



DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

The Townsend Building
401 Federal Street Suite 2
Dover, Delaware 19901-3639
DOE WEBSITE: <http://www.doe.k12.de.us>

Mark T. Murphy
Secretary of Education
Voice: (302) 735-4000
FAX: (302) 739-4654

June 15, 2015

Dr. Freeman L. Williams
Christina School District
600 N. Lombard Street
Wilmington, DE 19801

RE: LEA Determination Under the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)

Dear Dr. Williams:

Under the IDEA, the Department is required to review the performance of local education agencies (LEAs) on the targets identified in the State's Performance Plan (SPP) and make annual determinations on LEA performance.

As discussed in the November Chiefs' meeting, the federal Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) has broadened their focus from holding states accountable for compliance indicators only to now holding states accountable for both compliance and results indicators. Beginning this spring, LEAs are receiving their annual determination based on a combination of the following compliance and results indicators:

- **Compliance:**

- Indicator 4b Significant Discrepancy, by Race or Ethnicity, in the rate of Suspensions and Expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements
- Indicators 9 & 10 Disproportionate Representation related to Identification
- Indicator 11 Timely Evaluations
- Indicator 12 Early Childhood Transition from Part C/preschool special education services to Part B/school-age special education services
- Indicator 13 Transition Planning in the IEP
- Other Equitable Services, Needs-Based Funding, Fiscal Monitoring
- Other Corrective Action as a result of an Administrative Complaint or Due Process

- **Results:**

- Indicator 3b Participation in the State Assessment
- Indicator 3c Proficiency on the State Assessment
- Indicator 4a Significant Discrepancy in the rates of long-term Suspension of Students with Disabilities
- Indicator 7 Early Childhood Outcomes

Based on information from OSEP, Indicator 1/Graduation Rate will be added next year.

As a result of the review of your LEA's data, the Department has determined your LEA **NEEDS INTERVENTION** in implementing the regulations of the IDEA.

Christina School District
LEA Determination Under the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)
June 15, 2015
Page 2

Attached, please find an overview of the “IDEA General Supervision & Reporting Requirements” along with an explanation of how your LEA’s determination was calculated. The response table provides the Department’s analysis of the reported data, and identifies, by indicator, the LEA’s status in meeting its targets.

Exceptional Children Resources staff will be in contact with you to discuss next steps including the development of a **Corrective Action Plan**. In the interim, please do not hesitate to contact me by phone at (302) 735-4210, or by e-mail maryann.mieczkowski@doe.k12.de.us.

Sincerely,



Mary Ann Mieczkowski
Director, Exceptional Children Resources

Sincerely,



Michael Watson
Chief Academic Officer

MAM:BJM/bd
Attachment

cc: Mark T. Murphy, Secretary of Education
Penny Schwinn, Chief Accountability Officer
Katherine Villari, Chief Performance Officer
Ryan Reyna, Director, Office of Accountability
Lisa Lawson, Director, Special Education Services
Barbara Mazza, Education Associate, Exceptional Children Resources
Maria N. Locuniak, PhD., NCSP, Education Associate, Exceptional Children Resources
Sarah Celestin, Education Associate, Exceptional Children Resources

IDEA General Supervision & Reporting Requirements

The Department's General Monitoring Duties Under the IDEA

By way of background, the IDEA requires the Department to monitor the implementation of Part B of the IDEA in the LEAs throughout the State. In addition, the Department is required to annually report to the public on the performance of the State and each LEA. The Department's monitoring activities must primarily focus on: (1) improving educational results and functional outcomes for all children with disabilities and (2) ensuring that public agencies meet the program requirements of Part B, with a particular emphasis on the requirements most closely related to improving educational results for children with disabilities. The Department is responsible for monitoring LEAs using quantifiable indicators in certain priority areas and for using qualitative indicators to allow an adequate measure of performance in each area. IDEA regulations outline the three priority areas as: (1) the provision of FAPE in the least restrictive environment, (2) the State's exercise of general supervision, including child find, effective monitoring, the use of resolution meetings, mediation, and a system of transition services, and (3) disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services to the extent such representation is the result of inappropriate identification.

The State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Reports

The IDEA further requires the State to have a performance plan in place that evaluates the State's efforts to implement the requirements and purposes of Part B of the IDEA and describes how the State will improve the implementation of Part B. As part of its State Performance Plan (SPP), the State must establish measurable and rigorous targets for various indicators under the three priority areas mentioned above. The SPP currently has seventeen indicators and the State must report annually to the U.S. Department of Education on the performance of the State under the SPP.

In addition to its federal submission, the Department is responsible for reporting annually to the public on the performance of each LEA located within the State on the targets described in the SPP. On an annual basis, each LEA must use the targets established in the SPP and the three priority areas mentioned above, to analyze and report on its local performance to the Department. In turn, the Department will review the LEA's performance and assign a determination level.

Based on the Department's analysis of data provided by each LEA and information obtained through audits, monitoring visits, administrative complaints, due process proceedings, and any other publicly available information, the Department assigns one of the following determination levels: Meets the Requirements and purposes of IDEA, Needs Assistance in implementing the requirements of IDEA, Needs Intervention in implementing the requirements of IDEA, or Needs Substantial Intervention in implementing the requirements of IDEA.

Federal and state regulations addressing the SPP, APR, and the LEA's reporting obligations can be found at 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.600-602, 646 and 14 DE Admin Code §§ 927.1.0 through 8.0, and §§ 40.0 through 46.0.

FFY 2013 LEA Annual Determinations

FFY 2013 determinations were made based on a combination of the following compliance and results indicators:

- **Compliance:**

- Indicator 4b Significant Discrepancy, by Race or Ethnicity, in the rate of Suspensions and Expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements
- Indicators 9 & 10 Disproportionate Representation related to Identification
- Indicator 11 Timely Evaluations
- Indicator 12 Early Childhood Transition from Part C/preschool special education services to Part B/school-age special education services
- Indicator 13 Transition Planning in the IEP
- Other Equitable Services, Needs-Based Funding, Fiscal Monitoring
- Other Corrective Action as a result of an Administrative Complaint or Due Process

- **Results:**

- Indicator 3b Participation in the State Assessment
- Indicator 3c Proficiency on the State Assessment
- Indicator 4a Significant Discrepancy in the rates of long-term Suspension of Students with Disabilities
- Indicator 7 Early Childhood Outcomes

Meets Requirements	=	≥ 80% (compliance and results combined)	and	If monitored on-site, LEA is engaged in Prong 1 or Prong 2		
Needs Assistance	=	60% to 79% (compliance and results combined)	and/or	LEA is engaged in a Corrective Action Plan related to any compliance indicator(s)/issues or does not meet targets for results	and/or	Outstanding Noncompliance from On-Site Monitoring (beyond 1 year)
Needs Intervention	=	≤ 59% (compliance and results combined)	and/or	LEA is engaged in an Intervention Plan or Compliance Agreement related to any compliance indicator(s)/issues or does not meet targets for results	and/or	Outstanding Noncompliance from On-Site Monitoring (beyond 2 years)
Needs Significant Intervention	Phase in Spring, 2016					

Christina School District

Compliance Indicators	Data From: (Time Period)	SPP Target 2013 - 2014	State Data	LEA Data	LEA Score	Possible Points
Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements. Note - The LEA score is the Rate Ratio which for FFY 2012 had a target of 1.26	2012 - 2013 SY	0.00%	12.82%	Did not meet target for African American	0	1
Indicator 9: Disproportionality/All Disabilities	12/1/13	0.00%	4.65%	Met target	1	1
Indicator 10: Disproportionality/Specific Disabilities	12/1/13	0.00%	4.65%	Did not meet target	0	1
Indicator 11: Initial Evaluation Timelines	2013 - 2014 SY	100.00%	99.79%	100.00%	1	1
Indicator 12: Preschool Transition Part C to Part B	2013 - 2014 SY	100.00%	97.00%	100.00%	1	1
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition (LEA - actual percentage)	2013 - 2014 SY	100%	48.43%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Equitable Services/Needs-Based Funding/Fiscal Monitoring					1	1

Results Indicators	Data From: (Time Period)	SPP Target 2013 - 2014	State Data	LEA Data	LEA Score	Possible Points	
Indicator 3B Participation Math	Spring, 2014						
Grade 3		95.00%	98.60%	98.83%	1	1	
Grade 4		95.00%	98.78%	97.56%	1	1	
Grade 5		95.00%	98.76%	97.88%	1	1	
Grade 6		95.00%	97.69%	92.40%	0	1	
Grade 7		95.00%	97.43%	93.65%	0	1	
Grade 8		95.00%	97.78%	96.65%	1	1	
Grade 10		95.00%	92.45%	81.82%	0	1	
Indicator 3B Participation Reading							
Grade 3		95.00%	96.22%	97.25%	1	1	
Grade 4		95.00%	96.60%	95.93%	1	1	
Grade 5		95.00%	96.70%	95.77%	1	1	
Grade 6		95.00%	96.33%	91.63%	0	1	
Grade 7		95.00%	96.41%	94.07%	0	1	
Grade 8		95.00%	96.87%	94.58%	0	1	
Grade 10		95.00%	90.10%	83.33%	0	1	
Indicator 3C Performance Rate Math							
Grade 3		41.80%	36.69%	35.57%	0	1	
Grade 4		41.80%	37.00%	30.42%	0	1	
Grade 5		41.80%	33.08%	27.80%	0	1	
Grade 6	41.80%	23.21%	18.61%	0	1		
Grade 7	41.80%	27.61%	21.19%	0	1		
Grade 8	41.80%	27.73%	21.65%	0	1		
Grade 10	41.80%	30.96%	17.95%	0	1		

Christina School District

Results Indicators	Data From: (Time Period)	SPP Target 2013 - 2014	State Data	LEA Data	LEA Score	Possible Points
Indicator 3C Performance Rate Reading	Spring, 2014					
Grade 3		41.40%	33.87%	32.66%	0	1
Grade 4		41.40%	36.45%	28.39%	0	1
Grade 5		41.40%	38.91%	36.40%	0	1
Grade 6		41.40%	30.32%	23.04%	0	1
Grade 7		41.40%	30.04%	24.79%	0	1
Grade 8		41.40%	29.29%	24.23%	0	1
Grade 10		41.40%	34.56%	18.33%	0	1
Indicator 4A: Significant Discrepancy in the rates of long-term suspension of students with disabilities Note - The LEA score is the Rate Ratio which for FFY 2012 had a target of 1.26	2012 - 2013 SY	0.00%	2.56%	Met target	1	1
Indicator 7A: Early Childhood Outcomes - Social/Emotional	June, 2014					
Percent Increase Rate of Growth		85.20%	86.41%	76.00%	0	1
Percent Within Age Expectation		54.20%	48.81%	33.00%	0	1
Indicator 7B: Early Childhood Outcomes - Knowledge						
Percent Increase Rate of Growth		87.30%	86.63%	80.00%	0	1
Percent Within Age Expectation		49.80%	45.39%	31.00%	0	1
Indicator 7C: Early Childhood Outcomes - Behavior						
Percent Increase Rate of Growth		87.30%	85.60%	81.00%	0	1
Percent Within Age Expectation	65.00%	61.51%	46.00%	0	1	

Determination Summary	
Compliance Indicators Score	4
Out of a Possible:	6
Results Indicators Score	8
Out of a Possible:	35
Score Total	12
Out of a Possible:	41
Percentage:	29.3%
Other: Engaged in Prong 1/Prong 2 for On-Site Monitoring	
Other: Engaged in a Compliance Agreement for Indicator 4	

Annual Determination: Needs Intervention

District Progress on State Performance Plan Indicators for Students with Disabilities - FFY 2013

Christina

Indicator 1 - Graduation Rates

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Graduates</u>	<u>Dropouts</u>	<u>Graduation Rate</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>
1	2012	71	65	52.21%	87.00%	No
1	2013	66	62	51.56%	87.00%	No
1	2014	80	69	53.70%	63.00%	No

Indicator 2 - Dropout Rates

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>	<u>Dropouts</u>	<u>Dropout Rate</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>
2	2012	509	65	12.77%	3.80%	No
2	2013	708	62	8.76%	3.80%	No
2	2014	693		1.88%	5.50%	Yes

Indicator 3 - Performance on AYP

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>School Level</u>	<u>Meets Reading Target?</u>	<u>Meets Math Target?</u>	<u>Meets AYP Target?</u>
3A	2012	Elem	Yes	No	No
3A	2012	Middle	Yes	No	No
3A	2012	High Sch	Yes	No	No
3A	2013	Elem	Yes	Yes	No
3A	2013	Middle	No	Yes	No
3A	2013	High Sch	No	No	No

District Progress on State Performance Plan Indicators for Students with Disabilities - FFY 2013

Christina

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>School Level</u>	<u>Meets Reading Target?</u>	<u>Meets Math Target?</u>	<u>Meets AYP Target?</u>
3A	2014	Elem	Yes	Yes	Yes
3A	2014	Middle	No	No	No
3A	2014	High Sch	No	No	No

Indicator 3B - Participation in State Assessments

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Grade</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u># Eligible</u>	<u># Tested</u>	<u>% Tested</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>
3B	2012	3	Math	216	208	96.30%	99.3%	No
3B	2013	3	Math	202	202	100.00%	99.3%	Yes
3B	2014	3	Math	256	253	98.83%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	4	Math	215	213	99.07%	99.0%	Yes
3B	2013	4	Math	280	280	100.00%	99.0%	Yes
3B	2014	4	Math	246	240	97.56%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	5	Math	259	255	98.46%	99.3%	No
3B	2013	5	Math	266	266	100.00%	99.3%	Yes
3B	2014	5	Math	283	277	97.88%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	6	Math	215	211	98.14%	98.5%	No
3B	2013	6	Math	242	242	100.00%	98.5%	Yes
3B	2014	6	Math	250	231	92.40%	95.0%	No

District Progress on State Performance Plan Indicators for Students with Disabilities - FFY 2013

Christina

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Grade</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u># Eligible</u>	<u># Tested</u>	<u>% Tested</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>
3B	2012	7	Math	185	179	96.76%	98.3%	No
3B	2013	7	Math	226	226	100.00%	98.3%	Yes
3B	2014	7	Math	252	236	93.65%	95.0%	No
3B	2012	8	Math	204	197	96.57%	97.4%	No
3B	2013	8	Math	183	183	100.00%	97.4%	Yes
3B	2014	8	Math	239	231	96.65%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	10	Math	150	127	84.67%	95.4%	No
3B	2013	10	Math	150	150	100.00%	95.4%	Yes
3B	2014	10	Math	143	117	81.82%	95.0%	No
3B	2012	3	Reading	216	200	92.59%	99.2%	No
3B	2013	3	Reading	199	199	100.00%	99.2%	Yes
3B	2014	3	Reading	255	248	97.25%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	4	Reading	215	208	96.74%	98.7%	No
3B	2013	4	Reading	275	275	100.00%	98.7%	Yes
3B	2014	4	Reading	246	236	95.93%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	5	Reading	259	253	97.68%	99.5%	No
3B	2013	5	Reading	258	258	100.00%	99.5%	Yes

District Progress on State Performance Plan Indicators for Students with Disabilities - FFY 2013

Christina

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Grade</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u># Eligible</u>	<u># Tested</u>	<u>% Tested</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>
3B	2014	5	Reading	284	272	95.77%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	6	Reading	215	200	93.02%	98.4%	No
3B	2013	6	Reading	237	237	100.00%	98.4%	Yes
3B	2014	6	Reading	251	230	91.63%	95.0%	No
3B	2012	7	Reading	185	168	90.81%	98.2%	No
3B	2013	7	Reading	218	218	100.00%	98.2%	Yes
3B	2014	7	Reading	253	238	94.07%	95.0%	No
3B	2012	8	Reading	204	194	95.10%	97.6%	No
3B	2013	8	Reading	173	173	100.00%	97.6%	Yes
3B	2014	8	Reading	240	227	94.58%	95.0%	No
3B	2012	10	Reading	150	119	79.33%	95.8%	No
3B	2013	10	Reading	138	138	100.00%	95.8%	Yes
3B	2014	10	Reading	144	120	83.33%	95.0%	No

Indicator 3C - Performance on State Assessments

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Grade</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u># Tested</u>	<u># Meets</u>	<u>% Meets</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>
3C	2012	3	Math	208	98	47.12%	36.00%	Yes
3C	2013	3	Math	202	65	32.18%	41.80%	No

District Progress on State Performance Plan Indicators for Students with Disabilities - FFY 2013

Christina

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Grade</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u># Tested</u>	<u># Meets</u>	<u>% Meets</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>
3C	2014	3	Math	253	90	35.57%	41.80%	No
3C	2012	4	Math	212	80	37.74%	36.00%	Yes
3C	2013	4	Math	280	95	33.93%	41.80%	No
3C	2014	4	Math	240	73	30.42%	41.80%	No
3C	2012	5	Math	255	98	38.43%	36.00%	Yes
3C	2013	5	Math	266	70	26.32%	41.80%	No
3C	2014	5	Math	277	77	27.80%	41.80%	No
3C	2012	6	Math	209	37	17.70%	36.00%	No
3C	2013	6	Math	242	36	14.88%	41.80%	No
3C	2014	6	Math	231	43	18.61%	41.80%	No
3C	2012	7	Math	179	48	26.82%	36.00%	No
3C	2013	7	Math	226	44	19.47%	41.80%	No
3C	2014	7	Math	236	50	21.19%	41.80%	No
3C	2012	8	Math	197	53	26.90%	36.00%	No
3C	2013	8	Math	183	47	25.68%	41.80%	No
3C	2014	8	Math	231	50	21.65%	41.80%	No

District Progress on State Performance Plan Indicators for Students with Disabilities - FFY 2013

Christina

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Grade</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u># Tested</u>	<u># Meets</u>	<u>% Meets</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>
3C	2012	10	Math	125	30	24.00%	36.00%	No
3C	2013	10	Math	150	27	18.00%	41.80%	No
3C	2014	10	Math	117	21	17.95%	41.80%	No
3C	2012	3	Reading	200	104	52.00%	35.60%	Yes
3C	2013	3	Reading	199	40	20.10%	41.40%	No
3C	2014	3	Reading	248	81	32.66%	41.40%	No
3C	2012	4	Reading	207	79	38.16%	35.60%	Yes
3C	2013	4	Reading	275	105	38.18%	41.40%	No
3C	2014	4	Reading	236	67	28.39%	41.40%	No
3C	2012	5	Reading	253	119	47.04%	35.60%	Yes
3C	2013	5	Reading	258	83	32.17%	41.40%	No
3C	2014	5	Reading	272	99	36.40%	41.40%	No
3C	2012	6	Reading	198	51	25.76%	35.60%	No
3C	2013	6	Reading	237	57	24.05%	41.40%	No
3C	2014	6	Reading	230	53	23.04%	41.40%	No
3C	2012	7	Reading	168	44	26.19%	35.60%	No

District Progress on State Performance Plan Indicators for Students with Disabilities - FFY 2013

Christina

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Grade</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u># Tested</u>	<u># Meets</u>	<u>% Meets</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>
3C	2013	7	Reading	218	41	18.81%	41.40%	No
3C	2014	7	Reading	238	59	24.79%	41.40%	No
3C	2012	8	Reading	194	47	24.23%	35.60%	No
3C	2013	8	Reading	173	34	19.65%	41.40%	No
3C	2014	8	Reading	227	55	24.23%	41.40%	No
3C	2012	10	Reading	117	38	32.48%	35.60%	No
3C	2013	10	Reading	138	30	21.74%	41.40%	No
3C	2014	10	Reading	120	22	18.33%	41.40%	No

Indicator 4A - Disproportionality in Students Suspended > 10 Days

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>SY</u>	<u>Spec Ed Enroll</u>	<u>Reg Ed Enroll</u>	<u>Spec Ed Suspend</u>	<u>RegEd Suspend</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>	<u>Rate Ratio</u>
4A	2013	2418	13815	35	233	Yes	0.86

For FFY 2013 a Rate Ratio over 1.26 with cell size over 15 will trigger.

Indicator 4B- Disproportionality in Students Suspended > 10 Days by Race/Ethnicity

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Special Ed Enrolled</u>	<u>Spec Ed Suspend>10 days</u>	<u>Rate Ratio</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>
4B	2013	Afr.American	1127	32	1.96	1.26	No
4B	2013	AI/AK			6.91	1.26	Yes
4B	2013	Asian	53		0.00	1.26	Yes

District Progress on State Performance Plan Indicators for Students with Disabilities - FFY 2013

Christina

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Special Ed Enrolled</u>	<u>Spec Ed Suspend>10 days</u>	<u>Rate Ratio</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>
4B	2013	Hispanic	337		0.21	1.26	Yes
4B	2013	Multi.Racial	40		0.00	1.26	Yes
4B	2013	Nat.Haw./PI			0.00	1.26	Yes
4B	2013	White	851		0.08	1.26	Yes

An LEA can exceed the Rate Ratio with less than 10 students in the sub-category and not miss target.

Indicator 5A - LRE Ages 6 to 21 - Outside Regular Class < 21% of the Day

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u># Outside < 21%</u>	<u>% Outside < 21%</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>
5A	2012	2483	1332	53.64%	66.00%	No
5A	2013	2447	1269	51.86%	68.00%	No
5A	2014	2456	1290	52.52%	67.00%	No

Indicator 5B - LRE Ages 6 to 21 - Outside Regular Class >60% of the Day

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u># Outside > 60%</u>	<u>% Outside > 60%</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>
5B	2012	2483	642	25.86%	17.50%	No
5B	2013	2447	646	26.40%	17.30%	No
5B	2014	2456	664	27.04%	15.60%	No

Indicator 5C - LRE Ages 6 to 21 - Separate Settings

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u># Separate</u>	<u>% Separate</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>
5C	2012	2483	198	7.97%	3.60%	No
5C	2013	2447	224	9.15%	3.50%	No
5C	2014	2456	197	8.02%	5.20%	No

Indicator 6 - LRE Ages 3 to 5 - With Typical Peers (Early Childhood, Home, Part-time Early Childhood Part-Time Early Childhood Special Education)

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>FFY</u>	<u>Total EC</u>	<u># with Peers</u>	<u>% with Peers</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target</u>	
6	2012	395	395	100.00%	68.6%	Yes	Data for FFY 2011 is baseline.
6	2013	312	264	84.62%	45.0%	Yes	

District Progress on State Performance Plan Indicators for Students with Disabilities - FFY 2013

Christina

Indicator 7 - Percent of pre-school children aged 3 though 5 who demonstrate improved Positive Social-Emotional Skills; Acquisition and use of Knowledge Skills; and use of Appropriate Behaviors to meet their needs.

<u>School Year</u>	<u>% Increase Rate of Growth</u>	<u>Target Increase Rate of Growth</u>	<u>Met Growth Target?</u>	<u>% Within Age Expectation</u>	<u>Target within Age</u>	<u>Met Age Target?</u>	<u>Skillset</u>	
7	2012	77.8	90.6	No	54.8	60.4	No	7A - Social/Emotional
7	2012	80	93	No	45.2	54.5	No	7B - Knowledge
7	2012	77.2	91.9	No	68.3	65	Yes	7C - Behavior

<u>School Year</u>	<u>% Increase Rate of Growth</u>	<u>Target Increase Rate of Growth</u>	<u>Met Growth Target?</u>	<u>% Within Age Expectation</u>	<u>Target within Age</u>	<u>Met Age Target?</u>	<u>Skillset</u>	
7	2013	77	85.2	No	48	54.2	No	7A - Social/Emotional
7	2013	92	87.3	Yes	48	49.8	No	7B - Knowledge
7	2013	83	87.3	No	68	65	Yes	7C - Behavior

<u>School Year</u>	<u>% Increase Rate of Growth</u>	<u>Target Increase Rate of Growth</u>	<u>Met Growth Target?</u>	<u>% Within Age Expectation</u>	<u>Target within Age</u>	<u>Met Age Target?</u>	<u>Skillset</u>	
7	2014	76	85.2	No	33	54.2	No	7A - Social/Emotional
7	2014	80	87.3	No	31	49.8	No	7B - Knowledge
7	2014	81	87.3	No	46	65	No	7C - Behavior

Indicator 8 - Percent of parents with a child receiving Special Education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>% Agree</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>
8	2012	352	73	425	82.82%	87.00%	No
8	2013	271	40	311	87.14%	87.00%	Yes
8	2014	243	8	251	96.81%	87.00%	Yes

District Progress on State Performance Plan Indicators for Students with Disabilities - FFY 2013

Christina

Indicator 9 - Percent of LEA's with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Disproportionate representation data are found in the APR.

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Disprop representation is result of inappropriate identification</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target</u>
------------------	--------------------	---	---------------	-------------------

9	2012	No	0.0%	Yes
---	------	----	------	-----

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Disprop representation is result of inappropriate identification</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target</u>
------------------	--------------------	---	---------------	-------------------

9	2013	No	0.0%	Yes
---	------	----	------	-----

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Disprop representation is result of inappropriate identification</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target</u>
------------------	--------------------	---	---------------	-------------------

9	2014	No	0.0%	Yes
---	------	----	------	-----

Indicator 10 - Percent of LEA's with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year:</u>	<u>Disprop. Rep. is result of Inaprop. Identification</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target</u>
------------------	---------------------	---	---------------	-------------------

10	2012	No	0.0%	Yes
----	------	----	------	-----

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year:</u>	<u>Disprop. Rep. is result of Inaprop. Identification</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target</u>
------------------	---------------------	---	---------------	-------------------

10	2013	No	0.0%	Yes
----	------	----	------	-----

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year:</u>	<u>Disprop. Rep. is result of Inaprop. Identification</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target</u>
------------------	---------------------	---	---------------	-------------------

10	2014	Yes	0.0%	No
----	------	-----	------	----

Indicator 11 - Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 45 school days or 90 calendar days, whichever is shorter.

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>W/In Timelines</u>	<u>Not W/In Timelines</u>	<u>% Within</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>
------------------	--------------------	-----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------	---------------	--------------------

11	2012	4	0	100.00%	100.00%	Yes
----	------	---	---	---------	---------	-----

11	2013	4	0	100.00%	100.00%	Yes
----	------	---	---	---------	---------	-----

11	2014	21	0	100.00%	100.00%	Yes
----	------	----	---	---------	---------	-----

District Progress on State Performance Plan Indicators for Students with Disabilities - FFY 2013

Christina

Indicator 12 - Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Referred Less Not Eligible and Parent Refusals</u>	<u># Services By Age 3</u>	<u>% Services by Age 3</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>
12	2012	89	89	100.00%	100.00%	Yes
12	2013	93	91	97.85%	100.00%	No
12	2014	30	30	100.00%	100.00%	Yes

Indicator 13 - Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measureable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>IEP's Reviewed</u>	<u>IEP's Meeting Standard</u>	<u>% Meeting Standard</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>
13	2012				100.0	
		Data was not reviewed for this reporting period.				
13	2013				100.0	
		Data was not reviewed for this reporting period.				
13	2014				100.0	
		Data was not reviewed for this reporting period.				