

To what extent is there coordination with Title I, Part C, ELL, and others in the areas of data collection?

Performance Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI): department-wide initiative involving players from all divisions of USDE.

- Purpose: Coordinate data collection among all divisions.
- Vision: A warehouse containing common data on all children so data department units can “talk” to each other.

Under 618, states are supposed to collect data on disproportionality. How many monitor and analyze those data?

In Part B performance report (biennial report), states report on graduation, dropout, etc. as well as disproportionality. They are to present the analysis, and policies and procedures developed by districts identified as disproportional that address what the data tell them. Examples: How they are going to monitor, how they are going to address issues of disproportionality, and data accuracy procedures.

Did some states report not report anything?

OSEP received something from every state whether it was on the 20% variance or on their own formula. Quality varied.

When you go in to provide TA to states are they receptive to ideals of data collection and analysis or are they resistant?

States now realize they need good data to report and have been working to improve data systems. Doesn't appear to be any resistance especially, with NCLB. Westat reported 2 big challenges with data systems: costs and having resources to do it well.

Is there support for the notion that as data systems are developed, costs go down?

No signs supporting at this time.

9:45 – 10:30 am Update on Center Activities
(Jane Nell Luster)

(For more information email: jluste@lsuhsc.edu)

COMMENTS:

How are families and advocates included in the work plan development?

Since we're working with state departments there has not been direct involvement at this time. However, advocate role has come in the area of stakeholder involvement.

We have struggled with whether to post the states' work plans on the website. They are public documents and provide accountability; however, there is concern because states have indicated they wish they could see what others are doing. The concern is whether this public posting will result in patterning a state's plan after another state rather than based on the needs identified in the self-assessment process.

How do states feel about posting work plans?

We have not addressed it with them yet.

Maybe the Center should ask states for permission?

Sam Howarth indicated he would not have a problem with sharing New Mexico's plan. Larry Gloeckler said he also would not have a problem with having the New York work plan on the web site.

Is OSEP going to issue an RFP on early childhood outcomes? Will the Center work with whomever is awarded that grant?

All priorities coming out are trying to coordinate efforts among the Regional Resource Centers, specialty centers, and others. NCSEAM has as part of its work scope a work group on Early Childhood/Family Outcomes; therefore, NCSEAM will collaborate with others in this area.

What have you seen as far as accomplishments in states?

We have seen excitement in states in moving forward. Some accomplishments include:

- Being able to pull information from their data
- Wanting to get more directed with compliance so they can tailor their technical assistance efforts
- District report cards or profiles

Some needs have included the areas of

- Stakeholders
- Evaluation system for their monitoring system
- Organization around the concepts of focused monitoring

Is it fair to say your activities have been two-fold: needs assessment and improvement plans?

Yes

Has the center aggregated data to get a big picture of what is happening in states?

The group was referred to the grid in the packet.

In what areas do you invest your time, energy, and resources?

One of the dilemmas is how much detail (and paper) to give you regarding our work. We have a grid showing the heading areas as listed on the Implementation Checklist.

What is the interval between the completion of the work plan and next assessment?

We've set a date of 12-14 months.

10:30- 10:45 am Break

10:45 – Noon

Update and information from Work Groups

◆ Parent Involvement

(Batya Elbaum, Isabel Garcia, Larry Fuller & Paula Goldberg)

(For more information email: elbaum@miami.edu)

COMMENTS:

- The measures that NCSEAM is developing are intended to be global measures of critical variables related to parent involvement. One purpose they need to serve is that of providing reliable rankings of entities (e.g., districts) on these variables.
- Over several months, we have looked for publicly available parent-response measures that have been used either for research or program evaluation purposes. We have found 17-18 instruments that have been used to assess parent involvement; however, none of the existing instruments is suitable for measuring parent/family participation in early intervention/special education. At the same time, many have items suggesting useful content for the NCSEAM measure.
- During the five stakeholder group meetings held in NH, NM, MS, KY, and FL, participants were invited to suggest sample survey items covering content relevant to parents and families of children with special needs. The entire list of suggested items, categorized into the four family-related priorities that NCSEAM has identified, will be available on the NCSEAM website soon. NOTE: See Focused Monitoring Information page, click link to Parent/Family Involvement Workgroup.
- There was debate over the usefulness of measuring “parent satisfaction.” Some people consider parent satisfaction to be a less reliable index of the quality of services and of child outcomes than objective measures. On the other hand, many people perceive that parents’ judgments of the quality of the services their children receive and their children’s outcomes are informative and that incorporating these judgments as performance indicators demonstrates that parents do count.
- At present, it is anticipated that the measures will be used to evaluate the performance of large units such as districts and states. However, if there are a sufficient number of respondents from smaller entities, such as schools, then these could be an appropriate unit of analysis as well.
- There has been some preliminary discussion of whether early intervention outcomes for families are within our purview.
- We are sensitive to the fact that the role of parents in early intervention and special education changes from birth to 21, and we are considering how to address this in the development of the parent measures.
- Alan Coulter asked Board members to let NCSEAM staff know if they want to be involved in specific work groups.
- Robert Pasternack commented that parental satisfaction is still how we measure accountability for Part C. While parental involvement is important, we need to measure whether children are learning.

◆ Educational Benefit
(Sandy Schmitz, Leslie Seid-Margolis, Larry Gloeckler
& Sam Howarth)

(For more information email: sschmi@lsuhsc.edu)

COMMENTS:

Shared comments by Baltimore Educational Benefit (EB) workgroup; states included were California, Connecticut, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, and New York.

- The Educational Benefit meeting helped conceptualize educational benefit; it was time well spent.
- Framing an explanation of Educational Benefit as a training tool regarding what it is we're trying to accomplish with a monitoring system. Educational benefit is related to Focused Monitoring, in regard to finding the indicators and in crafting strategies for framing a plan for states and districts.

In the Educational Benefit workgroup, was there a discussion of lead indicators? Can we disaggregate lead indicators that we'd be able to monitor first and harder ones to gauge later?

- The training aspect that California (CA) uses (via IEP use) is a way to do this.
- The center has a macro-level view and using the center might be the best way to answer this. New Mexico uses overidentification, which may be pertinent more to their state than other states; it might be hard to identify global indicators for all states right now.
- There may be some variables that end up being germane to all of us.

Did a discussion arise at the Education Benefit meeting regarding global indicators?

- Can we compel people to look at certain indicators?
- I don't know of a large body of research that looks at what items have predictive validity of outcomes.

What if an IEP committee gives inappropriate direction for the student?

- The nature of administrative supervision was part of the discussion on "reasonably calculated." Long term, that may be the most difficult decision to make.
- We need to be careful overstepping our bounds at the state level. Need to make sure that districts are coming up with an education that is reasonably calculated for a student.
- We need to be strategic and move carefully.

Noon- 1:00pm

Lunch

Expected Results 2

1:00 – 2:00 pm Identification of Methods for Identifying Disproportionate Representation – Pros, Cons and Comparisons
(Alan Coulter & Marsha Brauen & Jim Bethel, Westat)
(For more information email: marshabrauen@westat.com)

COMMENTS:

I want to clarify that there is more than one method of calculating risk ratio.

There are variations. This is the formula that we chose to use (comparing one group to the rest of children.)

There is a natural limit to looking at disproportionality. When you have a high proportion of one racial group, then it becomes difficult to assess disproportionality (e.g. if a district is 95% African-American.

Why do we do this (calculation)? Why does NCSEAM need to look at this?

- This issue was discussed in the National Stakeholders meeting. Exit, LRE (B&C), and then disproportionality was the next area to be addressed.
- From NCCRESt's position, to get schools/districts to understand a common language to understand what data to look at, why is it important?
- Looking at disproportionality is monitoring for process. I worry that we could come up with highly technical ways to do the wrong thing.

Are there some folks who would disagree with your calculation of risk ratio?

- Westat is saying that the simple statistic may not be the best way to look at disproportionality. It is more important that we find out how we utilize this information to inform the monitoring.
- Risk ratio is not without problems. Washington, DC, for example, is an area where risk ratio is not a reliable estimate because it is an area that is predominantly one race/culture.
- It is not a problem with a couple of states but it is a broad problem.

Again, what is the value of the work of looking at these statistics on disproportionality?
The problem is that we want to get beyond this intellectual discussion on disproportionality and then get on from there.

Is it discriminatory, or is it misidentification (the disproportionality issue)?
Scholars around the country say there are problems with the abovementioned, it is beyond identification.

2:00 – 2:30 pm Response & Reaction from NCCRESt & Harvard Civil Rights Project

**Comments by Elizabeth Kozleski and David Gibson of the
National Center for Culturally Responsive
Educational Systems (NCCRESt): (this was all added)**

(For more information email: elizabeth.kozleski@cudenver.edu)

- Data from OSEP are presented in different formats on their website.
- Mapping out populations (school by school in cities and states) in order to look at issues of disproportionality is being developed. This helps look at geographical locations to find out where disproportionality is.

From your experience in Chicago, can you give us a sense of what created the disproportionality issue?

Yes, we can look at the maps and use them figure out what the disproportionality issues are. We still don't know, once the issue of disproportionality is identified, which precise, evidence-based responses are better for particular contexts. There are many options to choose from. Our work over the next year will explore the results of specific technical assistance and professional development efforts.

What variables have you identified in the places you have been that identify disproportionality ?

We've not been dealing with this long enough to come up with a list yet. We can tell someone that within a particular neighborhood, the student will be "x" times as likely to be identified.

So does that mean you tell the kid to move?

- This means that we work with that particular school to change some the problem.
- You may be looking at a label on a student who was identified in another district.

Do you have any information on Part C or 619?

No. But we are looking if whether a student was Part C or 619.

Comments by Dan Losen of the Harvard Civil Rights Project:

(For more information email: dlosen@law.harvard.edu)

- It is important to come up with one definition on an administrative level that will be able to permeate.
- Poverty alone does not explain the amount of disproportionality.
- Reading level (Hispanic student levels are similar to blacks, but they are underrepresented whereas blacks are overrepresented) and lead exposure does not explain it alone as well.
- This is an administrative tool, not a civil rights law. Good news is that this isn't about closing schools because of racial disparity. It's about getting TA to find out what's going on.
- There is a statistical trigger under NCLB: Need to look closer and come up with effective methods that provide support and meaningful, scientifically informed benchmarks through data.
- Part of this is informing parents of what data are and what are shown.
- Where is the success going on? Important to identify the success, to breed success.
- Whether using a benchmark with numbers. We are trying to look for flags through looking at percentages and ratios dealing with disprop.

I have heard real good answers to the question I asked about why this issue is important to discuss.

As a result of four years (New York) of these data and repeatedly giving data to the districts, things are changing. Progress is being made. Need to look at information in a sophisticated way.

- How are you seeing changes?
- Increased graduation rates and LRE for minority students.

What troubles me about this process is having a different methodology would be very difficult for us. Since the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) has different regions it may be hard coming up with a global definition since they are not here.

- We don't want to start rearranging civil rights law.
- The issue is that a state might be saying one thing and OCR may be saying something else. Since OCR is not here, it may be difficult coming up with a definition.

Alan commented - I think I am hearing from this conversation that we need to be cautious with OCR if we consensually create a definition.

- Why not be aggressive instead of cautious?

Alan's closing remarks: Tomorrow morning we are going to try to attain the impossible, think about the information, talk about it over our social this evening.

- 2:30 – 2:45 pm Break
- 2:45 – 4:00 pm Discussion on Methods of Identifying Disproportionate Representation
(Alan)

July 31 - Thursday

Expected Result 3

- 8:30 – 9:00 am Summary of Wednesday and Setting the Stage for Thursday
(Alan Coulter)

Jim Ysseldyke distributed copies of the Minnesota Report Card for Board information.

Larry Gloecker discussed data from New York. They have been collecting and publicly distributing comparison data for several years. It was noted that progress in reducing disproportionality has been seen.

Comments:

In your experiences, have you dealt with “race by language” interaction? i.e., disaggregating immigrant members of cultural groups from the numbers of English language speakers.

That question has never been raised, honestly.

Can you speak to the public relations issues of not showing success for several years (regarding New York’s data). And that you have to wait 3-5 years to see these data turn around.

We should be called courageous and don’t want to hide any of it. Need to be honest and forthright with data, because someone will report it. People are admiring the fact we are reporting it.

Larry, have you looked at whether the diploma gap is closing?

We are seeing progress across the board, proportionally.

Comment from Sam regarding New Mexico data: Stakeholders are worried: although LRE has improved, test scores have not.

- It is important to give stakeholders good news.
- There is a lot of inclusion of kids with disabilities in social environments but are they included in subject matter instruction.

When looking at New Mexico’s changes in LRE it made my day. We will be able to make changes in graduation rates as we learn how to make changes in our TA.

9:00 – 10:15 am Determine Indicators of Disproportionate Representation
(Alan Coulter)

Discussion on Disproportionality Definition

Risk ratio is useful but I think it might be good to use whites as the baseline of comparison.

It will be difficult if we have to change our (New York) method of looking at these data.

It is common practice to use white as baseline.

- Why can't they analyze it two different ways?
- It is difficult to tell local districts to analyze data and report in two different ways. Which one is right?

What do you do in some states that are minority majority in terms of the message?

This evolved out of issues of civil rights. It is important to look at this issue nationally.

It has been commonly known that each Office of Civil Rights (OCR) division uses different definitions.

- I think that you could have OSEP and OCR use the same definition...
- This board is here to make a recommendation, and we'll wait and see what happen as it goes up the chain to Stephanie Lee, Robert Pasternack.
- Are you at a point where you want to make a decision on creating a definition?

When you look at New York's definition how would their definition change if you used all others in the denominator instead of just whites?

- I don't think numerically that it would make a big difference.
- I ran the data at the last meeting. There are states where it makes a difference. Even though overrepresentation is aggregate, may not be a problem with Latino students, but sometimes at the district level, it is.
- Policy problem if denominators change. Hard to do consistent reporting. Makes historical tracking that much more difficult.
- What really happens is that you have to look long-term at choosing indicators since demographics may be changing.

Dan's point is - will there still be white privilege. Are we looking at demographic or sociopolitical?

There may be a need to identify a group that would be more representative to create a definition.

When you use 'all' as the denominator, I think that helps look at the issue better.

- With Latinos, you will be missing out on looking at differences in overrepresentation/underrepresentation if look only at 'everyone' as the baseline.
- Obviously this is not a statistics issue.

Have we already decided that we are using risk ratio?

What definition and who the comparison group is, are the two issues.

- Risk index is the precursor of risk ratio. You will see the risk index of each group reported. The risk ratio does not demonstrate that, for instance, in Iowa there is a much higher risk index for blacks to be identified as mentally retarded, however the risk ratio is lower than that in New York (although the risk index is only 1%)

10:15 – 10:30 am Break

10:30 – Noon Determine Indicators of Disproportionate Representation
(Alan Coulter)

Discussion (continued)

- Look at two measures (Risk Index and Risk Ratio); you need to compute the ratios respectively for different types of disabilities.
- Recommendation to use white students in the denominator for risk ratio (second recommendation is to use all as denominator)
- Is there utility to having both measures in the definition?
- Whatever combination of definition that gives the most accurate picture will be the most important.
- I feel like I need to take this back to my network; would be beneficial to get some options to discuss, and then bring it back to the meeting.
- I am not comfortable with several options.
- When do we put this out as an indicator, what direction do you as a Board want to move toward. We will then send this recommendation to Larry Wexler (OSEP). We react in the direction that you give us.
- We work at the discretion of states, so they can pick and choose what they want to look at.
- We need to look at the specific question we want to answer. To accompany those tables, we need to look at what the measures represent. (e.g. white in the denominator looks at disparity vs. the white privileged groups). What are the implications of any and all of the denominators. Not only look at the numbers but questions that illustrate the measures.
- I am trying to format this discussion so that we can give states assistance with this issue.
- If we go back and ask everyone else what they think about this issue, we'll get opinions all over the place, and will be right back where we are.
- It might be important to see how many other "Larry's" there are that are set in their ways before making a choice.
- This is not changing the law.
- Even though I am from the dominant culture, I do not see that I can bring this back, and explain it to receive any more information on this.
- We are looking at monitoring, in our purposes for this. I do not want to have people think we are interpreting the law.
- We are trying to get an interpretation for how to use this regarding monitoring.

- Diane feels that there is merit in going back and asking others who are more qualified.
- Can we do this electronically in between this meeting and the next?
- Could this information be useful for Part C?
- We would need to analyze this in reference to Part C. We would need more information.
- One way to look at it as the largest group in the state as the denominator.
- What are we voting on?
- There are four choices? 1) White. 2) Dominant culture of the state. 3) Both (meaning all other and White) and 4) All (meaning all others).
- Are we going to vote on the number of categories as well?

DECISIONS:

- Examine using both risk index and risk ratio
- Use white as the numeral in the denominator:
 - Options voted: Most racial/ethnic group in the state (0), Both (white and all other) (5); White (10) ; and All Other (4)
- We should try and work with our colleagues from WESTAT to look at the information in cells to come up with some selection rules.
- Examine for categories of 1) mental retardation, 2) emotional disturbance, 3) specific learning disabilities, 4) autism, 5) other health impairment, 6) speech/language impairment and 7) developmental delay.

Noon – 1:00 pm Lunch

Expected Results 4 & 5

1:00 – 2:15 pm Update on the Independent Evaluation
(Robin McWilliam)

(For more information email: robin.mcwilliam@vanderbilt.edu)

For a complete overview of this presentation –

[Click here for Dr. McWilliam's PowerPoint Presentation](#)

- Evaluation design is based on the TA to states. (Implementation measure, site visit, work plan and ongoing communication.)
- Data sources include work plans, interview, and Implementation Measure scores.
- Unit of analysis: Individual states and old vs. new states.
- Findings: value of satisfaction measures, value added, and monitoring priorities, assistance to OSEP, and state implementation of Focused Monitoring
- We are looking at “has the Center helped the states that it has worked with work on FM?”

Do you get any data that are not given to you from the states?

No. We are not looking at how they are affecting a district or school.

Have you asked for documents to triangulate?

Yes.

2:15 – 2:30 pm Break

2:30 – 4:00 pm Comments

Advisory Board

- Sufficient number of states versus depth of work.
- How do we get parents involved (full participants)?
- Part C- don't know how it will play out- concerned about the Regional Resource Centers and Center and uncertainty with process and the role of NECTAC.
- Evaluation- documenting the way things are (before) the way things are...during/after
- Indicators
 - Intended outcomes (parent)
 - Transactions
- Extent to which states implement Focused Monitoring—move to full implementation
- Multiple Stakeholder group(s)
 - Improvement Planning; Focused Monitoring; Special Education Advisory
 - Protection & Advocacy -
 - Family involvement versus parent involvement
 - Names versus Representative of group
 - Guidelines on how to choose representative
 - States' variability
 - How to work with stakeholders.
 - Evaluation- who are participants.
 - Use of online surveys
 - Common themes for reaching others
 - Questions & Answers (FAQ documents)
 - Listserv
 - Fliers
 - Communities of Practice

Planning for October & March

- ◆ Dates (October 2-3, 2003)
- ◆ Tentative Agendas

- Part C/619—early childhood and monitoring.
- Contrasting Federal Monitoring to states' monitoring
- Standard agenda-
 - Reports from workgroups
 - Information from the Independent Evaluator
 - Updates from OSEP (verification visits)
 - Center challenges

- Maybe need some time for workgroups to meet half a day earlier than full board meeting
- In March (March 24-26), issues to discuss
 - Focused Monitoring Implementation Checklist
 - Over-representation
 - OSEP indicators
 - Evaluation of monitoring
- For the October 2004 meeting, discuss Educational Benefit

OSEP

Larry Wexler's closing comments

- Center is doing an incredible job (gone from running to sprinting stages).
- Strong website
- Strong support from LSUHSC/HDC- Dr. Crow coming to the meetings is testimony to this.
- Parental involvement, educational benefit, and disproportionality discussions were valuable.
- Small amount of money for external evaluation yet it has been a beneficial part of the experience.
- Thanks to center staff and Patsy Poche for hosting/organizing this meeting.

Wrap-up
(Alan)