

### **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

May 24, 2018

Dr. Gina Harrison, Ed.D. Principal Gateway Lab School 2501 Centerville Road Wilmington, DE 19808

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

#### Dear Dr. Harrison:

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 Delaware Department of Education (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 2016, LEAs are receiving their annual determination based on a combination of the following compliance and results indicators:

#### • 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 5	Education Environments (Children 6-21)
0	Indicator 7	Early Childhood Outcomes: Positive Social-Emotional Skills, Acquisition and Use
		of Knowledge and Skills, and Use of Appropriate Behaviors

#### • 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

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.

May 24, 2018 Gateway Lab School FFY 2016 LEA Determination Under the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Page 2

# Based on a review of your LEA's data, the Department has determined your LEA <u>Needs Intervention</u> 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, Linda Smith, will be in contact with you to provide technical assistance and 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 <u>maryann.mieczkowski@doe.k12.de.us</u>.

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Mieczkowski Director, Exceptional Children Resources

#### MAM/ANB

Attachment

cc: Susan S. Bunting, Ed.D., Secretary of Education
 Carriann Van Dzura, Special Education Director
 Denise Stouffer, Education Associate, Charter School Office
 Maria N. Locuniak, Ph.D., NCSP, Education Associate, Exceptional Children Resources
 Linda M. Smith, 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 2016 determinations were made based on a combination of the following compliance and results indicators:

• Results:

٠

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 5	Education Environments (Children 6-21)
0	Indicator 7	Early Childhood Outcomes: Positive Social-Emotional Skills, Acquisition and Use
		of Knowledge and Skills, and Use of Appropriate Behaviors
Сог	npliance:	
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	Indiantona 0 P 10	Disproportionate Depresentation Balated to Identification
-	Indicators 9 & 10	Disproportionate Representation Related to Identification
0	Indicator 11	Timely Initial Evaluations
0		

• Indicator 13 Transition Planning in the IEP

Meets Requirements	H	$\geq$ 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)	

G	iateway	Lab Scho	ool			
Results Indicators	Data From: (Time Period)	SPP Target 2016	State Data	LEA Data	LEA Score	Possible Points
ndicator 1: Graduation Rate	2015-2016	74.10%	67.15%	NA	NA	NA
ndicator 2: Drop Out Rate	2015-2016	4.60%	<5%	NA	NA	NA
	2013-2010	4.00%	570	NA .	NA	NA NA
ndicator 3B: Participation Rate-ELA						
Grade 3		95.00%	>95%	>95%	1	1
Grade 4		95.00%	>95%	>95%	1	1
Grade 5	-	95.00%	>95%	95.00%	1	1
Grade 6	2016-2017	95.00%	>95%	>95%	1	1
Grade 7	,	95.00%	>95%	>95%	1	1
Grade 8		95.00%	>95%	93.75%	0	1
Grade 11		95.00%	89.05%	NA	NA	NA
ndicator 3B: Participation Rate-MATH						
Grade 3		95.00%	>95%	>95%	1	1
Grade 4		95.00%	>95%	>95%	1	1
Grade 5		95.00%	>95%	95.00%	1	1
Grade 6	2016-2017	95.00%	>95%	>95%	1	1
Grade 7	-	95.00%	>95%	>95%	1	1
Grade 8	5	95.00%	>95%	93.75%	0	1
Grade 11		95.00%	89.05%	NA	NA	NA
ndicator 3C: Proficiency Rate-ELA						
Grade 3		32.70%	23.92%	16.67%	0	1
Grade 4		32.70%	20.95%	28.57%	0	1
Grade 5	-	32.70%	22.97%	5.26%	0	1
Grade 6		32.70%	16.11%	13.64%	0	1
Grade 7		32.70%	17.49%	10.34%	0	1
Grade 8	5	32.70%	16.46%	6.67%	0	1
Grade 11	-	32.70%	13.57%	NA	NA	NA
ndicator 3C: Proficiency Rate-MATH						
Grade 3		29.20%	25.90%	<5%	0	1
Grade 4		29.20%	21.05%	14.29%	0	1
Grade 5	-	29.20%	14.94%	5.26%	0	1
Grade 6		29.20%	12.56%	8.70%	0	1
Grade 7	-	29.20%	13.42%	13.33%	0	1
Grade 8		29.20%	11.82%	<5%	0	1
Grade 11	-	29.20%	8.46%	NA	NA	NA
					-	

#### - + I ah Cak

Indicator 4A: Significant Discrepancy in the Rate of Long-Term Suspensions and Expulsions of Students with Disabilities Note: Indicator 4A is based on school year 2015 2016 data with a Rate Ratio of 1.20.		Rate Ratio 1.20	NA	Met Target	1	1
---	--	-----------------	----	------------	---	---

Results Indicators Continued	Data From: (Time Period)	SPP Target 2016	State Data	LEA Data	LEA Score	Possible Points
Indicator 5A: Percent of Children Aged 6 -21 Served Inside the Class 80% of the Day		70.00%	65.72%	94.17%	1	1
Indicator 5B: Percent of Children Aged 6 -21 Served Inside the Class Less Than 40% of the Day	2016-2017	15.10%	14.96%	<5%	1	1
Indicator 5C: Percent of Children Aged 6 -21 Served in Separate Schools, Residential Facilities and Homebound/Hospital Placements		4.50%	5.46%	<5%	1	1
Indicator 7A. Early Childhood Outcomes- Positive						
Social/Emotional Skills						
Percent Increase Rate of Growth	2016-2017	88.60%	89.89%	NA	NA	NA
Percent Within Age Expectation	2010 2017	58.00%	51.26%	NA	NA	NA
Indicator 7B. Early Childhood Outcomes-Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills						
Percent Increase Rate of Growth	2016 2017	91.10%	87.36%	NA	NA	NA
Percent Within Age Expectation	2016-2017	52.70%	48.60%	NA	NA	NA
Indicator 7C. Early Childhood Outcomes- Use of Appropriate Behaviors						
Percent Increase Rate of Growth		90.20%	88.19%	NA	NA	NA
Percent Within Age Expectation	2016-2017	65.30%	64.31%	NA	NA	NA
		0010070	01102/0			
Compliance Indicators	Data From: (Time Period)	SPP Target 2016	State Data	LEA Data	LEA Score	Possible Points
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. Indicator 4B is based on school year 2015-2016 data with a Rate Ratio of 1.20.		Rate Ratio 1.20	NA	Met Target	1	1
Indicator O. Disproportionate Depresentation						
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation	2016-2017	0.00%	17.50%	Met Targets	1	1
All Disabilities	2010 2017					
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation Specific Disabilities	2016-2017	0.00%	18.92%	Met Targets	1	1
Indicator 11: Initial Evaluations Conducted Within Timeline	2016-2017	100.00%	>95%	>95%	1	1
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition from Part C to Part B	2016-2017	100.00%	>95%	NA	NA	NA
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition	2016-2017	100.00%	>95%	>95%	1	1
Determination Summary			Ann	ual Determin	ation:	
Compliance Indicators Score	5		Ne	eds Interven	tion	
Possible Points:	5					
Results Indicators Score	14	Interven	tion Plan /Com	pliance Agree	ement:	No
Possible Points:	28		, con			
		1				
Score Total	19	1				
Out of a Dessible.	22	1				
Out of a Possible:	33					
Out of a Possible: Percentage: 5/18/2018	33 57.58%					2 0

#### **Gateway Lab School**

Graduation Rat	e						
Indicator 1	<u>School Year</u> 2015-2016	State Target 74.10%	<u>State Data</u> 67.15%	<u>Number Eligib</u> NA	e <u>Number Graduated</u> NA	LEA Data <u>% SWD Who</u> <u>Graduated</u> NA	<u>Met Target?</u> NA
Note: Percent	of youth with IEPs g	raduating from high scl	hool with a regular hig	school diploma within 4-year adjusted cohort			
Drop-Out Rate							
Indicator 2	School Year	State Target	<u>State Data</u>	Number Enrolle	d Number of Drop-Outs	LEA Data <u>% SWD who Dropped</u> <u>Out</u>	Met Target?
	2015-2016	4.60%	2.91%	NA	NA	NA	NA
Note:							

Participation R	Participation Rate in the State Assessment - ELA											
		State	State					LEA Data				
Indicator 3B	School Year	<b>Target</b>	<u>Data</u>	<u>Grade</u>	Subject	Number Eligible	Number Tested	Percent Tested	Met Target?			
	2016-2017	95.00%	98.15%	3	ELA	-	-	> 95%	Yes			
	2016-2017	95.00%	98.45%	4	ELA	-	-	> 95%	Yes			
	2016-2017	95.00%	97.93%	5	ELA	20	19	95.00%	Yes			
	2016-2017	95.00%	97.03%	6	ELA	22	22	> 95%	Yes			
	2016-2017	95.00%	97.34%	7	ELA	30	29	> 95%	Yes			
	2016-2017	95.00%	95.77%	8	ELA	16	15	93.75%	No			
	2016-2017	95.00%	89.05%	11	ELA	NA	NA	NA	NA			
Note:												

#### Participation Rate in the State Assessment - MATH

		State	State					LEA Data	
Indicator 3B	School Year	<b>Target</b>	Data	Grade	Subject	Number Eligible	Number Tested	Percent Tested	Met Target?
	2016-2017	95.00%	97.67%	3	MATH	-	-	> 95%	Yes
	2016-2017	95.00%	98.13%	4	MATH	-	-	> 95%	Yes
	2016-2017	95.00%	97.87%	5	MATH	20	19	95.00%	Yes
	2016-2017	95.00%	96.69%	6	MATH	23	23	> 95%	Yes
	2016-2017	95.00%	96.62%	7	MATH	31	30	> 95%	Yes
	2016-2017	95.00%	95.28%	8	MATH	16	15	93.75%	No
	2016-2017	95.00%	89.05%	11	MATH	NA	NA	NA	NA
Note:									

Gateway	Lab School
---------	------------

<b>Proficiency Ra</b>	te on the State Asses	sment - ELA						LEA Data	
		State	State					% of SWD Meeting	
Indicator 3C	School Year	Target	<u>Data</u>	Grade	Subject	Number Tested	Number Meets	Proficiency	Met Target?
	2016-2017	32.70%	23.92%	3	ELA	-	-	16.67%	No
	2016-2017	32.70%	20.95%	4	ELA	-	-	28.57%	No
	2016-2017	32.70%	22.97%	5	ELA	19	-	5.26%	No
	2016-2017	32.70%	16.11%	6	ELA	22	-	13.64%	No
	2016-2017	32.70%	17.49%	7	ELA	29	-	10.34%	No
	2016-2017	32.70%	16.46%	8	ELA	15	-	6.67%	No
	2016-2017	32.70%	13.57%	11	ELA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Note:									

#### Proficiency Rate on the State Assessment - MATH

								LEA Data	
		State	State					% of SWD Meeting	
Indicator 3C	School Year	Target	<u>Data</u>	<u>Grade</u>	Subject	Number Tested	Number Meets	Proficiency	Met Target?
	2016-2017	29.20%	25.90%	3	MATH	-	-	< 5%	No
	2016-2017	29.20%	21.05%	4	MATH	-	-	14.29%	No
	2016-2017	29.20%	14.94%	5	MATH	19	-	5.26%	No
	2016-2017	29.20%	12.56%	6	MATH	23	-	8.70%	No
	2016-2017	29.20%	13.42%	7	MATH	30	-	13.33%	No
	2016-2017	29.20%	11.82%	8	MATH	15	-	< 5%	No
	2016-2017	29.20%	8.46%	11	MATH	NA	NA	NA	NA
Note:									

Note:

Significant Discrepancy in the Rate of Long-Term Suspension and Explusions of Students with Disabilities

Indicator 4A	School Year	State Target	State Data	SWD Enrollment	Non-SWD Enrollment	SWD Suspended > 10 Days	Non-SWD Suspended > 10 Days	LEA Data (Rate Ratio)	Met Target?
	2015-2016	0.00%	66.67%	129	83	-	-	0.00	Yes
Note:	Indicator 4A is ba	sed on school year 201	.5- 2016 data with a	a Rate Ratio of > 1.20	and an N size of 15.				
	State data is a cal	lculation based on the i	number of LEAs tha	at met the N Size comp	pared to the same LEAs tha	t exceeded rate ratio of 1.	20		
Significant Disc	crepancy in the Rate	of Long-Term Suspens	ions and Expulsion	ns of Students with Dis	abilities by Race/Ethnicity	and Noncompliant Polici	es, Procedures, and Pra	actices	
						SWD Suspended > 10			
Indicator 4B	School Year	State Target	State Data	Race	SWD Enrolled	Days	Compliant	LEA Data (Rate Ratio)	Met Target?
	2015-2016								
	2013-2010	0.00	100.00%	Hispanic	75	-	Yes	0.00	Yes
	2015-2016	0.00 0.00	100.00% 100.00%	Hispanic American Indian	- 75	-	Yes Yes	0.00 0.00	Yes Yes
				•	75 - 39	- - -			
	2015-2016	0.00	100.00%	American Indian	-	- - -	Yes	0.00	Yes
	2015-2016 2015-2016	0.00 0.00	100.00% 100.00%	American Indian African American	- 39		Yes Yes	0.00 0.00	Yes Yes
	2015-2016 2015-2016 2015-2016	0.00 0.00 0.00	100.00% 100.00% 100.00%	American Indian African American White	- 39		Yes Yes Yes	0.00 0.00 0.00	Yes Yes Yes
	2015-2016 2015-2016 2015-2016 2015-2016	0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00	100.00% 100.00% 100.00% 100.00%	American Indian African American White Asian	- 39 - -	-	Yes Yes Yes Yes	0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00	Yes Yes Yes Yes

 Note:
 Indicator 4B is based on school year 2015-2016 data with a Rate Ratio of > 1.20 and an N size of 10.

 State data is a calculation based on the number of LEAs that met the N Size compared to the same LEAs that exceeded rate ratio of 1.20

Percent of Children Aged 6 to 21 Served Inside the Regular Class 80% or More of the Day									
Indicator 5A	<u>School Year</u> 2016-2017	<u>State Target</u> 70.00%	<u>State Data</u> 65.72%		<u>Number of SWD</u> 120	Number of SWD <u>In LRE A</u> 113	<b>LEA Data</b> <u>% in LRE A</u> 94.17%	<u>Met Target?</u> Yes	
Note:									
Percent of Child	ren Aged 6 to 21 Ser	ved Inside the Regular	Class Less Than 40% of the D	av					
				· ·					
Indicator 5B	<u>School Year</u> 2016-2017	<u>State Target</u> 15.10%	<u>State Data</u> 14.96%		Number of SWD 120	<u>Number of SWD In</u> <u>LRE B</u> -	<u>LRE Data % in LRE B</u> < 5%	<u>Met Target?</u> Yes	
Note:									
Percent of Child	ren Aged 6 to 21 Ser	ved in Separate School	s. Residential Facilities. and	in Homebound/Hospital Placements					
Indicator 5C	<u>School Year</u> 2016-2017	<u>State Target</u> 4.50%	<u>State Data</u> 5.46%		<u>Number of SWD</u> 120	Number of SWD In LRE C -	LRE Data <u>% in LRE C</u> < 5%	<u>Met Target?</u> Yes	
Note:									
Preschool Enviro	onments: Percent of	Children Aged 3 to 5 At	tending a Regular Early Chil	dhood Program and Receiving the Maj	jority of Special Educat	ion and Related Services	in the Regular Early Ch	ildhood	
Program <u>Indicator 6A</u>	<u>School Year</u> 2016-2017	<u>State Target</u> 48.50%	<u>State Data</u> 47.46%		<u>Number of SWD</u> NA	Number of SWD Receiving Services in the <u>Regular EC Program</u> NA	LEA Data Percent Receiving Services in the <u>Regular EC program</u> NA	<u>Met Target?</u> NA	
Note:									
Preschool Enviro	onments: Percent of	Children Aged 3 to 5 At	tending a Separate Special	Education Class, Separate School, or R	esidential Facility	Number of SWD Receiving Services	LEA Data Percent Receiving Services in		
Indicator 6B	<u>School Year</u> 2016-2017	<u>State Target</u> 33.50%	<u>State Data</u> 34.78%		<u>Number of SWD</u> NA	in Separate Setting NA	Separate Setting NA	<u>Met Target?</u> NA	
Note:									

	omes: Percent o	f Preschool Students Aged 3 t	o 5 Who Demons	trate Improved Skil	ls in Positive Social/Emo	tional Skills			
ndicator 7 <u>A</u>	<u>School Year</u> 2016-2017	Positive Social/Emotional Skills : Percent Increased Rate of Growth State Target 88.60%	<u>State Data</u> 89.89%	<u>LEA Data</u> NA	<u>Met Target</u> NA	Positive Social/Emotional Skills : Percent Within Age Expectation State Target 58.00%	<u>State Data</u> 51.26%	<u>LEA Data</u> NA	<u>Met Targe</u> NA
Note:									
Preschool Outc	omes: Percent o	f Preschool Students Aged 3 t	o 5 Who Demons	trate Improved Skil	ls in Acquisition and Lise	of Knowledge and Skills			
reschool Outco	omes: Percent o	i Preschool Students Aged 5 t	o 5 who Demons	strate improved skil	is in Acquisition and Ose	or knowledge and skins			
Indicator 7B	<u>School Year</u> 2016-2017	Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills: Percent Increased Rate of Growth State Target 91.10%	<u>State Data</u> 87.36%	<u>LEA Data</u> NA	<u>Met Target</u> NA	Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills: Percent Within Age Expectation State Target 52.70%	<u>State Data</u> 48.60%	<u>LEA Data</u> NA	<u>Met Target</u> NA
Note:									
Preschool Outc	omes: Percent o	f Preschool Students Aged 3 t	o 5 Who Demons	trate Improved Skil	ls in Use of Appropriate	Behaviors			
Indicator 7C	<u>School Year</u> 2016-2017	Use of Appropriate Behaviors: Percent Increased Rate of Growth State Target 90.20%	<u>State Data</u> 88.19%	<u>LEA Data</u> NA	<u>Met Target</u> NA	Use of Appropriate Behaviors: Percent Within Age Expectation State Target 65.30%	<u>State Data</u> 64.31%	<u>LEA Data</u> NA	<u>Met Targe</u> NA
Note:									
	nts with a Child	Receiving Special Education S	ervices Who Ren	ort That School Fac	litated Parent Involvem	ent as a Means of Improving	Services and Results for	r Children with Diisa	shilitios
	nts with a Child	Receiving Special Education S	ervices Who Rep	ort That School Faci	litated Parent Involvem	ent as a Means of Improving	Services and Results for	r Children with Diisa	abilities
	nts with a Child <u>School Year</u> 2016-2017	Receiving Special Education S State <u>Target</u> 88.00%	ervices Who Rep State <u>Data</u> 89.18%	ort That School Faci	litated Parent Involvem Total Number of <u>Respondents</u> -	ent as a Means of Improving <u>Number Agree</u> -	Services and Results for <u>Number Disagree</u> -	r Children with Diisa LEA Data <u>% Agree</u> 66.70%	<b>ibilities</b> <u>Met Target</u> No

				Gateway Lab School						
Disproportionate Representation of Racial and Ethnic Groups in Special Education and Related Services That is a Result of Inappropriate Identification										
• •	•		• •							
Indicator 9	School Year	State Target	State Data			LEA Data Compliant		Met Target?		
indicator 5	2010 2017									
	2016-2017	0.00%	17.50%			Yes		Yes		
Note: State da	ata reflects % of distr	ricts with Disproportio	nate Representation as a re	sult of inappropriate identification.						
Disproportiona	ate Representation o	of Racial and Ethnic Gr	oups in Specific Disability C	ategories That is a Result of Inappropriat	te Identification					
Indicator 10	School Year	State Target	State Data			LEA Data Compliant		Met Target?		
malcator 10	2016-2017	0.00%	18.92%			Yes		Yes		
	2010-2017	0.0070	10.5270			105		163		
Note: State da	ata reflects % of dist	ricts with Disproportio	nate Representation as a re	sult of inappropriate identification.						
Note. State da	ata renects /0 01 distr	icts with Disproportio	nate representation as a re							
				-						
Evaluations Co	nducted Within 45 S	chool Days or 90 Caler	ndar Days, Whichever is Sho	orter, of Receiving Parent Consent for Ini	tial Evaluation					
				Total Number of Initial	Number Within	Number Not Within	% LEA Data Within			
Indicator 11	School Year	State Target	State Data					Mat Target		
Indicator 11		State Target	State Data	<u>Evaluations</u>	<u>Timelines</u>	Timelines	<u>Timelines</u>	Met Target?		
	2016-2017	100.00%	98.97%	-	-	0	> 95%	Yes		
Note:	NA									
Farly Childhoo	d Transitions: Percer	nt of Children Referred	by Part C Prior to Age 3 W	ho Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Who	o Have an IFP Develope	d and Implemented by 1	heir Third Birthday			
Larry childrico						a and implemented by	inch innu birthiddy			
							LEA Data % Who			
				Total Number of SWD		Referred Minus Not	Received Services by			
Indicator 12	School Year	State Target	State Data	Who Turned Age 3	Eligible and/or	Parent Refusals	Age 3	Met Target?		
	2016-2017	100.00%	98.55%	NA		IA	NA	NA		
Note:										
Note.										
							•• ·			
		e with an IEP That Inclu	ides Coordinated, Measura	ble, Annual IEP Goals and Transition Serv	vices That Will Reasona	ble Enable the Student t	o Meet			
the Post-Secon	idary Goals									
				Total Number of IEPs	Number of IEPs Meeting	g	LEA Data % Meeting			
Indicator 13	School Vear	State Target	State Data			_		Met Target?		
Indicator 13	School Year	State Target	State Data	Reviewed	<b>Standard</b>		Standard	Met Target?		
Indicator 13	<u>School Year</u> 2016-2017	<u>State Target</u> 100.00%	<u>State Data</u> 99.24%					Met Target? Yes		
				Reviewed	<b>Standard</b>		Standard			
Indicator 13 Note:				Reviewed	<b>Standard</b>		Standard			

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: Group A. Enrolled in Higher Education Within One Year of Leaving High School, Group B. Enrolled in Higher Education or Competitively Employed Within One Year of Leaving High School, or Group 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									
Indicator 14	School Year	State Target	State Data	Total Number of Exiters	<u>Total Number of</u> Respondents	Group A Respondents	LEA Data % Group A	Met Target?	
	2016-2017	33.00%	49.47%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
		State Target	State Data			Group B Respondents	LEA Data % Group B	Met Target?	
		64.00%	82.59%			NA	NA	NA	
		State Target	State Data			Group C Respondents	LEA Data % Group C	Met Target?	
		100.00%	86.20%			NA	NA	NA	
Note:									