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Welcome!

- Introduction of Presenter and Professional Background
- Purpose and Objectives of the Workshop
- General Housekeeping
  - Sign – In
  - Reference Documents
  - Facilities
  - Electronic Devices
  - Workshop Time Frame
Workshop Goals

• Define disproportionate representation and identify the potential success gaps associated with the causes of disproportionate representation of minority students in our special education classrooms.

• Identify quality indicators associated with addressing success gaps among students and district data elements that inform these indicators.

• Review the Optional Data Collection tool to identify and address patterns of referral and placement of students.

• To utilize the Equity, Inclusion, and Opportunity Addressing Success Gaps Rubric to identify areas for focus including gaps in achievement, discipline, over identification and placement.
What is SWIFT?

**School Wide Integrated Framework for Transformation**
Utilizing Data to Address Disproportionality
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If NJDOE</th>
<th>Then</th>
<th>Then</th>
<th>Then</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides training and technical assistance on strategies for appropriate collection, analysis, interpretation and use of data to address success gaps that contribute toward the disproportionate representation of minority students in special education</td>
<td>...more schools will use the NJ Optional Data Collection Tool and Addressing Success Gap Rubric to analyze quality indicators that measure school effectiveness</td>
<td>...educators will focus on school improvement measures that support high quality instruction and inclusiveness for all students</td>
<td>...an increased percentage of students with IEPs will benefit from education in general education settings for a greater percentage of their school day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>...school leaders will use data that informs the improvement of quality indicators</td>
<td>...student accountability measures will demonstrate growth particularly for minority students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>...educators will correctly use data to reduce success gaps in quality indicators</td>
<td>...students are provided an education specific, responsive, and relevant to needs resulting in education success</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Equality & Social Justice

• Brown vs. Board of Education
• Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act
• Public Law 94-142
• Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
• No Child Left Behind (NCLB)
• Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEIA) Results Driven Accountability
Disproportionate Representation: What is it and why is it important for us to identify and address it?

A child miseducated is a child lost.
- John F. Kennedy
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What is Disproportionality?

Disproportionality is an over-representation in special education services, or under-representation of a particular racial or ethnic group in special or gifted education relative to the presence of this group in the overall student population. — National Association for Bilingual Education, 2002
Disproportionality

- Disproportionality exists in various forms:
  - National, state and district levels over-identification of students as disabled, or under identified as gifted/talented.
  - Over-representation can occur in classification, placement and suspension.
  - Under-representation can occur in intervention services, resources, access to programs and rigorous curriculum and instruction.
  - Higher incidence rates for certain populations in specific special education categories, such as cognitively impaired or emotionally handicapped.
  - Excessive incidence, duration, and types of disciplinary actions, including suspensions and expulsions experienced by minority students.
Why is Disproportionality a Concern?

- Services provided are not designed to meet student needs.
- Labeling a student tends to remain throughout school career.
- Lower expectations can lead to diminished academic and post-secondary opportunities.
- Students identified as disabled have a greater risk of dropping out.
- Students in special education programs may be educated separate from their typical peers and denied access to general education curriculum.
- Students identified as disabled are often stigmatized socially contributing to social emotional challenges.
- The over identification of students from minority populations can contribute to significant racial separation, because they are more likely to be placed in segregated classes.
- Students who are not disabled are treated as if they are.

CASE STUDY:
THE STORY OF JALEN

At your tables, read the case study and as a group, identify all the possible indicators that may have contributed to the identification and placement of Jalen in a class for the cognitively impaired. Be prepared to share.

NASP (2003). Portraits of the Children: Culturally Competent Assessment
Factors Contributing to Over-Identification and Disproportionality

- Discipline policies and practices
  - Suspension/Expulsion
- Lack of interventions and variable rates of referrals
- Limited opportunities to learn in the classroom
- Variability in assessment practices
- Differential access to educational opportunities
- Family and community
  - Detrimental views and interaction with families
- Teacher expectations and misconceptions
- Cultural biases
- District socio-demographics
“Title 1(A)(601)(C)(12)(A) Greater efforts are needed to prevent the intensification of problems connected with mislabeling and high dropout rates among minority children with disabilities.”
Federal Requirements

• The federal government monitors states on two performance indicators related to the disproportionate representation of minority students:

  **Indicator B9:** Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification; and

  **Indicator B10:** Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.
Federal Requirements

1. Determine which districts meet the state’s definition of disproportionality.
2. Determine if disproportionality is due to inappropriate identification through a review of policies, procedures and practices.
3. Data is collected annually to determine if significant disproportionality base on race of ethnicity occurs relate to:
   1. The identification of a child as a child with a disability; including particular disabilities.
   2. Placement of a child in separate educational environments; and
   3. Incidence, duration and type of disciplinary actions, including suspensions and expulsions.
Calculating Disproportionality

- States have the flexibility to choose their own definitions of disproportionality

- Methods for calculating disproportionality include: Risk ratios, weighted risk ratios, alternate risk ratios, composition, E-formula, etc.

- Thresholds for disproportionality (e.g., risk ratio thresholds of 2.0)
A relative risk GREATER than 1 means the risk is INCREASED for that population.

A relative risk of 1.0 means there is NO association between the risk factor and the population.

A relative risk LESS than 1 means the risk is decreased for that population.

Image recreated from: https://cpmc.coriell.org/genetic-education/understanding-risk
NJ Calculating Risk

• New Jersey formula for calculating risk was developed with assistance from the United States Office for Civil Rights and uses multiple measures to determine disproportionate representation.

• The measure includes three descriptive statistics
  • Unweighted risk ratio
  • Risk rate comparison
  • A measure of impact comparing expected vs. observed numbers of students identified as eligible for special education
  • The measures included a statistical test of significance – chi squared

• Districts are ranked on each of the three measures. Ranks for the three-year are totaled and those districts with the lowest ranks and an impact number of more than 25 students were identified as having disproportionate representation.
# National Patterns of Disproportionality

All Disabilities, age 6-21  (National Research Council Report)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Risk Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American:</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>1.2 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Am. Indian:</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>1.1 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White:</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>1.0 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic:</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>.9 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Pacific-Islander:</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>.4 times</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Patterns of Disproportionality

Mental Retardation (MR) Cognitively Impaired

**Composition:** 35% of Students served in the category of MR are African American; 17% of the overall student population is African-American

**Risk:** 2.6% of African Americans are served in the category of MR

**Odds Ratio:** Rate for African Americans is 2.4 times higher than that of White Students

No other groups are overrepresented in MR

National Patterns of Disproportionality

Emotional Disturbance (ED)

**Composition:** 26.4% of Students served in the category of ED are African American; 17% of the overall student population is African-American

**Risk:** 1.6% of African-American Students are served in the category of ED

**Odds Ratio:** Rate for African American Students is 1.6 times higher than that of White Students

≥No other group overrepresented in ED

National Patterns of Disproportionality

Learning Disabilities (LD)

**Composition:** 1.37% of Students with LD are Native American Indian; 1.1% of the overall student population is Native American Indian

**Risk:** 7.3% of Native American Indian Students are in LD

**Odds Ratio:** Native American Indian Students are 1.2 times more likely to be in LD than White Students

◆ No other group is overrepresented in LD

Reflection: LRE Data

- Review your district trend data and answer the following:

- Is there anything about your data that surprises you? Do you have any questions about the data? Are there any areas you would like to investigate further?
SUCCESS FOR ALL

REVIEW OF NATIONAL AND STATE SUCCESS GAPS
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Definition of Success Gap

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

Results Driven Accountability require states to address achievement gaps.

- Identification and/or placement in special education
- Suspension/Expulsion
- College and Career Preparation
- Graduation Rates
Racial and Ethnic Disparities

Roughly 9 percent of all 6- to 21-year-olds are placed in special education programs. Placement rates for American Indian (13.3 percent) and black (11.4 percent) students exceed the national average. Black students are diagnosed with intellectual disabilities and emotional disturbance at particularly high rates. Enrollment in special education services among Latino and white students mirrors the national average, a rate two times higher than for Asian students.

Disability Rates by Race (Ages 6-21)

- All students: 8.5%
- American Indian: 13.3%
- Black: 11.4%
- Latino: 8.5%
- White: 8.2%
- Asian: 4.2%

African-American Disability Incidence (as percent of national average)

- All disabilities
- Intellectual disability
- Emotional disturbance
- Specific learning disability
- Other health impairment
- Visual disability
- Traumatic brain injury
- Hearing impairment
- Speech or language impairment
- Autism
- Orthopedic impairment
- Deaf-blindness

Source: Education Week Research Center, 2015. Analysis of data from U.S. Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs and U.S. Census Bureau (2013)
### National Suspension/Expulsion Data K-12

#### Enrollment
- **White:** 51%
- **Two or More Races:** 2%
- **Hispanic/Latino of any Race:** 24%
- **Black/African American:** 16%
- **Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander:** 0.5%
- **Asian:** 5%
- **American Indian/Alaska Native:** 0.5%

#### In School Suspension
- **White:** 40%
- **Two or More Races:** 3%
- **Hispanic/Latino of any Race:** 22%
- **Black/African American:** 32%
- **Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander:** 0.2%
- **Asian:** 1%
- **American Indian/Alaska Native:** 0.2%

#### Out of School Suspension
- **White:** 36%
- **Two or More Races:** 3%
- **Hispanic/Latino of any Race:** 23%
- **Black/African American:** 33%
- **Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander:** 0.4%
- **Asian:** 2%
- **American Indian/Alaska Native:** 2%

#### Out of School Suspension Multiple
- **White:** 31%
- **Two or More Races:** 3%
- **Hispanic/Latino of any Race:** 21%
- **Black/African American:** 42%
- **Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander:** 0.3%
- **Asian:** 1%
- **American Indian/Alaska Native:** 2%

#### Expulsion
- **White:** 36%
- **Two or More Races:** 3%
- **Hispanic/Latino of any Race:** 22%
- **Black/African American:** 34%
- **Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander:** 0.3%
- **Asian:** 1%
- **American Indian/Alaska Native:** 3%

**SOURCE:** U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights, Civil Rights Data Collection, 2011-12.
National Suspension/Expulsion PreK

**Enrollment**
- White: 43%
- Two or More Races: 4%
- Hispanic/Latino of Any Race: 29%
- Black/African American: 18%
- Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander: 1.00%
- Asian: 4%
- American Indian/Alaska Native: 2.00%

**Out of School Suspension**
- 42%
- 3%
- 25%
- 42%
- 0.10%
- 1%
- 1%

**Out of School Suspension Multiple**
- 26%
- 4%
- 20%
- 48%
- 0.10%
- 1%
- 0%

NAEP Achievement Data Reading

Exhibit 25. Trend in NAEP mathematics average scores and score gaps for White and Black 13-year-old students.

Note: * indicates statistically different (p < .05) from 2012.

Adjusted for the limited number of questions from the 1973 mathematics assessment in common with the 1978 assessment and subsequent assessments.

Data includes African American. Race categories exclude Hispanic origin. Score gaps are calculated based on differences in rounded average scores.

NJDOE OSEP 2015-2016
NAEP Achievement Data Reading

**Figure 10. Trend in NAEP reading average scores and score gaps for White and Hispanic 13-year-old students**

- Original assessment format
- Revised assessment format

Note: Data excludes students of Hispanic origin. Hispanic includes Latino. Results are not available for Hispanic students in the Hispanic was not reported as a separate category at that time. Score gaps are calculated based on differences in rounded average scores.
NAEP Achievement Data Mathematics

**Figure 25.** Trend in NAEP mathematics average scores and score gaps for White and Black 13-year-old students.
NAEP Achievement Data Mathematics

Figure 24. Trend in NAEP mathematics average scores and score gaps for White and Hispanic 9-year-old students.

- Extrapolated data
- Original assessment format
- Revised assessment format
National Graduation Gap: Percent SWD Graduating with Standard Diploma 2010/11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Graduation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NJ Special Education Identification and Placement

The National Average 9% Placement Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Hispanic/Latino</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Two or More Races</th>
<th>Am. In/Alaska</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Rates</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ Rates</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Access to General Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Regular Education ≥ 80%</th>
<th>Regular Education ≤ 79% &gt; 40%</th>
<th>Regular Class &lt; 40%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>26.22</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>44.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>7.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>15.73</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>16.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NJ Suspension/Expulsion Data PreK-12

NAEP Achievement Grade 8 Reading

Source: New Jersey Department of Education, NEAP Results.
NAEP Achievement Grade 8 Reading

Source: New Jersey Department of Education, NEAP Results.
NAEP Achievement Grade 8 Math

Source: New Jersey Department of Education, NEAP Results.
NAEP Achievement Grade 8 Math

Source: New Jersey Department of Education, NEAP Results
NJ Graduation Rates 2013/14

Source: Ed.Gov., Ed Data Express, New Jersey Snapshot.
NJ Graduation Gap: Percent SWD Graduating with Standard Diploma 2013/2014

Source: New Jersey Department of Education, Office of Special Education Exiting Data as of June 2014.
DATA ANALYSIS

Digging Deep for the Root Cause
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New Jersey Optional Data Collection Tool

- NJ Office of Special Education Programs developed the Optional Data Collection tool to help you analyze your data to identify patterns of referrals by race/ethnicity.
- Used by district, school or grade level
- Useful for I&RS data gathering
- Data can be used to generate questions regarding identification and placement.
  - Who is being classified? (grade, gender, race)
  - Why are certain students being classified? (reason for referral)
  - Which teachers are classifying students the most?
  - What interventions can be used to reduce these referrals?
New Jersey Optional Data Collection Tool

Collection of Data on Students with Educational Difficulties

Directions: For each student who had educational difficulties enter the following information.
*If available, pre-I&RS information should be collected and analyzed in the same manner as I&RS information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Racial-Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Num. of Interventions</th>
<th>Frequency (per week)</th>
<th>Duration (num. of weeks)</th>
<th>Pre school</th>
<th>Free/Red. Lunch</th>
<th>Referred by (parent, teacher, etc)</th>
<th>Name of Referrer</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>CST Eval?</th>
<th>Eligible?</th>
<th>Eligible Category</th>
<th>Placement (A, B, C, D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

District ____________________________  School ____________________________  School Year ____________________________

District ____________________________  School ____________________________  School Year ____________________________
Root Cause Analysis

LOW STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

EXCESSIVE SUSPENSIONS / EXPULSIONS

MULTIPLE REFERRALS

LOW GRADUATION RATES

OVER IDENTIFICATION

PLACEMENT IN SEGREGATED SETTINGS

ROOT CAUSE: The deepest underlying cause, or causes or positive or negative symptoms within any process that, if dissolved, would result in elimination or reduction, or the symptom.
ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS: REFLECTING ON JALEN

At your tables, reflect on the factors that placed Jalen at risk. Identify a priority concern for the school and then dig deep to begin analyzing the potential root cause that the school needs to address to make sure other students like Jalen are not misidentified.

NASP (2003). Portraits of the Children: Culturally Competent Assessment
Diagnostic Tree Template

Priority Concern

Location
  - Curriculum
  - Behavior
  - Instruction

Location

Location
  - System Processes

Location
  - Outside Influences
SUCCESS GAP RUBRIC
Success Gap Rubric

- Created by the IDC IDEA Data Center for use by State Departments of Education, Districts and schools concerned about equity issues in schools.
- It is a self assessment to help districts and schools look closely at equity, inclusion, and opportunity for children.
- The rubric helps districts and schools investigate the root cause of the success gaps through the implementation of:
  1. Data based decision making
  2. Cultural responsiveness
  3. High quality core instructional program
  4. Universal screening and progress monitoring
  5. Evidence based interventions and supports
Indicator 1: Data Based Decision Making

- Use disaggregated data by gender, race/ethnicity, socio economic factors, disability and home languages 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
- Data are reviewed regularly to determine progress or change.
Indicator 2: Culturally Responsiveness

- Recognize diversity across student ethnicity, language and socioeconomic status.
- Provide teachers the training they need to meet the linguistic needs of all students.
- Use screening, referral, and assessment practices, procedures and tools unbiased and nondiscriminatory.
- Staff understands values and respects cultural differences of each child and informs the designing of instruction.
- Include parents in discussion/meetings about the school, and their children’s academic and behavioral program.
Indicator 3: Core Instructional Program

- Develop rigorous, consistent and well articulated K-12 instructional program, aligned with standards, and delivered with fidelity.
- Provide all students access to high quality instruction based on principles of Universal Design for Learning.
- Prepare all teachers to meet the diverse needs of students in a classroom that is culturally, linguistically and instructionally diverse.
- Inform parents of the core curriculum program, differentiation and accommodations made for their child.
Indicator 4: Assessment – Universal Screening and Progress Monitoring

- Develop a screening system that routinely screens all students for risk factors that might require early intervention.
- Provide teachers training on assessment for monitoring student performance for the purpose of adjusting instruction to meet students’ needs.
- Parents are informed of their student’s academic and behavioral progress in language they can understand.
Indicator 5: Interventions and Supports

• Develop system of intervention for students who have difficulty with academic and behavioral progress.
• Implement interventions with fidelity.
• Use a multi-tiered system of support to provide tiers of support based on severity of student need for both academic and behavior deficits.
  • Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports
• Parents are informed in their native or home language about the interventions implemented and their student’s responses.
Designing Schoolwide Systems for Student Success

**Academic Instruction**
(with fidelity measures)

- **Tertiary Interventions**
  - for individual students
  - Assessment-based
  - Resource Intensive

- **Secondary Interventions**
  - for some students: at-risk
  - Some individualizing
  - Small Group Interventions
  - High Efficiency
  - Rapid Response

- **Universal Interventions**
  - for all students
  - Preventive, Proactive
  - Differentiated Instruction
  - Research Validated Curriculum

**Behavioral Instruction**
(with fidelity measures)

- **Tertiary Interventions**
  - for individual students
  - Wraparound Intervention
  - Complex Multiple Life Domain FBA/BIPs

- **Secondary Interventions**
  - for some students: at-risk
  - Some individualizing
  - Small Group Interventions
  - High Efficiency
  - Rapid Response

- **Universal Interventions**
  - for all students
  - Preventive, Proactive
  - Differentiated Instruction
  - Research Validated Curriculum

---

RtI conceptual system with general and special education integrated at all three levels

- Screen All Students
- Monitoring Student Progress
- Monitoring Student Progress
- Monitoring Student Progress
- Monitoring Student Progress
- Monitoring Student Progress
- Monitoring Student Progress
- Monitoring Student Progress
- Monitoring Student Progress
Success Gap Rubric Example

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>
Success Gap Activity

• Review the indicators in the Success Gap Rubric and apply the rubric to what you know about Jalen and the school that identified him as cognitively impaired.

• In the discussion section identify what evidence do you have and what further evidence would need to support your determination.

• Share with group.
Case Study - Jalen

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q0VHJqD8ux4

- Watch the video on Jalen:

- What did the new school notice about Jalen?
- What process did they use to address it?
- What different educational options are now available to Jalen that was not available at the previous school?
- Will this make a difference in his achievement?
Factors that Contribute to the Appropriate Identification and Placement in SPED

• Referral
  • Referrals are supported by scientific, research or evidence based academic and/or behavioral interventions.
  • Functional and developmental information for referred students is collected to inform the referral process (health history, school history, language proficiency).

• Evaluation
  • A comprehensive evaluation process examines all suspected areas of disability including. (health, vision, hearing, social and emotional status, general intelligence, academic performance, prior instruction, communicative status, and motor abilities).
  • Placement teams avoid biased decision making.
  • Multiple non-discriminatory evaluation instruments are used unbiased by culture and linguistic background.
• Form a team of all stakeholder groups willing to make a commitment to the self assessment process. Include those who have knowledge of data analysis.
• Study the data both aggregated and disaggregated and relevant to the identified self assessment components.
• Conduct the self assessment.
• Provide evidence to support your claim.
• Place student at the center of all decisions.
• Ensure equitable participation.
• Develop a plan of action that includes activities, persons responsible, resources needed and timeline. Integrate with school improvement process.
QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS

Not *everything* that is faced *can* be changed. But *nothing* can be changed until it is faced.

- James Baldwin.
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