

Data-Based Management for Local Directors of Special Ed

Susan Wagner, President, Data Driven Enterprises

Mark Mlawer, Consultant

I. Background

A. IDEA 2004

1. Improve results/outcomes for students with disabilities
2. Comply with program requirements
 - Emphasize those requirements most closely associated with results/outcomes

- #### **B. IDEA 2004 has led to a greater emphasis on use of data to measure both results/outcomes and compliance**

II. What are the key data elements that districts should be examining?

- 20 Indicators (see Handout A)
- 425/427 (see Handout A)
- PAWS (Indicator 3)
- 636 (Indicator 4)

III. How should these key elements be examined?

- See Handout B

IV. What types of noncompliance might data suggest?

- A. General
 1. Organized in clusters of potential compliance concerns
 2. Not drawing compliance conclusions from data; data call for further probing and sometimes concrete steps

B. Child Find

1. Under-identification
2. Over-identification
3. Overall, by race, ethnicity

C. LRE

D. FAPE

1. Poor performance (graduation, dropout, state assessment results)
2. ESY
3. Related services
4. AT

V. How should one follow-up on red flags?

- A. Examine student records for (depending on issue):
1. Comprehensiveness of evaluations
 2. Needs from assessments (all addressed?)
 3. Eligibility determinations (ELL and lack of effective instruction ruled out?)

4. IEP reasonably calculated to result in educational benefit?


- a. Adequacy of goals, supports, services, accommodations etc.

5. Consideration of less restrictive settings/rationale for placements


6. Grades

7. Disciplinary history


8. Attendance history



B. Talking to staff about reasons for providing x instead of y, not providing x, etc.



C. Observing student in classes if instruction hasn't been effective



D. Reconvening IEP Teams to discuss lack of expected progress, restrictiveness of placement, need for FBA/BIP, adequacy of evaluation, goals, services, etc.