



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

Mr. David Perrington
Seaford School District
390 North Market Street Extended
Seaford, DE 19973

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

Dear Mr. Perrington:

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 **NEEDS INTERVENTION** in implementing the regulations of the IDEA.

Seaford 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.

Exceptional Children Resources staff will be in contact with you to discuss next steps including the development of a **Corrective Action Plan**. 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 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
David J. Alba, Ed.D., Director of Special Programs & Services
Barbara Mazza, Education Associate, Exceptional Children Resources
Maria N. Locuniak, PhD., NCSP, Education Associate, Exceptional Children Resources
Tracy Neugebauer, 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

Meets Requirements	=	≥ 80% (compliance and results combined)	and	If monitored on-site, LEA is engaged in Prong 1 or Prong 2		
Needs Assistance	=	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)
Needs Intervention	=	≤ 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)
Needs Significant Intervention	Phase in Spring, 2016					

Seaford 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%	33.33%	0	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%	98.51%	1	1	
Grade 4		95.00%	98.78%	100.00%	1	1	
Grade 5		95.00%	98.76%	98.44%	1	1	
Grade 6		95.00%	97.69%	100.00%	1	1	
Grade 7		95.00%	97.43%	96.77%	1	1	
Grade 8		95.00%	97.78%	100.00%	1	1	
Grade 10		95.00%	92.45%	86.96%	0	1	
Indicator 3B Participation Reading							
Grade 3		95.00%	96.22%	95.52%	1	1	
Grade 4		95.00%	96.60%	96.61%	1	1	
Grade 5		95.00%	96.70%	95.31%	1	1	
Grade 6		95.00%	96.33%	100.00%	1	1	
Grade 7		95.00%	96.41%	96.77%	1	1	
Grade 8		95.00%	96.87%	100.00%	1	1	
Grade 10		95.00%	90.10%	86.96%	0	1	
Indicator 3C Performance Rate Math							
Grade 3		41.80%	36.69%	10.61%	0	1	
Grade 4		41.80%	37.00%	27.12%	0	1	
Grade 5		41.80%	33.08%	25.40%	0	1	
Grade 6	41.80%	23.21%	11.11%	0	1		
Grade 7	41.80%	27.61%	16.67%	0	1		
Grade 8	41.80%	27.73%	27.50%	0	1		
Grade 10	41.80%	30.96%	35.00%	0	1		

Seaford 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	Spring, 2014					
Grade 3		41.40%	33.87%	6.25%	0	1
Grade 4		41.40%	36.45%	28.07%	0	1
Grade 5		41.40%	38.91%	34.43%	0	1
Grade 6		41.40%	30.32%	25.93%	0	1
Grade 7		41.40%	30.04%	23.33%	0	1
Grade 8		41.40%	29.29%	27.50%	0	1
Grade 10		41.40%	34.56%	30.00%	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	1
Indicator 7A: Early Childhood Outcomes - Social/Emotional	June, 2014					
Percent Increase Rate of Growth		85.20%	86.41%	77.00%	0	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%	90.00%	1	1
Percent Within Age Expectation		49.80%	45.39%	60.00%	1	1
Indicator 7C: Early Childhood Outcomes - Behavior						
Percent Increase Rate of Growth		87.30%	85.60%	80.00%	0	1
Percent Within Age Expectation	65.00%	61.51%	80.00%	1	1	

Determination Summary	
Compliance Indicators Score	5
Out of a Possible:	6
Results Indicators Score	17
Out of a Possible:	35
Score Total	22
Out of a Possible:	41
Percentage:	53.7%
Other: Engaged in Prong 1/Prong 2 for On-Site Monitoring	
Other: Engaged in a Corrective Action Plan as a results of an Administrative Complaint	

Annual Determination: Needs Intervention

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

Seaford

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	27		77.14%	87.00%	No
1	2013	17		77.27%	87.00%	No
1	2014			50.00%	63.00%	No

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	123		6.50%	3.80%	No
2	2013	107		4.67%	3.80%	No
2	2014	113		7.96%	5.50%	No

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

Seaford

<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	No	Yes	No
3A	2014	Middle	No	No	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	41	41	100.00%	99.3%	Yes
3B	2013	3	Math	56	56	100.00%	99.3%	Yes
3B	2014	3	Math	67	66	98.51%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	4	Math	44	44	100.00%	99.0%	Yes
3B	2013	4	Math	61	61	100.00%	99.0%	Yes
3B	2014	4	Math	59	59	100.00%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	5	Math	56	56	100.00%	99.3%	Yes
3B	2013	5	Math	57	57	100.00%	99.3%	Yes
3B	2014	5	Math	64	63	98.44%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	6	Math	47	47	100.00%	98.5%	Yes
3B	2013	6	Math	62	62	100.00%	98.5%	Yes
3B	2014	6	Math	54	54	100.00%	95.0%	Yes

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

Seaford

<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	47	46	97.87%	98.3%	No
3B	2013	7	Math	46	46	100.00%	98.3%	Yes
3B	2014	7	Math	62	60	96.77%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	8	Math	24	23	95.83%	97.4%	No
3B	2013	8	Math	47	47	100.00%	97.4%	Yes
3B	2014	8	Math	40	40	100.00%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	10	Math	26	25	96.15%	95.4%	Yes
3B	2013	10	Math	26	26	100.00%	95.4%	Yes
3B	2014	10	Math	23	20	86.96%	95.0%	No
3B	2012	3	Reading	41	36	87.80%	99.2%	No
3B	2013	3	Reading	51	51	100.00%	99.2%	Yes
3B	2014	3	Reading	67	64	95.52%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	4	Reading	44	40	90.91%	98.7%	No
3B	2013	4	Reading	55	55	100.00%	98.7%	Yes
3B	2014	4	Reading	59	57	96.61%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	5	Reading	56	50	89.29%	99.5%	No
3B	2013	5	Reading	57	57	100.00%	99.5%	Yes

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

Seaford

<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	64	61	95.31%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	6	Reading	47	45	95.74%	98.4%	No
3B	2013	6	Reading	63	63	100.00%	98.4%	Yes
3B	2014	6	Reading	54	54	100.00%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	7	Reading	47	46	97.87%	98.2%	No
3B	2013	7	Reading	45	45	100.00%	98.2%	Yes
3B	2014	7	Reading	62	60	96.77%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	8	Reading	24	22	91.67%	97.6%	No
3B	2013	8	Reading	48	48	100.00%	97.6%	Yes
3B	2014	8	Reading	40	40	100.00%	95.0%	Yes
3B	2012	10	Reading	26	24	92.31%	95.8%	No
3B	2013	10	Reading	25	25	100.00%	95.8%	Yes
3B	2014	10	Reading	23	20	86.96%	95.0%	No

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	41	15	36.59%	36.00%	Yes
3C	2013	3	Math	56		25.00%	41.80%	No

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

Seaford

<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	66		10.61%	41.80%	No
3C	2012	4	Math	42		30.95%	36.00%	No
3C	2013	4	Math	61		16.39%	41.80%	No
3C	2014	4	Math	59	16	27.12%	41.80%	No
3C	2012	5	Math	55	17	30.91%	36.00%	No
3C	2013	5	Math	57		17.54%	41.80%	No
3C	2014	5	Math	63	16	25.40%	41.80%	No
3C	2012	6	Math	46		28.26%	36.00%	No
3C	2013	6	Math	62		12.90%	41.80%	No
3C	2014	6	Math	54		11.11%	41.80%	No
3C	2012	7	Math	46	15	32.61%	36.00%	No
3C	2013	7	Math	46		23.91%	41.80%	No
3C	2014	7	Math	60		16.67%	41.80%	No
3C	2012	8	Math	23		34.78%	36.00%	No
3C	2013	8	Math	47		29.79%	41.80%	No
3C	2014	8	Math	40		27.50%	41.80%	No

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

Seaford

<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	25		56.00%	36.00%	Yes
3C	2013	10	Math	26		26.92%	41.80%	No
3C	2014	10	Math	20		35.00%	41.80%	No
3C	2012	3	Reading	36		33.33%	35.60%	No
3C	2013	3	Reading	51		27.45%	41.40%	No
3C	2014	3	Reading	64		6.25%	41.40%	No
3C	2012	4	Reading	38		36.84%	35.60%	Yes
3C	2013	4	Reading	55		18.18%	41.40%	No
3C	2014	4	Reading	57	16	28.07%	41.40%	No
3C	2012	5	Reading	50		28.00%	35.60%	No
3C	2013	5	Reading	57	15	26.32%	41.40%	No
3C	2014	5	Reading	61	21	34.43%	41.40%	No
3C	2012	6	Reading	44	17	38.64%	35.60%	Yes
3C	2013	6	Reading	63		22.22%	41.40%	No
3C	2014	6	Reading	54		25.93%	41.40%	No
3C	2012	7	Reading	46	17	36.96%	35.60%	Yes

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

Seaford

<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	45	16	35.56%	41.40%	No
3C	2014	7	Reading	60		23.33%	41.40%	No
3C	2012	8	Reading	22		40.91%	35.60%	Yes
3C	2013	8	Reading	48	16	33.33%	41.40%	No
3C	2014	8	Reading	40		27.50%	41.40%	No
3C	2012	10	Reading	24		58.33%	35.60%	Yes
3C	2013	10	Reading	25		24.00%	41.40%	No
3C	2014	10	Reading	20		30.00%	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	507	2851	5	36	Yes	0.78

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>10 days</u>	<u>Rate Ratio</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>
4B	2013	Afr.American	245		2.07	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

Seaford

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Special Ed Enrolled</u>	<u>Spec Ed Suspend>10 days</u>	<u>Rate Ratio</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>
4B	2013	Hispanic	48		0.00	1.26	Yes
4B	2013	Multi.Racial	22		0.00	1.26	Yes
4B	2013	Nat.Haw./PI			0.00	1.26	Yes
4B	2013	White	189		0.00	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 < 21%</u>	<u>% Outside < 21%</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>
5A	2012	519	430	82.85%	66.00%	Yes
5A	2013	507	415	81.85%	68.00%	Yes
5A	2014	546	456	83.52%	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 > 60%</u>	<u>% Outside > 60%</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Met Target?</u>
5B	2012	519	51	9.83%	17.50%	Yes
5B	2013	507	58	11.44%	17.30%	Yes
5B	2014	546	57	10.44%	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	519		0.00%	3.60%	Yes
5C	2013	507		0.00%	3.50%	Yes
5C	2014	546		0.37%	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	80	80	100.00%	68.6%	Yes	Data for FFY 2011 is baseline.
6	2013	71	30	42.25%	45.0%	No	

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

Seaford

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	100	90.6	Yes	100	60.4	Yes	7A - Social/Emotional
7	2012	100	93	Yes	100	54.5	Yes	7B - Knowledge
7	2012	100	91.9	Yes	100	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	92	85.2	Yes	55	54.2	No	7A - Social/Emotional
7	2013	93	87.3	Yes	54	49.8	No	7B - Knowledge
7	2013	100	87.3	Yes	80	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	2014	77	85.2	No	60	54.2	Yes	7A - Social/Emotional
7	2014	90	87.3	Yes	60	49.8	Yes	7B - Knowledge
7	2014	80	87.3	No	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	64	6	70	91.43%	87.00%	Yes
8	2013	63	4	67	94.03%	87.00%	Yes
8	2014	65	0	65	100.00%	87.00%	Yes

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

Seaford

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

9	2012	No	0.0%	Yes
---	------	----	------	-----

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

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

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

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

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

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

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>School Year:</u>	Disprop. Rep. is result of Inaprop. Identification	<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	19	2	90.48%	100.00%	No
----	------	----	---	--------	---------	----

11	2013	7	0	100.00%	100.00%	Yes
----	------	---	---	---------	---------	-----

11	2014	8	0	100.00%	100.00%	Yes
----	------	---	---	---------	---------	-----

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

Seaford

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	8	8	100.00%	100.00%	Yes
12	2013	5	4	80.00%	100.00%	No
12	2014	9	3	33.33%	100.00%	No

Indicator 13 - Percent of youth aged 16 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>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				100.0		
		Data was not reviewed for this reporting period.					
13	2013	36	7	19.44%	100.0	No	
13	2014				100.0		
		Data was not reviewed for this reporting period.					