Prepare for Impact!

W. Alan Coulter, Ph.D.
Human Development Center, LSUHSC
New Orleans, LA

3 Key Questions about RDA for Every Special Education Administrator
Thanks So Much

What a Privilege to be Have a Conversation with You
Why?
So what can we do? The experts recommend:

**Sit There**

- **Don’t Just Sit There**
- **Muscle Reminder**
- **Bone Reader**
- **Fat for Fitness**
OUR PURPOSE TODAY

What You Need to Know about Changes w/RDA & the Potential Impact on You!
Disclaimer

Alan is Not OSEP!

Adaptations were made from OSEP & other materials…
How Did We Get Here?

Context for RDA
39 Years of Special Education Law

Four Original Purposes of the Law

1. FAPE
2. Protect Rights
3. Provide Technical Assistance, and
4. to assess and assure the effectiveness of efforts to educate all children with disabilities”

a.k.a. – Accountability!
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”

IEP = Compliance

Ernest Boyer, 1979, p. 300.
Never Forget
There are More than
755+ Process Requirements in IDEA ’04 Regulations.
A Checklist Mentality

The Checkmark is NOT the Result!
Going to NonCompliance Jail?

Corrective Actions?
Settlement Agreements?
Independent Monitors?
I Should Have Checked that IEP More Carefully
Historic Focus

Procedural Compliance

Student Learning Outcomes
How Do We Know Special Education is Effective?
## Part 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>15:</td>
<td>Compliance Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:</td>
<td>Timely and Accurate Data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are the Basis of State Status Determinations (up to 2014)
<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>14</td>
<td>Postsecondary Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Resolution Session Agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mediated Agreements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meets Requirements
Needs Assistance
Needs Intervention

Source: www.ed.gov
States Aggregate Performance on Selected Compliance Indicators

Data Source: OSEP

Adapted from OSEP presentation
IDEA Part B State Determinations: 2007-14

Sources: 2007-13—IDEA Part B Annual Performance Report Compliance Data; 2014—IDEA Part B Annual Performance Report Compliance Data and Results Data, which includes EDFACTS (2012-13 School Year) and National Assessment of Educational Progress (2013 NAEP Results)
Success Was Being Realized
What Could Have Been in 2014 Before RDA

IDEA State Compliance Only: 2014

Source: 2014 IDEA Annual Performance Report Compliance Data

Data Source: OSEP
Never Forget

There are more than 755 Process Requirements in IDEA ’04 Regulations.

And even if You could be in Compliance with All 755,
You would have No Assurance of Results
What’s Missing
Time for a Shift
For too long we’ve been a compliance-driven bureaucracy when it come to educating students with disabilities,” said U.S. Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan.
“...Our national policy of ensuring equality of opportunity, full participation, independent living, and economic self-sufficiency for individuals with disabilities”

The Emphasis of I.D.E.A.
The Primary Focus of Federal and 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

Adapted from OSEP presentation
### 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 grade</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th grade</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th grade</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Range 87.9% to 23.5%

U.S. Total Graduation Rate for all Students with Disabilities = 63.55%

Data Source: OSEP
High School Graduation with a Regular Diploma.

The average state target was 72.8%. In 2011, 80% of states did not make their target.

States with Graduation Rates as low as 25% (Nevada) earn a “Meets Requirements" status determination rating.
Where IDEA (all Federal Programs) is Going
Shift the Balance

Student Learning Outcomes

Procedural Compliance
Shift the Balance

Student Learning Outcomes

Procedural Compliance
OSEP’s Purpose with Results Driven Accountability

Increasing Emphasis of Monitoring & Reporting Requirements toward:

✓ Determining whether Services to Children w/Disabilities are Effective in Improving the Educational & Functional Outcomes for Students,

+  

✓ While still Maintaining most of the Compliance Requirements
Remember This? Procedural Compliance Only

Not in 2014-15, or Ever Again

IDEA State Compliance Only: 2014

Source: 2014 IDEA Annual Performance Report Compliance Data

Data Source: OSEP
Vision for RDA

All components of an accountability system will be aligned in a manner that best support States in improving results for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities, and their families.

Adapted from OSEP presentation
Results Driven Accountability

State Status Determinations are Different Now
Procedural Compliance + Results

IDEA State Determinations Under Results Driven Accountability: 2014

Sources: IDEA Part B Annual Performance Report Compliance Data and Results Data, including ED Facts (2012-13 School Year) and National Assessment of Educational Progress (2013 NAEP Results)

Data Source: OSEP
## 2014 Rubric Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>85.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>92.73%</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>82.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>90.45%</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>80.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>90.23%</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>80.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>87.95%</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>85.23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from VA DoE presentation
IDEA Part B State Determinations: 2007-14

Shift Happens!

Sources: 2007-13—IDEA Part B Annual Performance Report Compliance Data; 2014—IDEA Part B Annual Performance Report Compliance Data and Results Data, which includes ED Facts (2012-13 School Year) and National Assessment of Educational Progress (2013 NAEP Results)
Any Questions So Far ?
How does RDA Affect You?
What Impact?

Preparing for What You Can Do
1. What Challenges do You See in Addressing RDA?
Critical Points

- Performance on Procedural Compliance in the past Several Years
- Performance on Results Measures in the past Several Years
- State’s SIMR & Your Performance
- Capacity to Support Staff in Improving Results
- Sustaining Procedural Compliance while Improving Results
Changes That Have Happened

State Level Applications
Revisions to Your State’s SPP & APR

The Revisions Guided by 3 Principles –

1. Aligned with the Principles of RDA, i.e., focus on what will most likely to impact improved educational results & functional outcomes

Unspoken Premise is...

Adapted from OSEP presentation
2. Reduced Reporting Burden

Only require Information Prescribed by Statute & Regulation, or Directly linked to Improved Educational Results & Functional Outcomes

Unspoken Premise is...

3. Maintaining Data Sources & Measures

Only Absolutely Needed for Reporting

Adapted from OSEP presentation
Revisions by OSEP for RDA include

Focus on 3 Results Indicators:
✓ Indicator #B1: Graduation Rates
✓ #B3: Assessment
✓ #B14: Post Secondary Outcomes

Attend to New Indicator:
✓ #17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)

Adapted from OSEP presentation
State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)

Comprehensive, Multi-Year Plan for Improving Results for Students, includes 3 Phases:

**Phase 1: FFY 2013-14**

(Reported in April, 2015)

✓ Data Analysis
✓ Identify **SIMR**
✓ Analyze **Infrastructure** to Support Improvement & Build Capacity
✓ Theory of **Action** (If-Then)
• Initiate Data Analysis
• Conduct broad Infrastructure Analysis
• Identify problem area

SSIP
Phase 1

SSIP
Phase 3

What is the Problem?

Why is this Happening?

How Well is the Solution Working?

What shall we do about it?

Implement Over Time

SSIP Phases 1 & 2

SSIP Phases 1 & 2

• Root Cause Analysis (inc. infrastructure)
  ID factors
  • For each factor, ID barriers & leverage points for improvement

• Search/evaluate evidence-based solutions
• Develop Action Steps
• Develop Theory of Action
• Develop Plan for Improvement

• Evaluation of progress annually
• Adjust plan as needed

Adapted from OSEP presentation
What are the Problems (Opportunities)?

SIMR - A Focus for Improvement

What’s a Pivotal Problem?

Theory of Action

Why’ We Will Do What we Do

In-Depth Data Analysis

In Depth Infrastructure Analysis

Data Analysis

Broad, Quantitative, & Qualitative

Infrastructure Analysis

Broad, Quantitative, & Qualitative
State-Identified Measureable Result – Part B

What are States working on?

- **Graduation**: AK, DC, FL, GA, MN, MT, NC, ND, NJ, PA, RMI, VA, WV
- **Reading/ELA**: AR, AS, AZ, CNMI, CO, CT, DE, FSM, GU, HI, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, LA, MI, MS, NE, NV, NM, NY, OH, OK, OR, Palau, SC, SD, TN, TX, VI, WA, WI, WY
- **Math**: KY, MD, ME, PR, RI, UT, VT
- **Reading and Math**: CA, MO
- **Early Childhood Outcomes**: MA, NH
- **Post-school Outcomes**: AL, BIE

Limited = 31 states
Broad = 25 states
??? = 3 states
Variations within SIMRs

• Child level variations
  • Disability category
  • Race/ethnicity
  • Gender
  • English learner
  • Poverty status
  • Grades/ages

• Variations in scope
  • Statewide versus focusing on a subset of districts or programs within the State
Any Questions So Far
To Address Your Success Gap, Find the Root Causes

- Two tools from the IDEA Data Center
Further Resources

- Tools are found at:
  - https://ideadata.org/resource-library/54611b49140ba0d8358b4569/
  - https://ideadata.org/resource-library/54611dfc140ba0cb398b4573/
- Are you interested in piloting these tools?
- Please provide feedback about the tools if you use them

Contacts:
- Tom Munk (TomMunk@westat.com),
- Nancy O’Hara (nancy.ohara@uky.edu),
- Cesar D’Agord (cdagord@wested.org) or
- Kristin Reedy (kreedy@wested.org)
Infrastructure – What Does it Look Like?

Structure & Processes

How do you assess/evaluate?
# Sustainability Rubric

A Tool to Help State Education Agencies Assess Their Current Efforts to Sustain Reform Strategies to Meet Student Achievement Goals

October 2013

## A. SEA Capacity

### 1. System Capacity > A. SEA Capacity

#### i. Align human capital decisions with priority goals and reforms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions to Consider</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Look-Fors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do all SEA staff members understand how their work supports the SEA's priority goals or reforms?</td>
<td>Individual staff and team goals are not aligned to the SEA's priority goals or reforms.</td>
<td>All staff in the SEA know how their individual goals align to the goals of their team but may not know how their goals align to the SEA's priority goals.</td>
<td>All staff in the SEA know how their individual goals align to priority goals; they also know how their work supports the SEA's priority reforms.</td>
<td>All staff members in the SEA demonstrate a thorough understanding of how their individual work and goals contribute to the agency's priority reforms and goals.</td>
<td>Staff can articulate how their work contributes to priority reforms and goals. Decisions to recruit, retain, promote and dismiss staff are grounded in the priority goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Systemic Improvement in the State Education Agency

A Rubric-Based Tool to

Develop and Implement the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)

Achieve an Integrated Approach to Serving All Students

Continuously Improve Practice in the SEA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential Indicators</th>
<th>I: No Development or Implementation</th>
<th>II: Limited Development or Partial Implementation</th>
<th>III: Mostly Functional Level of Development and Implementation</th>
<th>IV: Full Level of Implementation and Evidence of Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 SEA provides technical assistance aligned to SIMRs to improve outcomes for SWD</td>
<td>There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for providing technical assistance aligned to SIMRs to improve outcomes for SWD.</td>
<td>The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for providing technical assistance aligned to SIMRs to improve outcomes for SWD.</td>
<td>The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures for providing technical assistance aligned to SIMRs to improve outcomes for SWD.</td>
<td>The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for providing technical assistance aligned to SIMRs to improve outcomes for SWD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubric Score _____</td>
<td>Priority _____</td>
<td>Opportunity _____</td>
<td>Index _____</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BSCPC Presentation, 2015 Albuquerque
State Systemic Improvement Plan
What We Learned From Phase I and Expectations for Phase II

Source: Kavulic, 2015 – Albuquerque Institute
What We Learned

• States analyzed data from a variety of sources, including data collected outside of Parts C and B

• States identified concerns with data quality and additional data that they would like to collect

Source: Kavulic, 2015 – Albuquerque Institute
What We Learned

- States provided a lot of descriptive information on their infrastructure
- It was not always clear how States analyzed their infrastructure in relation to the SIMR
- Changes that States would need to make within their own infrastructure to support LEAs/EIS programs in implementing evidence-based practices were not always included

Source: Kavulic, 2015 – Albuquerque Institute
What We Learned

• Stakeholders were identified, but their involvement was not adequately described

• In Phase II, we want to see how States will be intentionally and meaningfully including stakeholders in the development, implementation and evaluation of their plan

Source: Kavulić, 2015 – Albuquerque Institute
What We Learned

• Development of the SSIP is an iterative process

• As you are developing the Phase II SSIP, you may realize that you need to analyze more data or components of your infrastructure or modify some of your coherent improvement strategies

• There is no end date nor start date to the different phases

Source: Kavulic, 2015 – Albuquerque Institute
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

Note: This is a State Plan - Not an LEA Plan

Adapted from OSEP presentation
Focus of Phase X 2

Building State capacity to support LEAs/EIS programs in implementing evidence-based practices that will lead to measurable improvement in the SIMR

• Builds on
  • Data and infrastructure analyses
  • Coherent improvement strategies
  • Theory of Action

Source: Kavulic, 2015 – Albuquerque Institute
Support for Local Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

How the State will support local implementation of evidence based practices to improve results

• Steps and activities to implement coherent improvement strategies
• How identified barriers will be addressed
• Responsibility for implementation
• Implementation with fidelity
• Resources needed
• Measuring expected outcomes
• Timelines

Source: Kavulic, 2015 – Albuquerque Institute
What We Learned

- **States did not report data specific to their infrastructure.**

- **In developing your Phase II SSIP, think about the changes that will need to be made within the State infrastructure and the type of data that is needed to enhance the infrastructure to support, improve, and sustain effective practice at the local level.**

Source: Kavulic, 2015 – Albuquerque Institute
What We Learned

• While States described other initiatives within the State, it was not always clear how the State would build off of these to meet the SIMR.

• In developing Phase II, consider how aligning with other initiatives can maximize impact, maintain momentum, and support sustainability.

Source: Kavulic, 2015 – Albuquerque Institute
Phase 1 Submitted on Time

But - Deadline Passed

Phase 1 Submitted on Time
SIMR - A Focus for Improvement

Support LEA Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

Evaluation Plan?

Adapted from OSEP presentation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential Indicators</th>
<th>I - No Development or Implementation</th>
<th>II - Limited Development or Partial Implementation</th>
<th>III - Mostly Functional Level of Development and Implementation</th>
<th>IV - Full Level of Implementation and Evidence of Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 The SSIP has an evaluation plan that includes data collection and analysis strategies</td>
<td>There is no formal SSIP evaluation plan that includes data collection and analysis strategies.</td>
<td>The SEA has developed a formal SSIP evaluation plan that includes data collection and analysis strategies.</td>
<td>The SEA has implemented a formal SSIP evaluation plan that includes data collection and analysis strategies.</td>
<td>The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the formal SSIP evaluation plan that includes data collection and analysis strategies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rubric Score _____  
Priority _____  
Opportunity _____  
Index _____
How is My State Education Agency Internally Aligned to Implement RDA?
How does RDA Affect You?
What Impact?
Preparing for What You Can Do
In Thinking about Your District

1. What Challenges do You See in Addressing RDA?
Critical Points

• Performance on Procedural Compliance in the past Several Years
• Performance on Results Measures in the past Several Years
• State’s SIMR & Your Performance
• Capacity to Support Staff in Improving Results
• Sustaining Procedural Compliance while Improving Results
2. What Resources do You Need in Addressing RDA?
Critical Points

• Resources You have Now to Emphasize Improving Results
• Identified Needs of Staff
• Data Sources to Measure and Visualize performance
• State’s Commitment to Continuing Professional Learning
• Costs to Sustain Gains Realized in Next few Years
3. What are the Public/Political Implications in Your Community for RDA?
Critical Points

• State’s Process to Determine LEA Status Determinations?
• State’s Process for Disseminating this Information to the Public, if at all?
• Current Local Stakeholder Involvement in Efforts to Improve Results
• Current Attitudes Towards Special Education
In Thinking about Your District

What are Opportunities & Accomplishments in your District on which You Can Build for Students w/ Disabilities?
Did We Cover What Was Promised?

✓ Well, Let’s Review
3 Sections for this Morning

1. **Context** – How We Got to this Point in Special Education
2. Results Driven Accountability – A **Shift** in Emphasis
3. Preparing for Impact - What **You** Can Do
Do We Have Time?
Impact is Coming!
Somewhere Over Your State
It’s Been a Pleasure
See You in Future with Better Results
How to Contact Alan?

W. Alan Coulter, Ph.D.

acoulter@lsuhsc.edu