

The Monitoring Conundrum

Ensuring the Use of Reliable and Valid
Data in Accountability

Topics

- Working Together
- Issues of Reliability and Validity
- Targeted Self Assessment Design

Compilation of
618 and other
data

State provides
technical
assistance

SPP teams review data
and target LEAs based on
data

LEAs address
improvement and
correction of
noncompliance

Targeted compliance
self-assessment
completed by
identified LEAs

Addressing Reliability

What is our confidence that any two individuals will arrive at the same conclusion?

- Explicit directions with examples
- Training

Addressing Reliability

What is our confidence that any two individuals will arrive at the same conclusion?

- Inter-rater reliability studies
 - By item and record
 - LEA staff and Bureau staff
- Results will be used to improve item directions and identify additional training needs

Validity

Are we measuring what we think we are measuring, and do we have confidence in our conclusions?

- Self assessment items built from related requirements document
- Sample size and selection procedures
- Individual cases versus systemic issues

Validity

What about consequential validity?

- Cyclical monitoring a potential threat
- System design allows for all districts every year

Florida's Compliance Self-Assessment System

Issues

- Procedural compliance monitoring
 - Good for validity
 - Good for reliability
 - No so good for meaningful impact?
- Substantive compliance monitoring
 - No so good for validity
 - No so good for reliability
 - Much better for meaningful impact!

Florida's Compliance Self-Assessment System

Objectives

- Meaningful impact
- Valid, reliable data
- Accurate, consistent data tracking
- Incorporate SPP indicator teams' targeted planning activities
- Timely identification of noncompliance
- Timely reporting to LEAs
- Timely correction of noncompliance
- Maximize limited resources

Florida's Compliance Self-Assessment System

2007-08 Web-based self-assessment

- Districts identified as “targeted” or “basic”
- Protocols aligned with related requirements
- Targeted
 - Dropout
 - LRE – K-12 and PreK
 - Assessment – participation and performance
 - Secondary transition
- Basic
 - IEP
 - Manifestation determination
 - Secondary transition

Florida's Compliance Self-Assessment System

“Context setting” – Sample selection

- Dropout – Schools with high dropout rate; > 10 days suspension; chronic truancy; primarily SLD, E/BD
- LRE – Schools with poor LRE data; primarily high incidence disabilities; regular class, separate class, or separate school placement
- Assessment – Schools with poor participation or performance data; primarily high incidence disabilities

Florida's Compliance Self-Assessment System

“Context setting” – Instructions

- All – Review all available data (grades, discipline, attendance, etc)
- Dropout – District data; school data; student at-risk due to discipline, attendance, disability; does the IEP substantively address all areas?
- LRE – District data; school data; does the IEP substantively support removal
- Assessment – District data; school data; does the IEP substantively address academic areas and instructional support

Florida's Compliance Self-Assessment System

“Do the right thing; check ‘no’ if ‘compliant,
but ----”

Common elements for Dropout, Assessment,
LRE, and IEP

1. Present level statements
2. Annual goals and short-term objectives
or benchmarks
3. Services that support 1 and 2 above

Florida's Compliance Self-Assessment System

1. Present level of academic achievement and functional performance that address the student's needs resulting from the disability
 - Dropout – 17 of 17 (100%)
15 of 17 (88%) systemic
 - Assessment – 4 of 4 (100%)
3 of 4 (75%) systemic
 - LRE – 22 of 29 (76%)
8 of 29 (28%) systemic
 - Basic IEP – 24 of 35 (68%)
18 of 35 (51%) systemic

Florida's Compliance Self-Assessment System

2. Measurable annual goals and short-term objectives/benchmarks designed to meet the students needs that result from the disability
 - Dropout – 15 of 17 (88%)
12 of 17 (71%) systemic
 - Assessment – 4 of 4 (100%)
1 of 4 (25%) systemic
 - LRE – 27 of 29 (93%)
12 of 29 (41%) systemic
 - Basic IEP – 26 of 35 (74%)
14 of 35 (40%) systemic

Florida's Compliance Self-Assessment System

3. Alignment among the present level statement, goals/objectives/benchmarks, and services
 - Dropout – 13 of 17 (76%)
8 of 17 (47%) systemic
 - Assessment – 4 of 4 (100%)
1 of 4 (25%) systemic
 - LRE – 16 of 29 (55%)
3 of 29 (10%) systemic
 - Basic IEP – 12 of 35 (34%)
7 of 35 (20%) systemic

Florida's Compliance Self-Assessment System

?????

- Noncompliance is correlated with poor outcome data?
- Context setting adds bias to the review?
- Context setting increases validity within targeted groups?
- Context setting decreases reliability across all groups?

Next steps...?

Thank you

Dr. Kim C. Komisar

Karen Denbroeder

Florida Department of Education

850.245.0475

Kim.Komisar@fldoe.org

Karen.Denbroeder@fldoe.org