# COSA Pre-Conference June 18, 2014

**Review of Oregon's Work in Special Education: Where is OSEP Going?**

Sarah Drinkwater, ODE
Assistant Superintendent

# Outcome for Today

- Review of State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report
- Review of Oregon's data
- New State Systemic Improvement Plan
- Results Driven Accountability
- Changes in resources for states

# Review of SPP/APR

- First State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report system began in 2005

- It was a 5-year plan that was extended for 2 additional years (2005-2012)

- The new SPP will combine the SPP and APR into one document

- Will cover period from 2013-2018

# Review of SPP/APR

- With reauthorization of IDEA (2004) states developed a performance plan to evaluate the state's implementation of Part B and Part C
- In addition, states were required to report to the public on the performance of each of its LEAs and early intervention programs according to the targets on the SPP

# What is the SPP?

- Currently it is a collection of performance (P) and compliance (C) indicators:
  - 20 indicators for Part B
  - 14 indicators for Part C

  Data is collected through the work of school districts and early intervention service programs (SPR&I; other data submitted to ODE each year)

## Targets and Data

| Part C Indicator | FFY 2010 Targets % | FFY 2010 Actual % | FFY 2011 Targets % | FFY 2011 Actual % | FFY 2012 Targets % | FFY 2012 Actual % (Draft) | FFY 2013 Target % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Timely IFSP Services (C) | 100.0 | 96.5 | 100.0 | 95.3 | 100.0 | 94.7 | 100 |
| 2. Services in Natural Environments (P) | 80.0 | 94.4 | 80.0 | 95.9 | 80.0 | 97.0 | 80.0 |
| 3. EC Outcomes (P) 1: Increased Rate of Growth A. Pos S-E Skills B. Use of Know. & Skills C. Use Approp. Behaviors | A. 80.9 B. 63.7 C. 64.4 | A. 81.7 B. 58.4 C. 64.9 | A. 80.9 B. 63.7 C. 64.4 | A. 83.6 B. 58.8 C. 64.6 | A. 81.4 B. 64.2 C. 64.9 | No data available yet | A. 81.4 B. 64.2 C. 64.9 |
| 2: Functioning Age Expectations A. Posit. S-E Skills B. Use of Know. & Skills C. Use Approp. Behaviors | A. 59.1 B. 7.3 C. 18.1 | A. 58.4 B. 10.7 C. 16.4 | A. 59.1 B. 7.3 C. 18.1 | A. 61.0 B. 9.1 C. 15.9 | A. 59.4 B. 7.6 C. 18.4 | | A. 59.4 B. 7.6 C. 18.4 |
| 4. Parent Involvement (P) A. Know Rights B. Communicate Needs C. Help Child Develop | A. 86.0 B. 85.0 C. 90.0 | A. 72.0 B. 72.0 C. 72.0 | A. 86.0 B. 85.0 C. 90.0 | A. 84.5 B. 81.0 C. 94.8 | A. 86.0 B. 85.0 C. 90.0 | A. 77.0 B. 72.0 C. 84.0 | A. 86.0 B. 85.0 C. 90.0 |
| 5. Child Find - Birth to 1 (P) | 0.62 | 0.62 | 0.63 | 0.76 | 0.64 | 0.75 | .64 |
| 6. Child Find - Birth to 3 (P) | 2.0 | 2.08 | 2.1 | 2.14 | 2.2 | 2.24 | 2.2 |
| 7. 45-day Timeline (C) | 100.0 | 99.8 | 100.00 | 99.6 | 100.0 | 99.7 | 100.0 |
| 8. Timely Transition from Part C to B (C) A. Transition Plan B. Transition Notification C. Transition Conference | A. 100.0 B. 100.0 C. 100.0 | A. 99.3 B. 100.0 C. 94.0 | A. 100.0 B. 100.0 C. 100.0 | A. 98.5 B. 100.0 C. 94.9 | A. 100.0 B. 100.0 C. 100.0 | A. 100.0 B. 100.0 C. 95.1 | A. 100.0 B 100.0 C. 100.0 |
| 9. Correction of Non-Compliance (C) | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | Removed next year |
| 12. Resolution Settlements (P) | NA | None | NA | None | NA | None | NA |
| 13. Mediation Agreements (P) | NA | None | NA | None | NA | None | NA |
| 14. Accurate and Timely Data (C) | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | No data available yet | 100.0 |

## Targets and Data

| Part B Indicator | FFY 2010 Targets % | FFY 2010 Actual % | FFY 2011 Targets % | FFY 2011 Actual % | FFY 2012 Targets % | FFY 2012 Actual % (Draft) | FFY 2013 Targets % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Graduation with Regular Diploma (P) | 4 yr => 65.0<br>5 yr => 70.0 | 4 yr => 41.8<br>5 yr => 46.7 | 4 yr => 67.0<br>5 yr => 72.0 | 4 yr => 42.2<br>5 yr => 46.8 | 4 yr => 67.0<br>5 yr => 72.0 | No data available yet | **4 yr =>67.0**<br>**5 yr =>72.0** |
| 2. Drop Out (P) | =< 3.6 | 4.6 | =< 3.6 | 4.3 | =< 3.5 | No data | **=>3.5** |
| 3. Assessment (P)<br>A. % of Districts meeting AYP for Disability Subgroup AMO<br>B. Statewide Assessment Participation rate—Reading<br>B. Statewide Assessment Participation rate—Math<br>C. Proficiency Rate—Math AMO<br>C. Proficiency Rate – Reading AMO | A. 14.0<br><br>B. 95.0<br><br>B. 95.0<br><br>C.70.0<br><br>C. 70.0 | A. 8.5<br><br>B. 98.4<br><br>B. 98.1<br><br>C. 31.1<br><br>C. 51.0 | A. 15.0<br><br>B. 95.0<br><br>B. 95.0<br><br>C. 80.0<br><br>C. 80.0 | A. 1.7<br><br>B. 98.4<br><br>B. 98.1<br><br>C. 29.9<br><br>C. 40.9 | A. 16.0<br><br>B. 95.0<br><br>B. 95.0<br><br>C. 90.0<br><br>C. 90.0 | No data available yet | **A. 16.0**<br><br>**B. 95.0**<br><br>**C. 95.0**<br><br>**D. 90.0**<br><br>**E. 90.0** |
| 4. A. Rates of Suspension & Expulsion (P) | Max 9.7 | 13.2 | Max 8.7 | 8.6 | Max 7.7 | No data available yet | **Max 7.7** |
| B. Susp & Expulsion – Race/Ethnicity (C) | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | No data available yet | **0.0** |
| 5. LRE for School Age (P)<br>A. In Regular Ed 80% or more<br>B. In Regular Ed Less than 40%<br>C. Enrolled in Higher Ed….. | A. 70.0<br>B. 10.8<br>C. 2.0 | A. 70.8<br>B. 10.7<br>C. 1.5 | A. 70.0<br>B. 10.8<br>C. 2.0 | A. 71.8<br>B. 10.7<br>C. 1.3 | A. 70.0<br>B. 10.8<br>C. 2.0 | A. 72.6<br>B. 10.8<br>C. 1.4 | **A. 70.0**<br>**B. 10.8**<br>**C. 2.0** |
| 6. ECSE Services w/ Typically Developing Peers (P)<br>A. Reg EC program<br>B. Separate Special Education Class | | | A. 0.0<br>B. 0.0 | A. 32.7<br>B. 25.6 | A. 35.0<br>B. 24.6 | A. 32.5<br>B. 25.2 | **A. 35.0**<br>**B. 24.6** |
| 7. Preschool Outcomes (P)<br>1: Increased Rate of Growth<br>A. Pos S-E Skills<br>B. Use of Know. & Skills<br>C. Use of Approp. Beh<br><br>2: Functioning Age Expectations<br>A. Pos S-E Skills<br>B. Use of Know. & Skills<br>C. Use of Approp. Beh | A. 74.3<br>B. 60.5<br>C. 44.8<br><br>A. 32.5<br>B. 23.6<br>C. 31.7 | A. 80.2<br>B. 54.3<br>C. 43.5<br><br>A. 29.0<br>B. 21.3<br>C. 29.2 | A. 74.3<br>B. 60.5<br>C. 44.8<br><br>A. 32.5<br>B. 23.6<br>C. 31.7 | A. 81.2<br>B. 53.6<br>C. 42.0<br><br>A. 32.9<br>B. 23.8<br>C. 31.1 | A. 74.8<br>B. 61.0<br>C. 45.3<br><br>A. 32.8<br>B. 23.9<br>C. 32.0 | No data available yet | **A. 74.8**<br>**B. 61.0**<br>**C. 45.3**<br><br>**A. 32.8**<br>**B. 23.9**<br>**C. 32.0** |

| Part B Indicator | FFY 2010 Target % | FFY 2010 Actual % | | FFY 2011 Target % | FFY 2011 Actual % | | FFY 2012 Targets % | FFY 2012 Actual % (Draft) | | FFY 2013 Targets % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8. Parent Involvement (P) ECSE (EC) School Age (SA) | EC = 66.0 SA = 41.0 | EC = 39.6 SA = 33.4 | | EC = 66.0 SA = 41.0 | EC = 46.6 SA = 34.7 | | EC = 66.0 SA = 41.0 | EC = 35.8 SA = 40.1 | | EC = 66.0 SA = 41.0 |
| 9. Disp Rep due to Inappropriate id (C) | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | No data available yet | | 0.0 |
| 10. Disp Rep due to Inappropriate id (by disability category) (C) | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 |
| 11. Child Find – Timely Evaluation (C) | 100.0 | 97.3 | | 100.0 | 98.6 | | 100.0 | 98.4 | | 100.0 |
| 12. Timely Transition from Part C to B (C) | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 |
| 13. Transition Goals & Services (C) | 100.0 | 81.5 | | 100.0 | 80.3 | | 100.0 | No data available yet | | 100.0 |
| 14. Postsecondary Outcomes (P) A. Enrolled in Higher ED B. Enrolled in Higher ED or competitively employed C. Enrolled in Higher Ed or other…… | A. 25.0 B. 51.0 C. 67.0 | A. 25.3 B. 54.1 C. 67.7 | | A. 26.0 B. 52.0 C. 68.0 | A. 25.1 B. 55.3 C. 71.8 | | A. 27.0 B. 53.0 C.69.0 | No data available yet | | A. 27.0 B. 53.0 C. 69.0 |
| 15. Correction of Non-Compliance (C) | 100.0 | 97.7 | | 100.0 | 99.8 | | 100.0 | No data available yet | | Removed next year |
| 18. Resolution Settlements (P) | 29.5 | 0.0 | | 29.5 | 0.0 | | 29.5 | 0.0 | | 29.5 |
| 19. Mediation Agreements (P) | 88.0 | 90.5 | | 88.0 | 89.5 | | 88.0 | 82.9 | | 88.0 |
| 20. Accurate and Timely Data (C) | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | No data available yet | | 100.0 |

# Part B Indicators (School Age)

- B1: Graduation with a regular diploma (P)
- B2: Drop out rate (P)
- B3: Participation of students with disabilities in state-wide assessment (P)
- B4A: Suspension/Expulsion rates (P)
- B4B: Suspension/Expulsion –Race/Eth (C)
- B5: LRE Placement (P)
- B6: Preschool settings (P)

# Part B Indicators (cont)

- B7: Preschool skills (P)
- B8: Parent Involvement (P)
- B9: Disproportionate representation in special education (C-0%)
- B10: Disproportionate representation in sub categories (C-0%)
- B11: Childfind—60 day timeline (C-100%)
- B12: Part C to B transition by 3rd birthday (C-100%)

# Part B Indicators (cont)

- B13: Secondary transition 16 yrs (C-100%)
- B14: Post School Outcomes (P)
- B15: Monitoring/correction of non-compliance (C-100%)
- B18: Resolution settlements (C around 100%)
- B19: Mediations (C-85% or so)
- B20: Accurate and timely data (C-100%)

# Part C Indicators

- C1: Timely IFSPs (C-100%)
- C2: Services in natural environments (P)
- C3: Child outcomes (P)
- C4: Family outcomes (P)
- C5: Childfind Birth-1 compared to national data (P)
- C6: Childfind 0-3 compared to national data (P)

# Part C Indicators (cont)

- C7: 45-day timeline for IFSPs (C-100%)
- C8: EC transition by 3$^{rd}$ BD (C-100%)
- C9: Monitoring/corrections of non-compliance (C-100%)
- C12: Resolution settlements (P)
- C13: Mediations (P)
- C14: Accurate and timely data (C-100%)

# Proposed SPP/APR with State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)

- Current SPP/APR system focused heavily on statutory and regulatory compliance, with limited focus on results for students with disabilities
- OSEP has proposed a multi-year State Systemic Improvement Plan focused on improving results for student with disabilities
- SSIP will include broad strategies with detailed improvement activities
- Compliance will still be monitored

# Proposed 2013-2018 SPP/APR

- OSEP has included 17 indicators for the 2013-2018 SPP/APR:
  - Graduation (P)
  - Dropout rates (P)
  - Participation in state-wide assessments (P)
  - Suspension/Expulsion: A is (P) & B is (C)
  - LRE (P)
  - Preschool LRE (P)
  - Preschool outcomes (P)
  - Parent involvement (P)

# Proposed SPP/APR (cont)

- Disproportionate representation (C)
- Disproportionate representation in disability categories (C)
- Evaluation timelines (C)
- Preschool transition (C)
- Secondary transition (C)
- Post School Outcomes (P)
- Resolution sessions (P)
- Mediations (P)
- SSIP (P)

# SSIP

- SSIP is the only new indicator focusing on long-range improvements in special education
- Two Phases
- Phase I (submitted with SPP/APR 2015)
  - Data analysis
  - Identification of focus for improvement
  - Infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity
  - Theory of action

# SSIP (cont)

- Phase II (submitted with SPP/APR 2016)
  - Infrastructure development
  - Support for LEAs
  - Implementation of evidence-based practices
  - Evaluation plan

# Components of RDA

- State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) measures results and compliance.
- Determinations reflect State performance on results, as well as compliance.
- Differentiated monitoring and technical assistance supports improvement in all States, but especially low performing States.

# Results Driven Accountability

- OSEP's vision:

- All components of an accountability system will be aligned in a manner that best support States in improving results for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities, and their families

# OSEP's Theory of Action

- Vision: All infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities will achieve improved educational results and functional outcomes. : All infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities will receive individualized services in natural settings

# If OSEP…

… Provides guidance in a timely and responsive manner

…Communicates its vision effectively

… Engages strategically with other ED programs, Federal agencies, States, grantees and outside organizations

… Provides differentiated resources and evidence-based information

# If OSEP (cont)

…Supports the development of effective personnel that support CWD

… Holds States and grantees accountable for clearly identified, measureable results

…Engages States in planning, assessment and evaluation

# Then…

- … States will have the information they need to align their activities to OSEP's vision
- …States will promote higher expectations for children with disabilities

# Then…(cont)

- … OSEP will more effectively leverage resources to improve services for children with disabilities
- OSEP will increase the reach and impact of its work
- … States have increased capacity to support LEAs and EIS providers to deliver effective interventions

# Then..(cont)

- …The number of effective personnel will increase
- … States put systems in place that lead to improved results for children with disabilities and protect the rights of children and families

# THEN…

- …States, LEAs and EIS providers will have higher expectations for CWD, will access resources to provide effective interventions and services to infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities.

# THEN…

- …All infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities will receive individualized services in natural settings and demonstrate improved educational results and functional outcomes.

# SSIP-Phase I-Analysis

- **Phase I**
- (submitted in 2015 with SPP/APR for 2013-14)
- Data Analysis;
- Identification of the Focus for Improvement;
- Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity; and
- Theory of Action

# Data Analysis

- Description of how State analyzed key data to determine area(s) for improvement


- ☐How were data disaggregated?
- ☐Concerns about data quality?

# Improvement Outcome

- How did the data analysis lead to the identification of the State's improvement outcome, e.g., improve performance on reading assessments?
- What broad strategies will the State implement to address this outcome and to build local capacity to improve outcomes, e.g., implement evidence-based early literacy practices?

# Infrastructure: Support Improvement and Build Capacity

- How the State analyzed its capacity to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs/EIS programs to implement, scale up, and sustain evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities
- Description should include governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data capacity, TA and accountability
- Coordinate with other State initiatives such as SIG, ESEA Flexibility, Child Care, Home Visiting

# Theory of Action

- A theory of action is at its core, a simple IF, THEN statement. "IF we adopt a new literacy program, THEN our students will be stronger readers and writers."

- A theory of action's strength lies in the specificity of thought that sets out the essential steps and checkpoints

- The SSIP theory of action should describe changes in the State system and local provider practices that must occur to achieve the State-identified, measurable improvement

# OSEP Support

- Our state liaisons and one additional OSEP staff will visit ODE August 20-22
- Provide technical assistance regarding the SSIP
- We will request specific assistance for Part C and Part B
- Will be helpful in preparing Phase I

# Other Changes

- Regional Resource Centers are being disbanded (grants are ending)
- We will miss the support from our Western Regional Resource Center (WRRC) housed at UO
- New grant proposal focusing on data integration and state-wide data systems

# Final Comments

- We welcome stakeholder input
- Student Services goal is to provide technical assistance to districts
- Building relationships – 3 regional visits (Roseburg, Pendleton, Redmond)
- 3 more regional visits in early fall (Hillsboro, Albany, Clackamas)
- Applying for three grants:
  - Project AWARE
  - School Climate Transformation
  - CEEDAR-Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability and Reform (Univ of Florida)