A SHARED PATH TO SUCCESS
SPECIAL EDUCATION REFORM
NYC PUBLIC SCHOOLS

PHASE ONE DATA
(2011-12)
PRELIMINARY DATA FOR
CITYWIDE EXPANSION 2012-13
Goals of Special Education Reform

Students with IEPs:

> have access to a rigorous academic curriculum and are held to high academic standards, enabling them to fully realize their potential and graduate prepared for independent living, college and careers;

> are taught in the “least restrictive environment” that is academically appropriate, and, as often as possible, alongside students without disabilities;

> receive special education services that are targeted and provide the appropriate level of support throughout the school day; and

> are able to attend their zoned schools or the schools of their choice, while still receiving the supports they need to succeed
Phase One of the Reform in NYC

Phase One of NYC’s special education reform occurred over SY 2010-11 to 2011-12.

> Who was included in Phase One of the Reform?

*Phase 1 Schools had diverse student populations*

- 260 total schools; 100 Elementary Schools, 60 Middle Schools, 100 High Schools
- Across all 5 boroughs
- Focus has been on articulating grades: kindergarten, 6th grade, and 9th grade

> How did we evaluate Phase One of the Reform?

- Since random assignment was not used to assign Phase 1 status, a viable comparison group had to be developed to evaluate the performance of Phase 1 schools
- Key indicators in Phase1 schools were compared to the same indicators in comparison group schools
IN THE FALL OF 2010, 260 SCHOOLS WERE SELECTED TO PARTICIPATE IN PHASE 1

Phase 1 schools serve higher proportions of Hispanic students, English Language Learners, and Students with Disabilities and nearly half of Phase 1 schools are located in the Bronx

Student Demographics in Phase 1 Schools compared to Citywide Averages *

- Demographic data are based on the Audited Register as of 10.31.2010.
Creation of a Comparison Group: Methodology

Identifying a Comparison Group

> Using a statistical procedure called Propensity Score Matching, we matched each Phase 1 school to a comparable school based on each school’s demographics, baseline achievement in New York State Math and English assessments, and location in 2009-10 (the year before Phase 1 began)

• Therefore, Phase 1 schools and the comparison groups of schools do not differ in terms of borough, total enrollment, new school, status and demographics including free/reduced lunch, ethnicity, % English Language Learners, % students with disabilities, and Math and ELA proficiency for students with disabilities

> Separate models were examined for schools with grades 3-8, grades 9-12, grades PK-2 only, and for new schools that opened in 2010-2011

> The result was an overall sample of 270 Comparison schools that would be compared to the 260 Phase 1 schools for all subsequent analyses
Phase 1 schools exhibited larger increases in Integrated Co-teaching and larger decreases in Self-contained program settings relative to Comparison schools.

Total Number of Students with IEPs in 2012 is 22,900 at Phase 1 Schools and 25,001 at Comparison Schools.

**Related Services Only**
- Phase 1: 2011 - 10.7, 2012 - 10.9
- Comparison: 2011 - 11.9, 2012 - 9.9

**SETSS**
- Phase 1: 2011 - 24.5, 2012 - 24.8
- Comparison: 2011 - 22.6, 2012 - 22.5

**Integrated Co-Teaching**
- Phase 1: 2011 - 33.1, 2012 - 36.0
- Comparison: 2011 - 33.1, 2012 - 34.7

**Self-Contained**
- Phase 1: 2011 - 31.6, 2012 - 29.5

**Least Restrictive Environment**

Source: June CAP. All Ns reported are for 2012.
PERCENT PROFICIENCY OF STUDENTS WITH IEPs AT PHASE 1 AND COMPARISON SCHOOLS IN GRADES 3-8 MATH AND ELA

Student-level analysis

**MATH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change 2011-2012 = +3.4 pts.

**ELA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change 2011-2012 = +1.4 pts.

In 2010, NYSED increased the scale score required to meet each of the proficiency levels. In addition, since 2011, NYSED has lengthened the exams by increasing the number of test questions. This analysis was conducted using student-level data.
ATTENDANCE RATES ARE COMPARABLE AT PHASE 1 AND COMPARISON SCHOOLS

Students with IEPs

Change 2011-2012 = +0.7 pts.
87.7% 88.4%

Change 2011-2012 = +0.9 pts.
87.8% 88.7%

Phase 1
Comparison
PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS WITH IEPs WITH ONE OR MORE SUSPENSIONS AT PHASE 1 AND COMPARISON SCHOOLS

Students with IEPs

Change 2011-2012 = -0.3 pts.

Phase 1

8.5% 8.2%

Comparison

9.3% 9.1%

Data reflect the number of students who received at least one principal or superintendent suspension during that school year. Data does not include summer suspensions. Source for numerator: Suspension data from Office of Safety and Youth Development. Source for denominator: June Register.
Citywide Expansion of the Reform

Citywide expansion of NYC’s special education reform began in Fall 2012.

> Reform implemented citywide in September 2012 in all 1700+ NYC public schools

> Students in articulating grades are now able to attend the same schools they would attend if they were not recommended for special education services

> Except in rare circumstances, students with disabilities will no longer be required to transfer schools because of changes to their IEPs
  • Now all schools are expected to meet the needs of the majority of their students with disabilities

> Schools have been supported with an expanded framework of professional development
ENROLLMENT CHANGES FOR SIXTH GRADERS

Students with IEPs articulating into sixth grade this past fall moved to less restrictive environments

Articulated SY13 6th Graders with IEPs n=12,907

When these 12,907 students moved from 5th to 6th grade:

- ICT recommendations among these students increased by 4 percentage points
- Self-contained recommendations among these students decreased by 3 percentage points
- Related services only recommendations among these students increased by 3 percentage points

ENROLLMENT CHANGES FOR NINTH GRADERS

Students with IEPs articulating into ninth grade this past fall moved to less restrictive environments.

When these 11,410 students moved from 8th to 9th grade:

- ICT recommendations among these students increased by 10 percentage points
- Self-contained recommendations among these students decreased by 12 percentage points
- Related services only recommendations among these students increased by 5 percentage points

Articulated SY13 9th Graders with IEPs n=11,410

As 8th graders w/ IEPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LRE</th>
<th>MRE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As 9th graders w/ IEPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LRE</th>
<th>MRE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

June 2012

- Related services only
- SETSS (Special Education Teacher Support Services)
- ICT (Integrated Co-Teaching)
- Self Contained
- Dual Recommendation*
- District 75 Programs

Nov. 2012

- Students with "Dual Rec." are those recommended for more than one of the programs listed above.

Professional Development

> From September until now, we’ve given professional development to over 12,000 school-level staff (including paraprofessionals, general and special educators, and school leaders) through 970 workshops

> Workshop topics have included
  - Specially Designed Instruction (e.g. ICT, SETSS)
  - Developing IEPs aligned to the Common Core Standards
  - Elementary and Secondary Literacy
  - Universal Design for Learning
  - Accessible Instructional Materials
  - Response to Intervention (RTI)

> We’ve developed partnerships with key organizations and educational institutions, such as
  - Teachers’ College Inclusive Classrooms Project
  - New York University
  - Goldmansour and Rutherford