

**Improving Special Education Services (ISES)
Stakeholders Meeting
Discussion Group Recommendations
December 9, 2011**



California Department of Education, Special Education Division's special project, California Services for Technical Assistance and Training (CalSTAT) is funded through a contract with the Napa County Office of Education. CalSTAT is partially funded from federal funds, State Grants #H027A080116A. Additional federal funds are provided from a federal competitively awarded State Personnel Development Grant to California (#H323A070011) provided from the U.S. Department of Education Part D of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Opinions expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the position of the U. S. Department of Education.

Performance Data/SPP Indicators Discussion Group Notes

1. What additional data and hypotheses are needed?

- General
 - Make district's data, which is sent to the State, more reliable
 - Successful districts share data collecting/reporting process possibly via Webinars
 - Identify sources of indicator data
 - Ongoing assessments needed & used
 - Need for data meeting/sharing across agencies – clearing house for data collection
 - More TA for districts/ schools - Re: Special Ed data (Best practices)
 - Is there a way data systems can speak to each other?
 - Visual depiction of data a must.
 - What outcomes are students with disabilities getting regardless of placement settings?
 - What information is the Individualized Education Program (IEP) team utilizing in their decision-making process to ensure the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) compliant placement decisions?
- Indicator 3
 - Disaggregate by all proficiency levels by school and district, make data available
 - Accessing data
- Indicator 5
 - Why are the LRE benchmarks not being met?
- Indicators 6-8
 - Reliable data from State and Federally-funded Pre-K programs for children with disabilities and report in user-friendly ways
- Indicator 13
 - Train how to integrate timely & measurable transition goals into the IEP
 - Are transition competencies aligned with secondary transition training needs?
 - What is the definition of “Competitively employed” and “Higher Education”, e.g. What is the minimum hours worked and pay earned?; What is the minimum number of units earned to be considered “higher education”?

- Indicator 14
 - Disaggregate by disability

2. Based on trend data review, what needs and priorities surfaced?

- Targeting LRE (Indicators 5 and 6)
 - Reliable data
 - Do something with the data
- ELA & Math Proficiency –all levels, especially high school
- Secondary Transitions
 - Data related to IEP
 - School to career
 - IEP exit plan
- Sharing consistent and valid data across agencies
- At school and district level, TA & Professional Development for all administrators and teachers: general and special education
 - Data collecting systems
 - Analyzing own data
 - Utilizing the data
- Disproportionality
 - African American students
 - Clear definition of suspension & expulsion
 - Under-represented
- Cultural competence throughout all indicators –
- What does data show?
- What do we do about it? (RTI may be a solution. Who do the students belong to – Special Education only?)
 - Start early & sustain through to high school
 - At school and district level, TA and Professional Development to teach collaborative skills re: RTI

3. What kind of improvement activities do you suggest?

- LRE is driving force
- Data Process
 - Identify sources
 - Collect (consistent and reliable)
 - Analyze
 - Utilize data to improve instruction and learning
- TA in all levels of systems – State, SELPA, LEA, school
 - Using Best Practices
- TA needs to model
 - Systematic and integrated process
 - Sustained Focus

- Resources needed – focused, time, materials, staff
- Professional Development for ALL staff:
 - Teachers: General Education and Special Education
 - Administrators
 - Higher Learning – CTC, Universities, Community colleges
- Train on Frequent not calculated (NC)'s data
- Statewide IEP document to reduce NC
- Publish list of frequent NC
- Review school climate survey (Special Education supports module)

Compliance Discussion Group Notes

1. What additional data and hypotheses are needed?

- Need to disseminate noncompliant findings to general education
- Break out data by:
 - Year, grade (e.g. elementary, secondary, preschool), placement
 - Monitoring forms categories (e.g. school age, preschool, English Language Learners, secondary transition)
- Analysis data:
 - English Language Learners
 - Evaluation of change by cause, population size, and district size
- Review data from the California School Climate Survey

2. Based on trend data review, what needs and priorities surfaced?

No comments recorded.

3. What kind of improvement activities do you suggest?

No comments recorded.

Consumer Discussion Group Notes

1. What additional data and hypotheses are needed?

- Synthesize data to help make sense of it all
- Use qualitative data – how to effectively use it?
 - How might we better capture anecdotal information about positive experiences that families and children have?
- Parent surveys:
 - Who did **not** receive the surveys?
 - Who are we **not** hearing from?
 - If gaps, how to get better representation?
 - We do not have a random stratified data sample. Why? Do we need it?
 - Combine data from different surveys to see if there are similarities in compliance complaints Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs), Family Resources Centers (FRCs), etc.
- Describe the process for moving from data-informed identification of focus areas for State Performance Plan (SPP). We have data and then what?
- Create summary of what surveys are distributed listing audience and purpose.
- Create chart on surveys listing top three findings

2. Based on trend data review, what needs and priorities surfaced?

3. What kind of improvement activities do you suggest?

- Display data results from surveys in a user-friendly, easily understood manner
- Develop feedback system to the families that participated in a survey so those families would be more likely to participate in the future. This strategy could increase survey completion rates.