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In This Talk

• C-SAIL findings-to-date concerning CCR standards reform for students with disabilities (SWD)

• Key C-SAIL findings from:
  – Interviews conducted with SEA officials
  – Surveys conducted with district administrators, principals, and teachers
  – The longitudinal study examining effects of CCR standards on reading and math NAEP performance
The State Administrator Perspective

- Spring 2016: C-SAIL conducted a structured interview to explore attributes of CCR standards reform policy
  - Across Kentucky, Massachusetts, Ohio, Texas, and California, 26 high-level SEA administrators participated.

- Interviews were transcribed and then coded in researcher-pairs (using Dedoose) to develop consensus on each line of the interview transcripts. The full research team resolved disagreements. Then, researchers examined the coded data to characterize each state’s efforts, and checked with State officials to ensure accuracy of interpretations.

- We highlight important similarities and 3 key differences among states pertaining to SWD
The State Administrator Perspective: Three Similarities among States

#1: SEA administrators stressed the universal applicability of CCR standards, in which the vast majority of SWD are held to the same standards as those without disabilities.

#2: SEA administrators reported providing detailed curricular resources to support schools in implementing standards for SWD (although strategies & focal points differ).

#3: States employ systematic methods of interdivisional and interagency coordination to promote consistent understanding and implementation of CCR-aligned supports for SWDs (strategies differ but focal points are more similar).
The State Administrator Perspective: Three Differences among States

#1: States rely on different approaches to help teachers implement CCR with SWD.

#2: States design resources and collaborative efforts in different ways to invest stakeholders in the authority of CCR standards reform for SWD.

#3: States emphasize different opportunities and challenges with the shift to CCR standards-aligned assessments for SWD.
Perspectives at the **District, School, & Teacher Levels**

- Rely on C-SAIL district, school, and teacher surveys from Ohio and Texas

- Selectively focus on questions pertaining to
  - Adequacy of supports and professional development for meeting the needs of SWD
  - Appropriateness of CCR standards for SWD
  - Extent to which teachers address the CCR standards’ emphasized vs. de-emphasized content.
  - Comparisons between for SWD vs. All Students

- Begin at the district level, where we highlight 3 similarities across SWD and All and 2 differences between SWD and All
The District Administrator View: Three Similarities

#1: Available supports are used at similar rates for All and SWD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Available</th>
<th>Available/ Not Used</th>
<th>Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWD</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#2: Available supports are similarly useful for All and SWD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Useful</th>
<th>Somewhat Useful</th>
<th>Useful</th>
<th>Very Useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWD</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#3: Expressed need is similar for additional implementation supports in the future (compared to what’s available now) for All and SWD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>More</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWD</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The District Administrator View: Difference #1

At the same time, district administrators judged PD as less comprehensive for SWD than for All.

- For ELA, 95% of district respondents viewed PD for All students as comprehensive, but when responding for SWD, the percentage fell to 78.

- For Math, 91% of district respondents across States viewed PD for All students as comprehensive, but when responding for SWD, the percentage dropped to 71.
The District Administrator View: **Difference #2**

*District administrators viewed CCR standards as more appropriate for All Students than for SWD.*

– This was the case for ELA and Math and across States.

– In this way, district administrator views appear to differ from the State-level perspective. (In interviews, SEA administrators, across states, stressed the universal applicability of CCR standards.)
The Principal Perspective

Viewed their observation feedback as mostly relevant for SWD, but also expressed need for additional support for SWD. They viewed standards as mostly but not universally appropriate.

- Relevance of observation feedback to teachers for instructional strategies for SWD
  - 1% Not at all; 20% small extent; 59% moderate extent; 20% large extent

- Need for additional support for SWD
  - 0% none; 9% a little; 45% some; 45% a great deal

- Appropriateness of CCR standards for SWD
  - For ELA: 26% indicated not appropriate; 70% appropriate
  - For Math: 35% not appropriate; 65% appropriate
The General Educator View
(Responded only for SWD in the regular accountability system, not alternate assessment students)

Across States and content areas, teachers feel less well prepared to teach CCR for SWD and for other low-achieving students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ELA</th>
<th></th>
<th>Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not</td>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>Moder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summed across moderately or well prepared, the pattern remains.

In ELA, .85 for SWD vs. .94 for LA
In Math, .80 for SWD vs. .88 for LA.
The Special Educator View for SWD (GE view for All)

Extent to which teachers address the CCR standards’ emphasized vs. de-emphasized content (higher numbers = teachers address more; we don’t report findings on high-school math due to small sample size)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standards’ Emphasized/De-Emphasized Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary ELA</td>
<td>3.06/3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Math</td>
<td>2.90/2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School ELA</td>
<td>3.27/2.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Across SWD & All

- **Elementary**: more de-emphasized content in ELA; more emphasized content in math
- **High School**: more emphasized content in ELA
The Longitudinal Study: NAEP Outcomes for SWD

- On composite scores, there were no significant 1-year, 3-year, or 5-year effects between States with higher v. lower pre-CCR proficiency standards ("treatment" vs. "counterfactual") for SWD, except for grade 8 reading at 1 year.

- Post-CCR NAEP performance, as a function of more vs. less challenging pre-CCR standards, was similar for SWD as for students without disabilities or with ELL status.

- As others have discussed, future analyses may provide a stronger basis for testing the effects of CCR standards.
Sources of Optimism and Caution: Results-to-date on Supports

– SEA officials believe they provide detailed resources to support implementation and systematic interdivisional/interagency coordination to promote consistent understanding and implementation of those supports.

– District administrators report using supports at similarly high rates and find the available supports similarly useful for SWD as for All Students. Yet, they also judge professional development to be less comprehensive for SWD than for All students. This seems contradictory, but may reflect greater needs/wider achievement gaps for SWD.

– Principals also expressed a mixed perspective. On one hand, they view their observation feedback to be moderately or largely relevant for SWD; on the other hand, they express need for additional supports for SWD.

– And general educators feel less well prepared to teach CCR standards to SWD than to other low-achieving students.
Sources of Optimism and Caution: 
Results-to-date on Appropriateness of Standards for SWD

- SEA officials stress the universal applicability of standards (for the vast majority of SWD).

- However, district administrators view the standards as less appropriate for SWD than for All, and general educators feel less well prepared to teach CCR standards to SWD than other low-achieving students.

- C-SAIL’s hope is that the FAST program will provide additional support necessary to help general educators identify productive strategies to achieve instructional alignment (and address more CCR-emphasized content).

- An optimistic note is that although special educators report addressing more de-emphasized content for elementary grade ELA, they indicate more emphasized content for elementary math and for high school ELA. This pattern is similar for general educator responses for All students, suggesting the FAST program’s elementary-grade ELA focus may be especially important.