

# **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. D. Dusty Blakey Superintendent Colonial School District 318 East Basin Road New Castle, DE 19720

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

Dear Dr. Blakey:

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:

0	Indicator 4B	Disproportionality in the rates of long-term suspensions of students with
		disabilities by race/ethnicity
0	Indicators 9 & 10	Disproportionate Representation related to identification
0	Indicator 11	Timely evaluations
0	Indicator 12	Early childhood transition from Part C/preschool special education services
		to Part B/school-age special education services
0	Indicator 13	Transition planning in the IEP

#### Results:

0	Indicator 1	Graduation Rate
0	Indicator 2	Drop Out Rate
0	Indicator 3B	Participation in the State Assessment
0	Indicator 3C	Proficiency on the State Assessment
0	Indicator 4A	Significant Discrepancy in the rates of long-term suspension of students with
		disabilities
0	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.

Colonial 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 Jon Cooper 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.kl2.de.us.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Mieczkowski

Director, Exceptional Children Resources

Mary and Muzhowske

Michael S. Watson Chief Academic Officer

S.left

MAM/MNLbjm Attachment

Steven H. Godowsky, Secretary of Education

Michael S. Watson, Chief Academic Officer

Jon Cooper Ed.D., Director of Special Education Services

Barbara Mazza, Education Associate, Exceptional Children Resources

Maria N. Locuniak, Education Ph.D., 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, 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:

0	Indicator 4B	Disproportionality in the rates of long-term suspensions of students with
		disabilities by race/ethnicity
0	Indicators 9 & 10	Disproportionate Representation related to identification
0	Indicator 11	Timely evaluations
0	Indicator 12	Early childhood transition from Part C/preschool special education services
		to Part B/school-age special education services
0	Indicator 13	Transition planning in the IEP

## Results:

0	Indicator 1	Graduation Rate
0	Indicator 2	Drop Out Rate
0	Indicator 3B	Participation in the State Assessment
0	Indicator 3C	Proficiency on the State Assessment
0	Indicator 4A	Significant Discrepancy in the rates of long-term suspension of students with disabilities
0	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 Colonial 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%	> 99%	1	1
Indicator 12: Preschool Transition Part C to Part B	2014-2015	100.00%	97.84%	> 99%	1	1
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition (LEA - Actual Percentage)	2014-2015	100.00%	98.15%	96.20%	0	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%	58.40%	0	1
Indicator 2: Drop Out Rate	2013-2014	5.20%	3.49%	2.79%	10.	1
Indicator 3B: Participation Math						
Grade 3		95.00%	97.10%	91.96%	0	1
Grade -	4	95.00%	97.03%	96.15%	1	1
Grade	5	95.00%	97.41%	97.56%	1	1
Grade	2014-2015	95.00%	97.28%	98.47%	1	1
Grade Grade	7	95.00%	97.45%	96.77%	1	1
Grade	В	95.00%	96.25%	98.56%	1	1
Grade 1	1	95.00%	92.09%	83.58%	0	1
Indicator 3B: Participation ELA						
Grade	3	95.00%	97.16%	91.82%	0	1
Grade -	4	95.00%	97.27%	94.90%	0	1
Grade	5	95.00%	97.76%	97.56%	1	1
Grade	2014-2015	95.00%	97.34%	> 99%	1	1
Grade	7	95.00%	97.33%	97.58%	1	1
Grade	8	95.00%	96.50%	98.56%	1	1
Grade 1	i	95.00%	91.95%	85.07%	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		15.00%	25.00%	15.53%	1	1
Grade 4		15.00%	18.59%	17.33%	- 4	1
Grade 5		15.00%	13.62%	10.00%	0	1
Grade 6	2014-2015	15.00%	9.67%	3.88%	0	1
Grade 7	1	15.00%	11.15%	9.17%	.0	1
Grade 8		15.00%	11.73%	6.57%	0	1
Grade 11		15.00%	8.67%	10.71%	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		19.30%	25.31%	12.87%	0	1
Grade 4		19.30%	21.67%	21.48%		1
Grade 5		19.30%	19.82%	16.67%	0	1
Grade 6	2014-2015	19.30%	15.13%	9.30%	0	1
Grade 7		19.30%	15.43%	12.40%	0	1
Grade 8		19.30%	16.45%	9.49%	0	1
Grade 11		19.30%	18.60%	12.28%	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%	4	1
Indicator 7A: Early Childhood Outcomes - Social/Emotional						
Percent Increase Rate of Growth	2014-2015	86.20%	85.86%	83.87%	0	1
Percent Within Age Expectation	2014-2015	55.30%	50.32%	51.35%	0	1
Indicator 7B: Early Childhood Outcomes - Knowledge						
Percent Increase Rate of Growth	2014-2015	89.00%	87.18%	87.50%	0	1
Percent Within Age Expectation	2014-2015	50.90%	47.06%	39.73%	Ö	1
Indicator 7C: Early Childhood Outcomes - Behavior						
Percent Increase Rate of Growth	2014-2015	88.10%	87.16%	81.67%	0	1
Percent Within Age Expectation	2014-2015	65.00%	63.58%	62.16%	0	1

Determination Summary	
Compliance Indicators Score	
Possible Points:	6
Results Indicators Score	14
Possible Points:	37
Score Total	19
Out of a Possible:	43
Percentage:	44.19%
Annual Determination	n:
Needs Intervention	r e

rict Progress on State Performance Plan Indicators for Students with Disabilities- FFY 2014	Colonial School District
District Prog	

Rate Target Met Target? 66.70% No	ate larget Met larget? 5.20% Ves		Number Tested Pe	91.82%	94,90%	895'26	%66 <	97.58%		85.07%		96.15%	97.56%	129 98.47% 95.00%	96.77%		83.58%		Number Meets Percent Meets	12.87%	21.48%			12.40% 19.30%			17.33%	10.00%		
S8.40%	Drop-Out Rate 2.79%		Number Eligible	110	157	123	130	124	139	19	112	156	123	131	124	139	19		Number Tested	101	149	120	129	121	137	) f	150	170	671	
Denominator 77	Drop-Outs	ent	Subject	ELA	ELA	ELA	ELA	ELA	EFA	ELA	MATH	MATH	MATH	MATH	MATH	MATH	MATH	ents	Subject	Ą	EF	됩	EFA	E E	<u> </u>	MATA	MATH	MATH	MATH	
Graduates 45	Enrolment 359	indicator 3B: Participation in State Assessment	Grade	e	4	S	9	7	00	Ħ	m	4	in	9	7	00	Ħ	Indicator 3C: Performance in State Assessments	Grade	m	4	S	9	7	» ;	‡ "	4	L)	9	

NA NA Note: ž ž 8 8 8 Note: Met Target? Yes Rate Ratio Met Target? No Met Target? Met Target? Met Target? Yes Yes Yes Yes 욷 Yes Yes Xes Indicator 48: Percentage of LEAs with Significant Discrepancy in the Rates of Long-Term Suspensions and Expulsions of Students with Disabilities by 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. Rate Ratio Met Tarket? D.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 000 0.00 SWD Suspended > 10 Days Non-SWD Suspended 38 Rate Ratio 68.00% **Target** 15.50% Tanget Target 5,00% **Tarket** 46.00% 0.00 000 0.00 0.00 000 0.00 SWD Suspended > 10 Days Percent in Separate Percent With Peers Percent in LREA Percent in LRE B 64.52% 10.26% Indicator 5B: LRE Ages 6 to 21 Outside Regular Class >60% of the Day Race/Ethnicity and Noncompliant Policies, Procedures, and Practices Indicator 5A: LRE Ages 6 to 21 Outside Regular Class < 21% of Day Total EC Total With Peers 193 79 SWD Enrolled Total in Separate Indicator 6: LRE Ages 3 to 5 Early Childhood with Typical Peers **Total in LREA** Non-SWD Enrollment 8615 Total in LRE B 526 140 410 603 13 ndicator 5C: LRE Ages 6 to 21 Separate Setting SWD Enrollment 1274 Race Hispanic Haw./P.I. American African American White Asian Multiple Indian Total 1364 Total 1364 Total 1364 School Year 2014 School Year 2015 School Year 2015 School Year School Year School Year 2015 2014 2014 2015 2014 2014 2014 2014 2014

뀾
2
ŧ
ž
2
ğ
Ž
8
養
ğ
1
Š
100
£
Ž
A.
8
8
Þ
Ŧ
Š
<u>s</u>
戛
3
Ž
Ē
3
Ē
ĕ
Ž
2
3
8
33
all a
N
4
롨
8
S
E
5
E
F
2
Þ
\$
Ξ

Knowledge Within Age. Expectation Met Target? No	Behavior Within Age Expectation Met Target? No	Social/Emotional Within Age Expectation Met Target? No		g Services and Results for Note:	ropriete klentification		Whichever is Shorter  Note:  NA
Knowledge Within Age Expectation Target 50.90%	Behavfor Within Age Expectation Target 65.00%	Social/Emotion al Within Age Expectation Israel 55.30%		Means of Improvin	: a Result of Inapp <u>Met Tanget?</u> Yes	Met Tanget. Yes	30 Calendar Days,
Knowledge Within Age Expectation 39.73%	Estavior Within Ase Emectation 62.16%	Social/Engional Within Age Expectation 51.35%		int involvement as a N Target 87.00%	elated Services That is	Automotive de la company	iin 45 School Days or 1 Met Target? Yes
Knowledge Increased Met Target? No	Behavior Increased Met Target? No	Social/Emotional Increased Met Tarret? No	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 Note 2015 73 88 82.95% 87.00% No	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    Disproportionate Representation as a Result of Inappropriate Identification?   Inappropriate Identification   Inapp	Daniel Condition of the	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  Within Not Within Not Within School Year Imelines Timelines Timelines Percent Within Percent Within 100,00% Yes Yes No. 2015
Knowledge Increased Target 89.00%	Behavior Increased Terret 88.10%	Social/Emotional Increased Target 86.20%		Education Services Who Repo Total 88	sproportional Representation of Racial and Ethnic Grou <u>Disproportionate Representation as a Result of</u> <u>Inappropriate Identification?</u> < 1%	Disproportionate Representation as a Result of Inappropriate Identification?	sluate Who Were Evaluated a  Percent Within > 99%
Knowledge Increased Rate Growth 87.50%	Betavior Increased Pate Growth 81.67%	Social/Emotional Increased Rate Growth 83.87%	Note:	Receiving Special Disagree	tional Representation of Racia lortionate Representation as a Inappropriate Identification? < 1%	notionate Representation as a longitudinate Identification?	Not Within Timelines
				Agree 73	A's with Dispropo	Dispro	hildren with Parer Within Timelines 100
School Year 2015	2015	2015		Indicator 8 - Percent of Pai Children with Disabilities <u>School Year</u> 2015	Indicator 9 - Percent of LE.  School Year  2015	School Year 2015	Indicator 11 - Percent of CI School Year 2015

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

Note:	Ā
MetTaret?	Yes
Fanct	100.00%
Percent Services by Age 3	%66 <
Number with.	8
Referred. Less Not Elieible and Parent. Refusals	
<u>School Year</u>	2015

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.

Note:	NA	
Met Target?	No	s (Results Indicator) – Percent of Youth Who Are No Longer in Secondary School, Had IEPs in Effect at the Time They Left School, and Were: hin One Year of Leaving High School, B. Enrolled in Higher Education or Competitively Employed Within One Year of Leaving High School, or
Target	100.00%	er in Secondary School, Ha Education or Competitive
IEP's Meeting Percent Meeting Standard Standard	96.20%	ent of Youth Who Are No Longe gh School, B. Enrolled in Higher
Standard	491	s Indicator) – Per (ear of Leaving Hi
Reviewed	510	utcomes (Result ion Within One
School Year	2015	Indicator 14 - Post-School O A. Enrolled in Higher Educati

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

Note:	Ř	
Group A Target Met? Yes	Group B Target Met? Yes	Group C Target. Met? No
Group A Target 25.00%	Group B Target 56.00%	Group C Target 100.00%
Group A Percentage 47.06%	Group B Percentage 76.47%	Group C Percentage 82.35%
Group A Respondents	Group B Respondents	Group C Respondents
Total Respondents 17		
Total Exiters S4		
School Year 2014		