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From the very beginning in 1975 with the passage of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (also known as Public Law 94-142), the Federal Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) has required states to focus our resources on procedural compliance through rigorous monitoring efforts and extensive reporting procedures.
State Monitoring and General Supervision under IDEA

Core Concepts
- Improving educational results and functional outcomes for all children with disabilities
- Ensuring that LEAs are meeting the procedural requirements under IDEA

Monitoring LEAs
- Quantifiable indicators in priority areas - compliance indicators and coordinated program reviews
- Qualitative indicators to measure performance
Reflecting on Outcomes

★ In 2012, the U.S. Department of Education recognized that the educational outcomes of children and youth with disabilities have not improved as much as expected even with intensive Federal regulatory oversight and significant funding provided to address closing achievement gaps through programs such as *No Child Left Behind* and *IDEA*. 
USED Is Shifting the Balance

★ OSEP announced movement toward prioritizing improvement of outcomes for students with disabilities
  ★ Movement from a one-size-fits-all, compliance-focused approach to general supervision to a more balanced system that looks at results and outcomes.

★ OSEP’s vision of Results Driven Accountability (RDA) – all components of accountability will be aligned in a manner that best supports States in improving results for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities, and their families.
Core Principles of RDA

★ OSEP is developing the RDA system in partnership with stakeholders.
★ The RDA system is transparent and understandable to States and the general public, especially individuals with disabilities and their families.
★ The RDA system drives improved outcomes for all children and youth with disabilities regardless of their age, disability, race/ethnicity, language, gender, socioeconomic status, or location.
★ The RDA system ensures the protection of the individual rights of each child or youth with a disability and their families, regardless of his/her age, disability, race/ethnicity, language, gender, socioeconomic status, or location.
★ The RDA system provides differentiated incentives, supports, and interventions based on each State’s unique strengths, progress, challenges, and needs.
★ The RDA system encourages States to direct their resources to where they can have the greatest positive impact on outcomes and the protection of individual rights for all children and youth with disabilities, and minimizes State burden and duplication of effort.
★ The RDA system is responsive to the needs and expectations of the ultimate consumers (i.e., children and youth with disabilities and their families) as they identify them.
Priorities of RDA

- To help close the achievement gap for students with disabilities

- To move away from a one-size-fits-all, compliance-focused approach

- To craft a more balanced system that looks at how well students are being educated in addition to continued efforts to protect their rights
Children with disabilities are part of, not separate from, the general education population. Thus, special education accountability should strengthen and compliment other ED reform initiatives, including ESEA flexibility.

An emphasis on compliance over results in special education fails to acknowledge those states where children with disabilities are achieving and being prepared for a range of college and career options appropriate to their individual needs and preferences.

The accountability system under the IDEA should provide meaningful information to the public regarding the effectiveness of states and local educational agencies in educating children with disabilities.
Two RDA Initiatives

★ Annual review of all **indicator data for both compliance and performance results** from the State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR).
  ★ New State Determinations

★ State Systemic Improvement Plan
  ★ New SPP/APR Indicator
  ★ Specific focus on how State and LEAs are accountable jointly to **improve results and demonstrate growth over time**.
  ★ Requires States and LEAs to **establish collaborative models using evidence-based practices** that will address improving educational results and student learning outcomes.
New Annual State Determinations

★ Compliance Matrix
★ Data validity and reliability
★ Rates of compliance
★ Timeliness of correction of noncompliance
★ Special conditions, if any

★ Results Driven Accountability Matrix
★ Statewide assessment – 4th and 8th grade
★ participation rates and proficiency gaps
★ 4th and 8th graders
★ NAEP participation and scoring – 4th and 8th grade
★ Future measures: growth of proficiency rates on statewide assessments, graduation rates
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part B Compliance Indicator¹</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2011</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 4B</strong>: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 9</strong>: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 10</strong>: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 11</strong>: Timely initial evaluation</td>
<td>97.30%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 12</strong>: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 13</strong>: Secondary transition</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 15</strong>: Timely correction</td>
<td>99.20%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 20</strong>: Timely and accurate State-reported data</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timely State Complaint Decisions</strong></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions</strong></td>
<td>94.40%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Longstanding Noncompliance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Conditions</strong></td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uncorrected identified noncompliance</strong></td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Compliance Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Points Earned**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Earned</th>
<th>Total Possible Points</th>
<th>Compliance Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>95.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The complete language for each indicator is located on page one of the State’s Part B FFY 2012 SPP/APR Response Table.
# Massachusetts

## Part B Results Driven Accountability Matrix: 2014

### Reading Component Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of 4th and 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular State Assessment</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th and 8th Grade Proficiency Gap on State Assessment</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Assessment of Educational Progress - Percentage 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above</td>
<td>41.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Assessment of Educational Progress - Percentage 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Excluded from Testing</td>
<td>11.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Assessment of Educational Progress - Percentage 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above</td>
<td>51.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Assessment of Educational Progress - Percentage 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Excluded from Testing</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Math Component Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of 4th and 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular State Assessment</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th and 8th Grade Proficiency Gap on State Assessment</td>
<td>37.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Assessment of Educational Progress - Percentage 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above</td>
<td>69.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Assessment of Educational Progress - Percentage 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Excluded from Testing</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Assessment of Educational Progress - Percentage 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above</td>
<td>55.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Assessment of Educational Progress - Percentage 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Excluded from Testing</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Component Elements</td>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Placeholder for FFY 2013)</td>
<td>(Placeholder for FFY 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results Total Points Available</td>
<td>Results Points Earned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance Total Points Available</td>
<td>Compliance Points Earned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination

85.23% MEETS REQUIREMENTS (green)

1. The Department is committed to using graduation data in determinations but identified potential discrepancies between States with respect to what is included as a regular high school diploma for children with disabilities, as reported to the Department. To ensure that States are treated equitably, we will work with States to address these discrepancies and plan to use graduation data in the 2015 Part B determinations.

2. Review the Part B Compliance Matrix for a breakdown of compliance points earned.

3. Review “How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2014: Part B” for a detailed description of how the Compliance Performance Percentage, Results Performance Percentage and the Results Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated.
IDEA State Determinations Under Results Driven Accountability: 2014

Sources: IDEA Part B Annual Performance Report Compliance Data and Results Data, including EDFacts (2012-13 School Year) and National Assessment of Educational Progress (2013 NAEP Results)
Results Focused Accountability in MA

- MA is an outcome-oriented state
- The system for making special education determinations is aligned with the State’s accountability system
- Outcome data informs state special education determinations
- Improving positive outcomes for students with disabilities is critical
• 2003: MA launches its accountability system based on performance

• First MA SPP/APR report - 20 compliance and performance indicators
• District-level public reporting

• First district determinations of need for special education technical assistance or intervention
• Includes focus on performance
• Compliance considerations also incorporated

• First full alignment of districts’ accountability status (performance focused) and special education determinations

• States report 17 SPP/APR indicators – delete three reporting data submitted to USED in other reports (complaints, hearing timelines, data reporting compliance)

• Phase I of SSIP process begins with stakeholder discussions, data review, and infrastructure analysis
• July: RDA Leadership Series

• OSEP suspends state visits
• Announces RDA concept

• Spring: SSIP phase timeline released (single SPP/APR Indicator)
• June: RDA announcement to Chief State School Officers
• June: State determinations weighted 50% compliance / 50% performance

The New Indicator: State Systemic Improvement Plan

SPP/APR Indicator 17

**Comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities.**

**Phase I: Analysis**
- Data analysis
- Infrastructure analysis
- State-identified measureable result(s) for children with disabilities (SIMR) – using one or more performance indicators
- Selection of coherent improvement strategies
- Theory of action

Baseline data and analysis report due April 1, 2015

**Phase II: Plan**
- Infrastructure development
- Support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve student outcomes
- Evaluation

Due February 1, 2016

**Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation**
- Continue implementation
- Report results of ongoing evaluation and make revisions to the SSIP

Due February 1, 2017 - 2020

2014 2015 2016 - 2019
Preparing and Planning for the SSIP

We are learning from stakeholders, data analysis, and research that we need to design/implement social/emotional supports for young children with disabilities.

Universally Designed Social Emotional Supports for Young Children with Disabilities

Stakeholder Input

Data and Infrastructure Analysis

Research
This will improve seven additional outcomes.

- Improve K Readiness
- Improve Disciplinary Practices and Reduce Removals
- Support Appropriate Identification and Eligibility
- Universally Designed Social Emotional Supports for Young Children
- Improve Engagement in School
- Improve Performance on Statewide Assessments
- Improve Literacy Development
- Promote Inclusive Education
- This will improve seven additional outcomes.
The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education and its Office of Special Education Planning and Policy Development seek to strengthen the Commonwealth’s public education system so that every student, and most especially every student with disabilities, is prepared to succeed in postsecondary education, compete in the global economy, and understand the rights and responsibilities of American citizens, and in so doing, to close all proficiency gaps.