



## 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. Phyllis R. Kohel  
Milford School District  
906 Lakeview Avenue  
Milford, DE 19963

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

Dear Dr. Kohel:

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.

Milford 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  
Laura Manges, Director of Special Education Services  
Barbara Mazza, Education Associate, Exceptional Children Resources  
Maria N. Locuniak, PhD., NCSP, 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)	<b>and</b>	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)	<b>and/or</b>	LEA is engaged in a Corrective Action Plan related to any compliance indicator(s)/issues or does not meet targets for results	<b>and/or</b>	Outstanding Noncompliance from On-Site Monitoring (beyond 1 year)
<b>Needs Intervention</b>	<b>=</b>	≤ 59% (compliance and results combined)	<b>and/or</b>	LEA is engaged in an Intervention Plan or Compliance Agreement related to any compliance indicator(s)/issues or does not meet targets for results	<b>and/or</b>	Outstanding Noncompliance from On-Site Monitoring (beyond 2 years)
<b>Needs Significant Intervention</b>	Phase in Spring, 2016					

# Milford 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%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Indicator 12: Preschool Transition Part C to Part B	2013 - 2014 SY	100.00%	97.00%	100.00%	1	1
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition (LEA - actual percentage)	2013 - 2014 SY	100%	48.43%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Equitable Services/Needs-Based Funding/Fiscal Monitoring					1	1

Results Indicators	Data From: (Time Period)	SPP Target 2013 - 2014	State Data	LEA Data	LEA Score	Possible Points	
Indicator 3B Participation Math	Spring, 2014						
Grade 3		95.00%	98.60%	100.00%	1	1	
Grade 4		95.00%	98.78%	100.00%	1	1	
Grade 5		95.00%	98.76%	100.00%	1	1	
Grade 6		95.00%	97.69%	97.67%	1	1	
Grade 7		95.00%	97.43%	98.04%	1	1	
Grade 8		95.00%	97.78%	96.15%	1	1	
Grade 10		95.00%	92.45%	100.00%	1	1	
Indicator 3B Participation Reading							
Grade 3		95.00%	96.22%	100.00%	1	1	
Grade 4		95.00%	96.60%	97.83%	1	1	
Grade 5		95.00%	96.70%	100.00%	1	1	
Grade 6		95.00%	96.33%	100.00%	1	1	
Grade 7		95.00%	96.41%	100.00%	1	1	
Grade 8		95.00%	96.87%	96.23%	1	1	
Grade 10		95.00%	90.10%	96.30%	1	1	
Indicator 3C Performance Rate Math							
Grade 3		41.80%	36.69%	71.43%	1	1	
Grade 4		41.80%	37.00%	77.78%	1	1	
Grade 5		41.80%	33.08%	67.21%	1	1	
Grade 6	41.80%	23.21%	21.43%	0	1		
Grade 7	41.80%	27.61%	38.00%	0	1		
Grade 8	41.80%	27.73%	20.00%	0	1		
Grade 10	41.80%	30.96%	19.23%	0	1		

# Milford 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%	52.38%	1	1
Grade 4		41.40%	36.45%	71.11%	1	1
Grade 5		41.40%	38.91%	62.30%	1	1
Grade 6		41.40%	30.32%	27.91%	0	1
Grade 7		41.40%	30.04%	20.41%	0	1
Grade 8		41.40%	29.29%	13.73%	0	1
Grade 10		41.40%	34.56%	23.08%	0	1
Indicator 4A: Significant Discrepancy in the rates of long-term suspension of students with disabilities Note - The LEA score is the Rate Ratio which for FFY 2012 had a target of 1.26		2012 - 2013 SY	0.00%	2.56%	Met target	1
Indicator 7A: Early Childhood Outcomes - Social/Emotional						
Percent Increase Rate of Growth	June, 2014	85.20%	86.41%	97.00%	1	1
Percent Within Age Expectation		54.20%	48.81%	70.00%	1	1
Indicator 7B: Early Childhood Outcomes - Knowledge						
Percent Increase Rate of Growth		87.30%	86.63%	89.00%	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%	90.00%	1	1
Percent Within Age Expectation		65.00%	61.51%	80.00%	1	1

<b>Determination Summary</b>	
Compliance Indicators Score	5
Out of a Possible:	5
Results Indicators Score	27
Out of a Possible:	35
Score Total	32
Out of a Possible:	40
Percentage:	80.0%

Other: Engaged in a Prong 1/Prong 2 for On-site Monitoring

**Annual Determination: Meets Requirements**

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

### Milford

#### 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	29		74.36%	87.00%	No
1	2013	28		84.85%	87.00%	No
1	2014	30		75.00%	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	112		7.14%	3.80%	No
2	2013	152		3.29%	3.80%	Yes
2	2014	132		3.79%	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			
3A	2013	Elem	Yes	Yes	Yes
3A	2013	Middle	Yes	Yes	Yes
3A	2013	High Sch			

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

### Milford

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

AYP was not calculated for this LEA in FFY 2013.

### 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	57	56	98.25%	99.3%	No
3B	2013	3	Math	54	54	100.00%	99.3%	Yes
3B	2014	3	Math	42	42	100.00%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	4	Math	41	41	100.00%	99.0%	Yes
3B	2013	4	Math	57	57	100.00%	99.0%	Yes
3B	2014	4	Math	45	45	100.00%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	5	Math	48	45	93.75%	99.3%	No
3B	2013	5	Math	41	41	100.00%	99.3%	Yes
3B	2014	5	Math	61	61	100.00%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	6	Math	51	51	100.00%	98.5%	Yes
3B	2013	6	Math	49	49	100.00%	98.5%	Yes
3B	2014	6	Math	43	42	97.67%	95.0%	Yes



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

### Milford

<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	31	31	100.00%	98.3%	Yes
3B	2013	7	Math	47	47	100.00%	98.3%	Yes
3B	2014	7	Math	51	50	98.04%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	8	Math	45	45	100.00%	97.4%	Yes
3B	2013	8	Math	35	35	100.00%	97.4%	Yes
3B	2014	8	Math	52	50	96.15%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	10	Math	30	29	96.67%	95.4%	Yes
3B	2013	10	Math	37	37	100.00%	95.4%	Yes
3B	2014	10	Math	26	26	100.00%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	3	Reading	57	55	96.49%	99.2%	No
3B	2013	3	Reading	48	48	100.00%	99.2%	Yes
3B	2014	3	Reading	42	42	100.00%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	4	Reading	40	40	100.00%	98.7%	Yes
3B	2013	4	Reading	58	58	100.00%	98.7%	Yes
3B	2014	4	Reading	46	45	97.83%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	5	Reading	48	46	95.83%	99.5%	No
3B	2013	5	Reading	41	41	100.00%	99.5%	Yes

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

### Milford

<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	61	61	100.00%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	6	Reading	51	51	100.00%	98.4%	Yes
3B	2013	6	Reading	49	49	100.00%	98.4%	Yes
3B	2014	6	Reading	43	43	100.00%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	7	Reading	30	30	100.00%	98.2%	Yes
3B	2013	7	Reading	47	47	100.00%	98.2%	Yes
3B	2014	7	Reading	49	49	100.00%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	8	Reading	45	45	100.00%	97.6%	Yes
3B	2013	8	Reading	35	35	100.00%	97.6%	Yes
3B	2014	8	Reading	53	51	96.23%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	10	Reading	30	28	93.33%	95.8%	No
3B	2013	10	Reading	37	37	100.00%	95.8%	Yes
3B	2014	10	Reading	27	26	96.30%	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	56	39	69.64%	36.00%	Yes
3C	2013	3	Math	49	32	65.31%	41.80%	Yes

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

### Milford

<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	42	30	71.43%	41.80%	Yes
3C	2012	4	Math	41	33	80.49%	36.00%	Yes
3C	2013	4	Math	57	39	68.42%	41.80%	Yes
3C	2014	4	Math	45	35	77.78%	41.80%	Yes
3C	2012	5	Math	45	39	86.67%	36.00%	Yes
3C	2013	5	Math	41	17	41.46%	41.80%	No
3C	2014	5	Math	61	41	67.21%	41.80%	Yes
3C	2012	6	Math	51	19	37.25%	36.00%	Yes
3C	2013	6	Math	49	22	44.90%	41.80%	Yes
3C	2014	6	Math	42		21.43%	41.80%	No
3C	2012	7	Math	30		40.00%	36.00%	Yes
3C	2013	7	Math	47		14.89%	41.80%	No
3C	2014	7	Math	50	19	38.00%	41.80%	No
3C	2012	8	Math	45	19	42.22%	36.00%	Yes
3C	2013	8	Math	35		25.71%	41.80%	No
3C	2014	8	Math	50		20.00%	41.80%	No

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

### Milford

<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	29		31.03%	36.00%	No
3C	2013	10	Math	37		18.92%	41.80%	No
3C	2014	10	Math	26		19.23%	41.80%	No
3C	2012	3	Reading	55	38	69.09%	35.60%	Yes
3C	2013	3	Reading	48	29	60.42%	41.40%	Yes
3C	2014	3	Reading	42	22	52.38%	41.40%	Yes
3C	2012	4	Reading	40	33	82.50%	35.60%	Yes
3C	2013	4	Reading	58	35	60.34%	41.40%	Yes
3C	2014	4	Reading	45	32	71.11%	41.40%	Yes
3C	2012	5	Reading	46	44	95.65%	35.60%	Yes
3C	2013	5	Reading	41	25	60.98%	41.40%	Yes
3C	2014	5	Reading	61	38	62.30%	41.40%	Yes
3C	2012	6	Reading	51		21.57%	35.60%	No
3C	2013	6	Reading	49		28.57%	41.40%	No
3C	2014	6	Reading	43		27.91%	41.40%	No
3C	2012	7	Reading	30		46.67%	35.60%	Yes

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

### Milford

<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	47		23.40%	41.40%	No
3C	2014	7	Reading	49		20.41%	41.40%	No
3C	2012	8	Reading	45		31.11%	35.60%	No
3C	2013	8	Reading	35		20.00%	41.40%	No
3C	2014	8	Reading	51		13.73%	41.40%	No
3C	2012	10	Reading	28		28.57%	35.60%	No
3C	2013	10	Reading	37		27.03%	41.40%	No
3C	2014	10	Reading	26		23.08%	41.40%	No

---

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

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>SY</u>	<u>Spec Ed Enroll</u>	<u>Reg Ed Enroll</u>	<u>Spec Ed Suspend</u>	<u>RegEd Suspend</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>	<u>Rate Ratio</u>
4A	2013	562	3529	2	91	Yes	0.14

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	195		0.00	1.26	Yes
4B	2013	AI/AK			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

### Milford

<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	79		0.00	1.26	Yes
4B	2013	Multi.Racial			0.00	1.26	Yes
4B	2013	Nat.Haw./PI			0.00	1.26	Yes
4B	2013	White	269		2.09	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	572	441	77.10%	66.00%	Yes
5A	2013	562	448	79.72%	68.00%	Yes
5A	2014	515	412	80.00%	67.00%	Yes

### 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	572	71	12.41%	17.50%	Yes
5B	2013	562	61	10.85%	17.30%	Yes
5B	2014	515	56	10.87%	15.60%	Yes

### 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	572		1.57%	3.60%	Yes
5C	2013	562		0.53%	3.50%	Yes
5C	2014	515		0.78%	5.20%	Yes

### 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	59	59	100.00%	68.6%	Yes	Data for FFY 2011 is baseline.
6	2013	48	20	41.67%	45.0%	No	

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

### Milford

**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	96.3	90.6	Yes	75	60.4	Yes	7A - Social/Emotional
7	2012	96.2	93	Yes	75	54.5	Yes	7B - Knowledge
7	2012	100	91.9	Yes	91.7	65	Yes	7C - Behavior

<u>School Year</u>	<u>% Increase Rate of Growth</u>	<u>Target Increase Rate of Growth</u>	<u>Met Growth Target?</u>	<u>% Within Age Expectation</u>	<u>Target within Age</u>	<u>Met Age Target?</u>	<u>Skillset</u>	
7	2013	93	85.2	Yes	62	54.2	Yes	7A - Social/Emotional
7	2013	92	87.3	Yes	59	49.8	Yes	7B - Knowledge
7	2013	88	87.3	Yes	79	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	97	85.2	Yes	70	54.2	Yes	7A - Social/Emotional
7	2014	89	87.3	Yes	61	49.8	Yes	7B - Knowledge
7	2014	90	87.3	Yes	80	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	65	18	83	78.31%	87.00%	No
8	2013	43	3	46	93.48%	87.00%	Yes
8	2014	40	1	41	97.56%	87.00%	Yes

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

Milford

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

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Disprop representation is result of inappropriate identification</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target</u>
9	2012	No	0.0%	Yes
<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Disprop representation is result of inappropriate identification</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target</u>
9	2013	No	0.0%	Yes
<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Disprop representation is result of inappropriate identification</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target</u>
9	2014	No	0.0%	Yes

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

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year:</u>	<u>Disprop. Rep. is result of Inaprop. Identification</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target</u>
10	2012	No	0.0%	Yes
<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year:</u>	<u>Disprop. Rep. is result of Inaprop. Identification</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target</u>
10	2013	No	0.0%	Yes
<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year:</u>	<u>Disprop. Rep. is result of Inaprop. Identification</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target</u>
10	2014	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	2	0	100.00%	100.00%	Yes
11	2013				100.00%	N/A
		No initial evaluation data was reported during this reporting period by this LEA.				
11	2014				100.00%	N/A
		No initial evaluation data was reported during this reporting period by this LEA.				



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

### Milford

**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	6	6	100.00%	100.00%	Yes
12	2013	14	14	100.00%	100.00%	Yes
12	2014	14	14	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	66	22	33.00%	100.0	No	
13	2013	Data was not reviewed for this reporting period.				100.0	
13	2014	Data was not reviewed for this reporting period.				100.0	