



DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

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

Steven H. Godowsky
Secretary of Education
Voice: (302) 735-4000
FAX: (302) 739-4654

May 31, 2016

Dr. Brenda Wynder
Superintendent
Lake Forest School District
5423 Killens Pond Road
Felton, DE 19943

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

Dear Dr. Wynder:

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

For FFY 2014, LEAs are receiving their annual determination based on a combination of the following compliance and results indicators:

- **Compliance:**

- Indicator 4B Disproportionality in the rates of long-term suspensions of students with disabilities by race/ethnicity
- 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

- **Results:**

- Indicator 1 Graduation Rate
- Indicator 2 Drop Out Rate
- 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 a review of your LEA's data, the Department has determined your LEA Needs Intervention in implementing the regulations of the IDEA.

Lake Forest School District
LEA Determination Under the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)
May 31, 2016
Page 2

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

Exceptional Children Resources staff will be in contact with Bernadette Maxwell to discuss next steps. In the interim, please do not hesitate to contact me by phone at (302) 735-4210, or by e-mail maryann.mieczkowski@doe.k12.de.us.

Sincerely,



Mary Ann Mieczkowski
Director, Exceptional Children Resources

Sincerely,



Michael S. Watson
Chief Academic Officer

MAM/MNLbjm
Attachment

cc: Steven H. Godowsky, Secretary of Education
Michael S. Watson, Chief Academic Officer
Bernadette Maxwell, Supervisor of Special Programs
Barbara Mazza, Education Associate, Exceptional Children Resources
Maria N. Locuniak, Education Ph.D., NCSP, Education Associate, Exceptional Children Resources
Jill Scannell, 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, and 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 in 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 2014 LEA Annual Determinations

FFY 2014 determinations were made based on a combination of the following compliance and results indicators:

- **Compliance:**

- Indicator 4B Disproportionality in the rates of long-term suspensions of students with disabilities by race/ethnicity
- 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

- **Results:**

- Indicator 1 Graduation Rate
- Indicator 2 Drop Out Rate
- Indicator 3B Participation in the State Assessment
- Indicator 3C Proficiency on the State Assessment
- Indicator 4A Significant Discrepancy in the rates of long-term suspension of students with disabilities
- Indicator 7 Early Childhood Outcomes.

Meets Requirements	=	≥ 80% (compliance and results combined)	and	LEA may be engaged in a Corrective Action Plan.	and/or	If monitored on-site, LEA is engaged in Prong 1 or Prong 2 corrective action.
Needs Assistance	=	60% to 79% (compliance and results combined)	and/or	LEA is engaged in an Intervention Plan.	and/or	Outstanding Noncompliance from On-Site Monitoring (beyond 1 year)
Needs Intervention	=	≤ 59% (compliance and results combined)	and/or	LEA is engaged in a Compliance Agreement.	and/or	Outstanding Noncompliance from On-Site Monitoring (beyond 2 years)

**Spring, 2016 LEA Annual Determination for FFY 2014
Lake Forest School District**

Compliance Indicators	Data From: (Time Period)	SPP Target 2014 - 2015	State Data	LEA Data	LEA Score	Possible Points
Indicator 4B: Percentage of LEAs with Significant Discrepancy in the Rates of Long-Term Suspensions and Expulsions of Students with Disabilities by Race/Ethnicity and Noncompliant Policies, Procedures, and Practices	2013-2014	0.00%	0.00%	Met Target	1	1
Indicator 9: Disproportionality/All Disabilities	2014-2015	0.00%	2.33%	< 1%	1	1
Indicator 10: Disproportionality/Specific Disabilities	2014-2015	0.00%	2.33%	< 1%	1	1
Indicator 11: Initial Evaluation Timelines	2014-2015	100.00%	99.46%	NA	NA	NA
Indicator 12: Preschool Transition Part C to Part B	2014-2015	100.00%	97.84%	88.00%	0	1
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition (LEA - Actual Percentage)	2014-2015	100.00%	98.15%	> 99%	1	1

Results Indicators	Data From: (Time Period)	SPP Target 2014 - 2015	State Data	LEA Data	LEA Score	Possible Points
Indicator 1: Graduation Rate	2013-2014	66.70%	67.66%	59.50%	0	1
Indicator 2: Drop Out Rate	2013-2014	5.20%	3.49%	5.88%	0	1
Indicator 3B: Participation Math						
Grade 3	2014-2015	95.00%	97.10%	98.43%	1	1
Grade 4		95.00%	97.03%	> 99%	1	1
Grade 5		95.00%	97.41%	> 99%	1	1
Grade 6		95.00%	97.28%	98.00%	1	1
Grade 7		95.00%	97.45%	95.23%	1	1
Grade 8		95.00%	96.25%	93.44%	0	1
Grade 11		95.00%	92.09%	92.85%	0	1
Indicator 3B: Participation ELA						
Grade 3	2014-2015	95.00%	97.16%	95.24%	1	1
Grade 4		95.00%	97.27%	> 99%	1	1
Grade 5		95.00%	97.76%	> 99%	1	1
Grade 6		95.00%	97.34%	98.00%	1	1
Grade 7		95.00%	97.33%	96.77%	1	1
Grade 8		95.00%	96.50%	93.33%	0	1
Grade 11		95.00%	91.95%	92.85%	0	1

Results Indicators	Data From: (Time Period)	SPP Target 2014 - 2015	State Data	LEA Data	LEA Score	Possible Points
Indicator 3C: Performance Rate Math						
Grade 3	2014-2015	15.00%	25.00%	28.57%	1	1
Grade 4		15.00%	18.59%	23.08%	1	1
Grade 5		15.00%	13.62%	19.51%	1	1
Grade 6		15.00%	9.67%	14.29%	0	1
Grade 7		15.00%	11.15%	16.67%	1	1
Grade 8		15.00%	11.73%	26.32%	1	1
Grade 11		15.00%	8.67%	11.54%	0	1
Results Indicators	Data From: (Time Period)	SPP Target 2014 - 2015	State Data	LEA Data	LEA Score	Possible Points
Indicator 3C: Performance Rate ELA						
Grade 3	2014-2015	19.30%	25.31%	30.00%	1	1
Grade 4		19.30%	21.67%	17.31%	0	1
Grade 5		19.30%	19.82%	30.95%	1	1
Grade 6		19.30%	15.13%	24.49%	1	1
Grade 7		19.30%	15.43%	16.67%	0	1
Grade 8		19.30%	16.45%	23.21%	1	1
Grade 11		19.30%	18.60%	19.23%	0	1
Indicator 4A: Percentage of LEAs with Significant Discrepancy in the Rates of Long-Term Suspensions and Expulsions of Students with Disabilities Note - The LEA score is the Rate Ratio which for FFY 2013 had a target of 1.24						
2013-2014		0.00%	0.00%	< 1%	1	1
Indicator 7A: Early Childhood Outcomes - Social/Emotional						
Percent Increase Rate of Growth	2014-2015	86.20%	85.86%	61.54%	0	1
Percent Within Age Expectation		55.30%	50.32%	35.29%	0	1
Indicator 7B: Early Childhood Outcomes - Knowledge						
Percent Increase Rate of Growth	2014-2015	89.00%	87.18%	68.75%	0	1
Percent Within Age Expectation		50.90%	47.06%	29.41%	0	1
Indicator 7C: Early Childhood Outcomes - Behavior						
Percent Increase Rate of Growth	2014-2015	88.10%	87.16%	50.00%	0	1
Percent Within Age Expectation		65.00%	63.58%	52.94%	0	1

Determination Summary	
Compliance Indicators Score	4
Possible Points:	5
Results Indicators Score	20
Possible Points:	37
Score Total	24
Out of a Possible:	42
Percentage:	57.14%
Annual Determination: Needs Intervention	

District Progress on State Performance Plan Indicators for Students with Disabilities- FFY 2014

Lake Forest School District

Indicator 1: Graduation Rates		Graduates	Denominator	Graduation Rate	Target	Met Target?	Note:
School Year	2014	22	37	59.50%	66.70%	No	NA

Indicator 2: Drop-Out Rates		Enrollment	Drop-Outs	Drop-Out Rate	Target	Met Target?	Note:
School Year	2014	119	-	5.88%	5.20%	No	NA

Indicator 3B: Participation in State Assessment		Grade	Subject	Number Eligible	Number Tested	Percent Tested	Target	Met Target?
School Year	2015	3	ELA	63	60	95.24%	95.00%	Yes
	2015	4	ELA	52	52	> 99%	95.00%	Yes
	2015	5	ELA	42	42	> 99%	95.00%	Yes
	2015	6	ELA	50	49	98.00%	95.00%	Yes
	2015	7	ELA	62	60	96.77%	95.00%	Yes
	2015	8	ELA	60	56	93.33%	95.00%	No
	2015	11	ELA	28	26	92.85%	95.00%	No
	2015	3	MATH	64	63	98.43%	95.00%	Yes
	2015	4	MATH	52	52	> 99%	95.00%	Yes
	2015	5	MATH	41	41	> 99%	95.00%	Yes
	2015	6	MATH	50	49	98.00%	95.00%	Yes
	2015	7	MATH	63	60	95.23%	95.00%	Yes
	2015	8	MATH	61	57	93.44%	95.00%	No
	2015	11	MATH	28	26	92.85%	95.00%	No

Indicator 3C: Performance in State Assessments		Grade	Subject	Number Tested	Number Meets	Percent Meets	Target	Met Target?
School Year	2015	3	ELA	60	18	30.00%	19.30%	Yes
	2015	4	ELA	52	-	17.31%	19.30%	No
	2015	5	ELA	42	-	30.95%	19.30%	Yes
	2015	6	ELA	49	-	24.49%	19.30%	Yes
	2015	7	ELA	60	-	16.67%	19.30%	No
	2015	8	ELA	56	-	23.21%	19.30%	Yes
	2015	11	ELA	26	-	19.23%	19.30%	No
	2015	3	MATH	63	18	28.57%	15.00%	Yes
	2015	4	MATH	52	-	23.08%	15.00%	Yes
	2015	5	MATH	41	-	19.51%	15.00%	Yes
	2015	6	MATH	49	-	14.29%	15.00%	No
	2015	7	MATH	60	-	16.67%	15.00%	Yes
	2015	8	MATH	57	-	26.32%	15.00%	Yes
	2015	11	MATH	26	-	11.54%	15.00%	No

Indicator 4A: Percentage of LEAs with Significant Discrepancy in the Rates of Long-Term Suspensions and Expulsions of Students with Disabilities
 Note - The LEA score is the Rate Ratio which for FFY 2013 had a target of 1.24.

School Year	SWD Enrollment	Non-SWD Enrollment	SWD Suspended > 10 Days	Non-SWD Suspended	Rate Ratio	Rate Ratio Target	Met Target?	Note:
2014	572	3208	-	-	0	1.24	Yes	NA

Indicator 4B: Percentage of LEAs with Significant Discrepancy in the Rates of Long-Term Suspensions and Expulsions of Students with Disabilities by Race/Ethnicity and Noncompliant Policies, Procedures, and Practices

School Year	Race	SWD Enrolled	SWD Suspended > 10 Days	Rate Ratio	Target	Met Target?	Note:
2014	Hispanic	39	-	0.00	0.00	Yes	NA
2014	American Indian	-	-	0.00	0.00	Yes	NA
2014	African American	166	-	0.00	0.00	Yes	NA
2014	White	342	-	0.00	0.00	Yes	NA
2014	Asian	-	-	0.00	0.00	Yes	NA
2014	Haw./P.I.	-	-	0.00	0.00	NA	NA
2014	Multiple	20	-	0.00	0.00	Yes	NA

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

School Year	Total	Total in LRE A	Percent in LRE A	Target	Met Target?
2015	604	461	76.32%	68.00%	Yes

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

School Year	Total	Total in LRE B	Percent in LRE B	Target	Met Target?
2015	604	88	14.57%	15.50%	Yes

Indicator 5C: LRE Ages 6 to 21 Separate Setting

School Year	Total	Total in Separate Setting	Percent in Separate Setting	Target	Met Target?
2015	604	-	< 1%	5.00%	Yes

Indicator 6: LRE Ages 3 to 5 Early Childhood with Typical Peers

School Year	Total EC	Total With Peers	Percent With Peers	Target	Met Target?	Note:
2015	72	51	70.83%	46.00%	Yes	NA

Indicator 7: Percent of Preschool Students Ages 3 to 5 Who Demonstrate Improved Skills in Social/Emotional, Knowledge, and Appropriate Behaviors to Meet Needs

School Year	Knowledge Increased Rate Growth	Knowledge Increased Target	Knowledge Increased Met Target?	Knowledge Within Age Expectation	Knowledge Within Age Expectation Target	Knowledge Within Age Expectation Met Target?	Behavior Increased Rate Growth	Behavior Increased Target	Behavior Increased Met Target?	Behavior Within Age Expectation	Behavior Within Age Expectation Target	Behavior Within Age Expectation Met Target?	Social/Emotional Increased Rate Growth	Social/Emotional Increased Target	Social/Emotional Increased Met Target?	Social/Emotional Within Age Expectation	Social/Emotional Within Age Expectation Target	Social/Emotional Within Age Expectation Met Target?
2015	68.75%	89.00%	No	29.41%	50.90%	No	50.00%	88.10%	No	65.00%	65.00%	No	61.54%	86.20%	No	35.29%	55.30%	No
2015																		
2015																		

Note: NA

Indicator 8 - Percent of Parents with a Child Receiving Special Education Services Who Report That School Facilitated Parent Involvement as a Means of Improving Services and Results for Children with Disabilities

School Year	Agree	Disagree	Total	Percent Agree	Target	Met Target?	Note:
2015	42	-	47	89.36%	87.00%	Yes	NA

Indicator 9 - Percent of LEA's with Disproportional Representation of Racial and Ethnic Groups in Special Education and Related Services That is a Result of Inappropriate Identification

School Year	Disproportionate Representation as a Result of Inappropriate Identification?	Target	Met Target?
2015	< 1%	0.00%	Yes

Indicator 10 - Percent of LEA's with Disproportional Representation of Racial and Ethnic Groups in Specific Disability Categories That is a Result of Inappropriate Identification

School Year	Disproportionate Representation as a Result of Inappropriate Identification?	Target	Met Target?
2015	< 1%	0.00%	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

School Year	Within Timelines	Not Within Timelines	Percent Within	Target	Met Target?	Note:
2015	NA	NA	NA	100.00%	N/A	Data Was Not Collected for this reporting period.

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 Birthday

<u>School Year</u>	<u>Parent Referrals</u>	<u>Number with Services by Age 3</u>	<u>Percent Services by Age 3</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>	<u>Note:</u>
2015	-	-	88.00%	100.00%	No	NA

Indicator 13 - Percent of Youth Age 14 and Above With an IEP That Includes Coordinated, Measurable, Annual IEP Goals and Transition Services that Will Reasonably Enable the Student to Meet the Post-Secondary Goals.

<u>School Year</u>	<u>IEP's Reviewed</u>	<u>IEP's Meeting Standard</u>	<u>Percent Meeting Standard</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>	<u>Note:</u>
2015	231	231	> 99%	100.00%	Yes	NA

Indicator 14 - Post-School Outcomes (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, or C. Enrolled in Higher Education or in Some Other Post-Secondary Education or Training Program; or Competitively Employed or in Some Other Employment Within One Year of Leaving High School

<u>School Year</u>	<u>Total Exits</u>	<u>Total Respondents</u>	<u>Group A Respondents</u>	<u>Group A Percentage</u>	<u>Group A Target</u>	<u>Group A Target Met?</u>	<u>Note:</u>
2014	26	-	-	33.33%	25.00%	Yes	
			<u>Group B Respondents</u>	<u>Group B Percentage</u>	<u>Group B Target</u>	<u>Group B Target Met?</u>	NA
			-	55.56%	56.00%	No	
			<u>Group C Respondents</u>	<u>Group C Percentage</u>	<u>Group C Target</u>	<u>Group C Target Met?</u>	
			-	55.56%	100.00%	No	