

## **DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

The Townsend Building 401 Federal Street Suite 2 Dover, Delaware 19901-3639 DOE WEBSITE: http://www.doe.k12.de.us Susan S. Bunting, Ed.D. Secretary of Education Voice: (302) 735-4000 FAX: (302) 739-4654

June 19, 2017

Mr. Joseph Mock Delaware Design-Lab High School 179 Stanton Christiana Road Newark, DE 19702

### **RE:** Revised June 2017 LEA Determination Under the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)

Dear Mr. Mock:

Thank you for your ongoing dedication and commitment to educating students with disabilities. We encourage you to use the information in this report to celebrate growth and identify opportunities for continued improvement.

Under the IDEA, the Department has a responsibility 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 2015, LEAs are receiving their annual determination based on a combination of the following compliance and results indicators:

#### • Compliance:

0	Indicator 4B	Significant Discrepancy in the Rate of Long-Term Suspensions and Expulsions of
		Students with Disabilities by Race/Ethnicity and Noncompliant Policies,
		Procedures, and Practices
0	Indicators 9 & 10	Disproportionate Representation Related to Identification
0	Indicator 11	Timely Initial Evaluations
0	Indicator 12	Early Childhood Transition from Part C to Part B
0	Indicator 13	Transition Planning in the IEP

#### • Results:

0	Indicator 1	Graduate Rate
0	Indicator 2	Drop-Out Rate
0	Indicator 3B	Participation Rate in the State Assessment
0	Indicator 3C	Proficiency Rate on the State Assessment
0	Indicator 4A	Significant Discrepancy in the Rate of Long-Term Suspension and Expulsions of
		Students with Disabilities
0	Indicator 7	Early Childhood Outcomes: Positive Social-Emotional Skills, Acquisition and Use
		of Knowledge and Skills, and Use of Appropriate Behaviors

THE DELAWARE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION IS AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER. IT DOES NOT DISCRIMINATE ON THE BASIS OF RACE, COLOR, RELIGION, NATIONAL ORIGIN, SEX, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, GENDER IDENTITY, MARITAL STATUS, DISABILITY, AGE, GENETIC INFORMATION, OR VETERAN'S STATUS IN EMPLOYMENT, OR ITS PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.

June 19, 2017 Delaware Design-Lab High School Revised June 2017 LEA Determination Under the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Page 2

# Based on a review of your LEA's data and current implementation of an Intervention Plan for IDEA Compliance Monitoring, the Department has determined your LEA *Needs Assistance* in implementing the requirements of the IDEA.

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, your LEA's status in meeting its targets.

Your Exceptional Children Resources liaison, Jill Scannell, will be in contact with you and continue to provide technical assistance with your Intervention Plan. In the interim, please do not hesitate to contact me at (302) 735-4210 or maryann.mieczkowski@doe.k12.de.us.

Sincerely,

Thary and These Kouske

Mary Ann Mieczkowski Director, Exceptional Children Resources

MAM/mnl

Attachment cc: Susan S. Bunting, Ed.D, Secretary of Education Ashley Bystricky, Special Education Coordinator Denise Stouffer, Education Associate, Charter School Office Maria N. Locuniak, Ph.D., NCSP, Education Associate, Exceptional Children Resources Jill Scannell, Education Associate, Exceptional Children Resources

Sincerely,

Michael S. Watson Chief Academic Officer

## **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 2015 determinations were made based on a combination of the following compliance and results indicators:

• Compliance:

0	Indicator 4B	Significant Discrepancy in the Rate of Long-Term Suspensions and Expulsions of Students with Disabilities by Race/Ethnicity and Noncompliant Policies,
		Procedures, and Practices
0	Indicators 9 & 10	Disproportionate Representation Related to Identification
0	Indicator 11	Timely Initial Evaluations
0	Indicator 12	Early Childhood Transition from Part C to Part B
0	Indicator 13	Transition Planning in the IEP

• Results:

0	Indicator 1	Graduate Rate
0	Indicator 2	Drop-Out Rate
0	Indicator 3B	Participation Rate in the State Assessment
0	Indicator 3C	Proficiency Rate on the State Assessment
0	Indicator 4A	Significant Discrepancy in the Rate of Long-Term Suspension and Expulsions of
		Students with Disabilities
0	Indicator 7	Early Childhood Outcomes: Positive Social-Emotional Skills, Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills, and Use of Appropriate Behaviors

Meets Requirements	=	$\geq$ 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		$\leq$ 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, 2017 LEA IDEA Annual Determination for FFY 2015 Delaware Design Lab

Compliance Indicators	Data From: (Time Period)	SPP Target 2015-2016	State Data	LEA Data	LEA Score	Possible Points
Indicator 4B: Significant Discrepancy in the Rates of Long-Term Suspensions and Expulsions of Students with Disabilities by Race/Ethnicity and Noncompliant Policies, Procedures, and Practices. Indicator 4B is based on school year 2014-2015 data with a Rate Ratio of 1.22.	2014-2015	Rate Ratio 1.22	Rate Ratio 1.22	NA	NA	NA
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation/All Disabilities	2015-2016	0.00%	0.00%	< 5%	1	1
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation/Specific Disabilities	2015-2016	0.00%	0.00%	< 5%	1	1
Indicator 11: Initial Evaluations Conducted Within Timeline	2015-2016	100.00%	97.01%	NA	NA	NA
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition from Part C to Part B	2015-2016	100.00%	98.86%	NA	NA	NA
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition	2015-2016	100.00%	99.23%	NA	NA	NA

Results Indicators	Data From: (Time Period)	SPP Target 2015 - 2016	State Data	LEA Data	LEA Score	Possible Points
Indicator 1: Graduation Rate	2014-2015	71.40%	65.61%	NA	NA	NA
Indicator 2: Drop Out Rate	2014-2015	4.90%	3.25%	NA	NA	NA
Indicator 3B: Participation Rate-Math						
Grade 3		95.00%	97.98%	NA	NA	NA
Grade 4		95.00%	97.75%	NA	NA	NA
Grade 5		95.00%	97.09%	NA	NA	NA
Grade 6	2015-2016	95.00%	95.64%	NA	NA	NA
Grade 7	1	95.00%	95.77%	NA	NA	NA
Grade 8		95.00%	95.70%	NA	NA	NA
Grade 11		95.00%	90.44%	NA	NA	NA
Indicator 3B: Participation Rate-ELA						
Grade 3		95.00%	97.96%	NA	NA	NA
Grade 4		95.00%	97.74%	NA	NA	NA
Grade 5		95.00%	97.42%	NA	NA	NA
Grade 6	2015-2016	95.00%	95.96%	NA	NA	NA
Grade 7	1	95.00%	95.64%	NA	NA	NA
Grade 8		95.00%	95.11%	NA	NA	NA
Grade 11		95.00%	90.36%	NA	NA	NA

Results Indicators	Data From: (Time Period)	SPP Target 2015 - 2016	State Data	LEA Data	LEA Score	Possible Points
Indicator 3C: Proficiency Rate-Math						
Grade 3		22.10%	26.69%	NA	NA	NA
Grade 4		22.10%	19.72%	NA	NA	NA
Grade 5	1	22.10%	14.89%	NA	NA	NA
Grade 6	2015-2016	22.10%	12.24%	NA	NA	NA
Grade 7		22.10%	12.81%	NA	NA	NA
Grade 8		22.10%	12.29%	NA	NA	NA
Grade 11		22.10%	12.23%	NA	NA	NA
Indicator 3C: Proficiency Rate-ELA						
Grade 3		26.00%	24.67%	NA	NA	NA
Grade 4		26.00%	21.66%	NA	NA	NA
Grade 5	-	26.00%	23.87%	NA	NA	NA
	2015-2016	26.00%	15.88%	NA	NA	NA
Grade 7		26.00%	16.51%	NA	NA	NA
Grade 8	-	26.00%	17.29%	NA	NA	NA
Grade 11	-	26.00%	18.03%	NA	NA	NA
Indicator 4A: Significant Discrepancy in the Rate of Long-Term		20.0070	10.0570			NA .
Suspension and Explusions of Students with Disabilities. Indicator 4A is based on school year 2014-2015 data with a Rate Ratio of 1.22.	2014-2015	Rate Ratio 1.22	Rate Ratio 1.22	NA	NA	NA
7A. Early Childhood Outcomes- Positive Social/Emotional Skills						
Percent Increase Rate of Growth	2015-2016	87.40%	89.27%	NA	NA	NA
Percent Within Age Expectation	2013 2010	56.70%	51.47%	NA	NA	NA
7B. Early Childhood Outcomes-Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills						
Percent Increase Rate of Growth	2015 2016	90.00%	85.60%	NA	NA	NA
Percent Within Age Expectation	2015-2016	51.80%	48.42%	NA	NA	NA
7C. Early Childhood Outcomes- Use of Appropriate Behaviors						
Percent Increase Rate of Growth		89.20%	86.91%	NA	NA	NA
Percent Within Age Expectation	2015-2016	65.20%	64.27%	NA	NA	NA
	1		II			
Determination Summary	1					
Compliance Indicators Score	2					
Possible Points:	2					
Results Indicators Score						
Possible Points:	0					
	0					
Score Total	2					
Out of a Possible:	2					
	100.00%					
Percentage:	100.00%					
Intervention Plan for On-Site Monitoring						
Annual Determination						
Needs Assistance						

## Spring 2017 LEA IDEA Annual Determination for FFY 2015

Delaware Design Lab

Graduation Rate

Graduation Nate						LEA Data		
Indicator 1	School Year			Number Eligible	Number Graduated	<u>% SWD Who Graduated</u>	State Target	Met Target?
<u></u>	2014-2015			NA	NA	NA	71.40%	NA
Note:	LEA did not have a	any graduates.						
Drop-Out Rate		, 0						
						LEA Data		
Indicator 2	School Year			Number Enrolled	Number of Drop-Outs	<u>% SWD Who Dropped Out</u>	State Target	Met Target?
	2014-2015			NA	NA	NA	4.90%	NA
Note:	NA - LEA did not h	ave students age	s 14-21					
<b>Participation Rate</b>	e in the State Assessn	nent						
						LEA Data	State	
Indicator 3B	School Year	<u>Grade</u>	<u>Subject</u>	Number Eligible	Number Tested	<u>% Tested</u>	Target	Met Target?
	2015-2016	3	ELA	NA	NA	NA	95.00%	NA
	2015-2016	4	ELA	NA	NA	NA	95.00%	NA
	2015-2016	5	ELA	NA	NA	NA	95.00%	NA
	2015-2016	6	ELA	NA	NA	NA	95.00%	NA
	2015-2016	7	ELA	NA	NA	NA	95.00%	NA
	2015-2016	8	ELA	NA	NA	NA	95.00%	NA
	2015-2016	11	ELA	NA	NA	NA	95.00%	NA
	2015-2016	3	MATH	NA	NA	NA	95.00%	NA
	2015-2016	4	MATH	NA	NA	NA	95.00%	NA
	2015-2016	5	MATH	NA	NA	NA	95.00%	NA
	2015-2016	6	MATH	NA	NA	NA	95.00%	NA
	2015-2016	7	MATH	NA	NA	NA	95.00%	NA
	2015-2016	8	MATH	NA	NA	NA	95.00%	NA
	2015-2016	11	MATH	NA	NA	NA	95.00%	NA
Note:	NA-LEA did not ha	ve students who	tested in that grad	de.				

<b>Proficiency Rate</b>	on the State Assessn	nent						
						LEA Data		
						% of SWD Meeting	State	
Indicator 3C	School Year	<u>Grade</u>	<u>Subject</u>	Number Tested	Number Meets	<b>Proficiency</b>	<b>Target</b>	Met Target?
	2015-2016	3	ELA	NA	NA	NA	26.00%	NA
	2015-2016	4	ELA	NA	NA	NA	26.00%	NA
	2015-2016	5	ELA	NA	NA	NA	26.00%	NA
	2015-2016	6	ELA	NA	NA	NA	26.00%	NA
	2015-2016	7	ELA	NA	NA	NA	26.00%	NA
	2015-2016	8	ELA	NA	NA	NA	26.00%	NA
	2015-2016	11	ELA	NA	NA	NA	26.00%	NA
	2015-2016	3	MATH	NA	NA	NA	22.10%	NA
	2015-2016	4	MATH	NA	NA	NA	22.10%	NA
	2015-2016	5	MATH	NA	NA	NA	22.10%	NA
	2015-2016	6	MATH	NA	NA	NA	22.10%	NA
	2015-2016	7	MATH	NA	NA	NA	22.10%	NA
	2015-2016	8	MATH	NA	NA	NA	22.10%	NA
	2015-2016	11	MATH	NA	NA	NA	22.10%	NA
Note:	NA-I FA did not h	ave students who	tested in that grad	de				

**Note:** NA-LEA did not have students who tested in that grade.

Significant Discrepancy in the Rate of Long-Term Suspension and Explusions of Students with Disabilities. Indicator 4A is Based on School Year 2014-2015 Data with a Rate Ratio of 1.22.

			Non-SWD	SWD Suspended	Non-SWD Suspended >	LEA Data	State Target	
Indicator 4A	School Year	SWD Enrollment	Enrollment	<u>&gt; 10 Days</u>	<u>10 Days</u>	Rate Ratio	Rate Ratio	Met Target?
	2014-2015	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1.22	NA

#### Note: NA for this school year.

Significant Discrepancy in the Rate of Long-Term Suspensions and Expulsions of Students with Disabilities by Race/Ethnicity and Noncompliant Policies, Procedures, and Practices. Indicator 4B Data is based on School Year 2014-2015 Data with a Rate Ratio of 1.22.

				SWD Suspended >	LEA Data	State Target	
Indicator 4B	School Year	<u>Race</u>	SWD Enrolled	<u>10 Days</u>	Rate Ratio	Rate Ratio	Met Target?
	2014-2015	Hispanic	NA	NA	NA	1.22	NA
	2014-2015	American Indian	NA	NA	NA	1.22	NA
	2014-2015	African American	NA	NA	NA	1.22	NA
	2014-2015	White	NA	NA	NA	1.22	NA
	2014-2015	Asian	NA	NA	NA	1.22	NA
	2014-2015	Haw./P.I.	NA	NA	NA	1.22	NA
	2014-2015	Multiple	NA	NA	NA	1.22	NA
Note:	NA for this sch	ool year.					

Percent of Children Aged 6 to 21 Served Inside the Regular Class 80% or More of the Day										
			Number of SWD	LEA Data						
Indicator 5A	School Year	Number of SWD	<u>in LRE A</u>	<u>% in LRE A</u>	State Target	Met Target?				
	2015-2016	37	32	86.48%	69.00%	Yes				
Note:										
Percent of Children	n Aged 6 to 21 Served Inside the Regular Class Less	Than 40% of the Day								
			Number of SWD	LRE Data						
Indicator 5B	School Year	Number of SWD	in LRE B	<u>% in LRE B</u>	State Target	Met Target?				
	2015-2016	37	-	10.81%	15.30%	Yes				
Note:										
Percent of Children	n Aged 6 to 21 Served In Separate Schools, Residen	tial Facilities, and in Home	bound/Hospital Placeme	nts						
			Number of SWD	LRE Data						
Indicator 5C	<u>School Year</u>	Number of SWD	in LRE C	<u>% in LRE C</u>	State Target	Met Target?				
	2015-2016	37	-	< 5%	4.80%	Yes				
Note:										
Percent of Children	n Aged 3 to 5 Attending a Regular Early Childhood F	Program and Receiving the	e Majority of Special Educ	ation and Related Services	in the Regular Earl	y Childhood				
Program										
			Number of	LEA Data						
			SWD Receiving	Percent Receiving						
			Services in the	Services in the						
Indicator 6A	School Year	Number of SWD	Regular EC Program	Regular EC program	State Target	Met Target?				
	2015-2016	NA	NA	NA	47.00%	NA				
Percent of Children	Percent of Children Aged 3 to 5 Attending a Separate Special Education Class, Separate School, or Residential Facility									
				LEA Data						
			Number of SWD	Percent Receiving						
			<b>Receiving Services</b>	Services in						
Indicator 6B	School Year	Number of SWD	in Separate Setting	Separate Setting	State Target	Met Target?				
	2015-2016	NA	NA	NA	34.00%	NA				
Note:	NA - LEA did not have students ages 3-5									

LEA Data % Aquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills Use of Knowledge 2015-2016 LEA Data % more state Target NA LEA Data % Met Target NA State Target Expectation NA State Target State Target NA Met Target? NA   LEA Data % Met Target? LEA Data % NA Met Target? Met Target?   Juse of Knowledge 2015-2016 NA State Target NA Met Target?   Juse of Knowledge 2015-2016 NA State Target Met Target? Met Target?   Juse of Knowledge 2015-2016 NA State Target Met Target? Met Target?   Juse of Knowledge Met Target? NA Met Target? NA   Juse of Knowledge Social/Emotional Skills Increased NA State Target Met Target? Met Target?   Juse of Knowledge Social/Emotional Skills Increased NA State Target NA Met Target?   Juse of Knowledge Social/Emotional Skills Increased NA State Target NA Met Target?   Juse of Knowledge Social/Emotional NA State Target NA Met Target?   NA NA NA State Target NA Met Target?   Social/Emotional Skills Increased NA State Target NA Met Target? NA   NA NA NA State Target NA Met Target?   NA	Percent of Preschool Students Aged 3 to 5 Who Demonstrate Improved Skills in Positive Social/Emotional Skills, Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills, and Use of Appropriate									
Acausistion and, bise of Knowledge, and Skills, increased Rate of 2015-2016 State Target Growth Met Target? EAData % Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills Within Age Expectations State Target NA Met Target?   LEA Data % Increased Rate of 90.00% NA NA State Target Met Target?   LEA Data % Increased Rate of 90.00% NA NA State Target Met Target?   LEA Data % Inproved Skills in Use of Appropriate Behavior. Ket Target? NA NA   2015-2016 State Target NA Met Target? Within Age Expectations NA State Target Met Target? Met Target?   2015-2016 NA State Target NA Met Target? NA State Target Scial/Emotional Skills Met Target?   2015-2016 NA State Target NA Met Target? NA State Target NA Met Target?   2015-2016 NA State Target NA NA NA State Target NA Met Target?   2015-2016 NA State Target NA Met Target? NA NA State Target Scial/Emotional Skills NA   2015-2016 NA State Target NA NA NA State Target NA	Behaviors									
ndicator Z School Year 2015-2016 School Year Growth NA State Target Met Target? Met Target? Expectations NA State Target Appropriate Behavior. Met Target?   1 LEA Data % NA LEA Data % NA LEA Data % NA NA State Target State Target? Met Target?   2015-2016 NA State Target NA State Target NA Met Target? NA   2015-2016 State Target NA State Target NA Met Target? NA   2015-2016 NA State Target Met Target? Met Target? NA   2015-2016 NA State Target Met Target? Met Target? NA   2015-2016 NA State Target NA NA NA NA   State Target 2015-2016 NA State Target NA Met Target? NA   No NA-LEA did not have students ages 3-5 in a pre-school program NA NA NA NA   No										
and Skills within Age   andicator Z School Year Growth State Target Met Target? NA NA State Target Met Target?   and Skills within Age Improved Skills in NA 90.00% NA NA State Target NA   Juse of NA Juse of NA State Target NA NA NA   Juse of Juse of Appropriate Behavior. State Target Met Target? NA N						LEA Data % Acquisition				
ndicator Z School Year 2015-2016 NA Siate Target Sills Within Age 2015-2016 NA Sills NA Siate Target Sills NA LEA Data % Improved Skills Vare of Appropriate Behavior 2015-2016 NA Sills Na Siate Target NA 2015-2016 NA Sills Na Siate Target NA 2015-2016 NA Sills Na Siate Target NA NA Sills Na Sills Na Siate Target NA NA Sills Na Sills Na Siate Target NA NA Sills Na Sills Na Siate Target NA NA Sills Na Sills N										
ndicator 7 School Year Growth State Target Met Target? Expectations State Target Met Target?   2015-2016 NA LEA Data % Improved Skills in Use of Appropriate Behavior. NA Skills in Use of Skills in Use of Appropriate Behavior. NA Met Target? NA State Target Met Target? NA NA State Target Met Target? NA State Target Met Target? NA NA State Target Met Target? Met Target? Met Target? NA										
2015-2016 NA 90.00% NA NA S1.80% NA   LEA Data % Improved Skills in Use of Appropriate Behavior. LEA Data % Improved Skills in Use of Appropriate Behavior. LEA Data % Improved Skills in Use of Appropriate Behavior. NA NA Met Target?   2015-2016 NA State Target NA Met Target? Within Age Expectation NA State Target NA Met Target?   2015-2016 NA State Target NA Met Target? Within Age Expectation NA State Target NA Met Target?   2015-2016 NA State Target NA Met Target? NA NA NA   2015-2016 NA State Target NA Met Target? Met Target? NA NA   2015-2016 NA State Target NA Met Target? NA NA NA State Target NA Met Target?   Vote: NA - LEA did not have students ages 3-5 in a pre-school program NA NA NA NA NA State Target Met Target?   Vote: NA - LEA did not have students ages 3-5 in a pre-school program NA NA NA State Target and Results for Children   Percent of Parents with a Child Re	Indicator 7	School Year		State Target	Met Target?		State Target	Met Target?		
Note: NA - LEA did not have students ages 3-5 in a pre-school program.										
Use of Appropriate Behavior LEA Data % Improved Skills in Use of Increased Rate of Correate Rate of State Target Met Target? Within Age Expectation NA State Target Met Target?   2015-2016 NA State Target Met Target? Within Age Expectation NA State Target Met Target?   2015-2016 NA State Target Met Target? NA NA NA   2015-2016 NA State Target Met Target? NA NA NA   2015-2016 NA State Target Met Target? NA NA NA   2015-2016 NA State Target Met Target? NA NA NA NA   2015-2016 NA State Target Met Target? NA NA NA State Target Met Target?   2015-2016 NA State Target Met Target? NA NA NA State Target Met Target?   2015-2016 NA State Target Met Target? NA NA NA State Target Met Target?   Percent of Parents with a Child Receiving Special Education Services Who Report That School Parent Involvement as a Means of Improving Se			LEA Data %							
Appropriate, Behavior, Increased Rate of 2015-2016 Appropriate, Behavior, Increased Rate of NA State Target, State Target, 89.20% Within Age Expectation NA State Target, Within Age Expectation NA Met Target, NA   2015-2016 NA State Target, 89.20% Within Age Expectation NA State Target, NA Met Target, NA   2015-2016 NA State Target, 89.20% Within Age Expectation NA State Target, 90.500% Met Target, NA   2015-2016 NA State Target, 90.500% Met Target, 87.40% Met Target, NA Within Age Expectation NA State Target, 90.500% Met Target, NA   Note: NA - LEA did not have students age 3-5 in a pre-school program   Percent of Parents with a Child Receiving Special Education Services Who Report That School Facent Involvement as a Means of Improving Services and Results for Children with Disabilities			Improved Skills in							
Behavior Skills in Use of   Increased Rate of Appropriate Behavior   2015-2016 NA State Target Met Target? Within Age Expectation State Target Met Target?   2015-2016 NA Sale Of Mark State Target Met Target? Met Target? Met Target? Met Target? Met Target? Met Target? NA   2015-2016 NA Social/Emotional Skills Social/Emotional Skills NA Social/Emotional Skills NA   2015-2016 NA State Target Met Target? Met Target? NA NA NA   Note: NA - LEA did not have students ages 3-5 in a pre-school program Met Target? Met Target? Met Target? Met Target?   Note: NA - LEA did not have students ages 3-5 in a pre-school program State Target Met Target? NA NA   Note: NA - LEA did not have students ages 3-5 in a pre-school program NA NA State Target Met Target?   Note: NA - LEA did not have students ages 3-5 in a pre-school program State Target Met Target ? Met Target ? Met Target ?   Na State Target NA			<u>Use of</u>							
Increased Rate of Growth 2015-2016 State Target NA Appropriate Behavior Within Age Expectation NA State Target 65.20% Met Target? NA   LEA Data % Positive Social/Emotional Stills Increased 2015-2016 LEA Data % NA LEA Data % Positive Social/Emotional Skills Skills Increased Rate of Growth NA State Target 87.40% Met Target? NA Met Target? NA Met Target? NA   Vote: NA - LEA did not have students ages 3-5 in a pre-school program Met Target? NA NA NA			Appropriate			LEA Data % Improved				
Growth 2015-2016State Target NAMet Target? 89.20%Within Age Expectation NAState Target 65.20%Met Target? NALEA Data % Positive Social/Emotional Skills Increased 2015-2016LEA Data % Positive Social/Emotional Skills Increased Rate of Growth NAState Target Met Target?Met Target? NAMet Target? NAVote:NA - LEA did not have students ages 3-5 in a pre-school programPostive 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										
2015-2016 NA 89.20% NA NA NA 65.20% NA   LEA Data % Positive Social/Emotional Skills Increased LEA Data % Positive Social/Emotional Skills Social/Emotional Skills NA NA NA NA   2015-2016 NA State Target NA Met Target? Within Age Expectation NA State Target NA Met Target? Met Target?   Note: NA - LEA did not have students ages 3-5 in a pre-school program NA NA NA NA NA   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 NA NA NA								_		
LEA Data % Positive LEA Data % Positive Notive Social/Emotional LEA Data % Positive NA NA Social/Emotional Skills   Skills Increased Social/Emotional Skills Social/Emotional Skills Na Social/Emotional Skills Na Na Na Na Na Na Social/Emotional Skills Na										
Positive Social/Emotional Skills Increased LEA Data % Positive Social/Emotional Skills   Skills Increased Social/Emotional Skills   Rate of Growth 2015-2016 State Target NA Met Target? NA Within Age Expectation NA State Target NA Met Target? NA   Note: NA - LEA did not have students ages 3-5 in a pre-school program   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		2015-2016	NA	89.20%	NA	NA	65.20%	NA		
Social/Emotional Skills Increased LEA Data % Positive. Social/Emotional Skills   Skills Increased Social/Emotional Skills   Rate of Growth State Target Met Target? Mithin Age Expectation State Target Met Target?   2015-2016 NA 87.40% NA NA Social/Emotional Skills NA   Note: NA - LEA did not have students ages 3-5 in a pre-school program 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			LEA Data %							
Skills Increased Rate of Growth State Target State Target Met Target? Within Age Expectation State Target Servectation Met Target? NA   2015-2016 NA 87.40% NA NA NA NA NA   Note: NA - LEA did not have students ages 3-5 in a pre-school program Na NA NA NA   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 Na Na			Positive							
Rate of Growth State Target Met Target? Within Age Expectation State Target Met Target?   2015-2016 NA 87.40% NA NA 56.70% NA   Note: NA - LEA did not have students ages 3-5 in a pre-school program 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			Social/Emotional			LEA Data % Positive				
2015-2016 NA 87.40% NA NA 56.70% NA										
Note: NA - LEA did not have students ages 3-5 in a pre-school program 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										
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		2015-2016	NA	87.40%	NA	NA	56.70%	NA		
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										
with Disabilities	Note:									
	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									
Total Number of LEA Data State	With Disabilities			Total Number of			LEA Data	State		
	Indicator 8	School Year			Number Agree	Number Disagree			Met Target?	
2015-2016 NA NA NA NA NA 87.00% NA										
Note: Data was not reported for the LEA	Note:	Data was not r	eported for the LEA							

Disproportionate	Representation of Racial	l and Ethnic Groups in Special Ed	ucation and Related	Services That is a Resul	t of Inappropriate Identificat	ion			
				LE	A Data				
				% Disproportional	te Respresentation as a				
Indicator 9	School Year				opriate Identification	State Target	Met Target?		
	2015-2016				< 5%	0.00%	Yes		
Note:	1010 1010					0.00,0			
	Representation of Racial	l and Ethnic Groups in Specific Di	isability Categories Tl	hat is a Result of Inapp	conriate Identification				
Disproportionate			submity cutegories in		A Data				
					te Respresentation as a				
Indicator 10	School Year				opriate Identification	State Target	Met Target?		
	2015-2016			<u>Result of mappi</u>	< 5%	0.00%	Yes		
	2013-2010				< 5%	0.00%	res		
Noto									
Note: Evaluations Cond	ustad Within 45 School D	ays or 90 Calendar Days, Whiche	war is Shortor of Pa	oiving Parent Concent	for Initial Evaluation				
Evaluations Conu			Number within	-	LEA Data				
	<b>A L L V</b>	Total Number of		Number Not		•·· - ·			
Indicator 11	School Year	Initial Evaluations	<u>Timeline</u>	within Timeline	<u>% within Timeline</u>	State Target	Met Target?		
	2015-2016	NA	NA	NA	NA	100.00%	NA		
Netes									
Note:	NA- No initial evaluation	•							
Percent of Childre	en Referred by Part C Prio	or to Age 3 Who Are Found Eligib	ie for Part B, and Wh	o have an IEP Develop	ed and implemented by Their	r Third Birthday			
			Number of						
			Students Referred						
		Total Number of	Minus Not Eligible		LEA Data				
	<b>A L L V</b>	SWD who Turned	and/or Parent		% Who Received Services	<b>. -</b> .			
Indicator 12	School Year	Age 3	<u>Refusals</u>		by Age 3	<u>State Target</u>	Met Target?		
	2015-2016	NA	NA		NA	100.00%	NA		
N			to Dout D						
Note:		udents transitioning from Part C							
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 G	oals								
		Total Number of	Number of IEPs		LEA Data				
Indicator 13	School Year	IEPs Reviewed	Meeting Standard		% Meeting Standard	State Target	Met Target?		
	2015-2016	NA	NA		NA	100.00%	NA		
						200.0073			
Note:	NA- LEA did not have s	tudents of transition age in grade	e 8 or ages 14 and abo	ove.					

Post-School Outcomes-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

<u>Ir</u>	ndicator 14	<u>School Year</u> 2014-2015	<u>Total Number of</u> <u>Exiters</u> NA	<u>Total Number of</u> <u>Respondents</u> NA	Group A Respondents NA	LEA Data % Group A NA	<u>State Target</u> 29.00%	<u>Met Target?</u> NA
					Group B Respondents NA	LEA Data % Group B NA	<u>State Target</u> 60.00%	<u>Met Target?</u> NA
N	ote:	NA-This LEA did not have students v	with IEPs exiting seco	ondary education.	Group C Respondents NA	LEA Data % Group C NA	<u>State Target</u> 100.00%	<u>Met Target?</u> NA