HARING CENTER
FOR INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

Inclusionary Practices and Systems:

DATA ANALYSIS PROTOCOLS

WHAT ARE DATA ANALYSIS PROTOCOLS?

Data analysis protocols are systems that encourage data-driven decision-making. They address ways to collect, analyze, and report data as well as how to use the information for school improvement and to inform instruction. The information helps schools determine if they are meeting their purpose and vision and challenge assumptions about how groups of students learn, including students with disabilities.

WHY ARE DATA ANALYSIS PROTOCOLS IMPORTANT? WHAT ARE THE OUTCOMES?

- When used to make decisions around teaching and learning, data analysis protocols facilitate a cultural shift in thinking among all stakeholders.
- Protocols that are monitored on a frequent schedule such as every 4-6 weeks often result in more equitable and informed instructional decisions.
- Research indicates that findings from data analysis protocols are often used in ways that achieve dramatic improvements in student performance and engagement.

IMPORTANT THINGS TO REMEMBER:

- Start small and begin with core issues.
- Ensure all students are included in data analysis protocols.
- Listen to what the data are communicating about the "big picture."
- Work to create trust and build support by sharing data.
- Provide professional learning opportunities for staff on how to use data.
- Revisit protocols to make sure the data are providing necessary information.

CASE STUDY: Chase Middle School

Ongoing data analysis to inform practice is vital to ensuring student needs are met throughout the school year. To make this happen, it's important to have systems in place to provide a structure to review data and formative assessments through common planning time or PLCs. This case study will look at how Chase took summative data and not only changed practices during the year, but used the data to inform larger system changes.

Chase Middle School analyzed data in 2017-2018 which showed that pull-out resource classes were not teaching students common core standards and as a result students were not making marked growth. In English and Language Arts, students receiving IEP services made .53 years of growth in one year. For Math, students receiving IEP services made only .19 years growth in one year. The data showed that students not accessing common core state standards were making half a year or much less growth. This was not acceptable and Chase MS made the decision to focus on ensuring all students received equitable instruction and were receiving instruction on common core standards In addition to the data, Chase MS also looked at the research to guide their next steps. LaRock (2018) surveyed special education teachers about their beliefs of teaching common core state standards. "The results showed that while the majority of these teachers echoed the general belief that the Common Core

State Standards are beneficial for students without disabilities, they did not believe that they are beneficial for students with disabilities". This mindset leads to teachers not exposing Special Education students to the Common Core State Standards. With this insight, Chase understood there was work to be done in shifting mindset. They led with the question, "How can we expect students to pass SBAC when they haven't been exposed to the curriculum?" Teachers shared that with students on IEPs having goals written for 2-4th grade, teachers focused on these goals instead of exposing students to grade level content. The solution for 2018-2019 was two-prong. First, rewrite goals to reflect grade level content and standards. Second, provide instruction and find entry points for students to common core standards. Decisions were made based on the baseline data. 2018-2019 data showed a positive correlation in a move to more inclusive practices for student and growth. Now students were making 1.31 years progress in ELA and .43 years progress in math. That is double or more the progress. Building on their success and looking toward continuous improvement, data analysis led to a decision to implement co-teaching inclusionary practice 2019-2020. General Education teacher who is a content specialist and special education teacher who is a learning specialist. In addition to the data, Chase MS again reviewed the research. Research by Nash-Aurand, Fowler, Aaroe, Friberg, & Watson (2013) indicated there was a significant increase in test scores of students with disabilities when they attended a co-taught class as opposed to a special education class. As Chase MS continues on their continuous growth, they continue to be informed by the data, are expanding their co-teaching practices, partnering with both feeder elementary and high schools to ensure a continuum of receiving instruction on common core standards for all students.

RESOURCES

1. **Bambrick-Santoyo, Paul (2019)** Driven by Data 2.0: A Practical Guide to Improve Instruction.
2. **Erkens, Cassandra (2019)** The Handbook for Collaborative Common Assessments: Tools for Design, Delivery, and Data Analysis (Practical Measures for Improving Your Collaborative Common Assessment Process).
3. **LaRock, D.E., 2018.** The common core state standards as applied to the instruction of students with disabilities: Special education teachers' perception (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University).
4. **Nash-Aurand, Fowler, Aaroe, Friberg, & Watson (2013)** A Comparison of general education Co-Teaching versus special education resource service delivery model on math achievement of students with disabilities.