

III. Examining Key Elements

The “Blue Report” in your Data Share-out Notebook will allow you to complete Steps 1 and 2, and in some cases, Step3.

Step 1: Look at your district’s overall rates.

- Pay particular attention to these four elements:
 - A. Primary Disabilities
 - B. Related services
 - C. LRE
 - D. PAWS

See Attachment 1.

Step 2: Compare your district’s rates to the state rates.

- Identify any that differ from the state rate by 5 or more percentage points and/or identify any area that you want to pursue.

See Attachment 1.

Step 3: Disaggregate your data at the general or “one-variable” level.

- Identify “most likely” and “least likely” groups in the identified areas.
- Variables that are used frequently in the focused monitoring process to disaggregate the data:
 - Primary disability
 - Related services
 - Environment
 - Grade
 - School
 - PAWS scores
- Let’s see what it tells us at the state level.

Example A: Primary Disability Categories *See Attachment 2.*

- This Attachment shows, for the state, the percent of all special ed students with a given disability, the percent of students at each grade level who are classified with a particular disability and the percent of students in each environment category who are classified with a particular disability.
- Compare your district's disability rates to the state's disability rates to determine where discrepancies exist.

Example B: Related Services *See Attachment 3.*

- This Attachment shows, for the state, the percent of all special ed students who receive a given related service, the percent of students at each grade level who receive a given related service, the percent of students in each disability category who receive a given related service, and the percent of students in each environment who receive a given related service.
- Compare your district's related service rates to the state's related service rates to determine where discrepancies exist.

Example C: LRE *See Attachment 4.*

Note: On your district's Blue Report, you have a 1-page report that shows the demographic characteristics of students in each LRE.

Example D: PAWS *See Attachment 5.*

Note: On your district's Blue Report, you have a 2-page report that shows the percentage of students who scored proficient disaggregated by various demographic characteristics.

Step 4: Disaggregate your data at the detailed or "multi- variable" level.

- Identify multi-variable "most likely" and "least likely" groups in the identified areas.
- When we do a prestaffing for a district that we will monitor, we generally do multiple variable drill-downs like the examples below. The purpose generally is to figure out one of the following:
 - **A.** Who are the students – their grade, their ethnicity, their ELL status, their related services, their environment, their PAWS performance – classified/not classified with a given disability at the district and how does this relate to state results?
 - **B.** Who are the students – their disability, their grade, their ethnicity, their ELL status, their environment, their PAWS performance – receiving/not receive related services at the district and how does this relate to state results?
 - **C.** Who are the students – their disability, their grade, their ethnicity, their ELL status, their related services, their environment, their PAWS performance – classified/not classified in a given environment at the district and how does this relate to state results?
 - **D.** Who are the students – their disability, their grade, their ethnicity, their ELL status, their related services, their environment – performing low on the PAWS and how does this relate to state results?

- Let's take each of these four general questions and see what they tell us at the state level.
 - Note: these least and most likely scenarios were created by entering different variables in a regression equation and seeing which variables are the strongest predictors.

Example A: Primary Disability Categories

- Let's determine who are the students most likely to be classified as LD. Who are the students least likely to be classified as LD?
- Let's break it down by grade groupings.

	Most likely to be classified as LD	Least likely to be classified as LD
Grades K-5	Students who are in grades 2-5, in the resource room, and not receiving any related services. Percent classified as LD = 71%	Students who are in grades K-1 and in the regular classroom. Percent classified as LD = 8%
Grades 6-8	Students who str in the resource room and are not receiving any related services. Percent classified as LD = 72%	Students who are not in the resource room and are receiving either AT or PT related services. Percent classified as LD = 2%
Grade 9-12	Students who are in the regular classroom and are not receiving any related services. Percent classified as LD = 72%	Students who are not in the regular classroom and are receiving either AT or PT related services. Percent classified as LD = 1%

Example B: Related Services

- ESY.
- Let's determine who are the students most likely to get ESY. Who are the students least likely to get ESY?
- Let's break it down by grade groupings.

	Most likely to receive ESY	Least likely to receive ESY
Grades K-5	Students who are in grades K-2; are AT, CD, or MU; are getting some related services (other than ESY), and are not in the regular classroom. Percent receiving ESY =50%	Students who are speech-language and are in the regular classroom. Percent receiving ESY=1%
Grades 6-8	Students who are in grade 6; are not speech-language; are getting some related services (other than ESY); and are in separate classrooms. Percent receiving ESY =38%	Students who are speech-language and are in the regular classroom. Percent receiving ESY=1%
Grade 9-12	Students who are not LD, are receiving PT, and are in separate classrooms. Percent receiving ESY =38%	Students who are LD, are not receiving any related services, and are not in the separate classroom. Percent receiving ESY=<1%

Example C: LRE

- Let's determine who are the students most likely to be in the resource room and who are the students least likely to be in the resource room.
- Let's break it down by grade groupings.

	Most likely to be in the Resource Room	Least likely to be in the Resource Room
Grades K-5	Students who are getting some related services and are CD or LD. Percent in RR=47%	Students who are not getting related services and are classified as speech-language. Percent in RR=3%
Grades 6-8	Students who are in grade 6 or 7 and are LD and are receiving counseling related services. Percent in RR=58%	Students who are not getting related services and are classified as speech-language. Percent in RR=10%
Grade 9-12	Students who are LD or AT and are receiving counseling services. Percent in RR=47%	Students who are classified as MU. Percent in RR=12%

Example D: PAWS Reading.

- Let's determine who are the students most likely to score proficient in reading and who are the students least likely to score proficient.
- Let's break it down by grade groupings.

	Most likely to score proficient	Least likely to score proficient
Grades 3-5	Speech-language students who are in the regular classroom and who are not ELL. Proficiency rate=61%	LD students who are not in the regular classroom and are ELL students. Proficiency rate = 6%
Grades 6-8	Autistic students who are in the regular classroom. Proficiency rate=64% (Note: these 33 students took the regular assessment.)	LD students who are in the resource room and are ELL students. Proficiency rate = 3%
Grade 11	Speech-language students or ED students who are in the regular classroom. Proficiency rate=17%	LD students who are in the resource room. Proficiency rate = 2%

Other interesting multi-variable findings:

- The reason that the proficiency rate for students in separate classroom settings is so much higher than that of students in the resource room is that almost 50% of students in separate classrooms take the alternate assessment whereas only 5% of students in the resource room take the alternate assessment. If we compare students in separate classrooms who took the regular assessment to students in the resource room who took the regular assessment, then about 15% of each group scored proficient in reading.

State July 2008 - 427 Data

Attachment 1

	State		District Example	
	# Students	%	# Students	%
A. Disability				
	14,941			
AT	421	3%		2%
BI	84	1%		<1%
CD	675	5%		3%
DD	61	<1%		<1%
ED	1,176	8%		15%
HI	191	1%		1%
HL	2,001	13%		14%
LD	5,773	39%		44%
MU	151	1%		1%
OI	97	1%		1%
SL	4,244	28%		19%
VI	67	<1%		<1%
B. Related Services				
AT	439	3%		3%
AU	105	1%		
CS	1,726	12%		9%
EI	12	<1%		
LS	3,890	26%		12%
OM	49	<1%		1%
OT	1,993	13%		17%
OY	139	1%		<1%
PS	106	1%		<1%
PT	490	3%		2%
RE	36	<1%		
SH	59	<1%		
SN	10	<1%		
SW	1,442	10%		20%
TR	562	4%		6%
CS/PS/SW	3,170	21%		29%
ESY	1,014	7%		2%
C. Environment				
RE	8,982	60%		55%
RR	4,293	29%		34%
SC	1,171	8%		6%
SF	435	3%		4%
SS	60	<1%		1%
D. PAWS Scores				
Math	7,241	43%		35%
Reading	7,204	31%		21%
Writing	7,171	20%		11%

State July 2008 - 427 Data

Attachment 2

What percent of students at each grade level are classified with a certain primary disability?

All Students		Grade													
		K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
A. Disability	14,941														
AT	3%	2%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	2%	3%	2%	
BI	1%	0%	<1%	<1%	<1%	1%	1%	1%	<1%	1%	0%	1%	1%	2%	
CD	5%	2%	4%	2%	3%	4%	4%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	6%	12%	
DD	<1%	4%	1%	0%	<1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	<1%	<1%	0%	0%	0%	
ED	8%	1%	3%	3%	5%	6%	6%	8%	12%	12%	16%	14%	13%	10%	
HI	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	
HL	13%	5%	8%	9%	12%	14%	16%	16%	17%	19%	17%	16%	14%	14%	
LD	39%	7%	12%	25%	36%	39%	45%	48%	50%	49%	51%	54%	53%	52%	
MU	1%	1%	1%	1%	<1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	3%	
OI	1%	1%	<1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	<1%	1%	1%	
SL	28%	74%	66%	54%	39%	30%	22%	15%	9%	7%	6%	5%	5%	3%	
VI	<1%	<1%	<1%	1%	1%	<1%	0%	<1%	<1%	1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	1%	
	100%	98%	99%	100%	101%	100%	101%	100%	99%	100%	101%	99%	100%	101%	

What percent of students in each environment are classified with a certain primary disability?

All		LRE			
		RE	RR	SC	SF
A. Disability	14,941				
AT	3%	2%	3%	10%	3%
BI	1%	<1%	1%	2%	1%
CD	5%	1%	6%	29%	8%
DD	<1%	1%	<1%	<1%	0%
ED	8%	5%	8%	17%	37%
HI	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
HL	13%	11%	17%	16%	13%
LD	39%	36%	54%	12%	20%
MU	1%	<1%	1%	9%	3%
OI	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
SL	28%	42%	9%	3%	11%
VI	<1%	<1%	<1%	1%	<1%
	100%	100%	101%	101%	98%

State July 2008 - 427 Data

Attachment 3

What percent of students at each grade level receive a given related service?

All Students		Grade													
		K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
B. Related Services	14,941														
AT	3%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	3%	3%	4%	4%	3%	4%	5%	4%	
AU	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	1%	<1%	<1%	
CS	12%	4%	7%	9%	12%	13%	13%	16%	15%	14%	13%	14%	13%	9%	
EI	<1%	0%	0%	0%	<1%	0%	<1%	<1%	0%	<1%	<1%	<1%	0%	<1%	
LS	26%	33%	34%	35%	31%	28%	27%	26%	21%	24%	18%	17%	16%	17%	
OM	<1%	<1%	<1%	1%	0%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	
OT	13%	25%	23%	22%	19%	16%	14%	9%	8%	6%	4%	4%	4%	6%	
OY	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	<1%	1%	1%	<1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	
PS	1%	<1%	1%	<1%	1%	<1%	1%	1%	<1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	<1%	
PT	3%	6%	5%	4%	3%	3%	3%	2%	3%	2%	2%	2%	2%	4%	
RE	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	0%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	
SH	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	1%	<1%	1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	1%	<1%	<1%	
SN	<1%	<1%	<1%	0%	<1%	0%	0%	0%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	0%	
SW	10%	3%	5%	5%	7%	7%	10%	13%	16%	14%	16%	13%	11%	8%	
TR	4%	4%	4%	3%	3%	3%	4%	4%	5%	4%	4%	3%	4%	6%	
CS/PS/SW	21%	8%	12%	14%	19%	20%	24%	29%	30%	28%	29%	27%	24%	17%	
ESY	7%	9%	9%	8%	7%	7%	7%	8%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	7%	

What percent of students with a particular disability receive a given related service? What percent of students in a given environment receive a given related service?

		Primary Disability										LRE			
		AT	BI	CD	ED	HI	HL	LD	MU	OI	SL	RE	RR	SC	SF
B. Related Services	14,941														
AT	3%	8%	10%	7%	2%	24%	3%	3%	21%	12%	1%	2%	3%	8%	3%
AU	1%	<1%	0%	1%	<1%	23%	1%	<1%	3%	0%	<1%	<1%	1%	<1%	1%
CS	12%	22%	19%	11%	37%	7%	21%	9%	7%	3%	3%	8%	16%	17%	21%
EI	<1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	<1%	<1%	0%	0%
LS	26%	63%	46%	66%	11%	50%	21%	19%	75%	26%	28%	20%	31%	54%	16%
OM	<1%	<1%	4%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	2%	1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	1%	1%
OT	13%	49%	43%	40%	7%	8%	16%	8%	74%	64%	8%	9%	16%	39%	13%
OY	1%	4%	0%	3%	2%	3%	1%	<1%	9%	3%	<1%	<1%	<1%	4%	3%
PS	1%	21%	2%	1%	5%	0%	1%	<1%	0%	2%	<1%	<1%	<1%	1%	3%
PT	3%	7%	21%	16%	<1%	1%	5%	<1%	54%	72%	<1%	2%	3%	17%	6%
RE	<1%	1%	1%	2%	<1%	0%	<1%	0%	5%	0%	0%	<1%	<1%	<1%	3%
SH	<1%	<1%	0%	1%	<1%	0%	1%	<1%	8%	1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	2%	1%
SN	<1%	<1%	0%	<1%	<1%	0%	<1%	0%	2%	1%	0%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%
SW	10%	16%	15%	16%	31%	6%	15%	8%	9%	8%	3%	6%	14%	22%	11%
TR	4%	17%	12%	21%	10%	6%	5%	<1%	31%	18%	<1%	1%	3%	25%	8%
CS/PS/SW	21%	39%	35%	27%	68%	13%	35%	17%	17%	12%	5%	14%	29%	40%	31%
ESY	7%	28%	27%	31%	9%	11%	8%	3%	42%	19%	2%	3%	8%	27%	52%

Attachment 4

5 Resource Room

Percent of each group of students who are educated in the Resource Room

	<u># students</u>	<u>% prof</u>		<u># students</u>	<u>% prof</u>
Females	5156	29.5%	Regular Classroom		
Males	9799	28.3%	Resource Room	4293	100.0%
			Separate Classrooms		
Asian Americans	93	18.3%	Separate Facilities		
African Americans	298	33.2%			
Hispanics	1518	35.4%	Autism	421	32.3%
Native Americans	766	26.5%	Traumatic Brain Injury	84	44.1%
Whites	12280	28.0%	Deaf-Blindness		
			Emotional Disability	1176	29.1%
Kindergarten	1287	10.1%	Hard of Hearing	191	33.0%
Grade 1	1285	15.6%	Other Health Impaired	2001	35.9%
Grade 2	1353	22.1%	Learning Disability	5773	39.9%
Grade 3	1334	27.7%	Mental Disability	675	37.1%
Grade 4	1371	30.5%	Multiple Disabilities	151	15.2%
Grade 5	1193	36.0%	Orthopedic Disability	97	22.7%
Grade 6	1164	37.6%	Speech/Language Disability	4244	8.8%
Grade 7	1027	40.8%	Visual Impairment	67	25.4%
Grade 8	1127	35.3%			
Grade 9	1119	34.4%	Took regular assessment	6777	35.3%
Grade 10	1031	32.7%	Took alternate assessment	424	31.1%
Grade 11	821	30.5%			
Grade 12	843	26.0%			
			Students who are receiving this many related services:		
ELL Students	441	35.8%	None	7912	23.4%
Non-ELL Students	14514	28.5%	1	4432	32.5%
			2-3	2283	40.5%
ESY Students	1014	35.6%	4 or more	328	24.1%
Non-ESY Students	13927	28.2%			

A district can compare its percentage of students in the resource room to the state's percent to see where there are large differences. For example, maybe a district has 70% of its students with LD in the resource room compared to 40% of the state students with LD. Why might this difference exist?

Attachment 5

3C Reading Proficiency Rate

Percent of each group who scored proficient on PAWS Reading in spring 2008

	<u># students</u>	<u>% prof</u>		<u># students</u>	<u>% prof</u>
Females	2627	31.8%	Regular Classroom	4107	39.4%
Males	4577	30.2%	Resource Room	2525	16.9%
			Separate Classrooms	525	31.1%
Asian Americans	46	43.5%	Separate Facilities	34	14.7%
African Americans	128	32.0%			
Hispanics	757	23.7%	Autism	210	43.3%
Native Americans	324	13.0%	Traumatic Brain Injury	40	20.0%
Whites	5949	32.5%	Deaf-Blindness		
			Emotional Disability	507	31.1%
Kindergarten			Hard of Hearing	104	37.5%
Grade 1			Other Health Impaired	1133	27.8%
Grade 2			Learning Disability	3330	21.3%
Grade 3	1165	33.5%	Mental Disability	297	40.7%
Grade 4	1206	41.2%	Multiple Disabilities	51	25.5%
Grade 5	1027	32.5%	Orthopedic Disability	45	62.2%
Grade 6	1030	32.3%	Speech/Language Disability	1453	49.4%
Grade 7	882	26.8%	Visual Impairment	29	48.3%
Grade 8	935	30.9%			
Grade 9			Took regular assessment	6780	29.5%
Grade 10	376	9.6%	Took alternate assessment	424	51.7%
Grade 11	547	16.6%			
Grade 12					
			Students who are receiving this many related services:		
ELL Students	235	23.7%	None	3679	33.0%
Non-ELL Students	6969	46.5%	1	2306	29.2%
			2-3	1094	26.5%
ESY Students	434	23.0%	4 or more	125	32.8%
Non-ESY Students	6766	32.2%			
			Overall	7204	30.8%

A district can compare its percentage of students who score proficient in reading to the state's percent to see where there are large differences. For example, maybe a district has 30% of its students in the regular classroom environment scoring proficient compared to 39% of the state students. Why might this difference exist?