Assessing and Improving SSIP Data Quality to Support SSIP Results

Handout 1 – Principles in Action in the SSIP

Definition of principle	Principle applied to the SSIP
Timely data are current per a specific period of time	• Up-to-date data are collected for the period of SSIP activities • Data are collected at intervals allowing for assessment of SSIP progress
Accurate data are consistent across time, methods, and locations (reliable) and represent what they intend to measure (valid)	• Evaluation measures align with the theory of action and are shown to have reliability and validity • Processes are in place for accurate data collection, entry, verification, and storage • Analysis methods are appropriate for the type of data identified and questions being answered
Complete data represent the expected population and subgroups	• Data are collected at the relevant levels of student, family, provider, district, state • Data are representative of the groups exposed to the coherent improvement strategies
Secure data are collected and stored with due consideration to maintaining confidentiality and with electronic and physical protections consistent with the sensitivity of the data	• SSIP data are collected, managed, stored, transmitted, used, reported, and destroyed in ways that preserve privacy and confidentiality of students, families, providers, etc. • Agencies have appropriate data-sharing agreements with third parties, such as external evaluators
Accessible data are readily available in formats that are understandable, user-friendly, and practical	• SSIP data are available to relevant decisionmakers in formats they can use • Evaluation data are disseminated to stakeholders on an ongoing basis and in a user-friendly manner
Usable data support decisionmaking for sound management, strong governance, and improvement of results for children and youth with disabilities and their families	• Data allow comprehensive analyses that assess progress toward achieving intended improvements, including building infrastructure and achieving short-term and intermediate outcomes necessary for achieving the SiMR • Data meaningfully inform next steps in the SSIP implementation

Handout 2 – Group Discussion

Data Quality Issue	Primary Principle Involved	Potential Solution
IEP data needed for the evaluation are generated at the school level, then collected by the LEAs, then transferred to the state team. The process is completed in fall after the year the IEPs are created.	**Timely.** The data are not current for the specific period of time needed. Since the data are not available until the next school year, the state is not able to assess quality or monitor progress during the implementation year.	
A baseline assessment of practitioner knowledge was conducted after the professional training program started.	**Accurate.** Although the data may be consistent across time, methods, and locations (reliable), they do not represent what they intend to measure, so they lack validity. Baseline data should reflect the situation prior to the intervention or training.	
Parents are asked to complete a survey but few (average 13%) provide responses.	**Complete.** The data do not represent the expected population or subgroups. Since so few parents respond to the survey, their answers cannot reasonably be expected to represent the views or opinions of most parents.	
LEAs send sensitive student information to the state evaluation team using email, but attached files are not password-protected.	**Secure.** These data are not being treated with due consideration to maintaining confidentiality and with electronic and physical protections consistent with the sensitivity of the data. Unprotected emailed files do not sufficiently guard confidentiality or sensitive information.	
LEAs provide student demographic and outcome data for the evaluation, but the datasets are in different formats (Excel, SPSS, Word tables) and the labeling in the data files is not clear or consistent.	**Accessible.** The data are not readily available in formats that are understandable, user-friendly, or practical. Different formats make the data difficult to compile, and the state has difficulty making sense of the data files without clear, consistent labeling.	
To assess teachers' fidelity of implementation of a math intervention, the state examines data on teachers' perceptions of the recent training and student assessment data.	**Usable.** The data are not able to support decisionmaking for sound management, strong governance, and improvement of results for children and youth with disabilities.	

Handout 3 – Table Activity

Data Quality Issue	Primary Principle Involved	Potential Solution
Coaching logs needed for the evaluation are kept in schools, and the state has difficulty obtaining these records.		
Student outcome data are part of the evaluation plan, but statewide testing occurs only once a year. The evaluation plan calls for progress to be monitored at frequent intervals.		
The results of statewide student testing are part of the evaluation plan, but the test selected by the state has changed each year for the past few years.		
Statewide test results are part of the evaluation plan data, but special education student scores cannot be analyzed because student disability status is often missing in the dataset.		
The external evaluator collects parent surveys, including personal sensitive information, using an online data collection system that is not at a secure site and stores the information unencrypted on servers without updated antivirus protections.		
The numbers of students in different disability subtypes are too small for data to be analyzed by subtype, even though data from all students are collected.		

Data Quality Issue in My State	Primary Principle Involved	Potential Solution