

Fort Worth, TX
March 3-4, 2020Nashville, TN
March 31-April 1, 2020

#ii20

Partnering for Progress: Engaging Local Education Agencies to Improve the Quality of their Data
Questions to Review During Today's Hands-On Activity

These questions are derived from the IDEA Data Center (IDC) *Data Meeting Protocol* for use in today's hands-on Interactive Institutes activity. Please consult the [Data Meeting Toolkit](#) for the complete facilitation guide as well as the full list of questions you can use during data meetings.

Discuss **Observations** of the Data

- What do you see?
- What are your initial thoughts and reactions?
- Is this what you expected to see? If so, how does it match your expectations? If not, why not?
- What surprises you?
- Are there particular data that catch your attention?
- What do these data not tell you?
- What are the limitations of these data? What do you and other stakeholders need to keep in mind about the data as you review them?

Discuss **Interpretations** of the Data

- What thoughts or assumptions do these data confirm or contradict?
- Are there any limitations to your conclusions or interpretations?
- Are there any perspectives you have not considered?
- Do you need additional data to answer your question?

Discuss **Implications** of the Data

- What do the data tell you about current infrastructure and practice needs?
- What are the implications?
- What is the significance for the work?
- Do the data suggest that you do something different or maintain your current course of action?

Determine **Next Steps**

- What programmatic action items, such as changes, additions, or eliminations of programs or activities, do the data analysis and discussion call for?
- What changes, additions, or eliminations to policy can result from the analysis?
- If the group identified data quality issues, how will you improve data quality? Consider how you can leverage established data governance procedures.
- If additional data are needed, will you need to collect new data?

Indicator 1 – Part B Data Display Wizard – Hands-on activity

Enter the data to match

- The years or descriptions in the **blue boxes**
- The data in the **yellow boxes** as shown

First table with subtitle “Compare data against targets over time”

2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
3,812	3,725	3,912	3,862	3,725	3,478	3,199
4,812	4,665	5,199	5,202	5,121	4,974	4,800
79.2%	79.8%	75.2%	74.2%	72.7%	69.9%	66.6%
68.3%	69.0%	71.0%	71.5%	72.0%	72.5%	73.0%

Second table with subtitle “Compare categories against each other and targets”

- Enter the data to match the blue boxes
- Enter the data in the **yellow boxes** as shown

District 1 (Large City)	District 2 (Suburb)	District 3 (Rural)	District 4 (Small City)	District 5 (Suburb)	District 6 (Rural)	District 7 (Large City)
395	155	21	44	136	40	250
469	182	85	103	175	77	402
84.2%	85.2%	24.7%	42.7%	77.7%	51.9%	62.2%
73.0%	73.0%	73.0%	73.0%	73.0%	73.0%	73.0%

Third table with subtitle “Create a countable representation of frequency”

Enter the percentage in the yellow box as shown

Create a countable representation of frequency

Enter percentage here:

67%

Indicator 5 – Part B Data Display Wizard – Hands-on Activity

Enter the data below to match

- The years in the **blue boxes**
- The data in the **yellow boxes** as shown in this screenshot

FFY:

Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21

5(A) Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day

5(A) Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day

Year target:



2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
167,142	165,044	170,668	172,450	166,424	169,881	170,125
100,998	103,425	96,554	97,501	104,120	105,690	110,400
60.4%	62.7%	56.6%	56.5%	62.6%	62.2%	64.9%
65.3%	65.4%	65.5%	65.6%	65.7%	65.8%	65.9%

FFY:

Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21

5(B) Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day

5(B) Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day

Year target:

2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
167,142	165,044	170,668	172,450	166,424	169,881	170,125
24,021	22,899	23,965	21,854	22,655	30,841	31,045
14.4%	13.9%	14.0%	12.7%	13.6%	18.2%	18.2%
15.2%	15.3%	15.4%	15.5%	15.6%	15.7%	15.8%

FFY:

Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21

5(C) Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements

5(C) Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements

Year target:

2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
167,142	165,044	170,668	172,450	166,424	169,881	170,125
3,201	3,412	3,398	3,245	2,987	6,912	7,102
1.9%	2.1%	2.0%	1.9%	1.8%	4.1%	4.2%
2.0%	2.1%	2.2%	2.3%	2.4%	2.5%	2.6%



Fort Worth, TX
March 3-4, 2020

Nashville, TN
March 31-April 1, 2020

#ii20

Indicator 8 – Part B Data Display Wizard – Hands-on Activity

Enter the data shown below to match

- The years or descriptions in the **blue boxes**
- The data in the **yellow boxes**

(You will be entering data only in the first two tables but you also will review the Likert-scale data already included in the last table in the Wizard.)

First table with subtitle “Compare data over time”

2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
6,699	6,801	7,002	7,311	7,254	6,984	7,100
8,321	8,450	8,771	8,612	8,314	8,898	8,604
80.5%	80.5%	79.8%	84.9%	87.3%	78.5%	82.5%
79.0%	79.0%	82.0%	83.0%	84.0%	81.0%	81.0%

Second table with subtitle “Compare categories against each other and targets”

District 1	District 2	District 3	District 4	District 5	District 6	District 7
745	469	171	355	584	101	803
923	601	250	398	622	185	874
80.7%	78.0%	68.4%	89.2%	93.9%	54.6%	91.9%
81.0%	81.0%	81.0%	81.0%	81.0%	81.0%	81.0%



Fort Worth, TX
March 3-4, 2020

Nashville, TN
March 31-April 1, 2020

#ii20

Indicator 11 – Part B Data Display Wizard – Hands-on Activity

Enter the data shown below to match

- The years in the **blue boxes**
- The data in the **yellow boxes** shown in the screenshots.

First table with subtitle “Compare data against targets over time”

(Note: The **second table** with subtitle “Identify counts of children not evaluated within deadline” will automatically populate once data is entered in the first table.)

2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
15,997	16,229	16,125	16,542	16,921	16,998	17,550
14,875	15,665	15,879	16,013	16,845	16,901	17,013
93.0%	96.5%	98.5%	96.8%	99.6%	99.4%	96.9%
100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Third table with subtitle “Explore details”

Most common reasons for delay in evaluation:	Number of evaluations delayed for this reason
Paperwork not processed in a timely manner	250
Delay in getting parental consent	111
Excessive student absences	85
Weather delays	27
Other	64