

4. What school district and state data would be useful in understanding the need to improve outcomes for all students, with the participation of Title I and Special Education? Where is that data available? If you choose, also include Title III and other programs?

5. As School Improvement under NCLB is focused on the building level, what do Special Education and Title I have to do to build connections to general educators and building administrators?

6. What stands in the way of Title I and Special Education working together to improve results for all students at the building level?
**If you choose, also include Title III and other programs*

7. If you could design a collaborative system for Title I and Special Education, what important elements would you include?
**If you choose, also include Title III and other programs*

8. Provisions of IDEA'97 permits some use of IDEA funds in more flexible ways for in school-wide programs. Provisions of IDEA '2004 emphasize early intervening services and suggest some additional flexibility. Although the legislation is new (Dec. 2004) and regulations are not expected until the end of the year, is there value in a collaborative approach to defining and projecting these potential opportunities at the SEA level with LEA staff and key stakeholders? If so, what value is there?

Section 1
Summary Form: Dialogue /Interview Questions

Question Number (circle): 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
--

Themes

(The 'big ideas' that can guide future planning)

Illustrative Quotes

(Real words of the participants and/or interviewees that show the issues, problems and potential)

(Real words of the participants and/or interviewees)

1.

1.

2.

2.

3.

3.

4.

4.

5.

5.

6.

6.

7.

7.

8.

8.

9.

9.

10.

10.

(Duplicate to summarize each question, as needed)

Section 2
Summary Form: Existing Efforts

<i>Policy Initiatives</i>
<i>That promote collaboration</i> <i>That impede collaboration</i>

- | | |
|----|----|
| 1. | 1. |
| 2. | 2. |
| 3. | 3. |
| 4. | 4. |
| 5. | 5. |

<i>Local Efforts</i>

- | | |
|--|---------|
| 1. District:
Initiatives:
Preliminary data:
Outcomes: (to date and projected) | School: |
| 2. District:
Initiatives:
Preliminary data:
Outcomes: (to date and projected) | School: |
| 3. District:
Initiatives:
Preliminary data:
Outcomes: (to date and projected) | School: |
| 4. District:
Initiatives:
Preliminary data:
Outcomes: (to date and projected) | School: |
| 5. District:
Initiatives:
Preliminary data:
Outcomes: (to date and projected) | School: |

Section 3: Projections about Collaboration

(This section is intended to identify the potential impact points where change may be initiated. It is also intended to identify the key roles, groups and stakeholders that must be engaged)

1. What data needs to be collected and synthesized to show the need for collaboration and set the stage for future work?

(e.g. . number of schools not meeting AYP in one or more subgroups, number of schools in safe harbor, projected outcomes as criterion for AYP adjusts upward, etc.)

<i>Data Set</i>	<i>Available From</i>	<i>Relevant Findings</i>	<i>Implications</i>

2. Given the data, what messages need to be clearly communicated from the SEA level so that it is more likely that Special Education and Title I work together to meet the benchmarks in NCLB?

** If you choose, also include Title III and other programs*

1.

2.

3.

3. What action needs to be initiated at the SEA level? Who needs to be involved?

Action

Involved

1.

1.

2.

2.

3.

3.

4. What messages need to be communicated at the local level? Who needs to embrace the message and help deliver it?

Message

Messengers

1.

1.

2.

2.

3.

3.

5. What action needs to be initiated at the local level? Who needs to be involved?

Action

Involved

1.

1.

2.

2.

3.

3.

Section 3
Summary Form: Messages, Actions and Involvement

Most Important Messages

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Priority Actions	Critical SEA Offices/ Influential Individuals/ Stakeholder Groups to be Involved
-------------------------	---

- | | |
|----|----|
| 1. | 1. |
| 2. | 2. |
| 3. | 3. |
| 4. | 4. |
| 5. | 5. |

(Duplicate as needed)

Section 4: The Cross-state Community of Practice for System Collaboration across IDEA and Title I at the SEA and LEA Level to Meet Benchmarks in NCLB for all Students.

(This section is intended to clarify the state commitment to learning with other states in a Community of Practice)

1. Has your state been a part of the Title I Community in the past 5 years? If so, who was on your state team?

2. Do these individuals still serve in positions that related to this effort? If so, have they been invited to share their experiences? If not, who needs to be engaged in the dialogue?

3. After completing this exercise, is there support for joining other states in a Community of Practice? If so, is your purpose to learn what other states are doing or to create an action effort in your state?

