



## DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

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

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

June 15, 2015

Dr. Susan S. Bunting  
Indian River School District  
31 Hosier Street  
Selbyville, DE 19975

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

Dear Dr. Bunting:

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

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

- **Compliance:**

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

- **Results:**

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

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

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

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

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

Please contact the DOE's Exceptional Children Resources Group with any questions concerning this determination.

Sincerely,



Mary Ann Mieczkowski  
Director, Exceptional Children Resources

Sincerely,



Michael Watson  
Chief Academic Officer

MAM:BJM/bd  
Attachment

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

## ***IDEA General Supervision & Reporting Requirements***

### ***The Department's General Monitoring Duties Under the IDEA***

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

### ***The State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Reports***

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

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

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

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

## FFY 2013 LEA Annual Determinations

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

- **Compliance:**

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

- **Results:**

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

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

# Indian River School District

Compliance Indicators	Data From: (Time Period)	SPP Target 2013 - 2014	State Data	LEA Data	LEA Score	Possible Points
Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements. Note - The LEA score is the Rate Ratio which for FFY 2012 had a target of 1.26	2012 - 2013 SY	0.00%	12.82%	Met targets for all races/ethnicities	1	1
Indicator 9: Disproportionality/All Disabilities	12/1/13	0.00%	4.65%	Met target	1	1
Indicator 10: Disproportionality/Specific Disabilities	12/1/13	0.00%	4.65%	Met target	1	1
Indicator 11: Initial Evaluation Timelines	2013 - 2014 SY	100.00%	99.79%	100.00%	1	1
Indicator 12: Preschool Transition Part C to Part B	2013 - 2014 SY	100.00%	97.00%	100.00%	1	1
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition (LEA - actual percentage)	2013 - 2014 SY	100%	48.43%	90.40%	0	1
Equitable Services/Needs-Based Funding/Fiscal Monitoring					1	1

Results Indicators	Data From: (Time Period)	SPP Target 2013 - 2014	State Data	LEA Data	LEA Score	Possible Points	
Indicator 3B Participation Math	Spring, 2014						
Grade 3		95.00%	98.60%	98.02%	1	1	
Grade 4		95.00%	98.78%	99.00%	1	1	
Grade 5		95.00%	98.76%	100.00%	1	1	
Grade 6		95.00%	97.69%	99.15%	1	1	
Grade 7		95.00%	97.43%	97.73%	1	1	
Grade 8		95.00%	97.78%	99.19%	1	1	
Grade 10		95.00%	92.45%	98.99%	1	1	
Indicator 3B Participation Reading							
Grade 3		95.00%	96.22%	97.00%	1	1	
Grade 4		95.00%	96.60%	97.94%	1	1	
Grade 5		95.00%	96.70%	98.96%	1	1	
Grade 6		95.00%	96.33%	98.31%	1	1	
Grade 7		95.00%	96.41%	96.21%	1	1	
Grade 8		95.00%	96.87%	100.00%	1	1	
Grade 10		95.00%	90.10%	98.95%	1	1	
Indicator 3C Performance Rate Math							
Grade 3		41.80%	36.69%	65.66%	1	1	
Grade 4		41.80%	37.00%	52.53%	1	1	
Grade 5		41.80%	33.08%	60.42%	1	1	
Grade 6	41.80%	23.21%	38.46%	0	1		
Grade 7	41.80%	27.61%	40.31%	0	1		
Grade 8	41.80%	27.73%	30.33%	0	1		
Grade 10	41.80%	30.96%	30.61%	0	1		

# Indian River School District

Results Indicators	Data From: (Time Period)	SPP Target 2013 - 2014	State Data	LEA Data	LEA Score	Possible Points
Indicator 3C Performance Rate Reading						
Grade 3	Spring, 2014	41.40%	33.87%	53.61%	1	1
Grade 4		41.40%	36.45%	41.05%	0	1
Grade 5		41.40%	38.91%	53.68%	1	1
Grade 6		41.40%	30.32%	49.14%	1	1
Grade 7		41.40%	30.04%	35.43%	0	1
Grade 8		41.40%	29.29%	36.97%	0	1
Grade 10		41.40%	34.56%	46.81%	1	1
Indicator 4A: Significant Discrepancy in the rates of long-term suspension of students with disabilities Note - The LEA score is the Rate Ratio which for FFY 2012 had a target of 1.26		2012 - 2013 SY	0.00%	2.56%	Met target	1
Indicator 7A: Early Childhood Outcomes - Social/Emotional						
Percent Increase Rate of Growth	June, 2014	85.20%	86.41%	99.00%	1	1
Percent Within Age Expectation		54.20%	48.81%	60.00%	1	1
Indicator 7B: Early Childhood Outcomes - Knowledge						
Percent Increase Rate of Growth		87.30%	86.63%	99.00%	1	1
Percent Within Age Expectation		49.80%	45.39%	61.00%	1	1
Indicator 7C: Early Childhood Outcomes - Behavior						
Percent Increase Rate of Growth		87.30%	85.60%	96.00%	1	1
Percent Within Age Expectation		65.00%	61.51%	75.00%	1	1

Determination Summary	
Compliance Indicators Score	6
Out of a Possible:	7
Results Indicators Score	28
Out of a Possible:	35
Score Total	34
Out of a Possible:	42
Percentage:	81.0%

**Annual Determination: Meets Requirements**

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

### Indian River

#### Indicator 1 - Graduation Rates

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Graduates</u>	<u>Dropouts</u>	<u>Graduation Rate</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>
1	2012	68	15	81.93%	87.00%	No
1	2013	75		86.21%	87.00%	No
1	2014	69	29	70.40%	63.00%	Yes

#### Indicator 2 - Dropout Rates

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>	<u>DropOuts</u>	<u>Dropout Rate</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>
2	2012	395		2.03%	3.80%	Yes
2	2013	398		3.02%	3.80%	Yes
2	2014	375		2.67%	5.50%	Yes

#### Indicator 3 - Performance on AYP

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>School Level</u>	<u>Meets Reading Target?</u>	<u>Meets Math Target?</u>	<u>Meets AYP Target?</u>
3A	2012	Elem	Yes	Yes	Yes
3A	2012	Middle	Yes	Yes	Yes
3A	2012	High Sch	Yes	Yes	Yes
3A	2013	Elem	Yes	Yes	Yes
3A	2013	Middle	Yes	Yes	Yes
3A	2013	High Sch	Yes	Yes	Yes

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

### Indian River

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

### Indicator 3B - Participation in State Assessments

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Grade</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u># Eligible</u>	<u># Tested</u>	<u>% Tested</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>
3B	2012	3	Math	72	70	97.22%	99.3%	No
3B	2013	3	Math	90	90	100.00%	99.3%	Yes
3B	2014	3	Math	101	99	98.02%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	4	Math	91	91	100.00%	99.0%	Yes
3B	2013	4	Math	97	97	100.00%	99.0%	Yes
3B	2014	4	Math	100	99	99.00%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	5	Math	104	102	98.08%	99.3%	No
3B	2013	5	Math	108	108	100.00%	99.3%	Yes
3B	2014	5	Math	96	96	100.00%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	6	Math	102	101	99.02%	98.5%	Yes
3B	2013	6	Math	122	122	100.00%	98.5%	Yes
3B	2014	6	Math	118	117	99.15%	95.0%	Yes



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

### Indian River

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Grade</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u># Eligible</u>	<u># Tested</u>	<u>% Tested</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>
3B	2012	7	Math	95	93	97.89%	98.3%	No
3B	2013	7	Math	106	106	100.00%	98.3%	Yes
3B	2014	7	Math	132	129	97.73%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	8	Math	110	109	99.09%	97.4%	Yes
3B	2013	8	Math	114	114	100.00%	97.4%	Yes
3B	2014	8	Math	123	122	99.19%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	10	Math	87	82	94.25%	95.4%	No
3B	2013	10	Math	87	87	100.00%	95.4%	Yes
3B	2014	10	Math	99	98	98.99%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	3	Reading	72	70	97.22%	99.2%	No
3B	2013	3	Reading	89	89	100.00%	99.2%	Yes
3B	2014	3	Reading	100	97	97.00%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	4	Reading	91	91	100.00%	98.7%	Yes
3B	2013	4	Reading	97	97	100.00%	98.7%	Yes
3B	2014	4	Reading	97	95	97.94%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	5	Reading	105	101	96.19%	99.5%	No
3B	2013	5	Reading	110	110	100.00%	99.5%	Yes

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

### Indian River

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Grade</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u># Eligible</u>	<u># Tested</u>	<u>% Tested</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>
3B	2014	5	Reading	96	95	98.96%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	6	Reading	102	96	94.12%	98.4%	No
3B	2013	6	Reading	121	121	100.00%	98.4%	Yes
3B	2014	6	Reading	118	116	98.31%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	7	Reading	95	92	96.84%	98.2%	No
3B	2013	7	Reading	106	106	100.00%	98.2%	Yes
3B	2014	7	Reading	132	127	96.21%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	8	Reading	110	110	100.00%	97.6%	Yes
3B	2013	8	Reading	112	112	100.00%	97.6%	Yes
3B	2014	8	Reading	119	119	100.00%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	10	Reading	87	83	95.40%	95.8%	No
3B	2013	10	Reading	88	88	100.00%	95.8%	Yes
3B	2014	10	Reading	95	94	98.95%	95.0%	Yes

---

### Indicator 3C - Performance on State Assessments

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Grade</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u># Tested</u>	<u># Meets</u>	<u>% Meets</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>
3C	2012	3	Math	69	55	79.71%	36.00%	Yes
3C	2013	3	Math	90	53	58.89%	41.80%	Yes

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

### Indian River

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Grade</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u># Tested</u>	<u># Meets</u>	<u>% Meets</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>
3C	2014	3	Math	99	65	65.66%	41.80%	Yes
3C	2012	4	Math	91	72	79.12%	36.00%	Yes
3C	2013	4	Math	97	63	64.95%	41.80%	Yes
3C	2014	4	Math	99	52	52.53%	41.80%	Yes
3C	2012	5	Math	102	61	59.80%	36.00%	Yes
3C	2013	5	Math	108	65	60.19%	41.80%	Yes
3C	2014	5	Math	96	58	60.42%	41.80%	Yes
3C	2012	6	Math	101	58	57.43%	36.00%	Yes
3C	2013	6	Math	122	62	50.82%	41.80%	Yes
3C	2014	6	Math	117	45	38.46%	41.80%	No
3C	2012	7	Math	93	64	68.82%	36.00%	Yes
3C	2013	7	Math	106	38	35.85%	41.80%	No
3C	2014	7	Math	129	52	40.31%	41.80%	No
3C	2012	8	Math	109	68	62.39%	36.00%	Yes
3C	2013	8	Math	114	57	50.00%	41.80%	Yes
3C	2014	8	Math	122	37	30.33%	41.80%	No

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

### Indian River

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Grade</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u># Tested</u>	<u># Meets</u>	<u>% Meets</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>
3C	2012	10	Math	82	31	37.80%	36.00%	Yes
3C	2013	10	Math	87	31	35.63%	41.80%	No
3C	2014	10	Math	98	30	30.61%	41.80%	No
3C	2012	3	Reading	69	58	84.06%	35.60%	Yes
3C	2013	3	Reading	89	50	56.18%	41.40%	Yes
3C	2014	3	Reading	97	52	53.61%	41.40%	Yes
3C	2012	4	Reading	91	71	78.02%	35.60%	Yes
3C	2013	4	Reading	97	49	50.52%	41.40%	Yes
3C	2014	4	Reading	95	39	41.05%	41.40%	No
3C	2012	5	Reading	101	64	63.37%	35.60%	Yes
3C	2013	5	Reading	110	74	67.27%	41.40%	Yes
3C	2014	5	Reading	95	51	53.68%	41.40%	Yes
3C	2012	6	Reading	96	57	59.38%	35.60%	Yes
3C	2013	6	Reading	121	51	42.15%	41.40%	Yes
3C	2014	6	Reading	116	57	49.14%	41.40%	Yes
3C	2012	7	Reading	92	53	57.61%	35.60%	Yes

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

### Indian River

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Grade</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u># Tested</u>	<u># Meets</u>	<u>% Meets</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>
3C	2013	7	Reading	106	39	36.79%	41.40%	No
3C	2014	7	Reading	127	45	35.43%	41.40%	No
3C	2012	8	Reading	110	66	60.00%	35.60%	Yes
3C	2013	8	Reading	112	50	44.64%	41.40%	Yes
3C	2014	8	Reading	119	44	36.97%	41.40%	No
3C	2012	10	Reading	83	37	44.58%	35.60%	Yes
3C	2013	10	Reading	88	33	37.50%	41.40%	No
3C	2014	10	Reading	94	44	46.81%	41.40%	Yes

### Indicator 4A - Disproportionality in Students Suspended > 10 Days

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>SY</u>	<u>Spec Ed Enroll</u>	<u>Reg Ed Enroll</u>	<u>Spec Ed Suspend</u>	<u>RegEd Suspend</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>	<u>Rate Ratio</u>
4A	2013	1195	7601	7	47	Yes	0.95

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

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

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Special Ed Enrolled</u>	<u>Spec Ed Suspend&gt;10 days</u>	<u>Rate Ratio</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>
4B	2013	Afr.American	264		3.62	1.26	Yes
4B	2013	AI/AK	18		0.00	1.26	Yes
4B	2013	Asian			0.00	1.26	Yes

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

### Indian River

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Special Ed Enrolled</u>	<u>Spec Ed Suspend&gt;10 days</u>	<u>Rate Ratio</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>
4B	2013	Hispanic	289		0.83	1.26	Yes
4B	2013	Multi.Racial	35		0.00	1.26	Yes
4B	2013	Nat.Haw./PI			0.00	1.26	Yes
4B	2013	White	581		0.82	1.26	Yes

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

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

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u># Outside &lt; 21%</u>	<u>% Outside &lt; 21%</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>
5A	2012	1183	717	60.61%	66.00%	No
5A	2013	1197	735	61.40%	68.00%	No
5A	2014	1270	843	66.38%	67.00%	No

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

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u># Outside &gt; 60%</u>	<u>% Outside &gt; 60%</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>
5B	2012	1183	193	16.31%	17.50%	Yes
5B	2013	1197	213	17.79%	17.30%	No
5B	2014	1270	239	18.82%	15.60%	No

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

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u># Separate</u>	<u>% Separate</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>
5C	2012	1183	144	12.17%	3.60%	No
5C	2013	1197	136	11.36%	3.50%	No
5C	2014	1270	95	7.48%	5.20%	No

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

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>FFY</u>	<u>Total EC</u>	<u># with Peers</u>	<u>% with Peers</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target</u>	
6	2012	246	63	25.61%	68.6%	No	Data for FFY 2011 is baseline.
6	2013	284	76	26.76%	45.0%	No	

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

### Indian River

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

<u>School Year</u>	<u>% Increase Rate of Growth</u>	<u>Target Increase Rate of Growth</u>	<u>Met Growth Target?</u>	<u>% Within Age Expectation</u>	<u>Target within Age</u>	<u>Met Age Target?</u>	<u>Skillset</u>	
7	2012	92.6	90.6	Yes	51.4	60.4	No	7A - Social/Emotional
7	2012	93.4	93	Yes	44	54.5	No	7B - Knowledge
7	2012	95.5	91.9	Yes	52.8	65	No	7C - Behavior

<u>School Year</u>	<u>% Increase Rate of Growth</u>	<u>Target Increase Rate of Growth</u>	<u>Met Growth Target?</u>	<u>% Within Age Expectation</u>	<u>Target within Age</u>	<u>Met Age Target?</u>	<u>Skillset</u>	
7	2013	96.7	85.2	Yes	58	54.2	Yes	7A - Social/Emotional
7	2013	94	87.3	Yes	46	49.8	No	7B - Knowledge
7	2013	96.6	87.3	Yes	72	65	Yes	7C - Behavior

<u>School Year</u>	<u>% Increase Rate of Growth</u>	<u>Target Increase Rate of Growth</u>	<u>Met Growth Target?</u>	<u>% Within Age Expectation</u>	<u>Target within Age</u>	<u>Met Age Target?</u>	<u>Skillset</u>	
7	2014	99	85.2	Yes	60	54.2	Yes	7A - Social/Emotional
7	2014	99	87.3	Yes	61	49.8	Yes	7B - Knowledge
7	2014	96	87.3	Yes	75	65	Yes	7C - Behavior

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

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>% Agree</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>
8	2012	158	12	170	92.94%	87.00%	Yes
8	2013	143	11	154	92.86%	87.00%	Yes
8	2014	139	3	142	97.89%	87.00%	Yes

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

### Indian River

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

Disproportionate representation data are found in the APR.

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

9	2012	Yes	0.0%	Yes
---	------	-----	------	-----

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

11	2012	8	0	100.00%	100.00%	Yes
----	------	---	---	---------	---------	-----

11	2013	17	0	100.00%	100.00%	Yes
----	------	----	---	---------	---------	-----

11	2014	1	0	100.00%	100.00%	Yes
----	------	---	---	---------	---------	-----



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

### Indian River

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

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Referred Less Not Eligible and Parent Refusals</u>	<u># Services By Age 3</u>	<u>% Services by Age 3</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>
12	2012	38	38	100.00%	100.00%	Yes
12	2013	42	42	100.00%	100.00%	Yes
12	2014	26	26	100.00%	100.00%	Yes

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

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>IEP's Reviewed</u>	<u>IEP's Meeting Standard</u>	<u>% Meeting Standard</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>	
13	2012	63	40	64.00%	100.0	No	
13	2013	Data was not reviewed for this reporting period.				100.0	
13	2014	21	19	90.48%	100.0	No	