

# **CCSSO Inclusive Leadership Webisode #2: Ensuring an Equitable Opportunity: Providing a High-Quality Education for Students with Disabilities**

**Kathleen Airhart**, Council of Chief State School Officers

**David Bateman, PhD.**, Shippensburg University

**James M. Paul**, Council of Chief State School Officers

Thursday, August 1<sup>st</sup>, 2019 2-3PM ET

For more information about the CCSSO Inclusive Leadership Webisode Series, please e-mail [kizzy.blackwell@ccsso.org](mailto:kizzy.blackwell@ccsso.org)

# Tech Norms

- ⌘ Log in to the WebEx system
- ⌘ Engage camera (helps with understanding in virtual meetings)
- ⌘ Upon entering, please share your name, role, and organization in the chat pod
- ⌘ Be in control... mute and unmute yourself
- ⌘ Please ask questions either via chat pod (at any time) or by raising your hand in WebEx (hand icon during discussion pieces)

# Introduction to Inclusive Leadership Webisode Series

Date/Time	Title	Description
<b>Monday, July 15<sup>th</sup>:</b> 1-2PM ET	Inclusive Education: Developing a Common Language Among States	This webisode will focus on defining inclusive schools and inclusive principal leadership. Toni Barton of the Relay Graduate School of Education, Kaylan Connally of CCSSO, and Carol Quirk of the Maryland Coalition for Inclusive Education presented.
<b>Thursday, August 1<sup>st</sup>:</b> 2-3PM ET	Ensuring an Equitable Opportunity: Providing a High-Quality Education for Students with Disabilities	This webisode will focus on CCSSO's new resource on individualized education programs <a href="#"><u><i>Ensuring an Equitable Opportunity: Providing a High-Quality Education for Students with Disabilities</i></u></a> . Kathleen Airhart of CCSSO, David Bateman of Shippensburg University, and James M. Paul of CCSSO will present.
<b>Wednesday, August 21<sup>st</sup>:</b> 12-1PM ET	Preparing Inclusive Principals: Leadership for Inclusive Schools	This webisode will focus on inclusive school leader preparation. Amy Farley of the University of Cincinnati, Sheryl Cowart Moss of Georgia State University, and Michelle Young of UCEA will present.
<b>Monday, September 9<sup>th</sup>:</b> 12-1PM ET	Braided Federal Funding: How Blending Federal Funds Can Advance Inclusive Principal Leadership	This webisode will focus on how to blend federal funds to advance inclusive principal leadership. Kathleen Airhart of CCSSO, Sheara Krvaric of Federal Education Group, PLLC, Peter Zamora of CCSSO, and Dean Zajic of the Kansas Department of Education will present.
<b>Thursday, October 10<sup>th</sup>:</b> 1-2PM ET	High-Leverage Practices in Special Education: A Professional Development Guide for School Leaders	This webisode will focus on high-leverage practices in special education. Lynn Holdheide of the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders, Erica McCray of the CEEDAR Center, and Deb Ziegler of the Council for Exceptional Children will present.



# Agenda

- ⌘ Introductions (James M. Paul, CCSSO)
- ⌘ ESSA, IDEA, Endrew and high quality IEPs –(David Bateman, Shippensburg University)
- ⌘ Question & Answer, Part I
- ⌘ SEA recommendations and State Examples (Kathleen Airhart, CCSSO and James M. Paul, CCSSO)
- ⌘ Question & Answer, Part II and Conclusion

# ESSA, IDEA, Endrew and high quality IEPs

David F. Bateman Ph.D.

[dfbate@ship.edu](mailto:dfbate@ship.edu)

Shippensburg University

# Changes Since 1982

- A Nation at Risk
- Reauthorization of IDEA 1997
- NCLB 2001/2002
- Reauthorization of IDEA 2004

**The Primary Requirement of  
the IDEA is to provide a  
special education that confers  
a free appropriate public  
education (FAPE)**

# Supreme Court Ruling: March 22, 2017

**“To meet its substantive obligation under the IDEA, a school must offer an IEP reasonably calculated to enable a child to make **progress appropriate in light of the child’s circumstances.**”**

***(Endrew, 2017, p. 16)***



# *Endrew* - Important Point #1

The Supreme Court **rejected**  
the “*de minimis*” or “trivial”  
educational benefit standard

**“A student offered an education program providing ‘merely more than *de minimis* progress from year to year can hardly be said to have been offered an education at all”  
(*Endrew*, 2017, p. 14)**

## *Endrew* Important Point #2

The *Endrew F.* decision did not replace or overturn the *Rowley* decision; rather, it **clarified** its FAPE standard

# *Endrew* - Important Point #3

The Supreme Court's decision  
emphasizes "progress"

# FAPE Analysis Under Rowley/Endrew

1. In the development of an IEP, has the IEP Team complied with the procedures set forth in the IDEA?
2. Is the IEP reasonably calculated to **enable** the child to **make progress** that is appropriate in light of his or her circumstances?

# ***Endrew* Important Point #4**

**The *Endrew* decision provides guidance to administrators, educators, & IEP Team members in developing IEPs that meet the *Endrew* standard.**

A focus on the particular child is at the core of the IDEA. The instruction offered must be “specially designed” to meet a child’s “unique needs” through an “individualized education program.” An IEP is constructed only after careful consideration of the child’s present levels of achievement, disability, and potential for growth



# Lessons from Endrew



**“An IEP must be drafted in compliance with a detailed set of procedures” that “emphasize collaboration among parents and educators” (*Endrew, 2017, p 2*).**

# Point #1

**"The nature of the IEP process, from the initial consultation through the state administrative proceedings, ensures that parents and school representatives will fully air their respective opinions on the degree of progress the IEP should pursue."  
*(Endrew, 2017, p 16).***

## **Point #2**

**Ensure meaningful parent involvement in IEP meetings and that their concerns are considered in establishing their child's educational/behavioral goals.**


**“The IEP is not a form document. It is constructed only after careful consideration of the child’s present levels of achievement, disability, and **potential for growth**” (*Endrew*, 2017, p 12).**

# Point #3

When developing the content of a student's IEP and subsequently reviewing and revising it, be sure that the present levels of academic achievement and functional (PLAAFP) statements are based upon evaluations and other **relevant** data that are **current**.

# Point #4

Ensure annual IEP goals are  
**challenging, appropriately  
ambitious, and measurable.**



**“An IEP must be reasonably calculated to enable a child to make **progress** **appropriate** in light of his circumstances.”**  
**(Andrew, 2017, p. 16)**

# Point #5

Continuously monitor and measure a child's progress on annual goals (and objectives/benchmarks, if applicable) and maintain specific data to demonstrate that progress has been made.



# Point #6

When progress reports and other data do not reflect an annual goal will be met, reconvene the IEP team to determine why, **make needed instructional changes**, and continue to **collect data.**

# Discussion, Reflection and Moving Forward

## Discussion and Reflection

- ⌘ What questions or comments do you have for David?
- ⌘ What additional questions did the presentation spark for you?

## Moving Forward

- ⌘ How could the work and resources David shared be applied in your context?
- ⌘ Do you have resources or work underway that aligns to David's presentations that could help peers?

# Publication released - June 2019

June 2019



## Ensuring an Equitable Opportunity:

Providing a High-Quality Education for Students with Disabilities

⌘ This resource, *Ensuring an Equitable Opportunity: Providing a High Quality Education for Students with Disabilities*, is available here:

<http://bit.ly/CCSSOIEPResource>

# State recommendations

- ⌘ This paper was developed through a 50 state scan of policies and practice related to IEPs, interviews with deputies and state special education directors, and conversations with national experts and advocacy organizations
- ⌘ Through these conversations, we developed the seven recommendations for state leaders and identified promising practices

## Contents

Introduction.....	2
Background.....	6
A Systems Approach: What can state leaders do?.....	8
I. Communicate high expectations for students with disabilities.....	8
II. Align internal structures and establish cross-functional teams.....	9
III. Develop guidance with clear terminology and examples of quality.....	11
IV. Braid and blend funds.....	13
V. Transform educator preparation, licensure, and support systems.....	14
VI. Provide comprehensive data systems for use by IEP teams and parents.....	17
VII. Encourage the use of a multi-tier system of supports.....	18
Conclusion.....	20
Glossary of Terms.....	21
References.....	24
Endnotes.....	25

# Recommendation 1:

## Communicate high expectations for students with disabilities

- ⌘ SWDs should be considered **first and foremost** general education students.
- ⌘ SWDs should receive **high-quality core instruction** enhanced by services and supports through special education.
- ⌘ Special education should be viewed as a **supplemental** service.
- ⌘ **Perceived low expectations** for SWDs often drive the design of inferior educational services.

# Recommendation 2:

## Align internal structures and establish cross functional teams

- ⌘ Align ESSA and IDEA teams within the state agency to **coordinate support** for all students.
  
- ⌘ Align teacher-effectiveness models for both special education teachers and general education teachers to **improve collaborative instruction**.
  
- ⌘ Align the work of **school improvement with special education** to better serve the needs of SWDs.
  - SWDs are often a subgroup that to be identified for improvement.
  
- ⌘ Align **state improvement plans** to incorporate the same goals/language
  - for example the SSIP and ESSA.

# Recommendation 3:

## Develop guidance with clear terminology and examples of quality

- ⌘ Develop **comprehensive guidance** with clear terminology, definitions, and examples of high-quality, standards-based IEPs aligned to Endrew:
  - addresses the child's **potential for growth**
  - is reasonably calculated to enable the child to **make progress**
  - is aligned to **challenging standards** with **specialty-designed instruction**
  - uses a **variety of data sources** to determine the amount of progress
  
- ⌘ A **high quality IEP** articulates both services and supports within the general classroom and specially designed instruction outside of core curricula.
  
- ⌘ Even the best IEP does not guarantee quality services unless the **responsibility is shared** between general and special educators

## Recommendation 4: Braid and blend funds

- ⌘ Encourage districts to **utilize blended funds** for intervening in low-performing (CSI) schools and schools with low-performing subgroups (TSI).
- ⌘ Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS) regs allow IDEA funds for **students not identified** but need additional academic / behavioral supports.
- ⌘ **Strategically focus resources** on SWDs to address persistent funding gaps and encourage use of evidenced-based practices for all students.



# Recommendation 5:

## Transform educator preparation, licensure and support systems

- ⌘ Special education and general education teachers should be prepared to teach, monitor, and support SWDs using **evidence-based practices**.
- ⌘ Create **strong pre-service programs** so that districts can focus professional development on supporting, revising, and improving educator practice.
- ⌘ Prepare school principals to create **inclusive buildings and classrooms** to:
  - Lead IEP meetings
  - Observe special education teachers
  - Intervene with student behavioral issues related to disability

# Recommendation 6:

## Provide comprehensive data systems for use by IEP teams and parents

- ⌘ Provide **statewide information systems** and dynamic **data dashboards**.
  - Dynamic systems that are robust and transparent would equip schools and IEP teams with the **fact-driven information** needed to measure progress.
  
- ⌘ Assessment data (benchmark assessments, progress monitoring, universal screeners) are useful in **demonstrating individual progress** over time.
  
- ⌘ Data can be used by SEAs to conduct **district and state special education determinations** and results-driven accountability required by IDEA.

# Recommendation 7:

## Encourage the use of a Multi-Tier System of Supports (MTSS)

### ⌘ Proactive approach with common key elements:

- universal screening
- systems of increasingly intensive supports and interventions
- progress monitoring
- team-based problem solving
- data-decision making.

### ⌘ MTSS

- **Meets the requirements** of both ESSA and IDEA.
- Serves as a **comprehensive system** that provides for swift responses to student academic and behavioral needs.
- Can be used as an **overarching framework of school improvement** to include PD, blended funds, comprehensive data systems, and guidance documents.

# Discussion, Reflection and Moving Forward, Part II

## Discussion and Reflection

- ⌘ What questions or comments do you have for David, Kathleen, and James?
- ⌘ What additional questions did the presentations spark for you?

## Moving Forward

- ⌘ How could the work and resources David, Kathleen, and James shared be applied in your context?
- ⌘ Do you have resources or work underway that aligns to David, Kathleen, and James' presentations that could help peers?

# Conclusion

Thank you for joining us. Please reach out to James M. Paul at [james.paul@ccsso.org](mailto:james.paul@ccsso.org) with any questions about the webisode series. Please join us for upcoming webisodes.

Date/Time	Title	Description
<b>Wednesday, August 21<sup>st</sup>:</b> 12-1PM ET	Preparing Inclusive Principals: Leadership for Inclusive Schools	This webisode will focus on inclusive school leader preparation. Amy Farley of the University of Cincinnati, Sheryl Cowart Moss of Georgia State University, and Michelle Young of UCEA will present.
<b>Monday, September 9<sup>th</sup>:</b> 12-1PM ET	Braided Federal Funding: How Blending Federal Funds Can Advance Inclusive Principal Leadership	This webisode will focus on how to blend federal funds to advance inclusive principal leadership. Kathleen Airhart of CCSSO, Sheara Krvaric of Federal Education Group, PLLC, Peter Zamora of CCSSO, and Dean Zajic of the Kansas Department of Education will present.
<b>Thursday, October 10<sup>th</sup>:</b> 1-2PM ET	High-Leverage Practices in Special Education: A Professional Development Guide for School Leaders	This webisode will focus on high-leverage practices in special education. Lynn Holdheide of the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders, Erica McCray of the CEEDAR Center, and Deb Ziegler of the Council for Exceptional Children will present.