	Lg Pop
2) Valley Mountain Regional Center	North: Urban/Rural	Rank 1	Median
3) San Diego Regional Center	South: Urban/Rural	Rank 3	Lg Pop
4) North Bay Regional Center	North: Rural	Rank 1	Sm Pop
5) East Los Angeles Regional Center	South: Urban	Rank 3	Sm Pop
6) Kern Regional Center	Central Valley: Rural	Rank 3	Sm Pop
7) Alta California Regional Center	North: Urban/Rural	Rank 2	Median

## **Comparison by Rank**

Comparisons are made between the RC's in order to find similarities, and potential key areas for improvement for those RC not meeting the State average for Child Outcomes Summary Statement 1-A

Additionally, comparisons between the RC's performing above the State average may shed light on potential improvement strategies.

## Rank 1

The RC's with Rank 1 (The top seven RC's in Indicator-3, Summary Statement 1-A, FFY 2012) have the following composition:

5 RC's are categorized as Urban/Rural  
 2 RC is categorized as Rural

3 RC's are located in Northern California  
 2 RC is located in Southern/Central California  
 1 RC is located in Central California  
 1 RC's are located in Southern California

3 RC's are categorized as a large population area  
 2 RC's are categorized as a median population area  
 2 RC's is categorized as a small population area

2 RC's had a percentage of 30% or less of all children meeting Indicator 3 criteria  
 2 RC's had a percentage between 31% and 41% of all children meeting Indicator 3 criteria  
 3 RC's had a percentage of over 42%and 53% of all children meeting Indicator 3 criteria

Regional Center	Percent of total children meeting Indicator 3 Criteria	Population Size of Area Served	Area of Coverage
South Central	52.2%	Median Pop	South & Central Valley: Urban/Rural
Central Valley	30.7%	Lg Pop	Central Valley: Urban /Rural
North Bay	37.1%	Sm Pop	North: Rural
Valley Mountain	41.3%	Median Pop	North: Urban/Rural
Inland Counties	43.4%	Lg Pop	South: Urban/Rural
Far Northern	30.8%	Sm Pop	North: Rural
Tri-Counties	48.2%	Lg Pop	South & Central Valley: Urban/Rural

## Rank 2

The RC's with Rank 2 (The middle seven RC's in Indicator-3, Summary Statement 1-A, FFY 2012) have the following composition:

2 RC's are categorized as Urban/Rural  
 5 RC's are categorized as Urban  
 0 RC's are categorized as Rural

2 RC's are located in Northern California  
 5 RC's are located in Southern California

2 RC's are categorized as a large population area  
 5 RC's are categorized as a median population area  
 0 RC's is categorized as a small population area

1 RC's had a percentage of 30% or less of all children meeting Indicator 3 criteria  
 3 RC's had a percentage between 31% and 41% of all children meeting Indicator 3 criteria  
 3 RC's had a percentage of over 42%and 53% of all children meeting Indicator 3 criteria

Regional Center	Percent of total children meeting Indicator 3 Criteria	Population Size of Area Served	Area of Coverage
Orange County	45.6%	Lg Pop	South: Urban
East Bay	43.2%	Median Pop	North: Urban
San Gabriel / Pomona	40.3%	Median Pop	South: Urban
Frank Lanterman	43.4%	Median Pop	South: Urban
Harbor	30.1%	Median Pop	South: Urban
Alta	31.0%	Median Pop	North: Urban/Rural
North LA	37.6%	Lg Pop	South: Urban/Rural

### Rank 3

The RC's with Rank (The lowest seven RC's in indicator-3, Summary Statement 1-A, FFY 2012) have the following composition:

- 2 RC's are categorized as Urban/Rural
- 3 RC's are categorized as Urban
- 2 RC's are categorized as Rural

- 2 RC's are located in Northern California
- 1 RC is located in Northern/Central California
- 21 RC is located in Central California
- 1 RC's are located in Southern California

- 2 RC's are categorized as a large population area
- 0 RC's are categorized as a median population area
- 5 RC's is categorized as a small population area

- 3 RC's had a percentage of 30% or less of all children meeting Indicator 3 criteria
- 3 RC's had a percentage between 31% and 41% of all children meeting Indicator 3 criteria
- 1 RC's had a percentage of over 42%and 53% of all children meeting Indicator 3 criteria

Regional Center	Percent of total children meeting Indicator 3 Criteria	Population Size of Area Served	Area of Coverage
Westside	31.5%	Sm Pop	South: Urban
Redwood Coast	32.3%	Sm Pop	North: Rural
San Andreas	29.7%	Lg Pop	North & Central Valley: Urban/Rural
Golden Gate	19.4%	Sm Pop	North: Urban
Kern	44.9%	Sm Pop	Central Valley: Rural
San Diego	25.6%	Lg Pop	South: Urban/Rural
East LA	35.6%	Sm Pop	South: Urban

### Sample Size for Indicator Three

Indicator 3 data is gathered using a sample (percentage) of the total children being served by the RCs. This percentage is based on those children whose data was entered into the Early Start System and who met the criteria for inclusion. In FFY 2011, the number of children in our representative sample was 12,987.

Regional Center	Sample Size	Total Children * FFY 2012 618 data	Percent of total children meeting Indicator 3 Criteria	Population Size of Area Served	Area of Coverage
Westside	330	1049	31%	Sm Pop	South: Urban
Redwood Coast	73	226	32%	Sm Pop	North: Rural
San Andreas	596	2010	30%	Lg Pop	North & Central Valley: Urban/Rural
Golden Gate	226	1162	19%	Sm Pop	North: Urban
Kern	311	692	45%	Sm Pop	Central Valley: Rural
San Diego	704	2749	26%	Lg Pop	South: Urban/Rural
East LA	421	1184	36%	Sm Pop	South: Urban
Orange County	1268	2782	46%	Lg Pop	South: Urban
East Bay	683	1580	43%	Median Pop	North: Urban
San Gabriel / Pomona	653	1619	40%	Median Pop	South: Urban
Frank Lanterman	569	1312	43%	Median Pop	South: Urban
Harbor	511	1697	30%	Median Pop	South: Urban
Alta	534	1723	31%	Median Pop	North: Urban/Rural
North LA	1041	2768	38%	Lg Pop	South: Urban/Rural
South Central	636	1219	52%	Median Pop	South & Central Valley: Urban/Rural
Central Valley	629	2046	31%	Lg Pop	Central Valley: Urban /Rural
North Bay	356	959	37%	Sm Pop	North: Rural
Valley Mountain	649	1571	41%	Median Pop	North: Urban/Rural
Inland Counties	1468	3386	43%	Lg Pop	South: Urban/Rural
Far Northern	181	587	31%	Sm Pop	North: Rural
Tri-Counties	1148	2384	48%	Lg Pop	South & Central Valley: Urban/Rural
<b>Total</b>	12987	34705			

Ranking - Regional Center FFY 2012					
Regional Center	State Rank	Child Meeting Indicator 3 Criteria	Total Children * FFY 2012 618 data	Summary Statement 1 Social / Emotional	Above or below State Average 43.3%
Westside	3	330	1049	26.6%	-16.7%
Redwood Coast	3	73	226	28.3%	-15.0%
San Andreas	3	596	2010	30.0%	-13.3%
Golden Gate	3	226	1162	30.8%	-12.5%
Kern	3	311	692	33.5%	-9.8%
San Diego	3	704	2749	35.5%	-7.8%
East LA	3	421	1184	36.2%	-7.1%
Orange County	2	1268	2782	36.8%	-6.5%
East Bay	2	683	1580	37.9%	-5.4%
San Gabriel / Pomona	2	653	1619	39.1%	-4.2%
Frank Lanterman	2	569	1312	39.9%	-3.4%
Harbor	2	511	1697	40.0%	-3.3%
Alta	2	534	1723	40.3%	-3.0%
North LA	2	1041	2768	41.7%	-1.6%
South Central	1	636	1219	42.0%	-1.3%
Central Valley	1	629	2046	44.8%	1.5%
North Bay	1	356	959	50.0%	6.7%
Valley Mountain	1	649	1571	51.2%	7.9%
Inland Counties	1	1468	3386	58.8%	15.5%
Far Northern	1	181	587	62.6%	19.3%
Tri-Counties	1	1148	2384	64.3%	21.0%
Total	21	12987	34705		

\* Total Child Count **Green font** = large population; **Black font** = median populations; **Purple font** = small populations

# CA SSIP Taskforce

## FFY 2011 Ethnicity by Regional Center

Ethnicity by Regional Center FFY 2011																						
	ACRC	CVRC	ELARC	FDLRC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IRC	KRC	NBRC	NLACRC	RCEB	RCOC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPRC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Grand Total
Native Hawaiian											4											4
Samoaan							3			1		1	1				3			1		10
Thai				1			1				4		2		2			4				14
Laotian	1	4					1					4		1			1			3		15
Other Pacific Isle	4				3	3	3	1	1	4	2	1			5		2			3		32
Russian	13			1	1	6	1				9	1	2		1		5				1	41
Cambodian	1	1	2	5		1	10	3	1	1	1	7	1					1		15		50
Hmong	9	24		1	4	1		2				1		3	1					7		53
Japanese	5		2	3		5	11	4		1	3	4	6	1	15						2	62
Native American	9	7			8	1	2	7	10	5	2		1	10			5	2				69
Korean	7	1	4	42		6	9	1		1	6	7	41		7		6	7	2		3	150
Other Asian	12	4	10	3	1	13	32	10	5	4	24	38	37		19	1	5	16	1	12	2	249
Filipino	25	5	7	26		27	24	20	7	16	51	48	47	1	14	2	25	27	4	16		392
Asian Indian	50	12	1	12		13	16	10	2	5	19	86	46	1	102	1	8	12		13	3	412
Chinese	15	3	75	17		72	7	14		2	8	110	38	1	70		16	62	2	4	2	518
Vietnamese	14		11	2		4	3	17	1	5	7	26	320		107		18	9	1	8		553
Multiple	31	16	17	4	32	24	6	144	10	21	30	5		1	16		123	92	37	58		667
Missing	48	67	19	46	2	34	86	50	35	103	96	258		3	2	38	33	43	8	112		1083
Black or Afr Am	111	59	10	27	8	36	149	163	47	49	142	192	27	6	12	203	61	48	4	116	97	1567
Other	61	16	5	3	2	62	81	30	6	9	287	33	543	3	248	8	14	19	7	12	298	1747
Unknown	154	62	62			209	58	938	14	38	53	3	84	7	25	7	1237	1	1131	171	18	4272
White	675	382	45	372	477	249	281	459	211	318	553	296	759	131	382	12	364	132	270	368	235	6971
Hispanic	397	1171	845	620	77	419	683	1140	425	333	1303	513	1255	49	906	898	643	1081	922	580	350	14610
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1642</b>	<b>1834</b>	<b>1115</b>	<b>1185</b>	<b>615</b>	<b>1185</b>	<b>1467</b>	<b>3013</b>	<b>775</b>	<b>916</b>	<b>2605</b>	<b>1634</b>	<b>3210</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>1934</b>	<b>1170</b>	<b>2569</b>	<b>1556</b>	<b>2389</b>	<b>1499</b>	<b>1011</b>	<b>33542</b>

**FFY 2012 Ethnicity by Regional Center**

Ethnicity by Regional Center FFY 2012																						
	ACRC	CVRC	ELARC	FDLRC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IRC	KRC	NBRC	NLACRC	RCEB	RCOC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPRC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Grand Total
Guamanian				1						1												2
Native Hawaiian		2									2	1							1			6
Laotian	2	4				2	2										1			2		13
Samoan	2				1	1	5						2		1	1	1				1	15
Thai	1		2			2	1	1			3		3		2		1	2				18
Other Pacific Isle	3	1			1	4	5		1	1	3	6	1		7		1	1		4		39
Russian	19			3	1	3					6		1		2		12				1	48
Hmong	10	21		3	7									2	1					7		51
Cambodian	1	1		12		1	11	2	1	2	1	3	3			1		2		15		56
Japanese	7		4	2		2	13				1		7		12		1	4	1	1	1	56
Native American	2	8	1		16	3	2	6	9	2	4	1	2	8			1		1		1	67
Korean	5	1	6	53	1	5	21	1			8	9	39		8		3	5	1	1	1	168
Other Asian	12	10	22	4	2	9	38	12	7	6	20	42	42		42	2	5	26	1	16	3	321
Filipino	25	6	14	27	1	26	46	17	2	7	42	37	34	1	10		31	28	4	17		375
Asian Indian	57	11		6		14	29	4	2	7	11	91	46		137		3	7	1	16	4	446
Vietnamese	14		19	4		3	9	7		3	8	25	244	1	107		15	11	1	2	1	474
Chinese	14	4	69	16	1	93	11	16		7	8	110	33		55		17	66	5	3	8	536
Multiple	52	13	24	5	24	42	103	100	8	12	26	9			14		105	40	23	46	4	650
Missing	31	59	6	68	7	37	14	47	31	127	52	220	1		2	41	23	123	9	113	22	1033
Black or Afr Am	127	70	13	43	15	33	191	162	54	49	133	183	27	6	3	220	58	50	3	123	89	1652
Other	49	38	13	24	5	62	69	26	3		349	30	460		290	9	25	26	6	27	228	1739
Unknown	219	95	81	1		140	30	1764	3	56	14	9	88	20	22	13	1514	5	1180	163	2	5419
White	706	437	36	354	414	242	299	346	184	336	605	281	660	134	325	12	339	140	230	398	299	6777
Hispanic	365	1265	874	686	91	438	798	875	387	343	1472	523	1089	54	970	920	593	1083	917	617	384	14744
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1723</b>	<b>2046</b>	<b>1184</b>	<b>1312</b>	<b>587</b>	<b>1162</b>	<b>1697</b>	<b>3386</b>	<b>692</b>	<b>959</b>	<b>2768</b>	<b>1580</b>	<b>2782</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>1219</b>	<b>2749</b>	<b>1619</b>	<b>2384</b>	<b>1571</b>	<b>1049</b>	<b>34705</b>

**DIAGNOSIS**

**FFY 2011 & FFY 2012 Diagnosis by Regional Center**

2011 Diagnosis Intellectual Disability (Formerly MR)							
Regional Center	Positive Social-emotional Skills, Including Social Relationships					Total Children Assessed	Summary 1
	a did not improve	b improved not nearer to same-aged peers	c improved nearer to same-aged peers	d improved to level comparable to same-aged peers	e maintained a level comparable to same-aged peers		
Alta	20.00%	66.67%	3.33%	3.33%	6.67%	30	7.14%
Central Valley	16.67%	66.67%	0.00%	16.67%	0.00%	6	16.67%
East Bay	20.00%	73.33%	0.00%	0.00%	6.67%	15	0%
East LA	11.76%	58.82%	0.00%	23.53%	5.88%	17	25%
Far Northern	7.14%	71.43%	14.29%	7.14%	0.00%	14	21.43%
Frank Lanterman	12.77%	61.70%	10.64%	10.64%	4.26%	47	22.22%
Golden Gate	66.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3	0
Harbor	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	0
Inland Counties	6.52%	52.17%	0.00%	26.09%	15.22%	46	30.77%
Kern	10.00%	85.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.00%	20	0
North Bay	16.67%	66.67%	0.00%	16.67%	0.00%	6	16.67%
North LA	0.00%	77.78%	11.11%	11.11%	0.00%	9	22.22%
Orange County	13.79%	68.97%	0.00%	3.45%	13.79%	29	4
San Andreas	0.00%	85.71%	0.00%	14.29%	0.00%	7	14.29%
San Diego	22.34%	70.21%	4.26%	2.13%	1.06%	94	6.45%
San Gabriel / Pomona	14.00%	70.00%	4.00%	10.00%	2.00%	50	14.29%
South Central	16.00%	72.00%	4.00%	8.00%	0.00%	25	12%
Tri-Counties	25.00%	37.50%	0.00%	25.00%	12.50%	16	28.57%
Valley Mountain	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2	0
Westside	20.00%	60.00%	0.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10	11.11%
Averages	15.47%	66.37%	3.59%	9.42%	5.16%		13.71%
Total Counts	69	296	16	42	23	446	

2012 Diagnosis Intellectual Disability (Formerly MR)							
Regional Center	Positive Social-emotional Skills, Including Social Relationships						
	a did not improve	b improved not nearer to same- aged peers	c improved nearer to same-aged peers	d improved to level comparable to same- aged peers	e maintained a level comparable to same- aged peers	Total Children Assessed	Summary 1
Alta	19.05%	52.38%	4.76%	14.29%	9.52%	21	21.05%
Central Valley	14.29%	85.71%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	7	0%
East Bay	0.00%	70.00%	10.00%	20.00%	0.00%	10	30%
East LA	8.33%	58.33%	8.33%	16.67%	8.33%	12	27.27%
Far Northern	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	2	50%
Frank Lanterman	9.80%	82.35%	3.92%	1.96%	1.96%	51	6%
Golden Gate	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1	100%
Harbor	40.00%	60.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5	0%
Inland Counties	15.22%	50.00%	8.70%	26.09%	0.00%	46	34.78%
Kern	16.67%	83.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6	0%
North Bay	33.33%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3	0%
North LA	13.64%	68.18%	9.09%	4.55%	4.55%	22	14.29%
Orange County	7.14%	57.14%	7.14%	21.43%	7.14%	14	30.77%
San Andreas	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2	50%
San Diego	31.58%	62.11%	2.11%	2.11%	2.11%	95	4.3%
San Gabriel / Pomona	13.64%	65.91%	4.55%	15.91%	0.00%	44	20.45%
South Central	0.00%	60.00%	20.00%	0.00%	20.00%	5	25%
Tri-Counties	9.09%	45.45%	0.00%	27.27%	18.18%	11	33.33%
Westside	80.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	5	0%
Averages	18.78%	62.43%	5.25%	10.22%	3.31%		16.00%
Total Counts	68	226	19	37	12	362	

**2011 Diagnosis  
Cerebral Palsy**

Regional Center	Positive Social-emotional Skills, Including Social Relationships						Total Children Assessed	Summary 1
	a did not improve	b improved not nearer to same-aged peers	c improved nearer to same-aged peers	d improved to level comparable to same-aged peers	e maintained a level comparable to same-aged peers			
Alta	6.25%	62.50%	0.00%	18.75%	12.50%	16	21.43%	
Central Valley	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	2	50%	
East Bay	0.00%	71.43%	0.00%	14.29%	14.29%	7	16.67%	
East LA	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1	0%	
Far Northern	33.33%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3	0%	
Frank Lanterman	0.00%	77.78%	0.00%	11.11%	11.11%	9	12.5%	
Golden Gate	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1	0%	
Harbor	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	1	100%	
Inland Counties	4.65%	41.86%	0.00%	18.60%	34.88%	43	28.57%	
Kern	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	3	0%	
North Bay	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1	0%	
North LA	20.00%	40.00%	0.00%	40.00%	0.00%	5	40%	
Orange County	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1	0%	
San Andreas	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	3	33.33%	
San Diego	19.05%	76.19%	4.76%	0.00%	0.00%	21	4.76%	
San Gabriel / Pomona	9.09%	63.64%	0.00%	9.09%	18.18%	11	11.11%	
South Central	0.00%	71.43%	0.00%	0.00%	28.57%	7	0%	
Tri-Counties	15.38%	30.77%	0.00%	38.46%	15.38%	13	45.45%	
Valley Mountain	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	4	0%	
Westside	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	3	33.33%	
Averages	9.03%	56.13%	0.65%	16.13%	18.06%		20.47%	
Total Counts	14	87	1	25	28	155		

2012 Diagnosis Cerebral Palsy								
Regional Center	Positive Social-emotional Skills, Including Social Relationships						Total Children Assessed	Summary 1
	a did not improve	b improved not nearer to same-aged peers	c improved nearer to same-aged peers	d improved to level comparable to same-aged peers	e maintained a level comparable to same-aged peers			
Alta	15.38%	46.15%	0.00%	23.08%	15.38%	13	27.27%	
Central Valley	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	3	66.67%	
East Bay	0.00%	75.00%	0.00%	12.50%	12.50%	8	14.29%	
East LA	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1	0%	
Frank Lanterman	7.14%	71.43%	0.00%	7.14%	14.29%	14	8.33%	
Harbor	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	3	0%	
Inland Counties	6.82%	43.18%	0.00%	40.91%	9.09%	44	45%	
North Bay	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%	3	50%	
North LA	0.00%	87.50%	12.50%	0.00%	0.00%	8	12.5%	
Orange County	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1	0%	
Redwood Coast	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1	0%	
San Andreas	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1	0%	
San Diego	18.52%	59.26%	3.70%	11.11%	7.41%	27	16%	
San Gabriel / Pomona	11.11%	66.67%	0.00%	22.22%	0.00%	9	22.22%	
South Central	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	1	0%	
Tri-Counties	0.00%	50.00%	10.00%	40.00%	0.00%	10	50%	
Westside	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1	0%	
Averages	9.46%	55.41%	2.03%	23.65%	9.46%		28.36%	
Total Counts	14	82	3	35	14	148		

2011 Diagnosis Epilepsy							
Regional Center	Positive Social-emotional Skills, Including Social Relationships						
	a did not improve	b improved not nearer to same-aged peers	c improved nearer to same-aged peers	d improved to level comparable to same- aged peers	e maintained a level comparable to same- aged peers	Total Children Assessed	Summary 1
Alta	0.00%	83.33%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%	6	0%
Central Valley	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1	0%
East Bay	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	3	0%
East LA	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1	0%
Far Northern	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1	0%
Frank Lanterman	25.00%	50.00%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%	4	25%
Inland Counties	4.00%	68.00%	0.00%	12.00%	16.00%	25	14.29%
Kern	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1	0%
North Bay	33.33%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3	0%
North LA	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	1	100%
Orange County	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1	0%
San Andreas	25.00%	75.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4	0%
San Diego	9.09%	90.91%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	11	0%
San Gabriel / Pomona	9.09%	63.64%	0.00%	18.18%	9.09%	11	20%
Tri-Counties	25.00%	25.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	8	50%
Valley Mountain	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	1	0%
Westside	0.00%	75.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	4	0%
<b>Averages</b>	<b>9.30%</b>	<b>67.44%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>12.79%</b>	<b>10.47%</b>		<b>14.29%</b>
<b>Total Counts</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>86</b>	

2011 Diagnosis Autism								
Regional Center	Positive Social-emotional Skills, Including Social Relationships						Total Children Assessed	Summary 1
	a did not improve	b improved not nearer to same- aged peers	c improved nearer to same- aged peers	d improved to level comparable to same- aged peers	e maintained a level comparable to same- aged peers			
Alta	34.07%	41.76%	5.49%	6.59%	12.09%	91	13.75%	
East Bay	23.73%	37.29%	23.73%	5.08%	10.17%	59	32.08%	
East LA	32.14%	14.29%	7.14%	32.14%	14.29%	28	45.83%	
Far Northern	20.00%	20.00%	60.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5	60%	
Frank Lanterman	26.74%	39.53%	25.58%	8.14%	0.00%	86	33.72%	
Golden Gate	66.67%	16.67%	0.00%	16.67%	0.00%	6	16.67%	
Harbor	83.33%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6	0%	
Inland Counties	24.62%	27.69%	24.62%	7.69%	15.38%	65	38.18%	
Kern	50.00%	29.17%	4.17%	8.33%	8.33%	24	13.64%	
North Bay	5.26%	52.63%	21.05%	15.79%	5.26%	19	38.89%	
North LA	21.74%	46.38%	11.59%	11.59%	8.70%	69	25.4%	
Orange County	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4	0%	
Redwood Coast	37.50%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%	8	0%	
San Andreas	43.75%	31.25%	12.50%	6.25%	6.25%	16	20%	
San Diego	34.44%	40.00%	12.78%	5.00%	7.78%	180	19.28%	
San Gabriel / Pomona	50.00%	27.59%	17.24%	1.72%	3.45%	58	19.64%	
South Central	34.78%	39.13%	17.39%	8.70%	0.00%	23	26.09%	
Tri-Counties	26.09%	34.78%	13.04%	13.04%	13.04%	23	30%	
Valley Mountain	31.58%	39.47%	10.53%	10.53%	7.89%	38	22.86%	
Westside	56.52%	17.39%	8.70%	8.70%	8.70%	23	19.05%	
Averages	32.85%	36.46%	14.80%	7.94%	7.94%		24.71%	
Total Counts	273	303	123	66	66	831		

2012 Diagnosis Autism								
Regional Center	Positive Social-emotional Skills, Including Social Relationships						Total Children Assessed	Summary 1
	a did not improve	b improved not nearer to same- aged peers	c improved nearer to same- aged peers	d improved to level comparable to same- aged peers	e maintained a level comparable to same- aged peers			
Alta	29.41%	47.06%	11.76%	3.53%	8.24%	85	16.67%	
Central Valley	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4	50%	
East Bay	18.75%	31.25%	28.13%	12.50%	9.38%	32	44.83%	
East LA	23.08%	38.46%	15.38%	11.54%	11.54%	26	30.43%	
Far Northern	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	1	0%	
Frank Lanterman	50.68%	34.46%	7.43%	5.41%	2.03%	148	13.1%	
Golden Gate	30.00%	40.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10	22.22%	
Harbor	33.33%	44.44%	11.11%	11.11%	0.00%	9	22.22%	
Inland Counties	33.33%	29.63%	25.93%	7.41%	3.70%	54	34.62%	
Kern	20.00%	80.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5	0%	
North Bay	20.00%	46.67%	20.00%	13.33%	0.00%	15	33.33%	
North LA	25.40%	39.68%	11.11%	17.46%	6.35%	63	30.51%	
Redwood Coast	66.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3	0%	
San Andreas	9.09%	63.64%	18.18%	0.00%	9.09%	11	20%	
San Diego	37.63%	41.24%	8.25%	6.19%	6.70%	194	15.47%	
San Gabriel / Pomona	32.91%	34.18%	16.46%	10.13%	6.33%	79	28.38%	
South Central	25.00%	25.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	8	50%	
Tri-Counties	11.11%	55.56%	5.56%	5.56%	22.22%	18	14.29%	
Valley Mountain	10.53%	47.37%	15.79%	5.26%	21.05%	19	26.67%	
Westside	60.00%	20.00%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	5	20%	
Averages	33.84%	39.29%	12.80%	7.60%	6.46%		21.82%	
Total Counts	267	310	101	60	51	789		

2011 Diagnosis Other Developmental Disability								
Regional Center	Positive Social-emotional Skills, Including Social Relationships							
	a did not improve	b improved not nearer to same- aged peers	c improved nearer to same- aged peers	d improved to level comparable to same- aged peers	e maintained a level comparable to same- aged peers	Total Children Assessed	Summary 1	
Alta	20.00%	55.00%	5.00%	5.00%	15.00%	20	11.76%	
Central Valley	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2	0%	
East Bay	5.77%	34.62%	3.85%	13.46%	42.31%	52	30%	
East LA	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	6	0%	
Frank Lanterman	0.00%	60.00%	0.00%	40.00%	0.00%	5	40%	
Golden Gate	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%	33.33%	3	50%	
Inland Counties	7.79%	16.88%	5.19%	24.68%	45.45%	77	54.76%	
Kern	12.28%	26.32%	1.75%	24.56%	35.09%	57	40.54%	
North Bay	0.00%	25.00%	25.00%	50.00%	0.00%	4	75%	
North LA	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2	50%	
Redwood Coast	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	2	0%	
San Andreas	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	3	0%	
San Diego	11.11%	33.33%	0.00%	44.44%	11.11%	9	50%	
San Gabriel / Pomona	0.00%	57.14%	0.00%	14.29%	28.57%	7	20%	
South Central	0.00%	50.00%	25.00%	0.00%	25.00%	4	33.33%	
Tri-Counties	20.00%	40.00%	0.00%	20.00%	20.00%	5	25%	
Valley Mountain	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	3	0%	
Westside	20.00%	80.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5	0%	
Averages	9.40%	32.71%	4.51%	19.17%	34.21%		36.00%	
Total Counts	25	87	12	51	91	266		

2012 Diagnosis Other Developmental Disability								
Regional Center	Positive Social-emotional Skills, Including Social Relationships						Total Children Assessed	Summary 1
	a did not improve	b improved not nearer to same-aged peers	c improved nearer to same-aged peers	d improved to level comparable to same-aged peers	e maintained a level comparable to same-aged peers			
Alta	12.50%	37.50%	0.00%	31.25%	18.75%	16	38.46%	
Central Valley	11.11%	11.11%	22.22%	11.11%	44.44%	9	60%	
East Bay	8.62%	12.07%	3.45%	20.69%	55.17%	58	53.85%	
East LA	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2	0%	
Frank Lanterman	11.11%	77.78%	0.00%	11.11%	0.00%	9	11.11%	
Golden Gate	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%	3	50%	
Harbor	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%	0.00%	40.00%	5	33.33%	
Inland Counties	2.17%	20.65%	2.17%	35.87%	39.13%	92	62.5%	
Kern	0.00%	35.71%	0.00%	35.71%	28.57%	14	50%	
North Bay	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	3	100%	
North LA	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2	0%	
Orange County	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1	0%	
San Andreas	25.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	4	0%	
San Diego	9.09%	45.45%	0.00%	18.18%	27.27%	11	25%	
San Gabriel / Pomona	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	1	100%	
South Central	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1	0%	
Tri-Counties	0.00%	30.00%	0.00%	30.00%	40.00%	10	50%	
Valley Mountain	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	2	0%	
Westside	33.33%	16.67%	16.67%	0.00%	33.33%	6	25%	
Averages	6.43%	25.70%	3.21%	26.91%	37.75%		48.39%	
Total Counts	16	64	8	67	94	249		

2011 Diagnosis Down Syndrome							
Regional Center	Positive Social-emotional Skills, Including Social Relationships						
	a did not improve	b improved not nearer to same- aged peers	c improved nearer to same- aged peers	d improved to level comparable to same- aged peers	e maintained a level comparable to same- aged peers	Total Children Assessed	Summary 1
Alta	6.25%	31.25%	0.00%	25.00%	37.50%	16	40%
Central Valley	4.17%	83.33%	0.00%	12.50%	0.00%	24	12.5%
East Bay	0.00%	75.00%	0.00%	8.33%	16.67%	12	10%
East LA	0.00%	70.00%	0.00%	10.00%	20.00%	10	12.5%
Far Northern	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2	0%
Frank Lanterman	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	25.00%	8.33%	12	27.27%
Golden Gate	0.00%	60.00%	0.00%	20.00%	20.00%	5	25%
Inland Counties	0.00%	38.10%	0.00%	30.95%	30.95%	42	44.83%
Kern	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5	0%
North Bay	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4	0%
North LA	25.00%	75.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4	0%
Redwood Coast	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	3	33.33%
San Diego	4.17%	79.17%	0.00%	12.50%	4.17%	24	13.04%
San Gabriel / Pomona	6.67%	66.67%	0.00%	26.67%	0.00%	15	26.67%
South Central	11.11%	66.67%	0.00%	22.22%	0.00%	9	22.22%
Tri-Counties	16.67%	25.00%	0.00%	16.67%	41.67%	12	28.57%
Valley Mountain	0.00%	85.71%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%	7	14.29%
Westside	0.00%	83.33%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%	6	0%
Averages	3.77%	62.74%	0.47%	17.92%	15.09%		21.67%
Total Counts	8	133	1	38	32	212	

2012 Diagnosis Down Syndrome							
Regional Center	Positive Social-emotional Skills, Including Social Relationships						
	a did not improve	b improved not nearer to same- aged peers	c improved nearer to same- aged peers	d improved to level comparable to same- aged peers	e maintained a level comparable to same- aged peers	Total Children Assessed	Summary 1
Alta	0.00%	57.14%	7.14%	21.43%	14.29%	14	33.33%
Central Valley	0.00%	71.43%	0.00%	19.05%	9.52%	21	21.05%
East Bay	0.00%	86.67%	0.00%	6.67%	6.67%	15	7.14%
East LA	0.00%	57.14%	0.00%	28.57%	14.29%	7	33.33%
Frank Lanterman	0.00%	90.91%	0.00%	9.09%	0.00%	11	9.09%
Golden Gate	0.00%	61.54%	0.00%	15.38%	23.08%	13	20%
Harbor	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2	0%
Inland Counties	1.69%	27.12%	0.00%	37.29%	33.90%	59	56.41%
Kern	0.00%	72.73%	0.00%	18.18%	9.09%	11	20%
North Bay	0.00%	75.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	8	0%
North LA	0.00%	93.10%	3.45%	0.00%	3.45%	29	3.57%
San Andreas	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	2	100%
San Diego	6.98%	74.42%	0.00%	4.65%	13.95%	43	5.41%
San Gabriel / Pomona	0.00%	46.15%	0.00%	38.46%	15.38%	13	45.45%
South Central	0.00%	86.67%	0.00%	13.33%	0.00%	15	13.33%
Tri-Counties	0.00%	53.33%	0.00%	40.00%	6.67%	15	42.86%
Valley Mountain	0.00%	57.14%	0.00%	42.86%	0.00%	7	42.86%
Westside	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	3	0%
Averages	1.39%	63.19%	0.69%	19.44%	15.28%		23.77%
Total Counts	4	182	2	56	44	288	