

# PSD Supporting Students with Disabilities Best Practices Rubric

#### Major Improvement Strategy #1 Committee

### Major Improvement Strategy #1 (MIS #1)

Align Curriculum and instruction for students with disabilities with rigorous expectations.

### **Purpose of Qualitative Survey and Use of Best Practices Rubric**

During the school year of 2012-13, Integrated Services staff completed a qualitative survey within the district in order to elicit information to determine the following:

- Current use of specific evidence-based strategies (Tier I III);
- Supporting intervention materials & strategies present in special education programs in PSD; and
- How students with disabilities are accessing state standards and general education instruction.

Building level programs were selected based on High School feeder schools for middle and elementary schools and the last two years of student achievement data that demonstrated specific trends. Integrated Services staff was interviewed by MIS #1 committee members. The following information is taken from those interviews as expressed by Integrated Services teams at each of the identified building sites. Staff feedback was collected and analyzed and used to develop themes in areas of best practice and targeted needs for increasing student achievement.

The Summary of Findings have been incorporated into a Best Practices Rubric using the 5+ Dimensions as a framework for organizing and connecting the information into Poudre School District's teaching and learning framework for all students. The *PSD Supporting Students with Disabilities Best Practice Rubric* is to be used with Integrated Services building level teams, in collaboration with general education representation and administration. The Rubric is designed for teams to reflect on their practice and systems and to support the development of a measurable continuous improvement plan in order to support higher academic achievement and expectations for students with disabilities in Poudre School District.

**Committee Members:** 

Laquitta Blehm Erin Coy Kara Harbison Cori Ramirez Sandra Rasmussen Christine Villard

Qualitative Data Collected: Spring, 2012 Data analyzed: Fall, 2012 Rubric developed 2013-2014

## **Summary of Findings**

- 1. Identified the need for staff development for Co-Teaching classes, particularly at the Secondary level
- 2. Identified the need to develop systematic and efficient tools for Progress Monitoring
- 3. Identified the need for common collaboration time with General Education in order to align curriculum and interventions
- 4. Successful schools have strong Administration support and involvement. Administration staff attends Integrated Services and IEP meetings. They also know the students and the families and work collaboratively to address challenges.
- 5. Generally speaking, high achievement schools have collaborative partnerships among Integrated Services and General Education teachers. In contrast, some lower performing schools appear to be missing strong General Education partnerships and may be working in isolation.
- 6. In general, higher performing schools have more inclusive practices. Integrated Services is seen as a support service for students. All staff views themselves as stakeholders and take responsibility for student growth.
- 7. Identified effective best practices for special education services are as follows:
  - "double dipping";
  - interventions that involve other staff outside of integrated services, and even, in some cases general education teachers;
  - high expectations for all students;
  - curriculum mapping and alignment of interventions to general education classroom instruction;
  - Integrated Services staff having easy access to lesson plans/learning targets with the option to co-teach or co-plan.

## **Schools Interviewed**

Elementary	Middle School	High School
Tavelli	Webber	Fossil Ridge High School
Irish	Preston	Rocky Mountain High School
Bacon	Boltz	Poudre High School
Lopez	Kinard	
O'Dea	Lincoln	
Laurel	Wellington	
Bauder		

Qualitative Data Collected: Spring, 2012 Data analyzed: Fall, 2012 Rubric developed 2013-2014