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What Is a Success Gap?

- A gap in educational outcomes between different groups of students. For example,
  - Students with disabilities (SWD) as compared to students without disabilities (SWOD)
  - Black SWD compared with non-Black SWD
- Perhaps in typical SIMR categories
  - Reading scores
  - Math scores
  - Post-school outcomes
- Or in underlying categories
  - Identification and/or placement for special education
  - Suspension rates
Equity, Inclusion, and Opportunity Can Lessen Success Gaps Between SWD and SWOD

Large gains may be possible for your SWD in SIMR and other categories if they gain equitable access to instruction that is

- Data based
- Part of a high-quality, fully differentiated core instructional program
- Built on universal screening and progress monitoring
- Part of a multi-tiered system of support
- Culturally responsive
Getting Results for SWD Overall by Addressing Success Gaps Between Subgroups of SWD

• Sometimes, the best way to improve statewide SIMRs for SWD is to focus on one or more large and under-performing subgroups of SWD in your state.

• Your schools may be working well for SWD, but not for all subgroups of SWD.

• Large gains may be possible for these subgroups of SWD if they gain equitable access to high-quality, culturally responsive instruction.

• If there are enough students in these subgroups, this can move the SIMR “needle” statewide.
Achievement: Disaggregated NAEP Math Scores, Grades 4 and 8, 2013, Washington, DC

- With disabilities: 195.6 (223.1)
- English language learner: 209.3 (234.6)
- Eligible for free or reduced lunch: 216.9 (250.6)
- Black: 218.2 (252.7)
- All students: 228.6 (260.3)
- Hispanic: 226.2 (261.8)
- Not English language learner: 230.2 (262.3)
- Without disabilities: 233.7 (268.0)
- Not eligible for Free or reduced lunch: 265.7 (293.1)
- White: 277.0 (314.7)
Achievement: Disaggregated Main NAEP Reading Scores, Grades 4 and 8, 2013, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

- With disabilities: 160.6, 216.0
- English language learner: 165.7, 220.4
- Hispanic: 193.3, 242.9
- Black: 196.4, 243.7
- Eligible for free or reduced lunch: 198.1, 245.3
- All students: 199.9, 248.5
- Not English language learner: 202.2, 250.6
- Without disabilities: 205.9, 255.4
- White: 214.0, 261.2
- Asian/Pacific Islander: 214.9, 265.4
- Not eligible for Free or reduced lunch: 227.3, 271.2
Graduation Rates 2011 and 2012

Source: http://eddataexpress.ed.gov/

In collaboration with DaSy, ECTA, NCSI, & NTACT
The Graduation Gap: What the Data Tell Us: All States, % of SWDs Graduating With Regular Diploma, 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>% Graduating Regular Diploma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students Receiving Suspensions and Expulsions, by Race/Ethnicity

**Enrollment**

- White: 51%
- Two or More Races: 1%
- Hispanic/Latino of Any Race: 24%
- Black/African American: 16%
- Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander: 1%
- Asian: 5%
- American Indian / Alaska Native: 1%

**In-School Suspension**

- White: 40%
- Two or More Races: 2%
- Hispanic/Latino of Any Race: 32%
- Black/African American: 22%
- Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander: 0%
- Asian: 3%
- American Indian / Alaska Native: 1%

Students Receiving Suspensions and Expulsions, by Race/Ethnicity

**Enrollment**

- White: 51%
- Two or More Races: 1%
- Hispanic/Latino of Any Race: 24%
- Black/African American: 16%
- Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander: 1%
- Asian: 5%
- American Indian / Alaska Native: 1%

**Out-of-School Suspension (multiple)**

- White: 31%
- Two or More Races: 2%
- Hispanic/Latino of Any Race: 42%
- Black/African American: 21%
- Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander: 3%

Preschool Students Receiving Suspensions, by Race/Ethnicity

**Enrollment**
- White: 43%
- Two or More Races: 4%
- Hispanic/Latino of Any Race: 2%
- Black/African American: 18%
- Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander: 1%
- Asian: 0%
- American Indian / Alaska Native: 1%

**Out-of-School Suspension (single)**
- White: 28%
- Two or More Races: 3%
- Hispanic/Latino of Any Race: 25%
- Black/African American: 42%
- Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander: 4%
- Asian: 1%
- American Indian / Alaska Native: 0%

SSIP Phase I - Disaggregated Data

• During your state’s SSIP data analysis, your SSIP team disaggregated your data.
  • What variables did you use in your state’s data disaggregation (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.)?
  • What “success gaps” did you find?
  • How are you using that information to create improvement strategies?
SSIP Phase II

The focus of Phase II is on building state capacity to support LEAs with the implementation of evidence-based practices that will lead to measurable improvement in the SIMR for SWD.

Will those EBPs

• Be implemented equitably for all subgroups of SWD?

• Have positive effects for all subgroups of SWD?
How to Close Success Gaps

- Data-based decision making
- Cultural responsiveness
- High-quality Core instructional program
- Universal screening and progress monitoring
- Evidence-based Interventions and supports
To Address Your Success Gap, Find the Root Causes

• Two tools from the IDEA Data Center
Intended Audiences

- State Departments of Education
- STATE STAFF RESPONSIBLE FOR SSIPs
- Local school districts
- Schools
- TA providers, professional developers, & consultants working with districts and schools
- Other stakeholders concerned about equity issues in schools
- General Ed. and Special Ed.
Which Are the Affected Subgroups Based on Your Data Disaggregation?

• Students with disabilities

OR

• Subgroups within students with disabilities
  • Type of disability
  • ELL
  • Migrant
  • Low socio-economic status
  • Race/ethnicity
  • Foster children
  • A geographic region
Structure of the Document(s)

- Introductory research brief
- Self-assessment rubric
Self-assessment Components

Capacity-building element: Understand the particular circumstances of success gaps (in the implementation of strategies and in student outcomes) at the state and the LEA levels

• Data-based decision making

• Cultural responsiveness

• High-quality Core instructional program

• Universal screening and progress monitoring

• Evidence-based interventions and supports
How to Address Success Gaps

1. Form state and/or LEA teams
2. Disaggregate & study the data
3. Self-assess using the rubric
4. Provide evidence
5. Consider the students first
6. Ensure equitable participation
7. Develop a plan of action
8. Incorporate the plan of action into the set of improvement areas identified in the Phase I of the SSIP
1. Data-based Decision Making

Probing Questions:
Does our school or district identify data elements or quality indicators that are tracked over time to measure school effectiveness? What are those data elements? Are the data valid and reliable? Are data disaggregated by student demographics such as race/ethnicity, gender, disability, etc. to identify gaps in achievement and performance and trends with over- or under-representation in identification, placement, and discipline? Are data reviewed at regular intervals to determine progress or change? Are data used to make policy, procedure, and practice decisions in our school? How regularly do we use these data to inform our decisions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 1</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Partially Implemented</th>
<th>Implemented</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decisions about the school curriculum, instructional programs, academic and behavioral supports, and school improvement initiatives are based on data</td>
<td>Decisions about the school curriculum, instructional programs, academic and behavioral supports, and school improvement initiatives are rarely based on systematic data.</td>
<td>Some teachers and programs consistently use systematic valid and reliable data to inform decisions about curriculum, instructional programs, academic and behavioral supports, and school improvement initiatives.</td>
<td>The data used are valid and reliable. A schoolwide formalized and systematic process is in place to monitor and reinforce the continuous improvement of individual learners, subgroups of learners, initiatives, and programs within the school. It is implemented by some but not all staff.</td>
<td>The data used are valid and reliable. The schoolwide process for data-based decision making is implemented and evident for all students and subgroups of students, in all classrooms, and is used in decisions about school initiatives or programs, as well.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is the evidence to support your rating?
Data-based Decision Making

• Use disaggregated data for decisions about
  • Curriculum and instructional programs
  • Academic and behavioral supports

• Make decisions about student interventions using multiple data sources, including
  • Screening
  • Progress monitoring
  • Formative and summative evaluation data
Cultural Responsiveness

• Recognize diversity across student ethnicity, language, and socio-economic status

• Provide training and resources so teachers can meet the linguistic needs of all students

• Include parents from all backgrounds in discussions about the school and about their children’s progress
Addressing Success Gaps in SC

John R. Payne, Director
Office of Special Education Services
South Carolina Department of Education
1429 Senate Street, Suite 808
Columbia, South Carolina 29201
(803) 734-8224 (Office)
(803) 734-5021 (Fax)
jrpayne@ed.sc.gov
http://www.ed.sc.gov
Eleven districts participated in the initial SSIP District Partners’ Meeting where the *Equity, Inclusion, and Opportunity: Addressing Success Gaps* rubric was introduced and fully explained. Participants were asked to return to their districts to complete the rubric with expanded teams.
In preparation for the meeting, the SCDE OSES SSIP Core Team developed the **SC SSIP District Partners’ Inventory** (based on the **Addressing Success Gaps** rubric) to be used as a self-guided learning activity. The Inventory was designed to gather more specific information about district practices.

---

### 1. Data-based Decision Making

Using the Likert scale below, indicate the degree to which the district practices data-based decision making.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning/Rarely</th>
<th>Partially/Initiatives</th>
<th>Implemented/School-wide</th>
<th>Exemplary/District-wide</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The district identifies data elements/quality indicators that are tracked over time to measure school effectiveness.
- The district makes decisions about school curriculum based on data.
- The district makes decisions about instructional programs based on data.
- The district makes decisions about behavioral supports based on data.
- The district makes decisions about school improvement initiatives based on data.
- Data are used to make policy decisions.
- Data are used to make procedure decisions.
- Data are used to make practice decisions.

Provide an example of data elements/quality indicators that are tracked over time to measure school effectiveness?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Are the data reliable? Yes [ ] No [ ]

How do you know? __________________________

________________________________________________________________________

To identify gaps in achievement, performance and trends with over- or under-representation in identification, placement, and discipline, are data disaggregated by student demographics, including:

- Race [ ]
- Gender [ ]
- Ethnicity [ ]
- Disability [ ]

Are data reviewed at regular intervals to determine progress or change? Yes [ ] No [ ]

If so, at which interval(s): Weekly [ ] Monthly [ ] Quarterly [ ] Semi-Annually [ ] Annually [ ]

If the intervals vary, provide examples of the data reviewed __________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Is the district’s use of data to inform decisions a strength or a challenge? If a strength, what procedures were put in place to get to this point? If a challenge, what are some of the barriers your district has experienced?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

---

### 2. Cultural Responsiveness

**Probing Questions:**

Are school staff prepared to work with students from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds? Is our school culture responsive and welcoming to students and families from culturally linguistically diverse groups? How well do our teaching staff reflect the cultural/linguistic makeup of our school’s population? Do school staff understand and value each individual child and each group’s unique cultural values and needs? Are teachers familiar with the beliefs, values, cultural practices, discourse styles, and other features of students’ lives that may impact on classroom participation and success, and are they prepared to use this information in designing instruction? Do research-based interventions account for the schools cultural context as a part of implementation? Are screening, referral, and assessment practices, procedures, and tools unbiased and nondiscriminatory? Do the staff at our school understand that our job is to be culturally responsive to all our students? Are we linguistically competent to communicate with our students and their families? Do culturally-responsive practices inform our outreach to the community including parents and community partners?

**Indicator 2a**

- Culture-responsive instructional interventions and teaching strategies
- Planning
- Partially Implemented
- Implemented
- Exemplary

What is the evidence to support your rating?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 2a</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Partially Implemented</th>
<th>Implemented</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture-responsive instructional interventions...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 2b</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Partially Implemented</th>
<th>Implemented</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture-responsive instructional interventions...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data collected from the Partners’ Inventory provided a method for OSES to determine root causes of low performance in reading within the select districts. Additionally, this data will guide the selection of appropriate plans and strategies in effort to promote an increase in reading proficiency in each SSIP partner district.

* Charts (right) reflect district responses to Partners’ Inventory questions 1, 2, and 4.
Practice Using the Success Gaps Rubric

• Focusing on the SIMR gap that you identified earlier,
  • Ask yourself if your state’s (or LEA’s) educational system is culturally responsive to the underperforming group
  • Work through the cultural responsiveness section of the rubric
  • Write your responses in the form, recognizing that they are preliminary, lacking data and lacking a team
  • As directed, share your responses at your topical table, then with the larger group
Core Instructional Program

• Rigorous, consistent, and well-articulated K-12 instructional program, aligned with standards, delivered with fidelity

• Effective differentiation in the core curriculum

• Informing parents in their native or home language about differentiation
Practice using the success gaps rubric

• Focusing on the SIMR gap that you identified earlier,
  • Ask yourself if your state’s (or LEA’s) core instructional program is of high quality and differentiated, especially for the underperforming group
  • Work through the core instruction program section of the rubric
  • Write your responses in the form, recognizing that they are preliminary, lacking data and lacking a team
  • As directed, share your responses at your topical table, then with the larger group
Assessment

• Valid universal screening
• Progress monitoring for all students
• Informing parents in their native or home language about results
Evidence-based Interventions and Supports

- Implemented with fidelity
- Instructional
- Behavioral
  - such as Positive Behavioral Supports or Restorative Justice
  - Tiered response protocols, not zero tolerance
- Informing parents in their native or home language about interventions and responses
Take a Closer Look....

• Equity
• Inclusion
• Opportunity
From This Brief Presentation and Activity…

• Would you use this tool on your SSIP?
• How would you use it?
• Do you have suggestions on how this rubric could be improved for a potential use in the SSIP?
Further Resources

• Tools are found at:
  • https://ideadata.org/resource-library/54611b49140ba0d8358b4569/
  • https://ideadata.org/resource-library/54611dfc140ba0cb398b4573/

• Are you interested in piloting these tools?

• Please provide feedback about the tools if you use them

Contacts:
  • Tom Munk (TomMunk@westat.com),
  • Nancy O’Hara (nancy.ohara@uky.edu),
  • Cesar D’Agord (cdagord@wested.org) or
  • Kristin Reedy (kreedy@wested.org)
For More Information

Visit the IDC website
http://ideadata.org/

Follow us on Twitter
https://twitter.com/ideadatapcenter
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