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Results Driven Accountability

Student Learning Outcomes

Procedural Compliance

Our Purpose Today

What You Need to Know About Changes Coming with RDA and the Potential Impact on You

Dr. Alan Coulter

- Over 25 years experience with U.S. OSEP and state DOEs and LEAs on accountability issues
- Served on the President’s Commission on Excellence in Special Education
- Director of Education Initiatives and an Associate Professor at the Louisiana State University Health Sciences and Human Development Center
- Director of the TIERS Group (Teams Intervening Early to Reach all Students)

4 Parts of this Webinar

1. Context – How We Got to this Point in Special Education
2. Results Driven Accountability – A Shift in Emphasis
3. All Aspects of RDA – What’s Happening Now
4. Preparing for Impact – What You Can Do
Part 1

How Did We Get Here?
Context for RDA

39 Years of Special Education Law

Four Original Purposes of the Law
1. “to assure that all children with disabilities have available to them... a free appropriate public education which emphasizes special education and related services designed to meet their unique needs”

Child Find Required
“all children residing in the State who are handicapped, regardless of the severity of their handicap, and who are in need of special education and related services are identified, located, and evaluated,...”

First 25 Years of IDEA

Prevalence of Disabilities in the U.S.

39 Years of Special Education Law

Four Original Purposes of the Law
2. “to assure that the rights of children with disabilities and their parents... are protected”
39 Years of Special Education Law

Four Original Purposes of the Law

3. “to assist States and Localities to provide for the educations of ALL children with disabilities”

4. “to assess and assure the effectiveness of efforts to educate all children with disabilities”

Monitoring Compliance

1978 - “The Office of Education will be looking at 6,000 to 7,000 IEPs in the next few months to see whether any problems are developing.”

Ernest Boyer, 1979, p. 300.

Technical Assistance & Dissemination
Projects Funded by the U.S. Department of Education

tadnet.org/pages/526-find-a-center

Never Forget

• There are More than 755 Process Requirements in IDEA ’04 Regulations.
A Checklist Mentality

Going to NonCompliance Jail?
- Corrective Actions?
- Settlement Agreements?
- Independent Monitors?

Historic Focus

IDEA-B: SPP Results Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Graduation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Drop out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Statewide Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Suspension and Expulsion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Educational Environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Preschool Educational Environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Preschool Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Parent Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Not Counted Towards Determination of Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Disproportionate Representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Disproportionate Representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Child Find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Early Childhood Transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Secondary Transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Compliance Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Postsecondary Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Resolution Session Agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Mediated Agreements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IDEA-B: SPP Compliance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Disproportionate Representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Disproportionate Representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Child Find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Early Childhood Transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Secondary Transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Compliance Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Timely and Accurate Data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are the Basis of State Status Determinations (up to 2014)
Procedural Compliance Works!

Child Find Works!

What Could Have Been before RDA
IDEA State Compliance Only: 2014

Never Forget
There are more than 755 process requirements in IDEA '04 regulations. Even if you could be in compliance with all 755, you would have NO ASSURANCE OF RESULTS.

What's Missing?
The Shift in Accountability

“For too long we’ve been a compliance-driven bureaucracy when it comes to educating students with disabilities,”

— U.S. Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan.

The Emphasis of I.D.E.A.

“...Our national policy of ensuring equality of opportunity, full participation, independent living, and economic self-sufficiency for individuals with disabilities”

The Primary Focus of Federal & State Monitoring activities shall be on –

• Improving Educational RESULTS and Functional OUTCOMES for all children with disabilities

  +

• Ensuring that States meet... the program requirements, with... emphasis on those most related to Improving Results

— 20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(2)

Percentage of public school students with a ‘proficient’ score, National Assessment of Educational Progress, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Students w/IEPs</th>
<th>Other students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reading</td>
<td>math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of 4th Grade Sw/Ds at or above Achievement Levels

% of 8th Grade Sw/Ds at or above Achievement Levels
OSEP’s Purpose with Results Driven Accountability

Increasing Emphasis of Monitoring & Reporting Requirements toward:

✅ Determining whether Services to Children with Disabilities are Effective in Improving the Educational & Functional Outcomes for Students,

+ While still Maintaining most of the Compliance Requirements
Results-Driven Accountability

State Status Determinations are Different Now

Procedural Compliance + Results
IDEA State Determinations Under Results Driven Accountability 2014

Revisions to Your State’s SPP & APR
The Revisions Guided by 3 Principles
1. Align with the Principles of RDA
   i.e., focus on what is most likely to impact improved educational results as well as functional outcomes

Revisions to Your State’s SPP & APR
2. Reduced Reporting Burden
   Only require Information Prescribed by Statute & Regulation, or Directly linked to Improved Educational Results & Functional Outcomes
3. Monitoring Data Sources & Measures
   Only absolutely Needed for Reporting

Revisions by OSEP for RDA include
Focus on 3 Results Indicators:
✓ #B1: Graduation Rates
✓ #B3: Assessment
✓ #B14: Post Secondary Outcomes
Attend to New Indicator:
✓ #17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)

State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)
Phase 1: FFY 2013-14
(Reported in February 2015)
✓ Data Analysis
✓ Identify SIMR
✓ Analyze Infrastructure
✓ Support Improvement & Build Capacity
✓ Theory of Action
**Indicator 17: SSIP**

**Phase 2: FFY 2014-15**
(Reported in February 2016)
- Infrastructure development
- Support Local Agency Implementation of Evidenced-Based Practices
- Evaluation Plan

**Phase 3: FFY 2015-16, 16-17, 17-18, 18-19**
- Results of Ongoing Evaluation & Revisions to SPP/APR

Data Source: OSEP

---

**What Are the Connections?**

- All Students access Instruction w/ Standards
- States, Locals, & Schools Accountable to Raise Performance & Close Gaps
- All Educators Evaluated, in part, on Improvements

**IMPROVED OUTCOMES FOR ALL STUDENTS**

---

**Part 3**

**Data Analysis**

Analyzing key data to select the state-identified measurable result for students with disabilities, and identifying root of low performance.

- Multiple data sources
- Disaggregated data
- Data Quality
- Compliance issue that present barriers
- Trends and patterns

---

**Alabama**

- **Reading**
  - Participation Rate: 99.69%
  - Proficiency Rate: 48.67%

- **Math**
  - Participation Rate: 99.54%
  - Proficiency Rate: 47.25%
Special Education Services, Alabama Department of Education

State Performance Plan - Annual Performance Report

Alabama Proficiency in Reading & Language Arts for Students w/IEPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alabama 2011 to 2012 ARMT Reading Proficiency Score Comparison

Idaho Graduation Rate

Data Source:
IDEA Section 618, Table 4-1. Students ages 14 through 21 with disabilities served under IDEA, Part B, who exited school

Graduated with Diploma
Grad Rates =         X 100
(Graduated with Diploma + Received a Certificate + Reached Maximum Age + Dropped Out)

Not included on denominator:
- Transferred to Gen Education;
- Moved and Known to Continue;
- Died

Special Education Graduation Rate

S. Education Graduation Rates 2009 to 2010

Source: Section 618 Data

Special Education Graduation Rate Trends (comparing 2005 to 2009)

Source: Section 618 Data
Special Education Graduation Rate Trends (comparing 2005 to 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>5-year trend Graduation Rate</th>
<th>National Rank 5-year trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Marian</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. and outlying</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>Lowest rank = 57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Information from RMI, FSM and Palau is not included on ESEA data tables.

Source: Section 618 Data

Infrastructure Analysis

Analyzing the capacity of the current system to support improvement and build capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain evidence-based practices.

- Components: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability.
- Involves: current state improvement plans, strengths of system, coordination, analysis of general education initiatives, decision making, and stakeholders

Oregon Department of Education Reorganization

Phase 1
State Identified Measurable Result

Describes the result our State wants to achieve based on the Data and Infrastructure analysis

- Focus is on student level outcomes, not process outcomes
- Clearly defines the result, narrowed down from indicator or indicator component
- Single result or cluster of results

States Must Declare
April 1, 2015

Phase 1

Data Analysis
State Identified Measurable Result

Coherent Improvement Strategies

Describes the improvement strategies on which our State will focus, that will lead to a measurable, child-based result.

- Data analysis leads to area of focus
- Must clearly define improvement area
- How will addressing the area improve results?
- Focus on local capacity

Alabama - In Project Closing the Gap feeder pattern implementation sites, 73.47% and 65.50% of students w/IEPs showed gains on STAR Assessments from Fall 2013 to Spring 2014.

Source: Evaluation Data analyzed by Evergreen Evaluation, Inc. Submitted through the Grant Performance report for the Alabama state personnel development grant, May 2014.
Alabama’s Regional Implementation of:

- Instructional Coaching
- Effective Co-Teaching and Co-Planning
- Safe and Civil Schools
- Content Expertise for Special Educators through linkages with ARI and AMSTI

= MEASURABLE RESULT

Theory of Action

Describes the general improvement strategies that will need to be carried out and outcomes that will need to be met to achieve our goals.

- Focuses on how and why the program will produce a change, using “if-then” statements to generate a logical explanation and reveal strategies and assumptions about how resources are to be used.

AI’s Theory of Action (Hypothesis)

If......then....

If...students with IEPs receive effective instruction in reading/language arts in their Least Restrictive Environment, and
If...students with IEPs receive appropriate secondary transition services and supports and exit high school prepared for college/career/adulthood in the 21st Century,
Then... students will be able to achieve positive post-school outcomes and engage in higher education and competitive employment opportunities.
How Does RDA Affect You?

In Thinking about Your District
What Challenges do You See in Addressing RDA?

Critical Points
Performance on Procedural Compliance in the past several years

Critical Points
Performance on Results Measures in the past several years

Critical Points
State’s SIMR & Your Performance

Critical Points
Capacity to Support Staff in Improving Results
Critical Points
Sustaining Procedural Compliance while Improving Results

In Thinking about Your District
What Resources do You Need in Addressing RDA?

Critical Points
Resources You have Now to Emphasize Improving Results

Critical Points
Identified Needs of Staff

Critical Points
Data Sources to Measure and Visualize performance

Critical Points
State’s Commitment to Continuing Professional Learning
Critical Points
Costs to Sustain Gains Realized in Next few Years

In Thinking about Your District
What are the Public Political Implications in Your Community for RDA?

Critical Points
State’s Process to Determine LEA Status Determinations

Critical Points
State’s Process for Disseminating this Information to the Public, if at all

Critical Points
Current Local Stakeholder Involvement in Efforts to Improve Results

Critical Points
Current Attitudes Towards Special Education
In Thinking about Your District

What are Opportunities & Accomplishments on which You Can Build in your District for Students with Disabilities?

Q & A

Anything else you want to add?

Thanks So Much for Your Time & Ideas

How to Contact Alan?

W. Alan Coulter, Ph.D.
acoulter@lsuhsc.edu

SPEDexpectations Fall 2014 Webinar Series

Julie Weatherly
Staying Out of Due Process in Special Education: Five Timely Do’s and Don’ts

Barry M. Prizant
Family Collaboration: An essential element for SPED Success

Alan Coulter
Prepare for Impact: 3 Key Questions About RDA for Every SPED Administrator

Watch the webinars at plearn.co/SPEDexpectations

PresenceLearning

The Lending Provider of

Live Online Therapy
Services for K-12 Students

Watch for our Winter/Spring Series “Special Agents of Change” with Dr. Frances Stetson, Trip Hawkins, Dr. Shari Robinson, Dr. Martha Burns