

An Addendum
to the Original
Curriculum Management Audit™
Central Islip (NY) Union Free School District
July 2005



Two students using technology in a Central Islip Union Free School District school



International Curriculum Management Audit Center
Phi Delta Kappa International
Eighth and Union
Bloomington, Indiana 47404

April 2007

An Addendum
to the Original
Curriculum Management Audit™
Central Islip (NY) Union Free School District
July 2005

Conducted Under the Auspices of
International Curriculum Management Audit Center
Phi Delta Kappa International
P. O. Box 789
Bloomington, IN 47404-0789

(Copyright use authorization obtained from
Curriculum Management Systems, Inc.
P. O. Box 857, Johnston, IA 50131)

Date Audit Presented: April 2007

Members of the Central Islip (NY) Union Free School District Audit Team:

Gene Johnson, Ed.D.
Beverly W. Nichols, Ph.D.

Table of Contents

I. Participation Rates in Regents’ Testing	2
Exhibit 1.1 Participation of Students in Regents’ Testing	2
II. Student Achievement.....	4
Exhibit 2.1 Percent Achieving Graduation Requirement in English	4
Exhibit 2.2 Percent Achieving Graduation Requirement in Mathematics.....	5
Exhibit 2.3 Percent Scoring at Each Interval for Regents Comprehensive English and Mathematics A	6
III. Graduation Rates	7
Exhibit 3.1 Percent of Students Earning Local Diplomas	7
Exhibit 3.2 Types of Diplomas Students with Disabilities Disaggregated by Gender and Ethnicity	8
IV. Drop Out Rates	9
Exhibit 4.1 High School Non-completion Rates	9
V. Placement of School Aged Students with Disabilities.....	10
Exhibit 5.1 Placement of School-Age Students with Disabilities	10
RECOMMENDATIONS	13
Recommendation 1: Increase student participation rates for state testing. Develop a comprehensive plan that outlines roles and responsibilities of staff in implementing school plans that will increase student participation rates in testing.....	13
Recommendation 2: Increase graduation rates of students with disabilities along with decreasing drop out rates. Develop an articulated plan that outlines roles and responsibilities for monitoring the progress toward graduation of students with disabilities	14
Recommendation 3: Increase achievement in English Language Arts and Mathematics for students with disabilities. Develop a comprehensive curriculum management plan that supports the instruction and ongoing progress of students with disabilities.....	14
Auditors’ Biographical Data	17

Addendum
to the Original
Curriculum Management AuditTM
Central Islip (NY) Union Free School District
July 2005

Purpose of the Addendum:

To address specific issues related to students with disabilities in the Central Islip Union Free School District (student participation rates in state testing, student achievement, graduation rates, and drop out rates). The issues were identified as areas of concern by the New York Department of Education.

Scope of the Work:

The auditors will provide analyses and recommendations as follows:

1. Analyze the student participation rates for state testing using 03-04, 04-05 and 05-06 student data (three years). The data will be disaggregated by students with disabilities, gender, ethnicity, SES, and any other subgroup areas identified by the school district.
2. Analyze three years of student achievement data (03-04, 04-05, 05-06) in math and English Language Arts for students with disabilities.
3. Analyze the graduation rates of special education students using 03-04, 04-05 and 05-06 student data. The data will be disaggregated data by students with disabilities, gender, ethnicity, and SES. Where appropriate, data will be analyzed by diploma type.
4. Analyze the drop out rates of special education students using 03-04, 04-05 and 05-06 student data.
5. Develop a recommendation to increase the student participation rates for state testing.
6. Develop a recommendation to increase the graduation rates of special education students.
7. Develop a recommendation to decrease dropout rates.
8. Develop a recommendation to improve achievement in English Language Arts for students with disabilities.
9. Develop recommendations to improve achievement in math for students with disabilities.

NOTE: For the purpose of this work, analysis means organizing the data in an effort to determine where the issues exist. The disaggregated data to be analyzed will be that which is provided by Central Islip Union Free School District personnel.

Organization of the Addendum:

This addendum will be organized by the tenets of the scope of the work. Where appropriate, references will be made to content of the original curriculum management audit that was delivered to the school district in July, 2005.

Auditors:

- Dr. Gene Johnson, PDK/CMSi Curriculum Management Auditor
- Dr. Beverly Nichols, PDK/CMSi Curriculum Management Auditor

I. Participation Rates in Regents' Testing

The auditors analyzed student participation rates in Regents' testing using data provided by Central Islip Union Free School District personnel. The source of the data was the *A-1 Performance of the Accountability Cohort on Achieving Graduation Requirements* and *B-1 Verification of Regents Examination Data* reports for cohort groups from the years 2000, 2001, and 2002. Both of these reports are New York State Department of Education reports.

Exhibit 1.1 shows the participation rates of students in Regents' testing in the Central Islip Senior High School for the years 2003-2004 through 2005-2006 in English and mathematics.

Exhibit 1.1
Participation of Students in Regents' Testing
Central Islip Senior High School
2003-04 through 2005-06

Student Group	Senior Year	Cohort Count	# Not tested English	% Not tested English	# Not tested Mathematics	% Not tested Mathematics
All	2004	363	74	20%	113	31%
	2005	415	73	18%	84	20%
	2006	363	113	31%	74	20%
General Education	2004	284	57	20%	91	32%
	2005	298	54	18%	72	24%
	2006	284	91	32%	57	20%
Students with Disabilities	2004	70	15	21%	22	31%
	2005	112	15	21%	12	11%
	2006	70	22	31%	15	21%
Black	2004	110	28	25%	36	33%
	2005	159	28	18%	28	18%
	2006	132	14	11%	15	11%
Hispanic	2004	140	30	21%	56	40%
	2005	179	39	22%	48	27%
	2006	152	24	16%	25	16%
White	2004	87	14	16%	19	22%
	2005	59	5	8%	7	12%
	2006	52	4	8%	4	8%

Exhibit 1.1 (continued)						
Participation of Students in Regents' Testing						
Central Islip Senior High School						
2003-04 through 2005-06						
Student Group	Senior Year	Cohort Count	# Not tested English	% Not tested English	# Not tested Mathematics	% Not tested Mathematics
Female	2004	166	34	20%	51	31%
	2005	226	31	14%	38	17%
	2006	187	18	10%	14	7%
Male	2004	197	40	20%	62	31%
	2005	189	41	22%	46	24%
	2006	171	26	15%	30	18%
<i>Source of Data: A-1 Performance of the Accountability Cohort on Achieving Graduation Requirements, Cohorts of 2000, 2001, 2002. Data provided by central office staff of the Central Islip Union Free School District. (Participation data specifically extracted from those reports.)</i>						

The following observations can be made from Exhibit 1.1:

- Non-participation rates for both general education students and students with disabilities exceed the number allowable under No Child Left Behind participation guidelines.
- The percent of students not tested in English was higher in 2006 than in 2004; the rate increased by 12% for general education students and 10% for students with disabilities.
- Non-participation for both groups of students declined in mathematics between 2004 and 2006, although the rate for students with disabilities was lowest in 2005.
- Non-participation for students with disabilities was not significantly different in English or mathematics than that of general education students, with the exception of mathematics in 2005. In that year, the percentage of students with disabilities completing the test was higher than that of general education students.
- The percentage of students who were tested in English and mathematics declined across all ethnic groups between 2004 and 2006.
- The percentage of white students who were not tested in all three years was lower than the percentage not tested for black or Hispanic students.
- In 2005 and 2006, more females were tested in English and mathematics than males.

II. Student Achievement

The auditors analyzed the number of students achieving graduation requirements in English and mathematics using data provided by Central Islip Union Free School District personnel. The source of the data used was from the *A-1 Performance of the Accountability Cohort on Achieving Graduation Requirements* for cohort groups from the years 2000, 2001, and 2002.

Exhibit 2.1 shows the percent of students achieving graduation requirements in English for the years 2004 through 2006.

Exhibit 2.1
Percent Achieving Graduation Requirement in English
Central Islip Senior High School
2004 – 2006

Student Group	Senior Year	Cohort Count	Number Scoring in Regents Exam Intervals				Passed Competency	# Not tested	% Not tested	% Achieving Graduation Requirement
			0-54	55-64	65-84	85-100				
All	2004	363	17	16	150	92	8	74	20%	73%
	2005	415	6	25	165	117	7	73	18%	76%
	2006	363	41	42	103	42	18	113	31%	55%
General Education	2004	284	14	13	124	76	0	57	20%	75%
	2005	298	2	19	119	104	0	54	18%	81%
	2006	284	34	34	90	35	0	91	32%	56%
Students with Disabilities	2004	70	2	2	24	16	5	15	21%	69%
	2005	112	4	6	45	13	7	15	21%	63%
	2006	70	7	7	13	7	11	22	31%	54%
<p><i>Note: Numbers across rows do not total to cohort count. However, these were the numbers contained in the A-1 Performance of the Accountability Cohort on Achieving Graduation Requirement.</i></p> <p><i>Source of Data: A-1 Performance of the Accountability Cohort on Achieving Graduation Requirements, Cohorts of 2000, 2001, 2002</i></p> <p><i>Data provided by central office staff of the Central Islip Union Free School District.</i></p>										

A review of the data in Exhibit 2.1 leads to the following observations:

- The percent of students achieving the graduation requirement in 2006 was lower than that in 2004 for both general education students and students with disabilities.
- General education students showed an increase in 2005, but students with disabilities showed a consistent decrease over the three-year period.
- In 2006 the percent of students with disabilities achieving proficiency was only slightly lower (2%) than general education students. The gap was largest (18%) in 2005.
- For both groups of students the highest number of scores fell in the 65-84 interval for each year of the three-year period.

Exhibit 2.2 shows the percent of students achieving graduation requirements in mathematics for the years 2004 through 2006.

Exhibit 2.2
Percent Achieving Graduation Requirement in Mathematics
Central Islip Senior High School
2004 – 2006

Student Group	Senior Year	Cohort Count	Number Scoring in Regents Exam Intervals				Passed Competency	# Not tested	% Not tested	% Achieving Graduation Requirement
			0-54	55-64	65-84	85-100				
All	2004	363	41	42	103	42	18	113	31%	56%
	2005	415	53	55	159	20	33	84	20%	64%
	2006	363	17	16	150	92	8	74	20%	73%
General Education	2004	284	34	34	90	25	0	91	32%	56%
	2005	298	42	36	131	17	0	72	24%	62%
	2006	284	14	13	124	76	0	57	20%	75%
Students with Disabilities	2004	70	7	7	13	7	11	22	31%	54%
	2005	112	11	18	27	3	31	12	11%	71%
	2006	70	2	2	24	16	6	15	21%	69%
<i>Note: Numbers across rows do not total to cohort count. However, these were the numbers contained in the A-1 Performance of the Accountability Cohort on Achieving Graduation Requirement.</i>										
<i>Source of Data: A-1 Performance of the Accountability Cohort on Achieving Graduation Requirements, Cohorts of 2000, 2001, 2002</i>										
<i>Data provided by central office staff of the Central Islip Union Free School District.</i>										

The following observations are based on Exhibit 2.2:

- The percent of students meeting the graduation requirement on the Regents Exam in mathematics increased consistently for general education students over the three-year period.
- The percent of students with disabilities who met the graduation requirement in mathematics also increased between 2004 and 2006, but the highest success rate was in 2005. The percent meeting the requirement declined slightly in 2006.
- In 2004 the difference between general education students and students with disabilities in the percent of students meeting the graduation requirements in mathematics was just 2%. In 2005 the gap was 9%, and in 2006 it was 6%.
- As noted with English (Exhibit 2.1) the highest number of scores for both groups of students was in the 65-84 interval.

Exhibit 2.3 shows the percent of students scoring at each interval on the Regents' test in Comprehensive English and Mathematics A.

Exhibit 2.3
Percent Scoring at Each Interval for
Regents Comprehensive English and Mathematics A
Central Islip Senior High School
2004 – 2006

Examination	Student Group	Sr. Year	Cohort Size (from A-1)	# of Students Tested	# of students scoring in each interval				% of students scoring in each interval			
					0-54	55-64	65-84	85-100	0-54	55-64	65-84	85-100
Regents Comprehensive English	All students	04	363	366	39	28	171	128	11%	8%	47%	35%
		05	415	377	11	16	199	101	3%	5%	61%	31%
		06	358	381	31	35	236	79	8%	9%	62%	21%
Regents Comprehensive English	General Ed.	04	284	292	18	26	133	115	6%	9%	46%	39%
		05	298	327	11	16	199	101	3%	5%	61%	31%
		06	306	399	10	30	220	79	3%	9%	65%	23%
Regents Comprehensive English	SWD	04	70	74	21	2	38	13	28%	3%	51%	18%
		05	112	50	17	5	26	2	34%	10%	52%	4%
		06	50	42	21	5	16	0	50%	12%	38%	0%
Regents Mathematics A	All students	04	363	320	42	62	191	25	13%	19%	60%	8%
		05	415	395	48	49	266	32	12%	12%	67%	8%
		06	358	696	52	110	462	72	7%	16%	66%	10%
Regents Mathematics A	General Ed.	04	284	289	35	50	180	24	12%	17%	62%	8%
		05	298	345	25	37	251	32	7%	11%	73%	9%
		06	306	643	43	99	431	70	7%	15%	67%	11%
Regents Mathematics A	SWD	04	70	31	7	12	11	1	23%	39%	35%	3%
		05	112	50	23	12	15	0	46%	24%	30%	0%
		06	50	53	9	11	31	2	17%	21%	58%	4%

Note: Numbers across rows do not always total to cohort count or number tested. However, these were the numbers contained in the A-1 and B-1 reports.

Source of Data: B-1 Verification of Regents Examination Data report; the cohort size was gained from the A-1 Performance of the Accountability Cohort on Achieving Graduation Requirements report.

Observations from Exhibit 2.3 include the following:

- As noted in Exhibits 2.1 and 2.2, the highest number and percentage of scores for all three student groups was in the 65-84 interval in both English and mathematics in the years reported here.
- In English, there was a marked decline in the percent of students scoring at the highest interval (85-100) for all student groups. In 2006 no students with disabilities scored at that interval, compared with 18% in 2004.
- In mathematics, the percent of general education students scoring at the highest interval increased slightly over the three-year period, while the percent for students with disabilities fluctuated and showed no pattern.
- The percent scoring at the highest interval in English during this three-year period tended to be considerably higher than the percent scoring at the same level in mathematics. The exception was in the 2006 scores for students with disabilities.

- The number of students with disabilities being tested on these two exams—Comprehensive English and Mathematics A—varied each year. In 2004, in a cohort of 70 students, 74 were tested in English and only 31 in mathematics. In 2005, the same number of students completed each exam; this number was less than 50% of the cohort of students with disabilities. In 2006, with a cohort size of 50 students, 42 students completed the English test while 53 completed the Mathematics A exam.

III. Graduation Rates

The auditors analyzed the graduation rates of students using data provided by Central Islip Union Free School District personnel. The source of the data used were from the *A-3 Verification of Graduation-Rate Cohort Performance, Cohorts of 1999, 2000, 2001*. Data was also obtained from the *New York State School Report Card* covering 2002-03 through 2004-05.

Exhibit 3.1 shows the percent of students earning local diplomas for the years 2003 through 2005.

Exhibit 3.1

Percent of Students Earning Local Diplomas Central Islip Senior High School 2003-2005

Student Group	All Students			Students with Disabilities		
	Cohort Count	# Earning Local Diploma	% Earning Local Diploma	Cohort Count	# Earning Local Diploma	% Earning Local Diploma
2002-03 Seniors 1999 Cohort	331	243	73%	61 (18% of class)	41	67%
2003-04 Seniors 2000 Cohort	322	230	71%	65 (20% of class)	33	51%
2004-05 Seniors 2001 Cohort	410	252	61%	108 (26% of class)	50	46%

Source of data: A-3 Verification of Graduation-Rate Cohort Performance, Cohorts of 1999, 2000, 2001. Reports provided by central office staff of Central Islip Union Free School District.

The following observations can be made from Exhibit 3.1:

- The percent of students earning local diplomas declined between 2003 and 2005 for both the entire senior class and for students with disabilities.
- The decrease in graduation rate for students with disabilities was greater than that for the student body as a whole—21% for students with disabilities compared with 12% for the entire senior class.
- In 2005 less than 50% of students with disabilities in the 2001 cohort group earned local diplomas.
- The proportion of students with disabilities in each cohort group increased from 18% in the 1999 cohort group to 20% for the 2000 group and then to 26% for the 2001 cohort.

Exhibit 3.2 shows the types of diplomas earned by gender and ethnicity diplomas for the years 2004 through 2006.

Exhibit 3.2
Types of Diplomas
Students with Disabilities Disaggregated by Gender and Ethnicity
Central Islip High School
2004 – 2006

	Graduation Year	Total	Local Diploma w/o Regents Endorsement	IEP Diploma	Regents Diploma w/o Honors	Regents Diploma with Honors	Local Diploma w/o Regents Endorsement with CTE Endorsement
Total¹	2003-04	48	27 (56%)	5 (10%)	16 (33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	2004-05	42	6 (14%)	9 (21%)	20 (48%)	2 (5%)	5 (12%)
	2005-06	55	7 (13%)	35 (64%)	9 (16%)	0 (0%)	4 (7%)
Gender²							
Male	2003-04	27	15 (56%)	3 (11%)	9 (33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	2004-05	12	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	10 (83%)	0 (0%)	2 (17%)
	2005-06	25	3 (12%)	15 (60%)	5 (20%)	0 (0%)	2 (8%)
Female	2003-04	21	12 (57%)	2 (10%)	7 (33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	2004-05	30	6 (20%)	9 (30%)	10 (33%)	2 (7%)	3 (10%)
	2005-06	30	4 (13%)	20 (67%)	4 (13%)	0 (0%)	2 (8%)
Ethnicity²							
Black	2003-04	16	8 (50%)	3 (19%)	5 (31%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	2004-05	19	3 (16%)	5 (26%)	9 (47%)	0 (0%)	2 (11%)
	2005-06	24	4 (17%)	15 (63%)	3 (13%)	0 (0%)	2 (8%)
White	2003-04	14	10 (71%)	0 (0%)	4 (29%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	2004-05	15	2 (13%)	4 (27%)	4 (27%)	2 (13%)	3 (20%)
	2005-06	11	2 (18%)	4 (36%)	3 (27%)	0 (0%)	2 (18%)
Hispanic	2003-04	18	9 (50%)	2 (11%)	7 (39%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	2004-05	8	1 (13%)	0 (0%)	7 (87%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	2005-06	20	1 (5%)	16 (80%)	3 (15%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
¹ Percents represent the percent of diploma type for all diplomas issued to students with disabilities.							
² Percents represent the percent of diploma type for diplomas issued to a specific category of students disaggregated by gender or ethnicity.							
Note: Percents may not total 100 due to rounding.							
Source of Data: Diplomas for Students with Disabilities, Central Islip Public Schools. Reports provided by central office staff of the Central Islip Union Free School District.							
Note: The data above are similar to, but not completely consistent with, data contained in the New York State School Report Card covering 2002-03 through 2004-05.							

The following observations can be made from Exhibit 3.2. It should be noted that, in making observations about subgroups, the N-count for each subgroup was 30 or fewer students. Because of the numbers, care should be taken in drawing conclusions:

- The predominant type of local diploma varied from year to year. Local Diploma without Regents Endorsement was awarded to 56% of the students in 2004, while Regents Diplomas without Honors went to 48% of the students in 2005. In 2006, 64% of students with disabilities who received diplomas were awarded an IEP Diploma.

- A pattern for the yearly awarding of diplomas by type appeared in most subgroups that matched that for the group as a whole. Exceptions were female students in 2004-05 and white students in both 2004-05 and 2005-06. Diplomas for both the female students in 2004-05 and white students in the last two years shown are more evenly distributed across types.
- The greatest shift across groups was from the high number of Regents Diploma without Honors for 2004-05 graduates to the large percentage of IEP Diplomas in 2005-06.

IV. Drop Out Rates

The auditors analyzed the drop out rates of students using data provided by Central Islip Union Free School District personnel. The source of the data used was from the *A-3 Verification of Graduation-Rate Cohort Performance, Cohorts of 1999, 2000, 2001*. Data were also obtained from the *New York State School Report Card* covering 2002-03 through 2004-05.

Exhibit 4.1 shows the number of students and percent of those students who either dropped out or entered a GED program. The data cover the years 2002-2003 through 2004-2005.

Exhibit 4.1

High School Non-completion Rates Central Islip Senior High School 2002-2003 through 2004-2005

		2002-03		2003-04		2004-05	
		No. of Students	% of Enrollment	No. of Students	% of Enrollment	No. of Students	% of Enrollment
General-Education Students	Dropped out	45		34	1.9%	73	4.4%
	Entered GED Program	0		0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Total Non-completers	45		34	1.9%	73	4.4%
Students with Disabilities	Dropped out	11		12	3.2%	25	8.0%
	Entered GED Program	0		0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Total Non-completers	11		12	3.2%	25	8.0%
All Students	Dropped out	56	3.0%	46	2.2%	98	5.0%
	Entered GED Program	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Total Non-completers	56	3.0%	46	2.2%	98	5.0%

Source of data: Taken directly from table entitled "High School Non-completion Rates" in New York State School Report Card. Report provided by central office staff of the Central Islip Union Free School District.

The following observations are based on the data in Exhibit 4.1:

- Because percentages were not provided, comparisons cannot be made for the 2002-03 school year and subsequent years.

- The non-completion rate for students with disabilities more than doubled from 2003-04 to 2004-05.
- The non-completion rate for students with disabilities over these three years was almost twice that of general education students.
- No students over the three-year period entered a GED program.

V. Placement of School Aged Students with Disabilities

The information contained in Exhibit 5.1 is not in response to any of the four areas addressed earlier. Rather, it is part of a foundational piece for one of the recommendations, related to inclusionary placement of students with disabilities in the Central Islip Union Free School District. Data for the entire school district are included here, as the data were not broken down by school or grade levels in the document provided to auditors.

Exhibit 5.1 shows the placement of school aged students with disabilities according to the amount of time spent in general education settings or settings outside of general education.

Exhibit 5.1

Placement of School-Age Students with Disabilities Central Islip Unified Free School District 1999-2004

	National Average (2003-04)	12/1/99	12/1/00	12/1/01	12/1/02	12/1/03	12/1/04
In General Education 80% or more of the school day	49.9%	31.7%	27.3%	28.3%	29.1%	31.0%	31.4%
In General Education 40% to 79% of the school day	27.7%	0.4%	3.4%	23.8%	23.8%	27.2%	24.2%
In General Education 0% to 39% of the school day	18.5%	51.0%	51.7%	32.0%	25.8%	27.0%	30.4%
All settings outside general education buildings	3.9%	16.9%	17.6%	15.9%	15.1%	14.8%	14.0%

Source of Data: District Data Summary Report, 2005, for Placements of School-Age Students with Disabilities, from New York State Department of Education. Data provided for auditors by Central Islip Union Free District personnel.

The following observations are based on Exhibit 5.1:

- Approximately one-third of students with disabilities in the school district spent 80% or more of their day in general education classes in all years reported.

- The percentage of students with disabilities in General Education for 80% or more of the school day remained very stable over the six-year period; the percentage each year was approximately 20% below that of the national average in 2003-04.
- The number of students with disabilities who spend 40-79% of their school day in general education increased considerably in the 2001-02 school year. The percentage went from 3.4% to 23.8% and remained close to that number in subsequent years. The percentage of students in this setting in these more recent years was close to the national average in 2003-04.
- The number of students with disabilities spending 0-39% of their school day in general education declined from over half the students (51.7%) in 2000-01 to less than one-third in the 2001-02 school year. The numbers in that placement have fluctuated between 25% and 32% in the years since. These numbers have been 7% to 12% higher than the national average in the years since 2001.
- The percentage of students in settings outside general education buildings has been relatively stable across the six years included in Exhibit 5.1. The percentages have been more than four times as great as the national average in 2003-04.

Summary

In reviewing the data for students with disabilities as the related to student participation in state testing, student achievement, graduation rates and drop-out rates, auditors found the following trends:

- Participation rates for both students with disabilities and general education students are below acceptable rates mandated by No Child Left Behind. Participation rates for students with disabilities are similar to, and in some cases better than, the rates for general education students (See Exhibit 1.1).
- The percent of students with disabilities meeting the graduation requirement in English decreased between 2004 and 2006, while the percent meeting the requirement in mathematics increased (See Exhibits 2.1 and 2.2).
- The number of students with disabilities being tested each year varies greatly by content area and in relation to the cohort size (See Exhibit 2.3).
- The percent of students with disabilities receiving local diplomas in 2005 was less than half the 2001 cohort. The percent of students with disabilities receiving diplomas declined over the three-year period for which data were provided, and the number each year was consistently less than that for all students by a difference as low as 6% and as high as 20% (See Exhibit 3.1).
- The predominant type of diplomas for students with disabilities was different for each of the three years for which data were provided. In 2006, the most recent graduating class, 64% of the students received IEP diplomas. (See Exhibit 3.2.)
- The dropout rate for students with disabilities has been almost twice that of general education students (See Exhibit 4.1).
- The percentage of students with disabilities who are placed in the least restrictive environment has consistently been below national averages in the period of time for which data were provided (See Exhibit 5.1).

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1: Increase student participation rates for state testing. Develop a comprehensive plan that outlines roles and responsibilities of staff in implementing school plans that will increase student participation rates in testing.

Note: While this audit addendum is to specifically address the needs of students with disabilities, the participation rate of all students in state assessments is an issue. The recommendations here can be applied to all students.

1.1: Review Finding 1.1 of the July 2005 Central Islip Union Free Curriculum Management Audit report. This finding indicates that at the time of the audit, there were no Board of Education policies in place that required a student and assessment process, a system to support data use to determine curriculum effectiveness, periodic reports to the board on program effectiveness, and no process to determine the effectiveness of all district functions. One critical function would be the organization of the assessment process that includes making sure that students who should be tested are tested.

1.2: Review Finding 4.1 of the July 2005 Central Islip Union Free Curriculum Management Audit report. This finding indicated that the school district lacked a comprehensive student assessment plan. Characteristics of a comprehensive student and program assessment plan are listed on page 76 of the report. Characteristic 8 indicates the importance of specifying the roles and responsibilities of the Board, Central office staff, and school based staff. This criterion is critical to the challenge of increasing the student participation rates for state testing. Specified personnel must be directed to develop a school-wide plan to make sure that a high percentage of students are tested.

1.3: Review Recommendation 4 of the July 2005 Central Islip Union Free Curriculum Management Audit report. A.5.1 recommends that the Superintendent re-define the position of Testing Coordinator and make the person in this position responsible for the overall direction for testing within the system. One of the areas of accountability for this position should be providing support to schools on determining exactly which students should be tested.

1.4: The Board of Education should direct the Superintendent to develop a plan to increase the percentage of all students taking state tests to an acceptable level. This plan should be developed and implemented immediately.

- The plan should be developed in collaboration with English teachers, mathematics teachers, and the testing coordinator to increase the number students with disabilities completing state assessments (Regents Exam or Regents Competency Test).
- Identify a testing coordinator who has as one of his/her specific responsibilities ensuring the participation of students in test-taking.
- Identify the best testing environment for the students.
- Schedule testing within the parameters established by the state but with sufficient time for make-up testing.
- Be diligent in tracking down students who need to take the test and were not tested in the original test administration schedule.
- Schedule testing of special education students in small groups with teachers they know.
- Monitor students' movement to the testing area.
- Provide incentives (such as healthy treats) to make the testing a more inviting experience.

1.5: The Board of Education should direct the Superintendent to present a public report that outlines the tenets of the plan to increase student participation in state testing.

1.6: Implement a formal evaluation of the plan to increase student participation in state testing after the state testing cycle in 2007-2008 and report the results to the Board of Education.

Recommendation 2: Increase graduation rates of students with disabilities along with decreasing drop out rates. Develop an articulated plan that outlines roles and responsibilities for monitoring the progress toward graduation of students with disabilities.

2.1: Review [Finding 1.1](#) of the July 2005 Central Islip Union Free Curriculum Management Audit report. This finding indicates that at the time of the audit, there were no Board of Education policies in place that required an aligned, tested, and taught curriculum in the Central Islip School District. There were also no policies related to accountability for curriculum control through roles and responsibilities for specific staff members. In order for graduation rates to increase for students with disabilities, the steps below should be addressed:

2.2: Develop a district philosophy about special education that is well-articulated from preschool through senior high. Include in the philosophy district expectations for inclusion (see [Exhibit 5.1](#)).

2.3: Monitor instruction in special education and inclusion classrooms. Provide training for administrators and others who are assigned this responsibility.

2.4: Provide staff development for both general education teachers and special education teachers in three areas:

- General education: Provide training in the ways to meet the needs of special education students.
- Special education: Provide training in the content knowledge in the courses for which they are responsible.
- General education and special education: provide training on strategies for collaborating with one another in meeting the needs of students.

2.5: Provide ongoing monitoring for credit attainment of special education students. This should be the direct responsibility of a certified member of the school staff.

2.6: Monitor the course-taking patterns of special education students to help ensure their equal access to courses that will provide knowledge necessary to be successful on Regents exams.

2.7: Provide training for special education teachers in writing IEP's that reflect standards-based curriculum and instruction.

Recommendation 3: Increase achievement in English Language Arts and Mathematics for students with disabilities. Develop a comprehensive curriculum management plan that supports the instruction and ongoing progress of students with disabilities.

3.1: Review [Finding 1.1](#) of the July 2005 Central Islip Union Free Curriculum Management Audit report. This finding indicates that at the time of the audit, there were no Board of Education policies in place that required an aligned, taught, and tested curriculum in the Central Islip School District. There were also no policies related to accountability for curriculum control through roles and responsibilities for specific staff members. In order for achievement to increase in ELA and math, policies must be in place that direct quality curriculum management (See [Exhibit 1.1.3](#) of the July 2005 report).

3.2: Review [Finding 2.1](#) of the July 2005 Central Islip Union Free Curriculum Management Audit report. In [Exhibit 2.1.1](#), the characteristics of a comprehensive curriculum management plan are outlined. As of the time of the audit report in 2005, the school district lacked a curriculum management plan.

- 3.3:** Review Recommendation 3 of the July 2005 Central Islip Union Free Curriculum Management Audit report, specifically the recommendations related to curriculum management planning (page 101).
- 3.4:** Provide administrators and others with supervisory responsibilities with specific training related to monitoring selection of appropriate, standards-based curricular content and instructional strategies used to deliver that content in classrooms.
- 3.5:** Review the alignment of district curriculum with state standards and expectations.
- 3.6:** Revise the curriculum as needed so that all students have the opportunity to learn the knowledge and skills for which they will be held accountable.
- 3.7:** Provide instruction in the classroom for students with disabilities (as well as all students) that reflects the expectations of the standards-based curriculum assessed on the Regents exams.
- 3.8:** Deliver instruction for students with disabilities in a manner that takes into consideration the various needs, learning styles and modalities of those students.
- 3.9:** Provide staff development in appropriate instructional strategies for special education teachers as well as general education teachers who teach students with disabilities.
- 3.10:** Provide staff development related to content as appropriate for special education teachers who lack expertise in an area they are called upon to teach.
- 3.11:** Develop a means to assess student learning and diagnose deficiencies in advance of high-stakes testing. This could be in the form of short diagnostic assessments for each objective or slightly longer assessments that cover several objectives.

Auditors' Biographical Data



Gene Johnson, Ed.D.

Dr. Gene Johnson is currently the Associate Superintendent for Secondary Administration in the Shawnee Mission School District in the metropolitan Kansas City area. Previously he served as Associate Superintendent for Educational Services, Director of Elementary Programs, and an elementary school principal in Shawnee Mission. He also served as a teacher and building administrator in the Topeka Public Schools and North Topeka School Districts. Dr. Johnson received his B.A. degree from Yankton College, South Dakota; his M.A. degree from Washburn University in Topeka, Kansas; and his Ed.D. degree in educational policy and administration from the University of Kansas.

Dr. Johnson's experiences include extensive work in effective instruction, school improvement, and system planning. He is a past member of the Kansas Advisory Council for School Accreditation. He is a certified walk through trainer, has participated in PDK trainings for Indiana school corporations, and serves as a lead auditor for Curriculum Management Systems, Inc. Dr. Johnson received his curriculum management audit training in Vail, Colorado in 1994. He also serves as a trainer for Curriculum Management Systems, Inc. Dr. Johnson has served on audit teams or on external evaluation teams in 13 states.



Beverly W. Nichols, Ph.D.

Beverly Nichols is an independent education consultant assisting schools and school systems in many areas of school improvement. She recently served as the Coordinator of Evaluation and Assessment and Resource Specialist for Secondary Mathematics in Shawnee Mission, Kansas Public Schools. She has over 40 years of experience in mathematics education and educational leadership, including administrative roles at the junior and senior high school levels and in curriculum and assessment. Dr. Nichols is a recipient of the Presidential Award for Excellence in Teaching Mathematics and has served on the Board of Directors as well as many committees for the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. .

Dr. Nichols received her B.A. and M.A. from Arizona State University, an Ed. S. in School Administration from Emporia State University, and her Ph.D. in curriculum and instruction from the University of Missouri at Kansas City. She completed her curriculum audit management training in Bloomington, Indiana and San Antonio, Texas in 1997. She has participated in audits or external evaluations in 14 states.

