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About IDC

• The IDEA Data Center (IDC) is funded by the U.S. Department of Education’s Office of Special Education Programs to provide technical assistance to build capacity within states for collecting, reporting, and analyzing high-quality IDEA data.

• Julie, Cesar and Amy are members of IDC’s Disproportionality and Equity Workgroup.
Overview of Presentation

• Discuss the definition of success gaps
  – Compliance (disproportionality) and results

• Describe methods for calculating disproportionality

• Provide data on disproportionality and results at the national-level and for Tennessee

• Present a tool that can help districts/schools identify and address factors that result in success gaps
“(12)(A) Greater efforts are needed to prevent the intensification of problems connected with mislabeling and high dropout rates among minority children with disabilities.”

IDEA 2004
What is a Success Gap?

Differences or “gaps” in a variety of educational factors and outcomes that affect the likelihood of educational success for some groups of students compared to their peers

– Compliance (disproportionality)
  • Identification and/or placement for special education
  • Suspension/expulsion rates

– Results
  • Achievement
  • College and career preparation
  • Graduation rates
What is Disproportionality?

Overrepresentation of a particular racial or ethnic group in special education relative to their representation in a comparison group.
Federal Requirements for States

Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in...

- B9: special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification; and
- B10: specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.
Federal Requirements for States (continued)

• Step 1: Determine which districts meet the state’s definition of disproportionality
• Step 2: Determine if disproportionality is due to inappropriate identification through a review of policies, procedures and practices
Federal Requirements for States (continued)

States must collect and examine data for each of their districts annually to determine if significant disproportionality based on race or ethnicity is occurring with respect to the:

• Identification of children as children with disabilities, including identification of children with particular disabilities;

• Placement of children in particular educational environments; and

• Incidence, duration, and type of disciplinary actions, including suspensions/expulsions.
Methods for Calculating Disproportionality: Risk

- What percentage of White children receive special education and related services?

\[
\text{Risk} = \frac{\text{White cwd}}{\text{All White children}} = \frac{74}{627} = 0.1180
\]

- 11.8% of White children in the district receive special education and related services.
Methods for Calculating Disproportionality: Risk Ratio

• What is the risk for White children receiving special education and related services as compared to the risk for all other children?

Risk Ratio = \( \frac{Risk \ for \ White \ children}{Risk \ for \ all \ other \ children} = \frac{.1180}{.1076} = 1.097 \)

• White children in the district are 1.10 times as likely as all other children to receive special education and related services.
Methods for Calculating Disproportionality: Risk Ratio (continued)

Percentage of Hispanic children receiving special education compared to the percentage of all other children receiving special education.

Risk ratio = \( \frac{\text{Risk for Hispanic children}}{\text{Risk for all other children}} = \frac{0.09}{0.02} = 4.5 \)

- Children with disabilities
- Children without disabilities

- Hispanic: 91% (9%) vs. 98% (2%)
- All other children: 91% (9%) vs. 98% (2%)

- IDEA DATA CENTER
Methods for Calculating Disproportionality: Composition

• What percentage of children receiving special education and related services are Black or African American?

Composition = \frac{\text{Black or African American}}{\text{All}} = \frac{5}{102} = 0.049

• 5% of students receiving special education services are Black or African American.
Methods for Calculating Disproportionality: Difference in Composition

• What is the difference between the percentage of children receiving special education who are Black or African American and the percentage of enrolled children who are Black or African American?

Difference in composition = Black or African American cwd composition – Black or African American enrollment composition

= 4.90% - 3.12% = 1.78%

• The percentage of children receiving special education who are Black or African American is 1.78 percentage points higher than the percentage of enrolled children who are Black or African American.
Percentage of children receiving special education who are Hispanic compared to the percentage of enrolled children who are Hispanic.

Difference in composition = Hispanic cwd composition – Hispanic enrollment composition

= 9.0% - 2.0% = 7.0%
Factors When Calculating Disproportionality

• Thresholds
  – Depends on method

• Minimum cell sizes
  – What cell is included in the definition?
  – Size of cell

• Multiple years of data
Methodological Flexibility

• States have the flexibility to choose their own definitions of disproportionality
  – Methods for calculating disproportionality
    • Risk ratios, weighted risk ratios, alternate risk ratios, composition, E-formula, etc.
  – Thresholds for disproportionality (e.g., risk ratio thresholds of 2.0)
  – Minimum cell sizes
National Results for Indicator B9 in FY 2012

[Bar chart showing the percentage of districts with disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification for the years 2005-06 to 2012-13.]
National Results for Indicator B10 in FY 2012

Percentage of districts with disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>0.1 to 4.9%</th>
<th>5.0 to 9.9%</th>
<th>10% or greater</th>
<th>Not reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Risk Ratio Trends:
All Disabilities

Year
2006 (n=52) 2007 (n=51) 2008 (n=48) 2009 (n=39) 2010 (n=52) 2010 (n=52) 2012 (n=52)

Ratio to All Other Children
0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1 1.2 1.4

- Black or African American
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- White
- Hispanic/Latino
- Asian
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- Two or more races
Risk Ratios in 2012:
All Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Tennessee</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latino</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Risk Ratio Trends: Emotional Disturbance

Ratio to All Other Children

Black or African American
American Indian or Alaska Native
White
Hispanic/Latino
Asian
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
Two or more races

Year
2006 (n=52)
2007 (n=51)
2008 (n=48)
2009 (n=39)
2010 (n=52)
2011 (n=52)
2012 (n=52)
Risk Ratios in 2012:
Black or African American Emotional Disturbance

- 1.0 to 1.5
- 1.5 to 2
- Greater than 2
Risk Ratios in 2012:
White Emotional Disturbance

- 1.0 to 1.5
- 1.5 to 2
- Greater than 2

The map shows the risk ratios across different states, with varying shades indicating the ratio ranges.
Risk Ratios in 2012: Emotional Disturbance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Tennessee</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latino</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Risk Ratio Trends: Intellectual Disabilities

Ratio to All Other Children

Year
2006 (n=52), 2007 (n=51), 2008 (n=48), 2009 (n=39), 2010 (n=52), 2011 (n = 52), 2012 (n = 52)

- Black or African American
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- White
- Hispanic/Latino
- Asian
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- Two or more races
Risk Ratios in 2012: Intellectual Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Tennessee</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latino</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Risk Ratio Trends: Specific Learning Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Black or African American</th>
<th>American Indian or Alaska Native</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Hispanic/Latino</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006 (n=52)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 (n=51)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 (n=48)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 (n=39)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 (n=52)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 (n=52)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 (n=52)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Risk Ratios in 2012: Specific Learning Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Tennessee</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latino</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Risk Ratios in 2012:
Inside regular classroom less than 40% of day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Tennessee</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latino</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Risk Ratios in 2011: In-School and Out-of-School Suspensions/Expulsions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Tennessee</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latino</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions?
What is a Success Gap?

Differences or “gaps” in a variety of educational factors and outcomes that affect the likelihood of educational success for some groups of students compared to their peers

– Compliance (disproportionality)
  • Identification and/or placement for special education
  • Suspension/expulsion rates

– Results
  • Achievement
  • College and career preparation
  • Graduation rates
Achievement: Disaggregated Main NAEP Reading Scores, Grades 4 and 8, 2013, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

- With disabilities: 160.6 - 216.0
- English language learner: 165.7 - 220.4
- Hispanic: 193.3 - 242.9
- Black: 196.4 - 243.7
- Eligible for free or reduced lunch: 198.1 - 245.3
- All students: 199.9 - 248.5
- Not English language learner: 202.2 - 250.6
- Without disabilities: 205.9 - 255.4
- White: 214.0 - 261.2
- Asian/Pacific Islander: 214.9 - 265.4
- Not eligible for Free or reduced lunch: 227.3 - 271.2
2013 NAEP – 4th Grade Reading – Average Scale Scores

- White: National 231, Tennessee 227
- Black: National 205, Tennessee 201
- Hispanic: National 207, Tennessee 203
- Asian: National 237, Tennessee 240
- Am Ind/AK Nat: National 206
- Nat HI/Pac Islander: National 210
- Two or more races: National 225

* Reporting Standards not met
Achievement: Disaggregated NAEP Math Scores, Grades 4 and 8, 2013, Washington, DC

- White:
  - Without disabilities: 314.7
  - Eligible for free or reduced lunch: 277.0

- Hispanic:
  - Without disabilities: 261.8
  - Eligible for free or reduced lunch: 260.3

- Black:
  - Without disabilities: 252.7
  - Eligible for free or reduced lunch: 250.6

- Not English language learner:
  - Without disabilities: 262.3
  - Eligible for free or reduced lunch: 260.6

- English language learner:
  - Without disabilities: 234.6
  - Eligible for free or reduced lunch: 230.2

- With disabilities:
  - Without disabilities: 226.2
  - Eligible for free or reduced lunch: 228.6
2013 NAEP – 4th Grade Math – Average Scale Scores

**National** vs. **Tennessee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Tennessee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am Ind/AK Nat</td>
<td>228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat HI/Pac Islander</td>
<td>235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Reporting Standards not met
College and Career Preparation: Proportion of Students enrolled in SAT/ACT by Race/Ethnicity, 2011, Memphis City Schools, TN

District Enrollment

- Am In/ AK Nat: 0.4
- Black: 8.3
- Nat HI/Pac Isl: 1.4
- White: 0.1
- Asian: 0.1
- Hispanic: 7.4
- Two or More: 0.1

n = 107,485

SAT/ACT Enrollment

- Am In/ AK Nat: 0.1
- Black: 1.7
- Nat HI/Pac Isl: 0.6
- White: 0.6
- Asian: 4.5
- Hispanic: 6.6
- Two or More: 0.1

n = 9,188

Data Source: Civil Rights Data Collection
College and Career Preparation: Proportion of Students enrolled in SAT/ACT by Race/Ethnicity, 2011, Shelby County SD, TN

District Enrollment
- Am In/AK Nat: 4.8
- Black: 4.9
- Nat HI/Pac Isl: 1.4
- White: 0.3
- Asian: 0.2
- Hispanic: 0.5
- Two or More: 0.3

n = 46,698

SAT/ACT Enrollment
- Am In/AK Nat: 3.6
- Black: 4.6
- Nat HI/Pac Isl: 0.5
- White: 0.3
- Asian: 38.2
- Hispanic: 52.5
- Two or More: 0.3

n = 7,629

Data Source: Civil Rights Data Collection
Graduation Rates: Ratio of Diploma and Certificate of Completion to Total Secondary Enrollment, 2009, Memphis City Schools, TN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Certificate of Attendance or Completion</th>
<th>Diploma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SWD (IDEA-Eligible)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 72,520

Data Source: Civil Rights Data Collection
Graduation Rates: Ratio of Diploma and Certificate of Completion to Total Secondary Enrollment, 2009, Shelby County SD, TN

- Black: 12% Diploma, 0% Certificate
- Hispanic: 20% Diploma, 0% Certificate
- SWD (IDEA-Eligible): 2% Certificate, 20% Diploma
- White: 21% Diploma
- Total: 22% Diploma
- Asian or Pacific Islander: 25% Diploma
- LEP: 25% Diploma

Data Source: Civil Rights Data Collection
Why focus on success gaps?
Why focus on success gaps?

• AYP/AMO
• Focus School
• Priority School
• Disproportionate Representation
• Significant Disproportionality
• State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)
• Because we care about and believe in all of our students
Equity, Inclusion, and Opportunity

Addressing Success Gaps

Rubric

https://ideadata.org/resource-library/
Intended Audiences

• State departments of education
• Local school districts
• Schools
• TA providers, professional developers, & consultants working with districts and schools
• Other stakeholders concerned about equity issues in schools
• General Ed. and Special Ed.
Structure of the Document(s)

- Introductory research brief
- Self-assessment rubric
To address success gaps...

... look closely at equity, inclusion, and opportunity for children in the affected groups
Potential Root Causes (EIO)

- Data-based Decision Making?
- Instructional Program?
- Progress Monitoring, Universal Screening?
- Cultural Responsiveness?
- Evidence-based Interventions?

Examples of Success Gaps

- Black and Hispanic students are the lowest performing race/ethnicities in NAEP scores
- In some SDs districts across the country, black and other minority students are less likely to enroll on SAT/ACT
- Suspensions Rate is more than 2.5 times greater for Black SWD than all other SWD
- Black Students are 1.6 times more likely to be identified with IDs than other students
- SWDs and minority students are less likely to graduate with a regular diploma
- Sp. Ed. Identification Rate for Black and Nat Am SWDs is greater than other race/ethnicities
- Black Students are 1.6 times more likely to be identified with IDs than other students
- Black and Hispanic students are the lowest performing race/ethnicities in NAEP scores
- In some SDs districts across the country, black and other minority students are less likely to enroll on SAT/ACT
Investigate the root causes of your success gaps

Have you implemented these five elements?

• Data-based decision making
• Cultural responsiveness
• High-quality core instructional program
• Universal screening and progress monitoring
• Evidence-based interventions and supports
Data-Based Decision Making

• Use disaggregated data for decisions about
  – Curriculum and instructional programs
  – Academic and behavioral supports

• Make decisions about student interventions using multiple data sources, including
  – Screening
  – Progress monitoring
  – Formative and summative evaluation data
Cultural Responsiveness

• Recognize diversity across student ethnicity, language, and socio-economic status

• Provide training and resources so teachers can meet the linguistic needs of all students

• Include parents from all backgrounds in discussions about the school and about their children’s progress
Core Instructional Program

- Rigorous, consistent, and well-articulated K-12 instructional program, aligned with standards, delivered with fidelity
- Effective differentiation in the core curriculum
- Universal design for learning
- Informing parents in their native or home language about differentiation
Assessment

• Valid universal screening
• Progress monitoring for all students
• Informing parents in their native or home language about results
Evidence-Based Interventions and Supports

• Implemented with fidelity
• Instructional
• Behavioral
  – such as Positive Behavioral Supports or Restorative Justice
  – Tiered response protocols, not zero tolerance
• Informing parents in their native or home language about interventions and responses
1. Data-based Decision Making

Probing Questions:

Does our school or district identify data elements or quality indicators that are tracked over time to measure school effectiveness? What are those data elements? Are the data valid and reliable? Are data disaggregated by student demographics such as race/ethnicity, gender, disability, etc. to identify gaps in achievement and performance and trends with over- or under-representation in identification, placement, and discipline? Are data reviewed at regular intervals to determine progress or change? Are data used to make policy, procedure, and practice decisions in our school? How regularly do we use these data to inform our decisions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 1</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Partially Implemented</th>
<th>Implemented</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decisions about the school curriculum, instructional programs, academic and behavioral supports, and school improvement initiatives are based on data</td>
<td>Decisions about the school curriculum, instructional programs, academic and behavioral supports, and school improvement initiatives are rarely based on systematic data.</td>
<td>Some teachers and programs consistently use systematic valid and reliable data to inform decisions about curriculum, instructional programs, academic and behavioral supports, and school improvement initiatives.</td>
<td>The data used are valid and reliable. A schoolwide formalized and systematic process is in place to monitor and reinforce the continuous improvement of individual learners, subgroups of learners, initiatives, and programs within the school. It is implemented by some but not all staff.</td>
<td>The data used are valid and reliable. The schoolwide process for data-based decision making is implemented and evident for all students and subgroups of students, in all classrooms, and is used in decisions about school initiatives or programs, as well.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is the evidence to support your rating?
To address success gaps...

Step One - Recognize the need for change in your school’s or district’s current practices and policies because you have identified a group of students who are experiencing success gaps.

Step Two - Identify the root causes of the problem.

Step Three - Make the changes that address those root causes.
How to Address Success Gaps

1. Form a team
2. Study the data
3. Conduct a self-assessment
4. Provide evidence
5. Consider the students first
6. Ensure equitable participation
7. Develop a plan of action
“Equity, inclusion and opportunity for all students is an important goal, but one that is not easily achieved.”
(EIO)
More About IDC

• Visit the IDC website at: http://ideadata.org/

• Follow us on Twitter: https://twitter.com/ideadatacenter
The contents of this presentation were developed under a grant from the U.S. Department of Education, #H373Y130002. However, the contents do not necessarily represent the policy of the Department of Education, and you should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government. Project Officers: Richelle Davis and Meredith Miceli
Questions?