

Focused Monitoring Update

Back to School Meeting
Bureau of Special Education
September 15, 2008
Dana Corriveau

What is Focused Monitoring?

“A process that *purposefully* selects priority areas to examine for compliance/results while *not specifically examining other areas* for compliance to *maximize resources, emphasize important variables, and increase the probability of improved results.*”

National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM)

Purpose of Focused Monitoring

- Focus more on results for students and less on procedures.
- Prioritize resources and efforts.
- Connect special education monitoring and improvement planning activities with general education initiatives.
- Align the Bureau's training and technical assistance with district's priorities.

Focused Monitoring Steering Committee

- Stakeholder group - district representatives, parents, other Department staff, Bureau staff, State Advisory Council, SERC
- Meets 2 – 4 times annually
- Evaluate prior year
- Determine next area of focus (Key Performance Indicator, KPI)

History Lesson

- 2003 – 04: compliance monitoring cycle stopped, stakeholder group met monthly for one year to develop Focused Monitoring System
- 2004-06: LRE and Disproportionality
- 2006-08: Suspension / Expulsion

Connecticut moved from doing the “compliance review process” on a cyclical basis, so your district got a visit every six years. There was a very large protocol, and there were lots of files reviewed strictly for compliance.

We have moved away from strictly compliance and are now looking at the bigger picture – improvement and results.

*Typical Cycle... in a
(very small) nutshell*

- Steering committee selects Key Performance Indicator (KPI)
- Letters to all districts with data
 - “Green” = good data, keep it up
 - “Yellow” = warning, keep an eye on this
 - “Red” = concerning data, analyze it for accuracy, what is your hypothesis, what is your plan to address it?

Red, Green and Yellow refer to the color coded maps that were done in previous years. Letters are still sent to the same effect, but at this time, maps are not available.

Cycle con't...

- Districts with data of concern respond back to the Department
- Responses are reviewed to determine further activity for districts with data of concern
- **Materials are requested well in advance of the visit**
- Visit happens
- Report is written with findings, required actions, recommendations

Cycle con't...

- Improvement planning session held, funds are requested
- District completes required actions, implements improvement plan
- District continues to provide progress reports

I need closure!!

- 1 year to correct required actions
Letter for “closeout of required actions” is sent
- **Progress of improvement plan continues to be monitored!** (18 – 24 months)
- After progress reports and data show improvement
Letter for “closeout of focused monitoring activities” is sent (You’re done!)

Data

- Sources to help identify a district for focused monitoring:
SEDAC
PSIS
ED 166
Assessment (CMT/CAPT)
Accommodations (bubble page)

The only data we have are the data you give us.

If districts give us inaccurate data, then we only have inaccurate data to work with.

Thoughts About Data

- These aren't my students
- This isn't my data
- We use different data
- You changed the way it was collected
- The data is too old

... you can always give us your most recent, up to date data from your own central data collection system and we can use that to verify the need for further activity.

2006-08

- Key Performance Indicator (KPI):

Decrease the number of students in all disability categories who are suspended or expelled as defined by Connecticut General Statute (Sec. 10-233a(b)): “exclusion from regular classroom activities beyond 90 minutes.”

Just putting the definition out there caused districts to take action. Many educators were aware of the definition and immediately changed practices. This includes those practices of letting students sit in the office for two periods, or asking parent to come pick up their child from school because they’re “having a rough day”. If the child is excluded from regular classroom activities beyond 90 minutes, it’s a suspension.

UNIQUE STUDENT SUSPENSION RATE: SPECIAL EDUCATION

	2005-06	2006-07
RED: (> 10%)	58	52
YELLOW: (5 - 10%)	37	57
GREEN: (< 5%)	74	60

In 2005-06, there were 58 districts in the state who suspended/expelled more than 10% of its students in special education.

In 2005-06, there were 37 districts in the state who suspended/expelled between 5 and 10% of its students in special education.

In 2005-06, there were 74 districts in the state who suspended/expelled less than 5% of its students in special education.

In 2006-07, there were 52 districts in the state who suspended/expelled more than 10% of its students in special education.

In 2006-07, there were 57 districts in the state who suspended/expelled between 5 and 10% of its students in special education.

In 2006-07, there were 60 districts in the state who suspended/expelled less than 5% of its students in special education.

The difference between 2005-06 and 2006-07 did get worse in some areas... but it could have been due to better data collection, that was more accurate and more reliable. This isn't such a bad thing!

UNIQUE STUDENT SUSPENSION RATE: GENERAL EDUCATION

	2005-06	2006-07
RED: (> 10%)	11	11
YELLOW: (5 - 10%)	33	32
GREEN: (< 5%)	125	126

In 2005-06, there were 11 districts in the state who suspended/expelled more than 10% of its general education students.

In 2005-06, there were 33 districts in the state who suspended/expelled between 5 and 10% of its general education students.

In 2005-06, there were 125 districts in the state who suspended/expelled less than 5% of its general education students.

In 2006-07, there were 11 districts in the state who suspended/expelled more than 10% of its general education students.

In 2006-07, there were 32 districts in the state who suspended/expelled between 5 and 10% of its general education students.

In 2006-07, there were 126 districts in the state who suspended/expelled less than 5% of its general education students.

GENERAL/SPECIAL EDUCATION SUSPENSION RATE: Difference

	2005-06	2006-07
RED: (> 10%)	22	23
YELLOW: (5 - 10%)	41	48
GREEN: (< 5%)	106	98

In 2005-06, there were 22 districts who had a difference of greater than 10% between their special education and general education suspension/expulsion rates.

In 2005-06, there were 42 districts who had a difference between 5 and 10% between their special education and general education suspension/expulsion rates.

In 2005-06, there were 106 districts who had a difference of less than 5% between their special education and general education suspension/expulsion rates.

In 2006-07, there were 23 districts who had a difference of greater than 10% between their special education and general education suspension/expulsion rates.

In 2006-07, there were 48 districts who had a difference between 5 and 10% between their special education and general education suspension/expulsion rates.

In 2006-07, there were 98 districts who had a difference of less than 5% between their special education and general education suspension/expulsion rates.

The gap remains....

SPECIAL EDUCATION: 10+ Days SUSPENSION RATE

	2005-06	2006-07
RED: (> 2%)	51	40
YELLOW: (1 - 2%)	30	28
GREEN: (< 1%)	88	101

This IS the performance on indicator 4 in the State Performance Plan, in which Connecticut did not meet its target for the 2006-07 school year.

In 2005-06, 51 districts suspended/expelled more than 2% of its students in special education for greater than 10 days.

In 2005-06, 30 districts suspended/expelled between 1 and 2% of its students in special education for greater than 10 days.

In 2005-06, 88 districts suspended/expelled less than 1% of its students in special education for greater than 10 days.

In 2006-07, 40 districts suspended/expelled more than 2% of its students in special education for greater than 10 days.

In 2006-07, 28 districts suspended/expelled between 1 and 2% of its students in special education for greater than 10 days.

In 2006-07, 101 districts suspended/expelled less than 1% of its students in special education for greater than 10 days.

Although we didn't meet our target, the data show we are moving in the right direction.

Indicator 3

- Participation and performance of students with disabilities on statewide assessments
 - A. Number of districts met the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.
 - B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
 - C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs.

The site visit teams and the Bureau realized that issues in least restrictive environment, disproportionality, and behavior were symptoms of a bigger problem.

Indicator #3 CMT Assessments, 2006-07

	Math Participation	Reading Participation	Math Performance	Reading Performance
Met Target	135	135	28	17
Substantial Compliance			58	38
Did Not Meet			49	80
Not Applicable (No Data or Too Small)	34	34	34	34

In the 2006-07 school year, there were 135 districts who met the target for participation rates in math and reading CMT. That's everyone!

In the 2006-07 school year, we only had 28 districts meet the target for math performance on the CMT, and only 17 met the target for reading performance on the CMT.

This is about the number of districts who have students in special education making proficiency targets for AYP.

In the 2006-07 school year, 49 districts did not meet the target in math performance, and 80 districts did not meet the target for reading performance.

This data includes students who take the alternative assessment, also known as the "skills checklist".

Indicator #3 CAPT Assessments, 2006-07

	Math Participation	Reading Participation	Math Performance	Reading Performance
Met Target	29	27	12	11
Substantial Compliance			4	2
Did Not Meet	10	12	23	26
Not Applicable (No Data or Too Small)	130	130	130	130

In the 2006-07 school year, there were 29 and 27 districts who met the target for participation rates in math and reading CAPT, respectively.

In the 2006-07 school year, there were 10 and 12 districts who did not meet participation rates in math and reading CAPT, respectively.

In the 2006-07 school year, we only had 12 districts meet the target for math performance on the CAPT, and only 11 met the target for reading performance on the CAPT.

This is about the number of districts who have students in special education making proficiency targets for AYP.

In the 2006-07 school year, 23 districts did not meet the target in math performance, and 26 districts did not meet the target for reading performance.

This data includes students who take the alternative assessment, also known as the "skills checklist".

Plans for 08-09

- Looking at “academic achievement”
- Meet with stakeholders twice this fall (October 2 and December 10)
- Make sure there is input, clear definitions
- Determine data points, protocols, investigation needs

Plans for 08-09 con't

- Initial letters to districts mid-October
- Your responses due back to us mid-November
- Notification of visit by mid-November
- Visits occur January – April
- 4 – 6 visits

Plans for 08-09 con't

- Continuing alignment with general ed
 - Bureau of Compliance, Accountability and Monitoring
 - Bureau of School and District Improvement

Technical Assistance

- October 21 and 30 - Indicator 3
- Look for flyer soon

- Ed Benefit training
- CALI training
- SRBI training

Districts who attend the October 21 or October 30 sessions should be telling us, in their response if they get a “red” letter, what they are doing as a result of the information learned, and what the district realized as a result of that session.

Any other strategic activity going on in the district to improve the achievement of students with disabilities should also be addressed in your responses.

General Supervision

- A system of ongoing monitoring activities;
- Monitoring activities are those which lead to findings of noncompliance, corrective action, and improvement planning. We monitor...
 - SPP/APR
 - Fiscal Verification
 - Redirection/CEIS
 - Approved Private Schools
 - Dispute Resolution
 - PJ/LRE
 - *Focused Monitoring*

The Bureau has been talking about “general supervision” at much more length the past 12 months. This is our system of ongoing monitoring activities.

In the SPP/APR, these include the calls you get from Patricia Anderson about secondary goals and services; calls from Maria Synodi about FAPE at 3; letters from Nancy Cappello about disproportionality, and other monitoring that goes on for the indicators in the State Performance Plan.

We will be coordinating our system of fiscal verification, meaning your IDEA grants and verification of the use of funds. This is in development, don’t panic.

And the list goes on, notice that focused monitoring is just a piece of this larger general supervision. It is an intricate and complex set of systems that need to be coordinated and aligned. We’ve come a long way, but there’s still work to do.

Contact

- Dana Corriveau
Bureau of Special Education
dana.corriveau@ct.gov

Thank you!!