



DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

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

Susan S. Bunting, Ed.D.
 Secretary of Education
 Voice: (302) 735-4000
 FAX: (302) 739-4654

FFY 2018 IDEA LEA Annual Determination Business Rules

Indicator	Description	Business Rule	Note/s
1 (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))	Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma Divided by the number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	NA- LEA had graduates but no special education graduates. LEA did not have any graduates.
2 (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))	Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (did not graduate, did not die, or did not transfer to another school and was not included in the end of the year enrollment) Divided by # of students enrolled with IEPs (ages 14-21) on September 30	NA- LEA did not have students ages 14-21.
3B (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))	Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participation rate for children with IEPs. 	Number of children with IEPs participating in state assessments Divided by the total number of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window, calculated separately for reading and math, and subtracting students with approved exemptions <i>Note: Denominator does not include students with approved exemptions from DDOE. All students enrolled during the testing window are included – "Full Academic Year" filter is not used.</i>	NA- LEA did not have students who tested in that grade.
3C (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))	Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards. 	(Number of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level or alternate academic achievement standards) Divided by the total number of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and, calculated separately for reading and math <i>Note: All students enrolled during the testing window are included – "Full Academic Year" filter is not used.</i>	NA- LEA did not have students who tested in that grade.

Indicator	Description	Business Rule	Note/s
<p>4A (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>State Determination: The number of LEAs that met the state established “N” size and exceeded the state bar (rate-ratio). Divided by Number of LEAs that met the state established “N” size</p> <p>LEA Determination: Number of SWD Suspended or Expelled > than 10 days Divided by Number of General Ed Students Suspended or Expelled > than 10 days</p> <p>An LEA meets target if they exceed the rate ratio but had too few students in the cell. An LEA meets the target because they did not exceed rate ratio. An LEA does not meet the target if they exceed state established “N” size <u>and</u> the state bar (rate ratio).</p>	<p>Indicator 4A is based on school year 2017-2018 date with a Rate Ratio of > 2.0 and an “N” size of 15, over 3 consecutive years of data</p> <p>Or</p> <p>Rate Ratio >5.0 and an n size of 5</p> <p>State data is a calculation based on the number of LEAs that met the “N” size compared to the same LEAs that exceeded the rate ratio of 2.0</p>
<p>4B (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))</p>	<p>Percent of districts that have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (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. 	<p>State Determination: The number of LEAs that met the state established “N” size and exceeded the state bar (rate-ratio). Divided by Number of LEAs that met the state established “N” size</p> <p>LEA Determination: Number of (race/ethnicity) SWD Suspended or Expelled > than 10 days Divided by General Ed Students Suspended > than 10 days in the LEA</p> <p>An LEA meets the target if they exceed the rate ratio but had too few students in the cell. An LEA meets the target if they exceed the rate ratio but are in compliance. An LEA meets the target if they do not exceed rate ratio. An LEA does not meet the target if they exceed the state established “N” size and the state bar (rate ratio) and was found to be noncompliant.</p>	<p>Indicator 4B is based on school year 2017-2018 date with a Rate Ratio of > 2.0 and an “N” size of 10, over 3 consecutive years of data</p> <p>Or</p> <p>Rate Ratio >5.0 and an “N” size of 5</p> <p>State data is a calculation based on the number of LEAs that met the “N” size compared to the same LEAs that exceeded the rate ratio of 2.0</p>
Indicator	Description	Business Rule	Note/s
<p>5 (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A = Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day • B = Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day • C = In separate schools, residential facilities, or 	<p>Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served Divided by Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21</p>	

	homebound/hospital placements.		
6 (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))	<p>Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility. 	<p>A. Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.</p> <p>B. Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times.</p>	NA- LEA did not have students ages 3-5.
7 (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))	<p>Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy) C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. 	<p>Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in each outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.</p> <p>Percent = # of preschool children reported in progress category © plus # of preschool children reported in category (d) divided by [#of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category © plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d)] times 100</p> <p>Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. Percent = # of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category © divided by [the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + ©] times 100.</p>	LEA- did not have students ages 3-5 in a preschool program.
8 (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))	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.	<p>Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities</p> <p>Divided by</p> <p>Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities</p>	Data were not reported for the LEA.

Indicator	Description	Business Rule	Note/s
<p style="text-align: center;">9 (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))</p>	<p>Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p>	<p>State Determination Number of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services Divided by representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification</p> <p>LEA Determination LEA Compliant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA was not identified with Disproportionate Representation as a result of both conditions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ LEA did not meet or exceed the relative risk ratio of 1.46 ○ LEA did not meet the minimum cell size of 15 in one or more racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services • LEA was not identified with Disproportionate Representation as a result of one of the conditions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ LEA did not meet or exceed the relative risk ratio of 1.46 or ○ LEA did not meet the minimum cell size of 15 in one or more racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services • LEA was identified with Disproportionate Representation as a result of both conditions, however Disproportionate Representation was not the result of inappropriate identification: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ LEA did meet or exceed the relative risk ratio of 1.46 ○ LEA did meet the minimum cell size of 15 in one or more racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services <p>LEA Noncompliant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA was identified with Disproportionate Representation as a result of both conditions and Disproportionate Representation was the result of inappropriate identification: 	<p>State data reflects % of districts with Disproportionate Representation as a result of inappropriate identification.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ LEA did meet or exceed the relative risk ratio of 1.46 ○ LEA did meet the minimum cell size of 15 in one or more racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. 	
Indicator	Description	Business Rule	Note/s
<p>10 (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))</p>	<p>Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p>	<p>State Determination Number of LEAs that meet the State-established cell size for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification Divided by Number of LEAs that meet with State-established cell size for one or more racial/ethnic groups times 100.</p> <p>LEA Determination LEA Compliant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA was not identified with Disproportionate Representation as a result of both conditions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ LEA did not meet or exceed the relative risk ratio of 1.50 ○ LEA did not meet the minimum cell size of 10 in one or more racial and ethnic groups in special education disability categories. • LEA was not identified with Disproportionate Representation as a result of one of the conditions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ LEA did not meet or exceed the relative risk ratio of 1.50 or ○ LEA did not meet the minimum cell size of 10 in one or more racial and ethnic groups in special education disability categories. • LEA was identified with Disproportionate Representation as a result of both conditions, however Disproportionate Representation was not the result of inappropriate identification: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ LEA did meet or exceed the relative risk ratio of 1.50 ○ LEA did meet the minimum cell size of 10 in one or more racial and ethnic groups in special education disability categories. <p>LEA Noncompliant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA was identified with Disproportionate Representation as a result of both 	<p>State data reflects % of districts with Disproportionate Representation as a result of inappropriate identification.</p>

Indicator	Description	Business Rule	Note/s
		<p>conditions and Disproportionate Representation was the result of inappropriate identification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ LEA did meet or exceed the relative risk ratio of 1.50 ○ LEA did meet the minimum cell size of 10 in one or more racial and ethnic groups in special education disability categories 	
<p>11 (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B)) (14 DE Admin Code § 925.2.0)</p>	<p>Percent of children who were evaluated within 45 school days or 90 calendar days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation.</p>	<p>Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received Divided by Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 45 school days or 90 calendar days</p>	<p>NA- no initial evaluations were reported.</p>
<p>12 (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays 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 e. Number of children who were referred to Part C and determined eligible for Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays <p>[c/(a-b-d-e)]x100= % complaint</p>	<p>NA- LEA did not have students transitioning from Part C to Part B.</p>
<p>13 (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>Number of youth in grade 8 or aged 14 (and above) with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition Divided by Number of youth with IEPs in grade 8 or aged 14 (and above)</p>	<p>NA- LEA did not have students of transition age in grade 8 or ages 14 and above. LEA was not required to report data for this reporting period.</p>

	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.		
Indicator	Description	Business Rule	Note/s
14 (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))	<p>Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school. • Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school. • 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. 	<p>Number of respondent youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school</p> <p>Divided by</p> <p>Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school</p>	NA- LEA did not have students with IEPs exiting secondary education.