

Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) has always required states to focus our efforts and resources on our general supervision responsibilities of procedural compliance through rigorous monitoring and extensive reporting procedures. OSEP’s new accountability framework, called Results Driven Accountability (RDA), brings into focus the educational results and functional outcomes for children with disabilities while balancing those results with the compliance requirements of IDEA. The purpose is to help close the achievement gap for students with disabilities, improve outcomes for our children while preparing them to have range of college and career options appropriate to their individual needs and preferences, move away from a one-size-fits-all compliance focused approach and to craft a more balanced system that looks at how well students are being educated in addition to continued efforts to protect their rights. In addition, children with disabilities are to be a part of, not separate from, the general population. Thus, Special Education Accountability should strengthen and compliment other general education initiative, including ESEA Flexibility.

The Delaware Department of Education (DDOE) Exceptional Children Resources Workgroup has developed a **Multi-Tiered System of Accountability** to improve results for children and ensure compliance of IDEA.

Tier I:

All LEAs are monitored through data analysis, desk audits, self-assessments, review of student records, on-site visits and/or student observations for the following:

Compliance	Results
?Disproportionate Suspension & Expulsion Ethnicity (Indicator 4b) ?Disproportionate Representation in Special Education (Indicators 9 & 10) ?Initial Evaluation Timelines (Indicator 11) ?Transition of Part C to Part B (Indicator 12) ?Secondary Transition (Indicator 13) ?Compliance of IEP Process ?Equitable Services for Parentally Placed Private School Student ?ESEA Routines ?Needs-Based Funding ?Consolidated Grant Reviews – Program and Fiscal Monitoring ?Fiscal Monitoring of MOE and Excess Costs Analysis of Due Process, Administrative ?Complaints and Mediations issues (Indicator 15 & 16)	?State Assessment Participation (Indicator 3b) ?State Assessment Performance (Indicator 3c) ?Significant Discrepancy Suspension and Expulsion (Indicator 4a) ?Early Childhood Outcomes (Indicator 7) ?Graduation Rate (Indicator 1) ?Drop-out Rate (Indicator 2) ?LRE (Indicator 5) ?LRE Preschool (Indicator 6) ?Post School Outcomes (Indicator 14) ?ESEA Routines – Student Performance ?Needs-Based Funding ?Consolidated Grant Reviews – Program and Fiscal Monitoring

If an LEA is found noncompliant or they have not met the targets for results, the LEA moves to Tier II. In addition, the DDOE conducts a Risk Based Analysis to identify LEAs for on-site monitoring. Data from all compliance and results indicators along with other factors are considered when identifying the movement to Tier II.

Tier II:

For compliance issues, the LEA is required to correct all individual student noncompliance, conduct a Root Cause Analysis in the area of noncompliance, and develop a Corrective Action Plan including improvement activities, benchmarks, and a timeline for submitting deliverables and status updates (Prong 1). Following the completion of these activities, DDOE reviews randomly selected student files to ensure the updated data review shows 100% compliance with the implementation of regulatory requirements (Prong 2). If continued noncompliance exists, the LEA will move to Tier III. For results issues, the LEA is considered a minimal LEA for ESEA Routine meetings. Meetings and discussions regarding improvement activities for results occur two times a year with LEA Administrators. Progress updates are provided on the LEAs Implementation Plan.

Compliance	Results
<p>LEA driven, DDOE monitors through deliverables, Prong I and II, progress/status updates and TA.</p> <p>?LEA corrects individual noncompliance ?LEA conducts a Self- Assessment including a Root Cause Analysis in the area of noncompliance ?LEA develops a Corrective Action Plan including improvement activities, benchmarks, and timeline for submitting deliverables and status updates. ?TA is provided as requested ?DDOE verifies correction of Prong I ?DDOE verifies compliance in Prong II ?DDOE monitors status of Corrective Action Plan</p>	<p>LEA driven, DDOE monitors through ESEA Routine meeting discussions of data and status of Implementation Plan.</p> <p>?LEA reviews data and conducts a Root Cause Analysis. This information is the basis of the discussion during ESEA Routine meetings. ?DDOE monitors through analysis of LEA data and status of Implementation Plan ?DDOE reviews alignment of data to Consolidated Grant to Implementation ?Activities to show improvement. ?TA is offered in area, if necessary</p>

If an LEA is found to continue in the areas of noncompliance, they have not completed the activities in their Corrective Action Plan or they have been identified as a moderate LEA for results, the LEA moves to Tier III. Again, the DDOE conducts a Risk Based Analysis to identify LEAs for on-site monitoring each year. Data from all compliance and results indicators along with additional data are considered when identifying the movement to Tier III. Tier III is driven by both LEA and DDOE.

Tier III:

Compliance	Results
<p>LEA and DDOE driven, DDOE monitors through deliverables, Prong I and II, progress/status updates and TA.</p> <p>?LEA corrects individual noncompliance ?LEA and DDOE conduct a Self- Assessment including a Root Cause Analysis in the area of noncompliance</p>	<p>LEA and DDOE driven, DDOE monitors through ESEA Routine meeting discussions of data and status of Implementation Plan.</p> <p>?LEA reviews data and conducts a Root Cause Analysis. This information is the basis of the discussion during ESEA Routine meetings. ?DDOE monitors through analysis of LEA data</p>

<p>?LEA and DDOE develop an Intervention Plan together to include improvement activities, benchmarks, and timeline for submitting deliverables and status updates. ?TA provided by DDDOE or other entity ?DDOE verifies correction of Prong I ?DDOE verifies compliance in Prong II ?DDOE monitors status of Intervention Plan</p>	<p>and status of Implementation Plan ?DDOE reviews alignment of data to Consolidated Grant to Implementation Activities to show improvement. ?TA is offered/provided in necessary areas</p>
--	--

For Tier III results issues, the LEA is considered a moderate LEA for ESEA Routine meetings. Meeting and discussions regarding improvement activities for results occur three times a year with LEA Administrators. Progress updates are provided on the LEAs Implementation Plan. TA is offered and provided to LEA by DDOE in between ESEA Routine meetings.

If an LEA continues to be noncompliant, the LEA moves into Tier IV and enters into a Compliance Agreement with DDOE. DDOE leads a Root Cause Analysis with the LEA in the area(s) of noncompliance and develops the Compliance Agreement which is signed by both parties.

Tier IV:

Compliance	Results
<p>DDOE driven, DDOE monitors through deliverables, Prong I and II, progress/status updates and TA is directed by DDOE and/or other entity.</p> <p>?LEA corrects individual noncompliance ?DDOE leads a Root Cause Analysis with LEA in the area of noncompliance ?DDOE develops a Compliance Agreement and the LEA and DDOE enter into the Compliance Agreement which includes improvement activities, benchmarks, PD, TA and timeline for submitting deliverables and status updates ?TA provided by DDDOE or other entity ?DDOE verifies correction of Prong I ?DDOE verifies compliance in Prong II ?DDOE monitors status of Compliance Agreement. ?Possible direction of IDEA funds</p>	<p>DDOE driven, DDOE monitors through ESEA Routine meeting discussions of data and status of Implementation Plan.</p> <p>?LEA reviews data and conducts a Root Cause Analysis. This information is the basis of the discussion during ESEA Routine meetings. ?DDOE monitors through analysis of LEA data and status of Implementation Plan ?DDOE reviews alignment of data to Consolidated Grant to Implementation Activities to show improvement. ?DDOE offers/provides TA to LEAs in areas of improvement. ?Possible direction of IDEA funds</p>

For Tier VI results issues, the LEA is considered an intense LEA for ESEA Routine meetings. Meeting and discussions regarding improvement activities for results occur three times a year with LEA Administrators. Progress updates are provided on the LEAs Implementation Plan. TA is offered/provided to LEA by DDOE in between ESEA Routine meetings.

Beginning in spring 2015, LEA Annual Determination will include Indicators 3, 4a, and 7 in addition to compliance indicators. This information will be included in the Results discussions and activities.

Accountability within ESEA Routines

The DDOE has implemented a cross department system of monitoring of districts through ESEA. LEAs submit an Implementation Plan to the DDOE which includes strategies and improvement activities to address multiple areas including student performance on assessments, instruction, college and career readiness, professional development, and family engagement, Suspension and Expulsions, RTI, etc. LEAs are considered minimal, moderate or intense based upon their data. Routine meetings are held with district leadership and representatives from DDOE branches/work groups at which time data and progress on the LEA's implementation plan are reviewed and discussed. This provides an opportunity for Exceptional Children Resources to engage in meaningful discussions about compliance and results relating to students with disabilities. TA is offered/provided in between ESEA Routine meeting.

Charter School Accountability

Charter schools are monitored through the DDOE Exceptional Children Resources and the Charter School Office. Exceptional Children Resources monitors compliance and results issues and works closely with charter school office staff to ensure that charter schools are meeting both compliance and results expectations. In addition, a representative from Exceptional Children Resources is part of the Charter School Accountability Committee which reviews all new, renewal, and request for modification applications. This provides an opportunity to ensure that charter schools have an understanding of federal and state special education regulations and that they have provisions in place to ensure requirements are met.

Dispute Resolution Process

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) encourages parents and LEAs to work collaboratively, in the best interests of children, to resolve the disagreements that may occur when working to provide a positive educational experience for all children, including children with disabilities. To this end, the IDEA and its implementing regulations provide specific options for resolving disputes between parents and public agencies, which can be used in a manner consistent with our shared goals of improving results and achieving better outcomes for children with disabilities.

Delaware's Special Education Dispute Resolution Options

Due Process Complaints. A due process complaint may be filed by a parent, school district, or charter school relating to the identification, evaluation, or educational placement of a child with a disability, or the provision of a free, appropriate public education to the child. When a due process complaint is received by the Department, the Secretary of Education will appoint a three member hearing panel (or a single hearing officer in the case of an expedited hearing), and inform the parties who has been appointed. The hearing panel must conduct an evidentiary hearing and issue a final decision within 45 days of the end of the 30 day resolution period.

14 Del. C. §§ 3135 to 3142; 14 DE Admin Code §§ 926.7.0 to 18.0; 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.507 to 518. See also, the Department of Education's " *Due Process Hearing Procedures*", dated September 2009.

School board members must receive a copy of any due process complaint received by the Department from the district superintendent, as well as a copy of any hearing panel decision or civil action filed by a parent seeking judicial review of a hearing decision. In addition, a decision to seek judicial review of a hearing decision must be made by a majority of school board members.

14 Del. C. § 3110(d); 14 DE Admin Code § 211

State Complaints. State complaints may be filed by any person or organization and must allege a violation of a requirement of Part B of the IDEA or the Department's regulations concerning the education of children with disabilities. Upon receipt of a state complaint, the Department will appoint an investigator and issue a written decision to the complainant within 60 days that addresses each allegation in the complaint.

14 DE Admin Code §§ 923.51.0 to 53.0; 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.151 to 153. For additional information, See also, the Department of Education's "Special Education State Complaint Procedures", dated May 2009

Mediation. The Department offers mediation to parents, districts, and charter schools to resolve special education disputes. Mediation is voluntary on the part of the parties, and conducted by a qualified and impartial mediator trained in effective mediation techniques.

4 DE Admin Code § 926.6.0; 34 C.F.R. § 300.506

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

The DDOE has developed a comprehensive technical assistance system that moves beyond short-term, episodic training to a community of practice that is sustainable and builds LEA capacity to improve results for students with disabilities. The system focuses on implementation of the Common Core State Standards as well as academic and behavioral supports. The DDOE engages in an analysis of state-level as well as LEA level data and in meaningful discussions with LEA leadership to identify LEAs in need of technical assistance. Once identified, The LEA and the DDOE enter into a Memorandum of Understanding which outlines the roles and responsibilities of both the LEA and the Department. Technical assistance is provided through a variety of formats including group training, on-site/online coaching, and consultation.

Following are examples of the technical assistance provided:

Writing Rigorous IEPs to Teach Educational Standards (WRITES): The DDOE has contracted with the University of Delaware, Center for Disabilities Studies' ACCESS Project to provide training and technical assistance relating to Standards-based IEPs. The ACCESS Project WRITES (Writing Rigorous IEPs to Teach Educational Standards) initiative provides professional development to identified LEAs and schools on developing and implementing standards-based IEPs. WRITES uses group trainings, individual coaching, online collaboration, and a variety of methods necessary in order to successfully support state education professionals in development and implementation of standards-based IEPs.

Evidence-based Instructional Strategies: The DDOE has contracted with University of Kansas to provide training and technical assistance in the Strategic Instruction Model (SIM). Training and coaching focus on content enhancements and learning strategies with implementation by both general and special educators.

Systematic Processes for Enhancing and Assessing Communication Supports (SPEACS): The DDOE has contracted with the University of Delaware, Center for Disabilities Studies' ACCESS Project and the

University of Kentucky to provide training and technical assistance in the area of communication for students with significant disabilities. Built on the premise that all students can communicate, the SPEACS initiative provides training and technical assistance to school teams who work with targeted students with complex communication needs to increase communication skills with the ultimate goal of symbolic communication.

IEP Development for Behavior & Social/Emotional Skills: The DDOE has contracted with The University of Delaware, Center for Disabilities Studies' PBS Project to provide training and technical assistance focused on IEP development related to behavioral goals and social/emotional supports. This includes group trainings, individual coaching, online collaboration, and a variety of methods necessary in order to successfully support state education professionals in development and implementation IEPs addressing behavioral needs.

Tiered Behavior Supports: The DDOE has contracted with Rose Iovannone to provide training and technical assistance which focuses on tiered behavior supports through Prevent-Teach-Reinforce (PTR). Training and coaching is provided to ensure teachers are able to implement behavior plans with fidelity.

Social Skills/PEERS®: The DDOE has contracted with Dr. Elizabeth Laugeson, Director of the UCLA PEERS Program, to provide technical assistance to improve social skills and social interactions among secondary students with various disabilities. Technical assistance includes school-based training, video demonstrations, and didactic instruction from Dr. Laugeson.

Universal Design for Learning: Open to all LEA staff with a focus universal design and differentiated instructional strategies to support the rigor of the Common Core State Standards.

Grade Band Extensions: Open to all LEA staff with a focus on increasing access to and performance in the general education curriculum for students with significant cognitive disabilities.

Accessibility Guidelines: Open to all LEA staff with a focus on increasing access to all assessments in the Delaware System of Student Assessments.

The DDOE evaluates technical assistance using the Guskey's Five Critical Levels of Professional Development: Participants' Reactions, Participants' Learning, Organization Support and Change, Use of New Knowledge and Skills, and Student Learning Outcomes. In addition, other measures are utilized such as coaching rubrics and coaching fidelity checklists based on Participatory Adult Learning Strategy (PALS).

DDOE staff engages in ongoing data analysis and evaluation of all technical assistance to ensure fidelity of implementation of evidenced-based strategies and attainment of measurable outcomes and to drive future technical assistance.

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

The DDOE has established a professional development framework that engages stakeholder groups to foster a collective responsibility and investment in improving results for students with disabilities. Professional development is provided on an ongoing basis and includes DDOE and stakeholder initiated topics such as IDEA regulations, procedural safeguards, policies, procedures, and practices, legislative updates, policy issues, State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report, State Systemic Improvement Plan, fiscal, updates from agency providers, and other current issues in special education both national and those specific to Delaware.

Professional development is provided through a variety of formats including the following:

Special Education Leadership Group: Meetings are held throughout the year, are open to the public, and

include LEA staff, outside agency providers, community members, stakeholder group representatives, and DDOE staff.

Special Education Directors: Meetings are held throughout the year and are open to current LEA Special Education Directors (both districts and charters).

Special School Professional Learning Community: Targeted professional development is provided for special school/program administrators with a focus on curriculum, assessment, and policy issues.

Charter Schools: Targeted professional development is provided for charter school administrators and staff based on topics identified through a needs survey.

Literacy Coalition & Literacy Cadre: Open to LEA identified staff such as district curriculum leaders and reading specialists, with a focus on literacy strategies and Response to Intervention. This work is led by the Curriculum Work Group with support from Exceptional Children Resource Work Group staff.

Common Ground for the Common Core: Open to all LEAs with a focus on aligning instruction and assessment with the CCSS. Special education teachers are part of the LEA leadership team.

Secondary Transition: Collaboration with National Centers (National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center and National Post School Outcomes Center). Open to all LEAs with a focus on increasing graduation rate/decrease dropout rate, improving transition planning, and improving post-school outcomes

State-Wide Transition Cadre: Open to all LEAs with a focus on data analysis and developing transition plans specific to LEA population. Open to all LEAs.

Regional Transition Council: Open to all LEAs with a focus on providing agency updates, TA/PD, and addressing questions/concerns relating to transition. Participants include LEAs, DDOE, agencies, and community members.

Other: Annual conferences such as Transition Conference and Inclusion Conference which is aligned with the priorities of TA projects.

The DDOE evaluates professional development using the Guskey's Five Critical Levels of Professional Development: Participants' Reactions, Participants' Learning, Organization Support and Change, Use of New Knowledge and Skills, and Student Learning Outcomes.

DDOE staff engages in ongoing data analysis and evaluation of all professional development to ensure high quality and to drive future professional development.

Stakeholder Involvement:

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

The State Performance Plan development was the result of collaboration between the DDOE's Exceptional Children Resource Group and other DOE work groups, various statewide committees and groups which include LEA representatives, parents, agency representatives and community members. Stakeholder groups include the following: Governor's Council for Exceptional Citizens (GACEC), Statewide Positive Behavior Support Cadre, Access to the General Education Curriculum Committee, Phase I SSIP Advisory Council, 619 Coordinators, Statewide Transition Cadre, NSTTAC State Team, Delaware PTA, Delaware Parent Information Center, Special Education Leadership Group and LEA Special Education Directors.

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2012 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2012 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2012 APR in 2014, is available.

The report is posted on the Department web site at:

<http://dedoe.schoolwires.net/site/default.aspx?PageType=3&ModuleInstanceID=3251&ViewID=7b97f7ed-8e5e-4120-848f-a8b4987d588f&RenderLoc=0&FlexDataID=10571&PageID=183>

Indicator 1: Graduation

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		74.00%	40.30%	81.00%	82.50%	84.00%	85.50%	58.10%
Data	69.87%	66.42%	69.78%	73.26%	73.26%	76.00%	75.70%	56.80%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	63.00%	66.70%	71.40%	74.10%	77.80%	81.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Graduation Rate targets are set within accordance to the DDOE’s ESEA Flexibility Request. The DDOE gathered stakeholder input on graduation rate targets through the ESEA Flexibility Waiver process.

The DDOE consulted with the Delaware Education Support System (DESS) Advisory Council, the state’s Committee of Practitioners, to provide input and make comments on the Delaware ESEA Flexibility Waiver. Additionally, members of the DESS Advisory were notified of the dates and times of the public town hall meetings for their attendance.

The DESS Advisory includes representatives from key groups of practitioners throughout the state: Delaware State Education Association (DSEA), Delaware School Boards Association (DSBA), Delaware Association of School Administrators (DASA), State Board of Education (SBE), Chief School Officers Association (CSOA), and the Delaware Charter School Network (DCSN). DESS also includes community members and representatives from the state’s Institutes of Higher Education.


Town Hall meetings were held in each of the three counties in Delaware. DDOE staff provided an overview of the ESEA Flexibility Waiver. This was an opportunity for all members of the public to engage with the DDOE regarding the proposal.

Additional feedback regarding the ESEA Flexibility Waiver was received by special education stakeholders groups: National Secondary Transition and Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC) State Team, State Transition Cadre, Governor’s Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens (GACEC), transition subcommittee, regional transition councils, Special Education Leadership Group, and County Special Education Directors.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2012-13 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file)	9/15/2014	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	919	919

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
spec C151; Data group 696)				
SY 2012-13 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/15/2014	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	1,536	1,536
SY 2012-13 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	9/23/2014	2012-13 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	59.83%	Calculate 

Explanation of Alternate Data

The data above was revised to be consistent with the submission of prior APRs.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2012 Data	FFY 2013 Target	FFY 2013 Data
919	1,536	56.80%	63.00%	59.83%

Graduation Conditions Field

Provide the four-year graduation cohort rate. The four-year graduation rate follows a cohort, or a group of students, who begin as first-time 9th graders in a particular school year and who graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years or less. An extended-year graduation rate follows the same cohort of students for an additional year or years. The cohort is "adjusted" by adding any students transferring into the cohort and by subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die during the years covered by the rate.

Under 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1)(iv), a "regular high school diploma" means the standard high school diploma awarded to students in a State that is fully aligned with the State's academic content standards and does not include a GED credential, certificate of attendance, or any alternative award. The term "regular high school diploma" also includes a "higher diploma" that is awarded to students who complete requirements above and beyond what is required for a regular diploma.

Graduation conditions for students in Delaware are currently in the process of changing for graduation classes.

For graduation credit requirements beginning with the Graduation Class of 2011 (Freshman Class of 2007-2008) through the Graduation Class of 2014 (Freshman Class of 2010-2011), a public school student shall be granted a State of Delaware Diploma when such student has successfully completed a minimum of twenty two (22) credits in order to graduate including: four (4) credits in English Language Arts, four (4) credits in Mathematics; three (3) credits in Science, three (3) credits in Social Studies, one (1) credit in physical education, one half (1/2) credit in health education, three (3) credits in a Career Pathway, and three and one half (3 ½) credits in elective courses. Students shall complete mathematics course work that includes no less than the equivalent of the traditional requirements of Geometry, Algebra I and Algebra II courses. Scientific investigations related to the State Science Standards shall be included in all three science course requirements. During the senior year students shall maintain a credit load each semester that earns them at least a majority of credits that could be taken that semester. A credit in Mathematics shall be earned during the senior year.

For graduation credit requirements beginning with the Graduation Class of 2015 (Freshman Class of 2011-2012), a public school student shall be granted a State of Delaware Diploma when such student has successfully completed a minimum of twenty four (24) credits in order to graduate including: four (4) credits in English Language Arts, four (4) credits in Mathematics, three (3) credits in Science, three (3) credits in Social Studies, two (2) credits in a World Language, one (1) credit in physical education, one half (1/2) credit in health education, three (3) credits in a Career Pathway, and three and one half (3 ½) credits in elective

courses. The student shall complete mathematics course work that includes no less than the equivalent of the traditional requirements of Geometry, Algebra I and Algebra II courses. Scientific investigations related to the State Science Standards shall be included in all three science course requirements. During the senior year the student shall maintain a credit load each semester that earns the student at least a majority of credits that could be taken that semester. A credit in Mathematics shall be earned during the senior year. Students may fulfill the two (2) credit World language requirement by either: Earning a minimum of two (2) World Language credits in the same language or, demonstrating Novice-high or higher proficiency level on a nationally recognized assessment of language proficiency, except English, in the skill areas of oral or signed expressive and receptive communication, reading and writing, that uses the levels of proficiency as identified by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Language, or as approved for use by the Delaware Department of Education.

For graduation credit requirements beginning with the Graduation Class of 2016 (Freshman Class of 2012-2013), a public school student shall be granted a State of Delaware Diploma when such student has successfully completed a minimum of twenty four (24) credits in order to graduate including: four (4) credits in English Language Arts, four (4) credits in Mathematics, three (3) credits in Science, three (3) credits in Social Studies, two (2) credits in a World Language, one (1) credit in physical education, one half (1/2) credit in health education, three (3) credits in a Career Pathway, and three and one half (3 ½) credits in elective courses. The student shall earn credit upon completion of mathematics course work that includes no less than the equivalent of the traditional requirements of Geometry, Algebra I and Algebra II courses. The student shall complete an Algebra II or Integrated Mathematics III course as one of the Mathematics credits. Scientific investigations related to the State Science Standards shall be included in all three science course requirements. The student shall complete a Biology course as one of the Science credits. The student shall complete a U. S. History course as one of the Social Studies credits. During the senior year the student shall maintain a credit load each semester that earns the student at least a majority of credits that could be taken that semester. A credit in Mathematics shall be earned during the senior year. Further provided, a student participating in a dual enrollment course or dual credit course, as defined in 14 DE Admin. Code 506 Policies for Dual Enrollment and Awarding Dual Credit, shall be considered to be meeting the majority of credits, as long as a credit in Mathematics is earned during the senior year. Students may fulfill the two (2) credit World language requirement by either: Earning a minimum of two (2) World Language credits in the same language or, demonstrating Novice-high or higher proficiency level on a nationally recognized assessment of language proficiency, except English, in the skill areas of oral or signed expressive and receptive communication, reading and writing, that uses the levels of proficiency as identified by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Language, or as approved for use by the Delaware Department of Education.

Delaware does not currently have any alternate routes for students with disabilities to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Not applicable.

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≤		7.40%	6.80%	6.20%	5.60%	5.00%	4.40%	3.80%
Data	5.20%	5.51%	4.28%	4.28%	3.30%	6.40%	5.80%	5.88%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	5.50%	5.20%	4.90%	4.60%	4.30%	4.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The DDOE consulted with various stakeholder groups to receive input into historical and current drop out data to determine targets for the current APR. These groups included the NSTTAC State Team, State Transition Cadre, Governor’s Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens (GACEC) transition subcommittee, regional transition councils, Special Education Leadership Group, and County Special Education Director. Members of these groups include students, parents, teachers, transition specialists, special education directors, state agency representatives, community service providers, and other community members.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21)	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
274	5,349	5.88%	5.50%	5.12%

Use a different calculation methodology

Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

Delaware uses an Event Rate method for reporting in its Annual Dropout Summary of Statistics. Event rate reporting is a snapshot which reflects the total numbers of students in grades 9-12 who dropped out of school in a single year divided by the fall enrollment of that same year. This method aligns with the reporting the DDOE under Title 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

The calculation is based on students who were included in the September 30 Enrollment Report to the state. A dropout for any particular year is any student who was in the September enrollment report who did not graduate, did not die, or did not transfer to another school and was not included in the end of year enrollment

report. Student who are identified as “whereabouts unknown” by a school district or charter school are assumed to be dropouts for this calculation.

of students who did not graduate, did not die, or did not transfer to another school and was not included in the end of year enrollment report

of Special Education Students Enrolled in grades 9-12 on September 30

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Not applicable.

Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥								
Data								

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥						

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

DDOE has set targets by grade bands. See Additional Information for target data.

The FFY 2013-2018 targets were set based on Delaware’s ESEA Flexibility Waiver and input from the Governor’s Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens. Targets remain the same because Delaware is in the process of an ESEA Flexibility Waiver renewal. Once the renewal is finalized, the DDOE will work with stakeholder groups to reset targets based on renewal targets and spring 2015 assessment data.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Does your State have an ESEA Flexibility Waiver of determining AYP? Yes No

Are you reporting AYP or AMO? AYP AMO

Number of districts in the State	Number of districts that met the minimum "n" size	Number of districts that meet the minimum "n" size AND met AYP	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
19					

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2013- FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013			2014			2015		
Grade Band	E	M	H	E	M	H	E	M	H

Target ≥	53.0	53.0	63.0	53.0	53.0	63.0	53.0	53.0	63.0
----------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

FFY	2016			2017			2018		
Grade Band	E	M	H	E	M	H	E	M	H
Target ≥	53.0	53.0	63.0	53.0	53.0	63.0	53.0	53.0	63.0

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data	
Part B Introduction Page	1/9/2015	Number of districts in the State	43	E	16
				M	16
				H	19

The prepopulated data was overwritten because the DDOE reports on districts only related to AYP/AMO. The district number does not include charter schools related to AYP/AMO because they are held accountable through an Academic Framework process. Additionally, out of the 19 districts, three districts are vocational technical districts that include high school students only. Therefore, the total number of districts for elementary and middle school grade bands is 16; whereas, the total number of districts for the high school grade band is 19.

The table below organizes the information requested in the “FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data” table by grade band (Elementary, Middle & High). The data is reported in this manner because the DDOE ESEA Flexibility Waiver and accountability workbook organize AYP/AMO reporting by grade band. To remain consistent, the DDOE has reported our FFY 2013 SPP/APR data with the same grade configuration. Additionally, The FFY 2013 data is reported by Reading, Math & Combined. The combined calculation is determined by dividing the total number of districts for Reading and Math that meet the minimum “n” size AND AYP by the total number of districts for Reading and Math that met the minimum “n” size.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Grade Band	# of Districts in the State	# of Districts that met the minimum “n” size		# of Districts that meet the minimum “n” size AND met AYP		FFY 2012 Data	FFY 2013 Target	FFY 2013 Data			Status	Slippage
		Rdg	Math	Rdg	Math			Rdg	Math	Rdg & Math		
Elementary	16	15	15	11	13	80.0	53.0	73.33	86.67	80.0	Met Target	No Slippage
Middle	16	16	16	9	10	81.3	53.0	56.25	62.50	59.38	Met Target	No Slippage
High (Gr. 10)	19	12	12	8	11	70.0	63.0	66.67	91.67	79.16	Met Target	No Slippage

--

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Not applicable.

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Reading	A Grade 3	2005	Target ≥		98.90%	99.00%	99.10%	99.20%	99.30%	99.20%	99.20%
			Data	99.20%	98.80%	99.62%	99.15%	99.79%	99.23%	91.85%	96.32%
	B Grade 4	2005	Target ≥			98.50%	98.60%	98.70%	98.80%	98.70%	98.70%
			Data	98.30%	98.50%	99.78%	99.14%	99.65%	98.65%	93.20%	96.31%
	C Grade 5	2005	Target ≥		99.20%	99.30%	99.40%	99.50%	99.60%	99.50%	99.50%
			Data	97.80%	99.20%	99.80%	99.21%	99.55%	99.08%	94.06%	96.53%
	D Grade 6	2005	Target ≥			98.20%	98.30%	98.40%	98.50%	98.40%	98.40%
			Data	98.00%	99.10%	99.58%	98.05%	98.30%	97.64%	94.90%	96.97%
	E Grade 7	2005	Target ≥			98.00%	98.10%	98.20%	98.30%	98.20%	98.20%
			Data	97.80%	98.50%	98.88%	98.06%	98.29%	97.69%	94.38%	96.99%
	F Grade 8	2005	Target ≥		97.30%	97.40%	97.50%	97.60%	97.70%	97.60%	97.60%
			Data	96.20%	98.20%	98.34%	98.18%	98.88%	97.39%	95.30%	96.54%
	G Grade 10	2005	Target ≥		95.50%	95.60%	95.70%	95.80%	95.90%	95.80%	95.80%
			Data	95.60%	99.50%	96.42%	96.55%	96.20%	92.09%	88.29%	91.44%
Math	A Grade 3	2005	Target ≥		99.00%	99.10%	99.20%	99.30%	99.40%	99.30%	99.30%
			Data	99.50%	98.90%	99.62%	98.73%	99.86%	99.12%	97.36%	99.17%
	B Grade 4	2005	Target ≥			98.80%	98.90%	99.00%	99.10%	99.00%	99.00%
			Data	98.60%	99.00%	99.85%	99.28%	99.72%	99.27%	98.07%	98.75%
	C Grade 5	2005	Target ≥		99.00%	99.10%	99.20%	99.30%	99.40%	99.30%	99.30%
			Data	99.20%	99.90%	99.80%	99.43%	99.68%	99.16%	96.90%	98.87%
	D Grade 6	2005	Target ≥			98.30%	98.40%	98.50%	98.60%	98.50%	98.50%
			Data	98.10%	99.10%	99.72%	98.12%	98.30%	98.20%	97.69%	98.31%
	E Grade 7	2005	Target ≥			98.10%	98.20%	98.30%	98.40%	98.30%	97.40%
			Data	97.90%	98.60%	98.75%	98.35%	98.61%	97.68%	96.76%	98.01%
	F Grade 8	2005	Target ≥		97.10%	97.20%	97.30%	97.40%	97.50%	97.40%	97.40%
			Data	96.30%	98.20%	98.66%	98.05%	99.08%	97.45%	96.09%	98.01%
	G Grade 10	2005	Target ≥		95.10%	95.20%	95.30%	95.40%	95.50%	95.40%	95.40%
			Data	95.50%	99.50%	96.60%	97.01%	96.56%	91.54%	90.22%	93.17%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
-----	------	------	------	------	------	------

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Grade 3	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	B ≥ Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	C ≥ Grade 5	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	D ≥ Grade 6	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	E ≥ Grade 7	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	F ≥ Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	G ≥ Grade 10	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A ≥ Grade 3	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	B ≥ Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	C ≥ Grade 5	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	D ≥ Grade 6	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	E ≥ Grade 7	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	F ≥ Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	G ≥ Grade 10	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The FFY 2013-2017 participation rate targets for students with disabilities were set during the development of Delaware’s ESEA Flexibility Waiver. Stakeholder input was an integral part of the ESEA Flexibility Waiver and included public town hall meetings in each county as well as meetings with stakeholder groups such as the Governor’s Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens. The targets were also presented to the Special Education Leadership Group and State Board for input. The targets of 95% participation across all grades and federal fiscal years align with the targets set through the ESEA Flexibility Waiver process. For FFY 2018, the participation rate target was continued from FFY 2017 because the target for FFY 2018 was not set during Waiver development. Delaware is currently in the process of an ESEA Flexibility Waiver renewal, and 3C targets will be revisited after the renewal process is complete.

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2013 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? yes

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? yes

Data Source: SY 2013-14 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C188; Data Group: 589) **Date:** 12/18/2014

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Reading assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	1430	1471	1608	1606	1671	1533	0	1323	0	0	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	74	63	85	69	59	61		85			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	1175	1242	1335	1329	1405	1290		966			
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	127	116	135	149	147	134		141			

Data Source: SY 2013-14 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C185; Data Group: 588) **Date:** 12/18/2014

Math assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	1429	1472	1610	1605	1673	1534	0	1324	0	0	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	70	59	68	53	51	50		71			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	1210	1276	1382	1365	1429	1315		1012			
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	129	119	140	150	150	135		141			

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A Grade 3	1,430	1,376	96.32%	95.00%	96.22%
B Grade 4	1,471	1,421	96.31%	95.00%	96.60%
C Grade 5	1,608	1,555	96.53%	95.00%	96.70%
D Grade 6	1,606	1,547	96.97%	95.00%	96.33%
E Grade 7	1,671	1,611	96.99%	95.00%	96.41%
F Grade 8	1,533	1,485	96.54%	95.00%	96.87%
G Grade 10	1,323	1,192	91.44%	95.00%	90.10%

Explanation of Group G Slippage

Reading – G Grade 10 – The FFY 2013 participation rate for Grade 10 slipped to 90.10% from 91.40% in FFY 2012. The rate was impacted by significantly low rates in a few high schools. These high schools reported problems with technology and scheduling. To improve rates, these high schools are targeted for technical assistance for the 2014-2015 school year.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A Grade 3	1,429	1,409	99.17%	95.00%	98.60%
B Grade 4	1,472	1,454	98.75%	95.00%	98.78%
C Grade 5	1,610	1,590	98.87%	95.00%	98.76%
D Grade 6	1,605	1,568	98.31%	95.00%	97.69%
E Grade 7	1,673	1,630	98.01%	95.00%	97.43%
F Grade 8	1,534	1,500	98.01%	95.00%	97.78%
G Grade 10	1,324	1,224	93.17%	95.00%	92.45%

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

Delaware DOE revised the 3B LEA and school-level data tables using the suppression rule described below:

Rows associated with an n count less than 15 are suppressed. Percentages less than 5% or more than 95% are replaced with the text "<5.0%" and ">95.0." N counts associated with the <5.0% or >95.0% cells are suppressed. This suppression is in alignment with the 2013-14 Delaware Comprehensive Assessment System Summary Report.

The revised tables are posted online at the following sites:

Office of Assessment Weblink - <http://tinyurl.com/p6kf9p2>

Special Education Weblink - <http://tinyurl.com/p9c33zw>

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Not applicable.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Reading	A Grade 3	2005	Target ≥		68.00%	71.00%	74.00%	77.00%	80.00%	35.60%	41.40%
			Data	60.60%	56.75%	59.16%	58.43%	45.00%	33.00%	43.20%	33.33%
	B Grade 4	2005	Target ≥			56.00%	62.00%	70.00%	80.00%	35.60%	41.40%
			Data	50.60%	52.56%	50.15%	49.88%	37.00%	30.00%	42.40%	38.85%
	C Grade 5	2005	Target ≥		60.00%	65.00%	70.00%	75.00%	80.00%	35.60%	41.40%
			Data	55.50%	55.13%	54.92%	54.08%	41.00%	29.00%	42.10%	38.19%
	D Grade 6	2005	Target ≥			45.00%	51.00%	59.00%	69.00%	35.60%	41.40%
			Data	39.70%	40.74%	43.75%	41.89%	30.00%	28.00%	29.40%	31.84%
	E Grade 7	2005	Target ≥			46.00%	52.00%	59.00%	68.00%	35.60%	41.40%
			Data	41.11%	42.41%	47.31%	46.53%	41.00%	26.00%	30.90%	27.51%
	F Grade 8	2005	Target ≥		42.00%	47.00%	53.00%	59.00%	65.00%	35.60%	41.40%
			Data	41.10%	42.12%	37.80%	44.76%	34.00%	24.00%	32.50%	32.69%
	G Grade 10	2005	Target ≥		30.00%	35.00%	40.00%	45.00%	50.00%	35.60%	41.40%
			Data	26.00%	29.80%	28.66%	28.65%	21.00%	31.00%	29.50%	30.07%
Math	A Grade 3	2005	Target ≥		57.00%	60.00%	63.00%	66.00%	69.00%	36.00%	41.80%
			Data	49.50%	51.06%	50.61%	48.07%	46.00%	35.00%	44.60%	34.95%
	B Grade 4	2005	Target ≥			50.00%	55.00%	61.00%	69.00%	36.00%	41.80%
			Data	45.90%	43.16%	45.23%	43.49%	39.00%	35.00%	43.00%	38.83%
	C Grade 5	2005	Target ≥		52.00%	56.00%	60.00%	64.00%	68.00%	36.00%	41.80%
			Data	46.50%	42.08%	43.54%	44.81%	39.00%	31.00%	40.10%	33.91%
	D Grade 6	2005	Target ≥			37.00%	42.00%	49.00%	58.00%	36.00%	41.80%
			Data	32.10%	38.89%	37.94%	37.09%	33.00%	23.00%	24.50%	25.12%
	E Grade 7	2005	Target ≥			31.00%	37.00%	43.00%	50.00%	36.00%	41.80%
			Data	26.90%	26.81%	31.63%	32.19%	28.00%	27.00%	28.40%	22.79%
	F Grade 8	2005	Target ≥		27.00%	32.00%	38.00%	44.00%	50.00%	36.00%	41.80%
			Data	27.30%	26.46%	27.60%	32.65%	29.00%	26.00%	34.80%	32.88%
	G Grade 10	2005	Target ≥		24.00%	28.00%	33.00%	39.00%	45.00%	36.00%	41.80%
			Data	23.10%	24.08%	24.53%	22.90%	22.00%	27.00%	30.90%	27.46%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
-----	------	------	------	------	------	------

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Grade 3	41.40%	47.30%	53.10%	59.00%	64.90%	64.90%
	B ≥ Grade 4	41.40%	47.30%	53.10%	59.00%	64.90%	64.90%
	C ≥ Grade 5	41.40%	47.30%	53.10%	59.00%	64.90%	64.90%
	D ≥ Grade 6	41.40%	47.30%	53.10%	59.00%	64.90%	64.90%
	E ≥ Grade 7	41.40%	47.30%	53.10%	59.00%	64.90%	64.90%
	F ≥ Grade 8	41.40%	47.30%	53.10%	59.00%	64.90%	64.90%
	G ≥ Grade 10	41.40%	47.30%	53.10%	59.00%	64.90%	64.90%
Math	A ≥ Grade 3	41.80%	47.70%	53.50%	59.30%	65.10%	65.10%
	B ≥ Grade 4	41.80%	47.70%	53.50%	59.30%	65.10%	65.10%
	C ≥ Grade 5	41.80%	47.70%	53.50%	59.30%	65.10%	65.10%
	D ≥ Grade 6	41.80%	47.70%	53.50%	59.30%	65.10%	65.10%
	E ≥ Grade 7	41.80%	47.70%	53.50%	59.30%	65.10%	65.10%
	F ≥ Grade 8	41.80%	47.70%	53.50%	59.30%	65.10%	65.10%
	G ≥ Grade 10	41.80%	47.70%	53.50%	59.30%	65.10%	65.10%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The FFY 2013-2017 performance rate targets for students with disabilities were set during the development of Delaware’s ESEA Flexibility Waiver. Stakeholder input was an integral part of the ESEA Flexibility Waiver and included public town hall meetings in each county as well as meetings with stakeholder groups such as the Governor’s Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens. The targets were also presented to the Special Education Leadership group and State Board for input. The targets outlined for 3C mirror the targets set through the ESEA Flexibility Waiver process. For FFY 2018, the performance rate target was continued from FFY 2017 because the target for FFY 2018 was not set during Waiver development. Delaware is currently in the process of an ESEA Flexibility Waiver renewal, and it is anticipated that 3C targets will be reset after the completion of the renewal process and an analysis of the spring 2015 state assessment data.

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2013 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? yes

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? yes

Data Source: SY 2013-14 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C178; Data Group: 584) **Date:** 12/18/2014

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Reading proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	1376	1421	1555	1547	1611	1485	0	1192	0	0	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	22	18	44	25	29	31		32			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	379	430	471	368	358	318		303			
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	65	70	90	76	97	86	0	77	0	0	0

Data Source: SY 2013-14 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C175; Data Group: 583) **Date:** 12/18/2014

Math proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	1409	1454	1590	1568	1630	1500	0	1224	0	0	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	24	21	27	16	21	21		19			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	438	458	418	273	328	305		287			
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	55	59	81	75	101	90	0	73	0	0	0

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A Grade 3	1,376	466	33.33%	41.40%	33.87%

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
B Grade 4	1,421	518	38.85%	41.40%	36.45%
C Grade 5	1,555	605	38.19%	41.40%	38.91%
D Grade 6	1,547	469	31.84%	41.40%	30.32%
E Grade 7	1,611	484	27.51%	41.40%	30.04%
F Grade 8	1,485	435	32.69%	41.40%	29.29%
G Grade 10	1,192	412	30.07%	41.40%	34.56%

Explanation of Group B Slippage

Reading – B Grade 4 - The FFY 2013 performance rate for Grade 4 slipped to 36.45% from 38.85% in FFY 2012. Several LEAs described that they were in the process of implementing new curricula and text materials aligned to the Common Core Standards during the 2013-2014 SY. These LEAs reported that the introduction of new curricula led to an implementation dip and attributed to decreased student performance. To assist LEAs, the DDOE is providing professional development and technical assistance through a state initiative, Common Ground for the Common Core, as well as site visits to provide feedback on Common Core implementation.

Explanation of Group D Slippage

Reading – D Grade 6 - The FFY 2013 performance rate for Grade 6 slipped to 30.32% from 31.84% in FFY 2012. Several LEAs described that they were in the process of implementing new curricula and text materials aligned to the Common Core Standards during the 2013-2014 SY. These LEAs reported that the introduction of new curricula led to an implementation dip and attributed to decreased student performance. To assist LEAs, the DDOE is providing professional development and technical assistance through a state initiative, Common Ground for the Common Core, as well as site visits to provide feedback on Common Core implementation.

Explanation of Group F Slippage

Reading – F Grade 8 - The FFY 2013 performance rate for Grade 8 slipped to 29.29% from 32.69% in FFY 2012. Several LEAs described that they were in the process of implementing new curricula and text materials aligned to the Common Core Standards during the 2013-2014 SY. These LEAs reported that the introduction of new curricula led to an implementation dip and attributed to decreased student performance. To assist LEAs, the DDOE is providing professional development and technical assistance through a state initiative, Common Ground for the Common Core, as well as site visits to provide feedback on Common Core implementation.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
------------	---	---	----------------	------------------	---------------

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	assigned				
A Grade 3	1,409	517	34.95%	41.80%	36.69%
B Grade 4	1,454	538	38.83%	41.80%	37.00%
C Grade 5	1,590	526	33.91%	41.80%	33.08%
D Grade 6	1,568	364	25.12%	41.80%	23.21%
E Grade 7	1,630	450	22.79%	41.80%	27.61%
F Grade 8	1,500	416	32.88%	41.80%	27.73%
G Grade 10	1,224	379	27.46%	41.80%	30.96%

Explanation of Group B Slippage

Math – B Grade 4 - The FFY 2013 performance rate for Grade 4 slipped to 37.00% from 38.83% in FFY 2012. Several LEAs described that they were in the process of implementing new curricula aligned to the Common Core Standards during the 2013-2014 SY. These LEAs reported that the introduction of new curricula led to an implementation dip and attributed to decreased student performance. To assist LEAs, the DDOE is providing professional development and technical assistance through a state initiative, Common Ground for the Common Core, as well as site visits to provide feedback on Common Core implementation.

Explanation of Group D Slippage

Math – D Grade 6 - The FFY 2013 performance rate for Grade 6 slipped to 23.21% from 25.12% in FFY 2012. Several LEAs described that they were in the process of implementing new curricula aligned to the Common Core Standards during the 2013-2014 SY. These LEAs reported that the introduction of new curricula led to an implementation dip and attributed to decreased student performance. To assist LEAs, the DDOE is providing professional development and technical assistance through a state initiative, Common Ground for the Common Core, as well as site visits to provide feedback on Common Core implementation.

Explanation of Group F Slippage

Math – F Grade 8 - The FFY 2013 performance rate for Grade 8 slipped to 27.73% from 32.88% in FFY 2012. Several LEAs described that they were in the process of implementing new curricula aligned to the Common Core Standards during the 2013-2014 SY. These LEAs reported that the introduction of new curricula led to an implementation dip and attributed to decreased student performance. To assist LEAs, the DDOE is providing professional development and technical assistance through a state initiative, Common Ground for the Common Core, as well as site visits to provide feedback on Common Core implementation.

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

The Disaggregated State Assessment Reports for Performance are reported publicly on the DDOE website. The reports can be found the following locations:

Office of Assessment Weblink - <http://tinyurl.com/p6kf9p2>

Special Education Weblink – <http://tinyurl.com/p9c33zw>

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Not applicable.

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≤		36.80%	36.80%	36.80%	13.50%	8.10%	0%	0%
Data	21.10%	31.60%	21.10%	21.10%	18.92%	0%	12.20%	10.26%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%



Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The DDOE Exceptional Children's work group met with several Advisory/Stakeholder groups to discuss target setting for FFY 2013 - 2018. Stakeholder groups included the Positive Behavior Support (PBS) Cadre which has state-wide representation including LEA directors, special education coordinators, school psychologists, PBS coordinators, and school administrators; and Governor's Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens which includes parents. The DDOE also met with special education leaders and directors in each county during scheduled meetings.

Historical data was provided to each group along with an explanation of the SPP and the need to set new targets. All groups agreed to maintain the target at 0% and to continuing to reduce the state bar by .02 subsequently through FFY 2018. Other discussions included alternative means to suspension and the continuation of technical assistance and professional development through Delaware's state-wide PBS project and SPDG behavior initiatives.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

-  Number of districts in the State
-  Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
1	39	10.26%	0%	2.56%

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a)):

- Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The prepopulated data was revised due to the use of lag data for this indicator. In FFY 2013 which based on data from 2012 - 2013 for this indicator, there were 30 LEAs (including both districts and charters). The total number of LEAs in Delaware fluctuates from year to year based on the number of charter schools in existence at that time.

The DDOE compares the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA to the rates for students without disabilities in the same LEA using a rate ratio calculation. These rates are then compared to the state bar. The DDOE defines "significant discrepancy" as those LEAs with a rate ratio which exceeds the "state bar," and for which the number of students with disabilities suspended or expelled greater than 10 days equals or exceeds 15 students. The DDOE calculates the LEAs' rate ratio by dividing the percentage of students with disabilities suspended or expelled greater than 10 days by the percentage of general education students suspended or expelled greater than 10 days within each LEA. The "state bar" has been established through consensus with stakeholder groups and is based on the rate ratio for the 2009-2010 school year with an annual reduction of .02.

The State bar for data reported for FFY 2013 is 1.26.

Step 1: Calculate Rate Ratio

LEA % of SWD Suspended > 10 days
LEA % of SWOD Suspended > 10 days

Step 2: Compare LEA Rate Ratio to "Bar"

FFY 2013 - 1.26 (based on 2012-2103 data)

Step 3: Examine Cell Size

4A - \geq 15 SWD Suspended/ Expelled > 10 days

Step 4: Define Significant Discrepancy

4A - LEAs with Rate Ratio above "Bar" and 15 or more students in cell

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2012, based on 2010-2011 data and FFY 2011, based on 2009-2010 data as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) was partially corrected. When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2013 APR, that it has verified that each district with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 and FFY 2011: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2013 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, **not including correction of findings**

Not applicable.

FFY 2012 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY2013 using 2012-2013 data)

Description of review

For FFY 2013, one LEA was identified with significant discrepancy and directed to complete a self-assessment to review policies, procedures, and practices which included a review of a prescribed sample of individual student records using a DDOE developed protocol. The DDOE reviewed the district's self-assessment that included written policies, procedures, and practices related to development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

- The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)
- The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:
 - The State DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

The DDOE found policies and procedures compliant. Therefore, the DDOE did not require revisions of the LEA's written policies, procedures. However, upon a review of individual student records, noncompliance was identified in the practices. The DDOE met with the LEA to conduct a Root Cause Analysis and to develop a Corrective Action Plan which included requirements for individual student corrections, professional development and technical assistance through the Delaware's PBS Project.

- The State did NOT ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
4	4	0	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Based on 2011-2012 data, the DDOE had identified 4 LEAs with significant discrepancy in long term suspensions and expulsions of students with disabilities.

Because three of the LEAs had previously entered into compliance agreements based on findings of noncompliance in individual student practices in June of 2013, the DDOE conducted online reviews of individual student records and interviews with LEA and school staff and ensured the practices were compliant with IDEA and that system corrections were made. The staff used DDOE developed protocol to conduct the review with 100% compliance of the subsequent data review..

The fourth district, entered into a Corrective Action Plan as this was their first finding of noncompliance. The DDOE conducted a review of additional individual student records, representative of the disability categories

and racial/ethnic groups. Based on this review, the DDOE verified that the LEA was correctly implementing the IDEA policies, procedures, and practices. with 100% compliance.

Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance

The DDOE provided the LEAs with a list of individual students that required corrections. After each LEA reported that corrections were completed, the DDOE reviewed the individual student documentation and verified that all student records were compliant.

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data					10.81%	8.10%	7.30%	9.75%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
5	5	39	9.75%	0%	12.82%

Explanation of Slippage

There was a total of 5 LEAs identified with noncompliance as compared to 4 from the previous year. One of the LEAs identified this year met the "n" size and exceeded the rate ratio of 1.26 when in previous years, it did not.

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The prepopulated data was revised due to the use of lag data for this indicator. In FFY 2013 which based on data from 2012 - 2013 for this indicator, there were 30 LEAs (including both districts and charters). The total number of LEAs in Delaware fluctuates from year to year based on the number of charter schools in

existence at that time.

The DDOE compares the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children in each LEA with IEPs in each racial/ethnic category to the rates for all students without disabilities in the same LEA using a rate ratio calculation. These rates are then compared to the state bar. The DDOE defines “significant discrepancy” as those LEAs with a rate ratio which exceeds the “state bar,” and for which the number of students with disabilities in each racial/ethnic category who are suspended or expelled greater than 10 days equals or exceeds 10 students. The DDOE calculates the LEAs’ rate ratio by dividing the percentage of students with disabilities in each racial/ethnic category who are suspended or expelled greater than 10 days by the percentage of general education students suspended or expelled greater than 10 days within each LEA. The “state bar” has been established through consensus with stakeholder groups and is based on the rate ratio for the 2009-2010 school year with an annual reduction of .02.

The state bar for data reported for FFY 2012 is 1.26.

Step 1: Calculate Rate Ratio

LEA % of Black SWD Suspended > 10 days

LEA % of SWOD Suspended > 10 days

Step 2: Repeat 1 – 3 for Each Race Category

American Indian/Alaskan Native; Asian; Black or African American; Hispanic/Latino; Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander; White; Two or More Races

Step 3: Compare LEA Rate Ratio for Each Race Category to “Bar”

Step 4: Examine Cell Size

4B - \geq 10 SWD Suspended/ Expelled > 10 days

Step 5: Define Significant Discrepancy:

4B - LEAs with Rate Ratio above “Bar” and 10 or more students in cell for any Race/ Ethnicity Category

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2012, based on 2010-2011 data and FFY 2011, based on 2009-2010 data, as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) was partially corrected. When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2013 APR, that it has verified that each district with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2012, based on 2010-2011 data, and 2011, based on 2009-2010 data: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2013 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Not applicable.

FFY 2012 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY2013 using 2012-2013 data)

Description of review

For FFY 2013, five LEAs were identified with significant discrepancy and directed to complete a self-assessment to review policies, procedures, and practices which included a review of a prescribed sample of individual student records using a DDOE developed protocol. The DDOE reviewed the district's self-assessment that included written policies, procedures, and practices related to development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

- The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)
- The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

The DDOE found policies and procedures compliant. Therefore, the DDOE did not require revisions of the LEAs written policies, procedures. However, upon a review of individual student records, noncompliance was identified in the practices. The DDOE met with the LEA to conduct a Root Cause Analysis and to develop a Corrective Action Plan which included requirements for individual student corrections, professional development and technical assistance through the Delaware's PBS Project.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
4	4	0	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Based on 2011-2012 data, the DDOE had identified 4 LEAs with significant discrepancy in long term suspensions and expulsions of students with disabilities.

Because three of the LEAs had previously entered into compliance agreements based on findings of noncompliance in individual student practices in June of 2013, the DDOE conducted online reviews of individual student records and interviews with LEA and school staff ensured the practices were compliant with IDEA and that system corrections were made. The staff used DDOE developed protocol to conduct the review to verify 100% compliance with this subsequent data review.

The fourth district, entered into a Corrective Action Plan as this was their first finding of noncompliance. The DDOE conducted a review of additional individual student records, representative of the disability categories and racial/ethnic groups. Based on this review, the DDOE verified that the LEA was correctly implementing the IDEA policies, procedures, and practices.

Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance

The DDOE provided the LEAs with a list of individual students that required corrections. After each LEA reported that corrections were completed, the DDOE reviewed the individual student documentation and

verified that all student records were compliant.

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2005	Target ≥		53.00%	56.00%	59.00%	62.00%	65.00%	65.00%	68.00%
		Data	49.75%	51.33%	53.20%	55.90%	58.70%	60.50%	63.50%	64.90%
B	2005	Target ≤		19.70%	19.20%	18.70%	18.20%	17.70%	17.50%	16.00%
		Data	20.16%	19.03%	18.30%	17.60%	16.90%	16.10%	15.60%	15.30%
C	2005	Target ≤		4.50%	4.00%	4.00%	3.80%	3.60%	3.60%	3.50%
		Data	4.92%	6.19%	6.40%	5.00%	5.20%	6.20%	6.30%	6.70%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	67.00%	68.00%	69.00%	70.00%	71.00%	72.00%
Target B ≤	15.60%	15.50%	15.30%	15.10%	14.90%	14.70%
Target C ≤	5.20%	5.00%	4.80%	4.50%	4.00%	3.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Targets for this indicator were set through advisement with multiple stakeholder groups. The DDOE presented trend data and targets from FFY 2005 to FFY 2013 to the Access to General Education Committee (AGEC), the advisory committee for SPP/APR Indicators 3 and 5. The AGEC developed recommendations for future targets from FFY 2013 to FFY 2018. The trend data and target recommendations were then presented to the Governor’s Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens and to Special Education Leadership Group, who represent all LEAs. The stakeholder groups recommended that the DDOE should focus on steadily increasing the percentage of students in Placement A while targeting a decrease in Placement C as demonstrated through our new targets.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	16,902	

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	11,358	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	2,626	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	778	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	15	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	79	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	11,358	16,902	64.90%	67.00%	67.20%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	2,626	16,902	15.30%	15.60%	15.54%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	872	16,902	6.70%	5.20%	5.16%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Not applicable.

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2012	Target ≥								45.00%
		Data							68.50%	43.50%
B	2012	Target ≤								35.00%
		Data							17.10%	37.70%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	45.00%	46.00%	47.00%	48.50%	49.00%	50.50%
Target B ≤	35.00%	35.00%	34.00%	33.50%	32.00%	31.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Targets for this indicator we set in collaboration with the Governor's Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens Infant and Early Childhood Committee and LEA Part B 619 Coordinators. Stakeholders reviewed historical data as well as previous targets for FFY 2005 - FFY 2013 to identify trends for preschool environments. Targets were recommended for FFY 2013 - FFY 2018. Stakeholders also provided recommendations for increasing inclusive opportunities for young children with special needs to receive services within community settings.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	1,815	2,052
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	1,602	934
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	0	531

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	b2. Number of children attending separate school	0	190
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	6

Explanation of Alternate Data

When the above prepopulated data was reviewed, the zeros in categories b1, b2, and b3 raised concerns. Upon closer review of the data, the State discovered that there was a system communication error between the state-wide online IEP system and the state-wide pupil accounting system. While placement in the online IEP system was verified as accurate by LEAs, the information in the state-wide pupil accounting system was not recognizing placement settings of b1, b2, and b3. This communication error impacted all reporting categories and has been corrected.

The DDOE continues to work closely with LEAs to develop and implement strategies through participation in the state Quality Rating and Improvement System (QIRS) and for providing quality inclusive experiences aligned with the Division of Early Childhood (DEC) and the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) position statements on inclusion.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	934	2,052	43.50%	45.00%	45.52%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	727	2,052	37.70%	35.00%	35.43%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Not applicable.

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A1	2008	Target ≥					90.50%	90.60%	90.60%	85.20%
		Data				90.50%	86.30%	90.90%	84.30%	85.00%
A2	2008	Target ≥					60.20%	60.30%	60.40%	54.20%
		Data				60.20%	51.40%	63.00%	53.50%	54.00%
B1	2008	Target ≥					92.90%	93.00%	93.00%	87.30%
		Data				92.90%	87.20%	89.90%	83.60%	87.40%
B2	2008	Target ≥					54.30%	54.40%	54.50%	49.80%
		Data				54.30%	46.00%	52.80%	49.50%	49.60%
C1	2008	Target ≥					91.80%	91.90%	91.90%	87.30%
		Data				91.80%	86.30%	91.50%	85.40%	87.10%
C2	2008	Target ≥					64.80%	64.90%	65.00%	65.00%
		Data				64.80%	64.90%	73.20%	63.50%	69.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	85.00%	86.20%	87.40%	88.60%	89.80%	91.00%
Target A2 ≥	54.00%	55.30%	56.70%	58.00%	59.30%	60.70%
Target B1 ≥	88.00%	89.00%	90.00%	91.10%	92.20%	93.40%
Target B2 ≥	50.00%	50.90%	51.80%	52.70%	53.70%	54.80%
Target C1 ≥	87.00%	88.10%	89.20%	90.20%	91.30%	92.30%
Target C2 ≥	65.00%	65.00%	65.20%	65.30%	65.40%	65.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Targets for this indicator we set in collaboration with the Governor's Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens Infant and Early Childhood Committee and LEA Part B 619 Coordinators. Stakeholders reviewed historical data as well as previous targets for FFY 2005 - FFY 2013 to identify trends for preschool outcomes. Targets were recommended for FFY 2013 - FFY 2018. Stakeholders also provided input on professional development to increase preschool outcomes in LEAs that did not meet targets.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	824
--	-----

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	5
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	93
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	329
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	280
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	117

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	609	707	85.00%	85.00%	86.14%
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	397	824	54.00%	54.00%	48.18%

Explanation of A2 Slippage

This year a large percentage of exiting children had less than one year (but greater than 6 months) of participation with Part B 619 Child Outcomes Process. Because we believe there is a correlation between length of participation and outcome increases, this may have had an overall impact. School district feedback suggests the shorter time a child is receiving services, the more difficult it is for the child to achieve skills comparable to same-aged peers. We are in the process of providing training to LEAs (school districts) regarding strategies for retention.

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	3
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	97
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	350
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	298
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	76

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	648	748	87.40%	88.00%	86.63%
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	374	824	49.60%	50.00%	45.39%

Explanation of B2 Slippage

This year a large percentage of exiting children had less than one year (but greater than 6 months) of participation with Part B 619 Child Outcomes Process. Because we believe there is a correlation between

length of participation and outcome increases, this may have had an overall impact. School district feedback suggests the shorter time a child is receiving services, the more difficult it is for the child to achieve skills comparable to same-aged peers. We are in the process of providing training to LEAs (school districts) regarding strategies for retention.

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	2
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	91
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	223
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	330
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	175

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	553	646	87.10%	87.00%	85.60%
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	505	821	69.00%	65.00%	61.51%

Explanation of C1 Slippage

This year a large percentage of exiting children had less than one year (but greater than 6 months) of participation with Part B 619 Child Outcomes Process. Because we believe there is a correlation between length of participation and outcome increases, this had an overall impact. We are in the process of providing training to LEAs (school districts) regarding strategies for program retention.

Explanation of C2 Slippage

This year a large percentage of exiting children had less than one year (but greater than 6 months) of participation with Part B 619 Child Outcomes Process. Because we believe there is a correlation between length of participation and outcome increases, this may have had an overall impact. School district feedback suggests the shorter time a child is receiving services, the more difficult it is for the child to achieve skills comparable to same-aged peers. We are in the process of providing training to LEAs (school districts) regarding strategies for retention.

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? Yes

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2013 in the FFY 2013 APR.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

FFY13 data was reported including all applicable targets. We ensured communication of goals and data (results) were also shared with districts (LEAs), stakeholders, and internal partners.

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? No

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2006

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		88.00%	85.00%	85.00%	86.00%	86.00%	86.50%	87.00%
Data	87.70%	83.00%	84.00%	85.30%	85.30%	86.00%	86.50%	89.70%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	88.00%	89.00%	90.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The targets for this indicator were developed in collaboration with various stakeholder groups including the Governor’s Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens, Delaware Parent Teacher Association, Delaware Parent Information Center, Special Education Leadership Group and Special Education Directors.

After reviewing historical data, it was determined that while the DDOE has met targets for this indicator for the last three years, response rate has not improved (FFY 2010: 12.6%, FFY 2011: 14%, FFY 2012: 13.1%). In an effort to increase response rate, the DDOE and stakeholders engaged in several activities including reviewing Delaware’s current survey and surveys from other states. In addition, stakeholder groups shared feedback from parents identifying barriers to completing the survey. This resulted in the following changes which will be implemented for FFY 2014 and in the targets that were set: increase number of survey questions, revise content of questions to address specific areas of the IEP process and special education services, and provide access to the survey through additional modalities and languages. The DDOE looks forward to reporting an increase in response rate for FFY 2014.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
1,693	1,861	89.70%	87.00%	90.97%

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school

age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

The DDOE distributes a parent survey to families of all students with IEPs including both preschool and school aged children. DDOE uses an electronic student tracking system in which every child has a unique single identifying number. LEAs are required to enter and maintain data regarding special education and related services such as the date eligibility is determined, disability code, and IEP meeting, initiation, and end dates. By requiring all LEAs to enter information into the electronic student tracking system, the DDOE is able to identify preschool children receiving special education and related services and include those families in the distribution of the parent survey.

Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.

The DDOE distributes a parent survey to all families of students with disabilities, ages preschool through age 21. By doing this, the DDOE ensures that all demographics are represented in the data. Surveys are disseminated through a third party contractor to all families in the state who have children with disabilities as reported on the December 1 Child Count in the state wide student tracking system. To ensure the reliability and validity of the survey data, all surveys are anonymous and returned to the contractor for analysis of the data. Responses are invalidated if not clear. In addition, the third party contractor provides for surveys to be returned directly rather than through the local education agency or state department to ensure confidentiality.

The demographic data were consistent with statewide representation of disability categories for the following primary eligibility categories: Autism, Blind/Visual Impairment, Deaf & Blind, Emotional Disturbance, Hearing Impairment, Mild Intellectual Disability, Moderate Intellectual Disability, Orthopedic Impairment, Other Health Impairment, Severe Intellectual Disability, Speech/Language Disability, and Traumatic Brain Injury. However, the disability categories of Learning Disability, Developmental Disability, and Preschool/Speech Delay were under-represented while Autism and Other Health Impairment were over-represented.

Disability Category	State Wide Representation	Representation Of Respondents
Learning Disability	44.9%	28%
Mild Intellectual Disability	5.1%	4%
Moderate Intellectual Disability	2.4%	3%
Severe Intellectual Disability	0.4%	1%
Emotional Disturbance	3.8%	3%
Other Health Impaired	11.6%	18%
Orthopedic Impaired	1.3%	1%
Hearing Impairment	1.2%	1%
Autism	6.8%	14%
Deaf/Blind	0.3%	0%
Blind/Visual Impairment	0.1%	1%
Speech/Lang	8.2%	15%
TBI	0.4%	1%
DD	11.1	7%
Preschool/Speech	11.1	2%

Surveys returned by parents who identified their children as Caucasian and Asian-Pacific Islander, and

Native American/Alaskan were representative of the student population. Surveys returned by parents who identified their children as African American and Hispanic/ Latino were under-represented when the percentages for the entire special education population are considered. However, 17% of respondents did not identify a racial/ethnic category which may account for the under-representation of African American and Hispanic-Latino groups.

Race/Ethnicity	State Wide Representation	Representation Of Respondents
Asian/Pacific Islander	1.5%	2%
Caucasian	46%	48%
African American	37%	19%
Native American/Alaskan	0.6%	0%
Hispanic/Latino	13.7%	7%
Bi-Racial/Multi-Racial	1.8%	7%

Was sampling used? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? No



Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State



No, the data does not accurately represent the demographics of the State

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Not applicable.

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations



Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%	0%	2.78%	2.78%	0%	0%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
22	2	43	0%	0%	4.65%

Explanation of Slippage

Twenty two LEAs were identified with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services. Each LEA was directed to conduct a self-assessment including a review of policies, procedures, and practices in the identification of children with disabilities. The DDOE convened an internal committee to review the LEAs; self-assessments. Based on that review, the DDOE identified noncompliance in two LEAs in the identification and eligibility determination of children with disabilities.

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

The DDOE used its September 30, 2013 student enrollment data and December 1, 2013 child count data for the FFY 2013 SPP/APR submission. Delaware collects enrollment data based on an annual count each

September 30. December 1 child count data are used for special education identification and individual educational classification identification.

Delaware uses the relative risk ratio method to determine whether there is disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education. When using the relative risk ratio method, the overall enrollment of all students is considered in relation to the enrollment of special education students. A minimum “N” size (Students with disabilities in a racial/ethnic category by LEA) of 15 is used in the calculation.

The relative risk ratio is calculated by comparing one ethnic group’s risk of being identified in special education with that of a comparison group (all other students). The calculation used for determining the relative risk ratio is found below:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \text{\# of SWD in X ethnic/racial group} \\ \text{Total \# in X ethnic/racial group in the school population} \end{array}}{\begin{array}{c} \text{Total \# of SWD} \\ \text{Total \# in the school population} \end{array}}$$

For example:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \text{248 SWD in Black ethnic/racial group} \\ \text{635 Total in Black ethnic/racial group} \end{array}}{\begin{array}{c} \text{405 Total \# SWD} \\ \text{2300 Total \# in school population} \end{array}} \\ \text{Relative Risk Ratio} = \mathbf{2.22}$$

After the relative risk ratio is calculated, the ratio is compared to the state “bar”, and if the LEA’s risk ratio is greater than or equal to the state “bar”, the LEA is identified as having disproportionate representation. The “bar” was informed by aggregate data from all LEAs as well as input from stakeholder groups. For FFY 2013, the state “bar” was set at a relative risk ratio of 1.46.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Not applicable.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations



Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%	0%	2.78%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
22	2	43	0%	0%	4.65%

Explanation of Slippage

Twenty two LEAs were identified with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services. Each LEA was directed to conduct a self-assessment including a review of policies, procedures, and practices in the identification of children with disabilities. The DDOE convened an internal committee to review the LEAs; self-assessments. Based on that review, the DDOE identified noncompliance in two LEAs in the identification and eligibility determination of children with disabilities.

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

The DDOE used its September 30, 2012 student enrollment data and December 1, 2012 child count data for the FFY 2012 SPP/APR submission. Delaware collects enrollment data based on an annual count each

September 30. December 1 child count data are used for special education identification and individual educational classification identification.

Delaware uses the relative risk ratio method to determine whether there is disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education. When using the relative risk ratio method, the overall enrollment of all students is considered in relation to the enrollment of special education students. A minimum “N” size (students with disabilities by racial/ethnic category and disability category by LEA) of 10 is used in the calculation.

For Indicator 10, the relative risk ratio is calculated by comparing one ethnic group’s risk of being identified with a specific disability with that of a comparison group (all other students). The calculation used for determining the relative risk ratio is found below:

$$\frac{\text{\# of students in } X \text{ ethnic/racial group in } Y \text{ disability category}}{\text{Total \# of students in } X \text{ ethnic/racial group in the school population}}$$

$$\frac{\text{\# of } \textit{Other} \text{ students in } Y \text{ disability category}}{\text{Total \# of } \textit{Other} \text{ students in the school population}}$$

For example:

$$\frac{135 \text{ students in } \textit{Black} \text{ ethnic/racial group in } \textit{LD} \text{ disability category}}{635 \text{ students in } \textit{Black} \text{ ethnic/racial group in the school population}}$$

$$\frac{109 \textit{ Other} \text{ students in } \textit{LD} \text{ disability category}}{1665 \textit{ Other} \text{ students in the school population}}$$

Relative Risk Ratio = 3.26

After the relative risk ratio is calculated, the ratio is compared to the state “bar”, and if the LEA’s risk ratio is greater than or equal to the state “bar”, the LEA is identified as having disproportionate representation. The “bar” was informed by aggregate data from all LEAs as well as input from stakeholder groups. For FFY 2013 the state “bar” was set at a relative risk ratio of 1.50.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Not applicable.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Indicator 11: Child Find

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2006

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		91.00%	94.90%	97.00%	98.20%	100%	97.76%	99.80%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
481	480	99.80%	100%	99.79%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	1
---	---

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

One school district completed one initial evaluation outside of the state established timeline. The student was placed in an alternative setting and the school did not complete the evaluation within the required timelines. The evaluation was completed within 60 school days and 97 calendar days which exceeded the state requirement of 45 school days or 90 calendar days.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

- The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.
- The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The State uses an electronic student tracking system in which every child has a unique single identifying number. This system is used to collect data regarding the date on which parents provide consent for initial evaluation and the date on which eligibility is determined. The eligibility determination date is the end date used in the calculation to determine whether LEAs are timely. By requiring all LEAs to identify the date of the eligibility determination, DDOE can monitor the completion of initial evaluations, including any initial evaluations completed outside of the timeline, through use of the state data system.

DDOE staff conduct a query of the data for all initial evaluations. The data query identifies all children whose eligibility determination occurs outside of the timeline. LEAs are provided the data for each evaluation conducted outside of the timeline, as well as the child’s specific identification number, the school of attendance, and the date eligibility was determined. The DDOE then requires LEAs to provide written explanations for the delay and corrections for each child evaluated outside of the timeline. After all corrections are made, the final number of children whose evaluations were outside of prescribed timelines is calculated. In all cases, DDOE verifies through the data tracking system that all evaluations are completed.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Not applicable.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	0	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The DDOE identified one LEA with noncompliance relating to the timeliness of initial evaluation. The LEA was directed to develop a Corrective Action Plan including steps to ensure correction of individual student noncompliance as well as to ensure all staff responsible for initial evaluations are adequately trained and properly implementing the regulation related to the provision of timely evaluations. To verify Prong 1, individual student corrections, the DDOE reviewed the LEA's submission of student data and conducted record reviews to verify 100% correction of individual noncompliance. In addition, technical assistance was provided by the DDOE during state wide and regional meetings at which time the timeline for initial evaluations was reviewed.

The state verified that the LEA with noncompliance was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements of the finding in accordance with OSEP memo 09-02 by reviewing updated data. All updated records reviewed demonstrated compliance relating to the regulatory area of timely evaluations.

Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance

The DDOE verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected.

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	81.60%	97.70%	97.70%	99.00%	99.00%	99.75%	99.00%	98.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	486
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	55
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	323
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	98
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	0

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e)	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
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. $[c/(a-b-d-e)] \times 100$	323	333	98.00%	100%	97.00%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e	10
--	----

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, or e. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

LEAs are required to provide additional information including an explanation for children who had an IEP developed and/or implemented after their third birthday, and documentation of the IEP meeting and initiation dates. Ten children from three LEAs were determined to be eligible for Part B services and did not have an IEP developed and implemented by the third birthday. The reason provided by all three LEAs was lack of sufficient professional staff working in the summer to ensure that children turning three transitioned to the

LEAs following federal and state transition regulations. In two of the three LEAs, staff turnover was an additional factor that negatively impacted the transition process. IEPs were implemented between 7 and 99 days after their third birthdays.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The state used a systematic transition collection process which has been in place for eight years. Each school year, the LEAs use an electronic process to report transition data to the Department of Education by June 30th. Information is reported on a state tracking spreadsheet: the total number of referrals received from Part C, the number of children not eligible for special education services, and the number of children with IEPs in place and receiving special education services begin prior to their third birthday.

LEAs are required to provide additional information including an explanation for children who had an IEP developed and/or implemented after their third birthday, and documentation of the IEP meeting and initiation dates.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, **not including correction of findings**

Not applicable.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
6	6	0	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

In FFY 2012, six instances of non-compliance were identified by DDOE involving early childhood transition from Part C to B in Delaware. DDOE issued a written notice to applicable LEAs identifying the non-compliance and citing the regulatory requirement.

The LEAs were directed to develop and implement corrective steps to ensure correction of individual student noncompliance as well as to ensure all staff are adequately trained and properly implementing the regulation related to early childhood transition from Part C to B. The LEAs submitted required documentation of individual student corrections and the training provided. To verify Prong 1, individual

student corrections, the DDOE reviewed the LEA's submission of student data and conducted record reviews to verify 100% correction of individual noncompliance. In addition, technical assistance was provided by the DDOE during state wide and regional meetings at which time the regulatory timeline for early childhood transition from Part C to B was reviewed.

The state verified that the LEAs with noncompliance were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements of the finding in accordance with OSEP memo 09-02 by reviewing updated data. All updated records reviewed demonstrated compliance relating to the regulatory area of early childhood transition from Part C to B.

Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance

The DDOE verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition



Compliance indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data					88.30%	80.10%	59.10%	50.50%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
77	159	50.50%	100%	48.43%

Explanation of Slippage

As recounted in our description of data collection method, the DDOE uses a risk based analysis when choosing districts for state monitoring. The districts being chosen for state monitoring are districts whose data or actions require further monitoring. During our 2013-2014, state monitoring the DDOE identified 5 LEAs (that included transition age youth) for state monitoring. Four of the LEAs showed growth (above the previous year’s state Indicator 13 data of 50%) while one LEA showed a significant decrease in all areas of IDEA compliance.

As a result of continued slippage, the DDOE has created a State Transition Cadre. The Cadre meets monthly to discuss transition related issues and concerns within the LEAs.

The DDOE has reviewed the historical process of Indicator 13 data collection and actual data and determined the need for an improved data sample to show a more comprehensive sample of state data. The new data collection method is described within the “Method of Data Collection” section.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Data is collected through on-site state monitoring of LEAs. In FFY 2013, 5 LEAs with students of transition age were reviewed for Indicator 13 requirements including 5 high schools, 4 middle schools and 3 special education programs. The DDOE reviewed 159 IEPs in FFY 2013 and 77 were determined compliant with Indicator 13 requirements for a 48% compliance rate.

Each LEA selected for on-site monitoring is chosen through a risk based analysis of various data collected by the DDOE. The analysis includes identifying those districts that have not been monitored within the cyclical process, identifying those who have in the past had non-compliance, identifying districts that have had administrative complaints filed with the DDOE within the past year, number of phone calls from parents with concerns, among others. Student records in each building are selected through a randomized sample. In addition to the risk-based analysis to choose LEAs for state monitoring, the DDOE reviews student records for all students of transition age for Indicator 13 purposes. **For Delaware, Indicator 13 data include all students age 14 or who have entered the eighth (8th) grade.**

Through analysis of the historical and current data with input provided by stakeholder groups, the DDOE determined that a broader sample is needed to more accurately represent the state. For the 2014-2015 School Year and beyond the DDOE will be implementing a new monitoring process for Indicator 13.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Beginning with the current school year, all districts and charters having transition age (age 14 or in the 8th grade) students, will be monitored for Indicator 13 each year. As a result the following new process will be implemented:

Phase 1 – LEA Self-Assessment

- LEAs will be required to conduct a self-assessment of all student records for students age 14 or in the 8th grade and above
- DOE will provide LEAs with an electronic spreadsheet to capture all data
- Self-Assessment will be sent to DOE.

Phase 2 – DOE validation of LEA submitted data

- DOE will review a sample of the submitted data for verification
- Sample will be a random selection process that represent all schools and disability categories within the LEA

At the completion of the DDOE verification of the LEA's self-assessment and submitted data, any identified noncompliance within the LEA will require the Prong1/Prong 2 monitoring process.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Not applicable.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
14	14	0	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

This verification was completed during Prong 2 of the monitoring process. When each LEA completed Prong 1 of the State monitoring process, they moved into Prong 2 of the process. During Prong 2 of the monitoring process, an additional random sample of IEPs was pulled and reviewed. All LEAs were verified as compliant.

Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance

This verification is part of the State's Prong 1 of the monitoring process. After noncompliance was identified, the DDOE met with LEA personnel to review the areas of noncompliance and to conduct a Root Cause Analysis for each area of noncompliance after which, the LEA developed a Corrective Action Plan. The Corrective Action Plan included steps to correct the identified areas of noncompliance (professional development and/or technical assistance to staff, creation of new policies and procedures, etc.). The LEAs held IEP meetings for those students who had areas of noncompliance and made the necessary corrections within a timeline determined by the DDOE. Once the individual noncompliance was corrected, the DDOE conducted a review of those files and verified the correction of all areas of noncompliance. The LEA then moved into Prong 2 of the monitoring process.

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2009	Target ≥						28.00%	30.00%	33.00%
		Data					24.40%	20.00%	25.00%	17.00%
B	2009	Target ≥						77.00%	80.00%	83.00%
		Data					71.00%	51.00%	51.00%	48.00%
C	2009	Target ≥						100%	100%	100%
		Data					100%	65.00%	64.00%	61.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	21.00%	25.00%	29.00%	33.00%	37.00%	41.00%
Target B ≥	52.00%	56.00%	60.00%	64.00%	68.00%	72.00%
Target C ≥	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The DDOE consulted with various stakeholder groups to review historical and current post school data to determine targets for the current SPP/APR. These groups included: NSTTAC State Team, State Transition Cadre, Governor’s Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens (GACEC) transition subcommittee, regional transition councils, Special Education Leadership Group, and County Special Education Directors. Members of these groups include students, parents, teachers, transition specialists, special education directors, state agency representatives, community service providers, and other community members.

Data analysis included reviewing historical data, post school outcomes, and current program implementation. Based on this analysis the stakeholder groups’ recommendation was to set new targets with an annual increase of .4%.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	390
--	-----

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	77
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	128
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	51
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	0

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	77	390	17.00%	21.00%	19.74%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	205	390	48.00%	52.00%	52.56%
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	256	390	61.00%	100%	65.64%

Was sampling used? No

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Not applicable.

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥								
Data								

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥						

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The DDOE met with stakeholders to review data for this indicator. However, targets were not set because the state had less than 10 resolutions sessions.

"States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding APR."

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2014	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	4	
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2014	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	4	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
4	4			100%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Targets were not set because the state had less than 10 resolution sessions.

"States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding APR."

However, the data for this indicator was shared with stakeholders:

	FFY 2007	FFY 2008	FFY 2009	FFY 2010	FFY 2011	FFY 2012
# of Resolutions Sessions	1	0	3	0	2	1
# of Resolution Sessions Resulting in a Resolution Agreement	0	N/A	1	N/A	2	0

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Not applicable.

Indicator 16: Mediation

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B)))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		88.00%	88.00%	88.00%	88.00%	88.00%	88.00%	88.00%
Data	64.00%	86.00%	86.00%	33.00%	0%	75.00%	83.33%	81.80%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥						

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The DDOE met with stakeholders to review data for this indicator. However, targets were not set because the state had less than 10 mediations.

"States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches ten or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding APR."

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	1	
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	4	
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1 Mediations held	8	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
1	4	8	81.80%		62.50%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Targets were not set because the state had less than 10 mediations. However, data for this indicator was shared with stakeholders.

"States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches ten or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding APR."

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Not applicable.

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Baseline Data

FFY	2013
Data	

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target					

Description of Measure

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

Statement

Description

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted



Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

This indicator is not applicable.