

Kentucky School for the Deaf
Summary of Report of Findings
June 2016
Kentucky Department of Education
Division of Learning Services

The Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) Division of Learning Services (DLS) has completed an extensive review of the instructional, intervention, and special education services being implemented at the Kentucky School for the Deaf. The review team consisted of staff from the KDE including the DLS Director, Exceptional Children Consultants, Academic Program Consultants, Division of Program Standards School Readiness Consultant that has a background in Deaf/Hard of Hearing, and KDE contract employees with expertise in data, finance, and special education regulations.

The findings were broken into two categories: compliance areas required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and evidence-based classroom instructional practices. The review consisted of a four-day onsite visit at the school during which time the team completed classroom walk-throughs, observations, interviews with school staff and administration, and a review of individual student due process files.

Thus, the Report of Findings separated the review into two broad categories:

- Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) compliance
- Effective teaching and learning practices

In addition to the KDE review, external partners conducted a review of instructional practices that included classroom observations and interviews with KSD staff. Dr. Terry Scott, Professor and Distinguished Scholar, Interim Dean of Research for Graduate Studies and a team from the University of Louisville completed the review. The findings from external partner review aligned with the KDE findings.

IDEA Findings:

Strengths:

- Individual Education Programs (IEPs) and Admissions and Release Committee (ARC) meetings contained parent and student input.
 - Parents' input was included.
 - Students' input was included.
- ARC meeting notices were included and appropriately completed.
 - Date, time and location were included on meeting notice.
 - Students were invited to meetings, when appropriate.
- Transition services were individualized and appropriate.
 - Students participated in planning.
 - Students' multi-year courses of study were included.
 - Postsecondary goals were based on age-appropriate transition assessment.
 - Students were invited to the ARC transition meeting.

- Postsecondary goals were updated annually.

Areas of Noncompliance:

The KDE identified two areas of noncompliance: student-specific and systemic. Systemic means a specific finding of noncompliance occur more than once. All findings of noncompliance must be remedied through a corrective action plan within one year.

The student specific noncompliance findings were documented in a table within the Report of Findings for each specific student file and a sealed envelope containing the student names was provided separately to the Director of Special Education to maintain each student's confidentiality.

Systemic Findings of Noncompliance:

- IEP (707 KAR 1:320)
 - Did not contain impact statements
 - Annual goals not measurable
 - Present levels of performance not containing baseline data
 - Program modifications and supports for personnel not completed appropriately
- Conference Summary (707 KAR 1:320, Section 9)
 - Explanation of evaluations missing
 - Summaries copied/pasted from integrated reports
- Determination of Eligibility (707 KAR 1:310)
 - Disabilities (other than deaf/hard of hearing [DHH]) not determined appropriately
 - Supporting evidence of eligibility missing
- Evaluation/Re-evaluation (707 KAR 1:310)
 - Description of each evaluation procedure, test, record, or reports used as basis for proposed or refused action not present
 - No description of action proposed or refused or some identical (not individualized)
- Least Restrictive Environment (707 KAR 1:350)
 - Statements not individualized to the needs of each student
- Admissions and Release Committee (ARC) Membership (707 KAR 1:320, Section 3)
 - Excusal forms not completed if the related service personnel did not attend
- Progress Monitoring (707 KAR 1:320)
 - Not all goals had evidence of data collection or analysis
- Related Services (707 KAR 1:320)
 - Related Service Personnel not always invited as needed
 - Minutes of service delivery for related services written inconsistently
- Transition Services (707 KAR 1:320)
 - IEPs contained no postsecondary goals related to all areas of transition
 - Outside agencies that would provide transition services not always invited to the ARC
- *No denial of Free and Appropriate Education (FAPE) found during this review*

Effective teaching and learning practices:

The review examined the components of a highly effective teaching and learning environment including levels of student attentiveness; use of instructional time; use of resources; implementation of Kentucky Academic Standards (KAS) and Expanded Core Curriculum (ECC) standards; teacher/student questioning; differentiation; use of assessment to guide instruction; and learning environment/culture.

Strengths:

- Teacher/student relationships
- Effective use of instructional time and resources
- Student engagement

Areas for Growth:

- Instruction
- Differentiation
- School-Wide Expectations
- Communication

Student/Classroom Observation and Analysis (SCOA) Classroom Observation: Delivery of instruction

Instructional Time by Minutes (n=680)	Time Observed
A. Whole group instruction	76%
B. Independent; small group; and/or 1:1 instruction	23%
C. No instruction	1%
Delivery of Instruction by Class/Sessions/Period (N=33)	Classes Observed
A. Whole group only	15
B. Blend of whole group, small group and 1:1 instruction	12
C. Independent work only	3
D. Small group Instruction only	2
E. 1:1 Instruction only	1

SCOA Classroom Observation: Indicators of effective teaching and learning

Indicators (n=33)	Observed
A. Learning targets posted and current to lesson/unit	67%
B. Lessons/Activities grade-level appropriate and aligned to current standards	88%
C. Positively stated rules and expectations posted/followed/taught/reinforced	52%
D. Routines established and followed by teachers and students	91%
E. Teacher-student relationships appear mutually respectful and productive	100%
F. Peer relationships appear respectful and productive	67%
G. Incorporates cultural diversity in classroom discussions and lessons	18%
H. Real-world discussions/applications/activities	56%
I. Differentiates curriculum/instructional methodology/assessment strategies	36%
J. Provides high quality feedback emphasizing effort and progress towards learning goals	45%

K. Focuses/refocuses class discussion by referring back to the learning targets/goals/essential questions	48%
L. Integrates current learning goals with previously taught content/learning to make connections	36%
M. Engages students in discussions related to how mastery will be demonstrated	33%
N. Options for accessing/interacting/expressing learning provided	39%
O. Provided with research-based instructional curricular supports	52%

Corrective Action Plan (CAP):

The DLS issued an all-encompassing CAP that must be completed by May 2017.

- The CAP was shared with the KSD Leadership Team on May 23, 2016.
- DLS is attending KSD leadership meetings and working directly with all KSD staff to implement the CAP to work through any questions or obstacles that may arise.
- Data for the CAP is being collected regularly and technical assistance is being provided as necessary by DLS.