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Background and Overview

• Shift from compliance-driven data to emphasis on results-driven accountability (RDA)

• Compliance data are hard and fast; results-driven data can be harder to pin down.

• This topical burst provides an overview of how to use compliance data for program improvement.
Results-Driven Accountability

Three Components:

1. **State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Reports** (SPP/APR), which measure results and compliance. States are currently developing State Systematic Improvement Plans (SSIPs) designed to improve outcomes in targeted areas.

2. **Determinations**, which reflect state performance on results, as well as compliance.

3. **Differentiated monitoring and support** for all states, but especially low-performing states.
Core Principles of RDA

Principle 1: *Involves partnership with stakeholders*

Principle 2: *Is transparent and understandable to educators and families*

Principle 3: *Drives improved results*

Principle 4: *Protects children and families*

Principle 5: *Includes differentiated incentives and supports to states*

Principle 6: *Encourages states to target resources and reduces burden*

Principle 7: *Is responsive to needs*
Compliance Indicators

- Compliance indicators include Indicators 4b, 9-13.
- OSEP sets the targets.
- Target for Indicators 9 and 10 is 0%.
- Remaining compliance indicators are 100%.

Results Indicators

- Results indicators include Indicators 1-3, 4a, 5-8, 14, 15-16, and 17 (SSIP).
- The state sets targets for results indicators.
Part B Compliance Indicators

- **I-4b: Suspension & Expulsion.** % of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy

- **I-9: Disproportionate Representation in Special Education.** % of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups due to inappropriate identification

- **I-10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories.** % of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification

- **I-11: Child Find.** % of children evaluated within 60 days or state timeframe

- **I-12: Part C to B Transition.** % of children found Part B eligible with IEP implemented by 3rd birthday

- **I-13: Secondary Transition with IEP Goals.** % of youth ages 16+ with measurable, annual IEP goals & appropriate transition assessment, services, and courses
Results Indicators

• I-1: Graduation Rate. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma
• I-2: Dropout Rate. % of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school
• I-3: Assessment Data. (a) % of districts meeting AYP targets, (b) Participation rate, (c) Proficiency rate
• I-4 a: Suspension & Expulsion. % of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs
• I-5: LRE Placement. % of children ages 6-21 with IEPs served (a) inside regular class 80% or more of day, (b) inside regular class less than 40% of day, (c) In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements
Results Indicators (cont.)

• I-6: Early Childhood Settings. % of children ages 3-5 with IEPS (a) receiving majority of special education and related services in regular early childhood program, (b) attending separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility

• I-7: Preschool Skills. % of preschool children ages 3-5 with IEPS with improved (a) positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); (b) acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and (c) use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

• I-8: Parental Involvement. % of parents who report that the school facilitated parent involvement
Results Indicators (cont.)

• I-14: Secondary Transition. % of youth with IEPs, no longer in school, (a) enrolled in higher education, (b) competitively employed, (c) enrolled in some other postsecondary education, training program, or other employment, within 1 year of leaving school

• I-15: Hearing Requests Resolved. % of hearing requests resolved through resolution session settlement agreements

• I-16: Mediation Agreements. % of mediations held resulting in mediation agreements

• I-17: State Systemic Improvement Plan. SPP/APR includes comprehensive, ambitious, achievable, multi-year SSIP, with Phase I analysis, Phase II plan, Phase III implementation and evaluation, with stakeholder involvement in all phases, for improving results for children with disabilities.
Interrelationships Between Compliance and Results Indicators
How to Move From Accountability to Program Improvement

- Leadership for Educational Improvement and Use of Data
- Tools for Generating Actionable Data
- Social Structures and Time Set Aside for Analyzing and Interpreting Data
- Professional Development and Technical Support for Data Interpretation
- Tools for Acting on Data
- Data-driven Decisionmaking as a Systemic Endeavor
• Conduct root cause analysis (including infrastructure) to identify contributing factors
• For each contributing factor, identify both barriers and leverage points for improvement

How well is the solution working?

What is the problem?

Why is it happening?

What shall we do about it?

SSIP
Phase I

SSIP
Phase I and II

SSIP
Phase III

• Evaluation of progress annually
• Adjust plan as needed
• Search/evaluate evidence-based solutions (Exploration Phase)
• Develop action steps (address barriers/use leverage points)
• Develop Theory of Action
• Develop Plan for Improvement (Implementation Framework)
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Implementation

A specified set of activities designed to put into practice an activity or program of known dimensions.
Implementation Science

- Usable Interventions
  - What is the evidence-based practice?

- Implementation Stages
  - Exploration
  - Installation
  - Initial implementation
  - Full implementation

- Implementation Drivers
  - Competency Drivers
  - Organization Drivers
  - Leadership Drivers
Implementation Science (cont.)

- Improvement Cycles
  - Plan
  - Do
  - Study
  - Act

- Implementation Teams
  - State
  - Regional
  - Local
  - Building
Connecting Compliance Data to Strategies to Improve Results

• Collect the Compliance Data
  • Make sure we are confident that data are:
    • Complete
    • Timely
    • Accurate

• Analyze the Data

• Interpret the Data
  • Areas of strength
  • Areas of need
  • Areas that need more investigation
Connecting Compliance Data to Strategies to Improve Results (cont.)

- Based on data, determine how to meet identified need(s) (State Identified Measurable Result—SIMR)
  - What evidence-based practice(s) could be used?
- Determine implementation plan
- Provide ongoing evaluation
What we focus on is what improves.
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