

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

Matthew Burrows, Ed.D. Superintendent Appoquinimink School District Tony Marchio Building, 313 South Fifth Street Odessa, DE 19730-4010

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

Dear Dr. Burrows:

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 Appoquinimink School District 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 Dr. McCullough 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 maryann.mieczkowski@doe.k12.de.us.

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Mieczkowski Director, Exceptional Children Resources

MAM/ANB

Attachment

cc: Susan S. Bunting, Ed.D., Secretary of Education
 Josette McCullough, Ed.D., Director of Special Education Services
 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
Cor	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	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

• Indicator 13 Transition Planning in the IEP

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)

Аррос	luinimir	ık School	District			
Results Indicators	Data From: (Time Period)	SPP Target 2016	State Data	LEA Data	LEA Score	Possible Points
Indicator 1: Graduation Rate	2015-2016	74.10%	67.15%	63.77%	0	1
Indicator 2: Drop Out Rate	2015-2016	4.60%	<5%	<5%	1	1
Indicator 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%	1	1
Grade 6	2016-2017	95.00%	>95%	93.55%	0	1
Grade 7	1	95.00%	>95%	>95%	1	1
Grade 8		95.00%	>95%	>95%	1	1
Grade 11		95.00%	89.05%	90.79%	0	1
Indicator 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%	1	1
Grade 6	2016-2017	95.00%	>95%	92.74%	0	1
Grade 7		95.00%	>95%	>95%	1	1
Grade 8		95.00%	>95%	>95%	1	1
Grade 11		95.00%	89.05%	90.79%	0	1
Indicator 3C: Proficiency Rate-ELA						
Grade 3		32.70%	23.92%	22.76%	0	1
Grade 4		32.70%	20.95%	30.00%	0	1
Grade 5		32.70%	22.97%	32.09%	0	1
Grade 6	2016-2017	32.70%	16.11%	12.07%	0	1
Grade 7		32.70%	17.49%	24.39%	0	1
Grade 8		32.70%	16.46%	22.13%	0	1
Grade 11		32.70%	13.57%	13.04%	0	1
ndicator 3C: Proficiency Rate-MATH						
Grade 3		29.20%	25.90%	24.14%	0	1
Grade 4		29.20%	23.90%	24.14%	0	1
Grade 5		29.20%	14.94%	17.29%	0	1
Grade 5		29.20%	14.94%	13.04%	0	1
Grade 6 Grade 7	2010-2017	29.20%	12.56%	19.51%	0	1
Grade 7		29.20%	13.42%	19.51%		1
					0	
Grade 11		29.20%	8.46%	<5%	0	1
Indicator 4A: Significant Discrepancy in the Rate of Long-Term Suspensions and Expulsions of Students with Disabilities		Rate Ratio 1.20	NA	Met Target	1	1

2015-2016 Rate Ratio 1.20

NA

Met Target

1

Appoquinimink School District

with a Rate Ratio of 1.20.

Note: Indicator 4A is based on school year 2015 2016 data

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		70.00%	65.72%	73.60%	1	1
Class 80% of the Day	-	70.00%	03.7270	73.00%	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%	5.03%	1	1
Indicator 5C: Percent of Children Aged 6 -21 Served in Separate Schools, Residential Facilities and		4.50%	5.46%	<5%	1	1
Homebound/Hospital Placements						
Indicator 7A. Early Childhood Outcomes- Positive Social/Emotional Skills						
Percent Increase Rate of Growth		88.60%	89.89%	87.50%	0	1
Percent Within Age Expectation	2016-2017	58.00%	51.26%	49.33%	0	1
Indicator 7B. Early Childhood Outcomes-Acquisition and Use		58.00%	51.2076	49.3370	U	<u> </u>
of Knowledge and Skills						
Percent Increase Rate of Growth		91.10%	87.36%	83.08%	0	1
Percent Within Age Expectation	2016-2017	52.70%	48.60%	50.00%	0	1
Indicator 7C. Early Childhood Outcomes- Use of Appropriate						
Behaviors						
Percent Increase Rate of Growth	2016-2017	90.20%	88.19%	84.38%	0	1
Percent Within Age Expectation	2010 2017	65.30%	64.31%	76.00%	1	1
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 9: Disproportionate Representation						
All Disabilities	2016-2017	0.00%	17.50%	Met Targets	1	1
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%	0	1
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition from Part C to Part B	2016-2017	100.00%	>95%	93.48%	0	1
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition	2016-2017	100.00%	>95%	>95%	1	1
Determination Summary			Ann	ual Determin	ation:	
Compliance Indicators Score	4			eds Interven		
Possible Points:	6					
Results Indicators Score	16	Interven	tion Plan /Com	pliance Agree	ement:	No
	10	intervent				
Possible Points:	40		·	<u> </u>		
Possible Points: Score Total	40 20		· ·			
Possible Points:	40					2 0

Appoquinimink School District

Graduation Rat	te				
Indicator 1	<u>School Year</u> 2015-2016	<u>State Target</u> 74.10%	<u>State Data</u> 67.15%	69 44 63.77% r	T <mark>arget?</mark> No
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	<u>School Year</u> 2015-2016	<u>State Target</u> 4.60%	<u>State Data</u> 2.91%		Target? Yes
Note:					

 School Year							LEA Data	
	<u>Target</u>	<u>Data</u>	<u>Grade</u>	Subject	Number Eligible	Number Tested	Percent Tested	Met Target?
2016-2017	95.00%	98.15%	3	ELA	148	145	> 95%	Yes
2016-2017	95.00%	98.45%	4	ELA	142	140	> 95%	Yes
2016-2017	95.00%	97.93%	5	ELA	136	134	> 95%	Yes
2016-2017	95.00%	97.03%	6	ELA	124	116	93.55%	No
2016-2017	95.00%	97.34%	7	ELA	128	123	> 95%	Yes
2016-2017	95.00%	95.77%	8	ELA	124	122	> 95%	Yes
2016-2017	95.00%	89.05%	11	ELA	76	69	90.79%	No

Participation Rate in the State Assessment - MATH

		State	State					LEA Data	
Indicator 3B	School Year	Target	<u>Data</u>	Grade	Subject	Number Eligible	Number Tested	Percent Tested	Met Target?
	2016-2017	95.00%	97.67%	3	MATH	148	145	> 95%	Yes
	2016-2017	95.00%	98.13%	4	MATH	142	138	> 95%	Yes
	2016-2017	95.00%	97.87%	5	MATH	135	133	> 95%	Yes
	2016-2017	95.00%	96.69%	6	MATH	124	115	92.74%	No
	2016-2017	95.00%	96.62%	7	MATH	128	123	> 95%	Yes
	2016-2017	95.00%	95.28%	8	MATH	123	121	> 95%	Yes
	2016-2017	95.00%	89.05%	11	MATH	76	69	90.79%	No
Note:									

Appoquinimink School District

		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	145	33	22.76%	No
	2016-2017	32.70%	20.95%	4	ELA	140	42	30.00%	No
	2016-2017	32.70%	22.97%	5	ELA	134	43	32.09%	No
	2016-2017	32.70%	16.11%	6	ELA	116	-	12.07%	No
	2016-2017	32.70%	17.49%	7	ELA	123	30	24.39%	No
	2016-2017	32.70%	16.46%	8	ELA	122	27	22.13%	No
	2016-2017	32.70%	13.57%	11	ELA	69	-	13.04%	No
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>	<u>Subject</u>	Number Tested	Number Meets	Proficiency	Met Target?
	2016-2017	29.20%	25.90%	3	MATH	145	35	24.14%	No
	2016-2017	29.20%	21.05%	4	MATH	138	39	28.26%	No
	2016-2017	29.20%	14.94%	5	MATH	133	23	17.29%	No
	2016-2017	29.20%	12.56%	6	MATH	115	15	13.04%	No
	2016-2017	29.20%	13.42%	7	MATH	123	24	19.51%	No
	2016-2017	29.20%	11.82%	8	MATH	121	-	11.57%	No
	2016-2017	29.20%	8.46%	11	MATH	69	-	< 5%	No
Note:									

Note.

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

Indicator 4A	<u>School Year</u> 2015-2016	<u>State Target</u> 0.00%	<u>State Data</u> 66.67%	<u>SWD Enrollment</u> 1229	Non-SWD Enrollment 9149	SWD Suspended > 10 Days -	Non-SWD Suspended <u>> 10 Days</u> -	LEA Data (Rate Ratio) 4.25	<u>Met Target?</u> Yes
Note:		used on school year 201							
	State data is a ca	Iculation 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 Dis	crenancy in the Rate	of Long-Term Suspens	ions and Expulsion	s of Students with Dis	abilities by Race/Ethnicity	and Noncompliant Polici	es Procedures and Pr	actices	
Significant Dis	crepancy in the Nate	or cong-renn Suspens		is of students with Dis	sabilities by Nace/Etimetry	•	es, riocedures, and ris	actices	
						SWD Suspended > 10			
Indicator 4B	School Year	State Target	State Data	Race	SWD Enrolled	<u>SWD Suspended > 10</u> <u>Days</u>	<u>Compliant</u>	LEA Data (Rate Ratio)	Met Target?
Indicator 4B	<u>School Year</u> 2015-2016	<u>State Target</u> 0.00	<u>State Data</u> 100.00%	<u>Race</u> Hispanic	SWD Enrolled 708		<u>Compliant</u> Yes	LEA Data (Rate Ratio) 0.00	<u>Met Target?</u> Yes
Indicator 4B									
Indicator 4B	2015-2016	0.00	100.00%	Hispanic	708	Days -	Yes	0.00	Yes
<u>Indicator 4B</u>	2015-2016 2015-2016	0.00 0.00	100.00% 100.00%	Hispanic American Indian	708	Days - -	Yes Yes	0.00	Yes Yes
Indicator 4B	2015-2016 2015-2016 2015-2016	0.00 0.00 0.00	100.00% 100.00% 100.00%	Hispanic American Indian African American	708 - 361	<u>Days</u> - - -	Yes Yes Yes	0.00 0.00 0.20	Yes Yes Yes
Indicator 4B	2015-2016 2015-2016 2015-2016 2015-2016	0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00	100.00% 100.00% 100.00% 100.00%	Hispanic American Indian African American White	708 - 361 98	<u>Days</u> - - - -	Yes Yes Yes Yes	0.00 0.00 0.20 0.00	Yes Yes Yes Yes
Indicator 4B	2015-2016 2015-2016 2015-2016 2015-2016 2015-2016	0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00	100.00% 100.00% 100.00% 100.00% 100.00%	Hispanic American Indian African American White Asian	708 - 361 98	<u>Days</u> - - - - -	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	0.00 0.00 0.20 0.00 0.00	Yes 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> 1432	Number of SWD <u>In LRE A</u> 1054	LEA Data <u>% in LRE A</u> 73.60%	<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 Day					
	U	Ŭ						
Indicator 5B	<u>School Year</u> 2016-2017	<u>State Target</u> 15.10%	<u>State Data</u> 14.96%		Number of SWD 1432	<u>Number of SWD In</u> <u>LRE B</u> 72	LRE Data % in LRE B 5.03%	<u>Met Target?</u> Yes
Note:								
Percent of Child	ren Aged 6 to 21 Serv	ved In Separate School	s, Residential Facilities, and in Hom	ebound/Hospital Placements				
Indicator 5C	<u>School Year</u> 2016-2017	<u>State Target</u> 4.50%	<u>State Data</u> 5.46%		Number of SWD 1432	Number of SWD In LRE C 27	LRE Data <u>% in LRE C</u> < 5%	<u>Met Target?</u> Yes
Note:								
Preschool Envir	onments: Percent of	Children Aged 3 to 5 At	tending a Regular Early Childhood I	Program and Receiving the Maj	ority of Special Educati	ion and Related Services	in the Regular Early Ch	ildhood
Program Indicator 6A	<u>School Year</u> 2016-2017	<u>State Target</u> 48.50%	<u>State Data</u> 47.46%		Number of SWD 162	Number of SWD Receiving Services in the <u>Regular EC Program</u> 54	LEA Data Percent Receiving Services in the <u>Regular EC program</u> 33.33%	<u>Met Target?</u> No
Note:								
Preschool Enviro	onments: Percent of	Children Aged 3 to 5 Af	tending a Separate Special Educati	on 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%		Number of SWD 162	<u>in Separate Setting</u> 74	Separate Setting 45.68%	Met Target? No
Note:			2					

Preschool Outcomes: Percent of Preschool Students Aged 3 to 5 Who Demonstrate Improved Skills in Positive Social/Emotional Skills : Sales 2017 Read Growth State Target Sea Bate LEA Data Meit Target No Social/Emotional Skills : Second Within Age Expectation State State Data LEA Data Meit Target No noticetor 72 2016-2017 Read Growth State Target Second Within Age	Proschool Outo	omos: Porcont of	Proschool Students Aged 2 t	n E Who Domons	trata Improved Skill	ls in Positivo Social/Emot	tional Skills			
School Year School Year School Year State Data 88.0% IAP Data 83.3% IAP Data 75.0% IMME Target No State Data 58.0% State Data 49.33% IAP Data 49.33% IAP Data 80.0% IAP Data No State Data 58.0% State Data 51.20% IAP Data 49.33% IAP Data No Note:	Preschool Outco	omes. Percent of	Freschool Students Aged 5 t	D 5 WHO Demons	trate improved skin	is in Positive Social Enio				
Preschool Outcomes: Percent of Preschool Students Aged 3 to 5 Who Demonstrate Improved Skills in Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills: Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills: Indicator 78 School Year Acquisition and Use of Skings Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills: Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills: State Data LEA Data Met Target State Data State Dat	Indicator 7A	School Year R	<u>Skills : Percent Increased</u> ate of Growth State Target				<u>Social/Emotional Skills :</u> <u>Percent Within Age</u> <u>Expectation State</u> <u>Target</u>			
Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills: Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills: Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills: Berearch Untrin Age Met Target State Data Met Target Indicator 78 School Year Growth State Target State Data Met Target State Data Ket Variable No State Data Ket Variable No No State Data Ket Variable No	Note:									
Acquisition and Use of Nonwiedge and Skills: Percent Increased Rate of 2016-2017 Acquisition and Use of Nonwiedge and Skills: Percent Increased Rate of 91.10% State Data 83.08% Met Target No State Data 52.70% State Data 48.60% LEA Data 50.00% Met Target No Note:	Preschool Outco	omes: Percent of	Preschool Students Aged 3 to	o 5 Who Demons	trate Improved Skil	ls in Acquisition and Use	of Knowledge and Skills			
Use of Appropriate Behaviors: Percent Increased Rate of Growth Increased Rate o		School Year	Knowledge and Skills: Percent Increased Rate of Growth State Target				Knowledge and Skills: Percent Within Age Expectation State Target			
Use of Appropriate Behaviors: Percent Increased Rate of Growth Increased Rate o										
Behaviors: Percent Increased Rate of GrowthEtate Data State TargetEta Data Met TargetMet Target NoState Target State TargetState Data State DataMet Target VesIndicator 7CSchool Year 2016-2017State Target 90.20%State Data 88.19%LEA Data 84.38%Met Target NoState Target State Target NoState Data 65.30%LEA Data 64.31%Met Target YesNote: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 DiisabilitiesIndicator 8School Year 2016-2017State 88.00%State Data 89.18%Total Number of Respondents 115Number Agree 103LEA Data 65.30%Met Target? Yes	Preschool Outco	omes: Percent of	Preschool Students Aged 3 to	o 5 Who Demons	trate Improved Skil	ls in Use of Appropriate I	Behaviors			
State State State Total Number of LEA Data Indicator 8 School Year Target Data Respondents Number Agree Number Disagree % Agree Met Target? 2016-2017 88.00% 89.18% 115 103 - 89.60% Yes	Indicator 7C	School Year	Behaviors: Percent Increased Rate of Growth State Target				Behaviors: Percent Within Age Expectation State Target			
StateStateTotal Number ofLEA DataIndicator 8School YearTargetDataRespondentsNumber AgreeNumber Disagree% AgreeMet Target?2016-201788.00%89.18%115103-89.60%Yes	Note:									
Indicator 8School YearTargetDataRespondentsNumber AgreeNumber Disagree% AgreeMet Target?2016-201788.00%89.18%115103-89.60%Yes										
Note: Unsure = 2	Indicator 8		Target	Data		Respondents		Number Disagree	<u>% Agree</u>	
	Note:	Unsure = 2								

Appoquinimink School District								
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?
<u>Indicator 5</u>	2010 2017							
	2016-2017	0.00%	17.50%			Yes		Yes
Note: State da	ta reflects % of distr	icts with Disproportio	nate Representation as a res	ult of inappropriate identification.				
Disproportiona	te Representation o	f Racial and Ethnic Gr	ouns in Specific Disability Ca	tegories That is a Result of Inappropria	ate Identification			
Disproportiona								
	School Year							
Indicator 10		State Target	State Data			LEA Data Compliant		Met Target?
	2016-2017	0.00%	18.92%			Yes		Yes
Note: State da	ta reflects % of distr	icts with Disproportio	nate Representation as a res	ult of inappropriate identification.				
Evaluations Cou	nducted Within 45 S	chool Days or 90 Caler	ndar Days Whichever is Shor	ter, of Receiving Parent Consent for In	itial Evaluation			
Litalations col		chool Days of 50 calci						
	Calcal Veen			Total Number of Initial	Number Within	Number Not Within	<u>% LEA Data Within</u>	
Indicator 11	School Year	Charles Trement	Chata Data	Evoluations	The set is a set		The states	Mast Taxast2
indicator 11		State Larget	State Data	Evaluations	Timelines	limelines	rimelines	wiet larget?
Indicator 11	2016-2017	State Target	State Data	Evaluations	Timelines	<u>Timelines</u>	<u>Timelines</u>	Met Target?
	2016-2017	100.00%	98.97%	<u>Evaluations</u> 176	<u>174</u>	<u>l'imelines</u> 2	> 95%	No
Note:	2016-2017 NA							
Note:	NA	100.00%	98.97%	176	174	2	> 95%	
Note:	NA	100.00%	98.97%		174	2	> 95%	
Note:	NA	100.00%	98.97%	176	174	2	> 95%	
Note:	NA	100.00%	98.97%	176	174	2	> 95%	
Note:	NA	100.00%	98.97%	176	174	2	> 95%	
Note:	NA	100.00%	98.97%	176	174 no Have an IEP Develope	2	> 95%	No
Note: Early Childhood	NA d Transitions: Percen	100.00%	98.97%	0 Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Wh <u>Total Number of SWD</u>	174 no Have an IEP Develope <u>Number of Students</u>	2 ed and Implemented by 1 s Referred Minus Not	> 95% Their Third Birthday <u>LEA Data % Who</u> <u>Received Services by</u>	No
Note:	NA d Transitions: Percen <u>School Year</u>	100.00% nt of Children Referred <u>State Target</u>	98.97% I by Part C Prior to Age 3 Who <u>State Data</u>	0 Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Wh <u>Total Number of SWD.</u> <u>Who Turned Age 3</u>	174 no Have an IEP Develope <u>Number of Students</u> <u>Eligible and/or</u>	2 ed and Implemented by 1 <u>Referred Minus Not</u> <u>Parent Refusals</u>	> 95% Their Third Birthday <u>LEA Data % Who</u> <u>Received Services by</u> <u>Age 3</u>	No Met Target?
Note: Early Childhood	NA d Transitions: Percen	100.00%	98.97%	0 Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Wh <u>Total Number of SWD</u>	174 no Have an IEP Develope <u>Number of Students</u> <u>Eligible and/or</u>	2 ed and Implemented by 1 s Referred Minus Not	> 95% Their Third Birthday <u>LEA Data % Who</u> <u>Received Services by</u>	No
Note: Early Childhood	NA d Transitions: Percen <u>School Year</u>	100.00% nt of Children Referred <u>State Target</u>	98.97% I by Part C Prior to Age 3 Who <u>State Data</u>	0 Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Wh <u>Total Number of SWD.</u> <u>Who Turned Age 3</u>	174 no Have an IEP Develope <u>Number of Students</u> <u>Eligible and/or</u>	2 ed and Implemented by 1 <u>Referred Minus Not</u> <u>Parent Refusals</u>	> 95% Their Third Birthday <u>LEA Data % Who</u> <u>Received Services by</u> <u>Age 3</u>	No Met Target?
Note: Early Childhood	NA d Transitions: Percen <u>School Year</u>	100.00% nt of Children Referred <u>State Target</u>	98.97% I by Part C Prior to Age 3 Who <u>State Data</u>	0 Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Wh <u>Total Number of SWD.</u> <u>Who Turned Age 3</u>	174 no Have an IEP Develope <u>Number of Students</u> <u>Eligible and/or</u>	2 ed and Implemented by 1 <u>Referred Minus Not</u> <u>Parent Refusals</u>	> 95% Their Third Birthday <u>LEA Data % Who</u> <u>Received Services by</u> <u>Age 3</u>	No Met Target?
Note: Early Childhood	NA d Transitions: Percen <u>School Year</u>	100.00% nt of Children Referred <u>State Target</u>	98.97% I by Part C Prior to Age 3 Who <u>State Data</u>	0 Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Wh <u>Total Number of SWD.</u> <u>Who Turned Age 3</u>	174 no Have an IEP Develope <u>Number of Students</u> <u>Eligible and/or</u>	2 ed and Implemented by 1 <u>Referred Minus Not</u> <u>Parent Refusals</u>	> 95% Their Third Birthday <u>LEA Data % Who</u> <u>Received Services by</u> <u>Age 3</u>	No Met Target?
Note: Early Childhood Indicator 12 Note:	NA d Transitions: Percen <u>School Year</u> 2016-2017	100.00% nt of Children Referred <u>State Target</u> 100.00%	98.97% I by Part C Prior to Age 3 Who <u>State Data</u> 98.55%	0 Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Wh <u>Total Number of SWD.</u> <u>Who Turned Age 3</u>	174 no Have an IEP Develope <u>Number of Students</u> <u>Eligible and/or</u>	2 ed and Implemented by T <u>Referred Minus Not</u> <u>Parent Refusals</u> 16	> 95% Their Third Birthday <u>LEA Data % Who</u> <u>Received Services by</u> <u>Age 3</u> 93.48%	No Met Target?
Note: Early Childhood Indicator 12 Note:	NA d Transitions: Percen <u>School Year</u> 2016-2017 th Age 14 and Above	100.00% nt of Children Referred <u>State Target</u> 100.00%	98.97% I by Part C Prior to Age 3 Who <u>State Data</u> 98.55%	0 Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Wh <u>Total Number of SWD</u> <u>Who Turned Age 3</u> 55	174 no Have an IEP Develope <u>Number of Students</u> <u>Eligible and/or</u>	2 ed and Implemented by T <u>Referred Minus Not</u> <u>Parent Refusals</u> 16	> 95% Their Third Birthday <u>LEA Data % Who</u> <u>Received Services by</u> <u>Age 3</u> 93.48%	No Met Target?
Note: Early Childhood Indicator 12 Note: Percent of Yout	NA d Transitions: Percen <u>School Year</u> 2016-2017 th Age 14 and Above	100.00% nt of Children Referred <u>State Target</u> 100.00%	98.97% I by Part C Prior to Age 3 Who <u>State Data</u> 98.55%	0 Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Wh <u>Total Number of SWD</u> <u>Who Turned Age 3</u> 55 le. Annual IEP Goals and Transition Ser	174 no Have an IEP Develope <u>Number of Students</u> <u>Eligible and/or</u> z	2 ed and Implemented by T <u>Referred Minus Not</u> <u>Parent Refusals</u> 16 uble Enable the Student t	> 95% Their Third Birthday <u>LEA Data % Who Received Services by</u> <u>Age 3</u> 93.48%	No Met Target?
Note: Early Childhood Indicator 12 Note: Percent of Yout the Post-Second	NA d Transitions: Percent School Year 2016-2017 th Age 14 and Above dary Goals	100.00% ht of Children Referred <u>State Target</u> 100.00%	98.97% I by Part C Prior to Age 3 Who <u>State Data</u> 98.55%	0 Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Wh <u>Total Number of SWD</u> <u>Who Turned Age 3</u> 55 le. Annual IEP Goals and Transition Ser <u>Total Number of IEPs</u>	174 no Have an IEP Develope <u>Number of Students</u> <u>Eligible and/or</u> rvices That Will Reasona <u>Number of IEPs Meetin</u>	2 ed and Implemented by T <u>Referred Minus Not</u> <u>Parent Refusals</u> 16 uble Enable the Student t	> 95% Their Third Birthday <u>LEA Data % Who</u> <u>Received Services by</u> <u>Age 3</u> 93.48% to Meet <u>LEA Data % Meeting</u>	No Met Target? No
Note: Early Childhood Indicator 12 Note: Percent of Yout	NA d Transitions: Percen <u>School Year</u> 2016-2017 th Age 14 and Above	100.00% nt of Children Referred <u>State Target</u> 100.00%	98.97% I by Part C Prior to Age 3 Who <u>State Data</u> 98.55%	0 Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Wh <u>Total Number of SWD</u> <u>Who Turned Age 3</u> 55 le. Annual IEP Goals and Transition Ser	174 no Have an IEP Develope <u>Number of Students</u> <u>Eligible and/or</u> z	2 ed and Implemented by T <u>Referred Minus Not</u> <u>Parent Refusals</u> 16 uble Enable the Student t	> 95% Their Third Birthday <u>LEA Data % Who Received Services by</u> <u>Age 3</u> 93.48%	No Met Target?
Note: Early Childhood Indicator 12 Note: Percent of Yout the Post-Second	NA d Transitions: Percent School Year 2016-2017 th Age 14 and Above dary Goals	100.00% ht of Children Referred <u>State Target</u> 100.00%	98.97% I by Part C Prior to Age 3 Who <u>State Data</u> 98.55%	0 Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Wh <u>Total Number of SWD</u> <u>Who Turned Age 3</u> 55 le. Annual IEP Goals and Transition Ser <u>Total Number of IEPs</u>	174 no Have an IEP Develope <u>Number of Students</u> <u>Eligible and/or</u> rvices That Will Reasona <u>Number of IEPs Meetin</u>	2 ed and Implemented by T <u>Referred Minus Not</u> <u>Parent Refusals</u> 16 uble Enable the Student t	> 95% Their Third Birthday <u>LEA Data % Who</u> <u>Received Services by</u> <u>Age 3</u> 93.48% to Meet <u>LEA Data % Meeting</u>	No Met Target? No
Note: Early Childhood Indicator 12 Note: Percent of Yout the Post-Second	NA d Transitions: Percent School Year 2016-2017 th Age 14 and Above dary Goals School Year	100.00% ht of Children Referred <u>State Target</u> 100.00% e with an IEP That Inclu <u>State Target</u>	98.97% I by Part C Prior to Age 3 Who State Data 98.55% udes Coordinated. Measurab	176 o Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Wh <u>Total Number of SWD</u> <u>Who Turned Age 3</u> 55 le. Annual IEP Goals and Transition Ser <u>Total Number of IEPs</u> <u>Reviewed</u>	174 no Have an IEP Develope <u>Number of Students</u> Eligible and/or rvices That Will Reasona <u>Number of IEPs Meetin Standard</u>	2 ed and Implemented by T <u>Referred Minus Not</u> <u>Parent Refusals</u> 16 uble Enable the Student t	> 95% Their Third Birthday LEA Data % Who Received Services by Age 3 93.48% to Meet LEA Data % Meeting Standard	No Met Target? No Met Target?
Note: Early Childhood Indicator 12 Note: Percent of Yout the Post-Second	NA d Transitions: Percent School Year 2016-2017 th Age 14 and Above dary Goals School Year	100.00% ht of Children Referred <u>State Target</u> 100.00% e with an IEP That Inclu <u>State Target</u>	98.97% I by Part C Prior to Age 3 Who State Data 98.55% udes Coordinated. Measurab	176 o Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Wh <u>Total Number of SWD</u> <u>Who Turned Age 3</u> 55 le. Annual IEP Goals and Transition Ser <u>Total Number of IEPs</u> <u>Reviewed</u>	174 no Have an IEP Develope <u>Number of Students</u> Eligible and/or rvices That Will Reasona <u>Number of IEPs Meetin Standard</u>	2 ed and Implemented by T <u>Referred Minus Not</u> <u>Parent Refusals</u> 16 uble Enable the Student t	> 95% Their Third Birthday LEA Data % Who Received Services by Age 3 93.48% to Meet LEA Data % Meeting Standard	No Met Target? No Met Target?

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										
Indiante 14	Cabaal Vaar	Charles Toward	Chata Data	Total Number of Fuiters	Total Number of	Crown A Dannan danta		Mat Taurat		
Indicator 14	<u>School Year</u> 2016-2017	State Target 33.00%	<u>State Data</u> 49.47%	<u>Total Number of Exiters</u> 67	<u>Respondents</u> 20	Group A Respondents 16	LEA Data % Group A 80.00%	<u>Met Target?</u> Yes		
		<u>State Target</u> 64.00% <u>State Target</u> 100.00%	<u>State Data</u> 82.59% <u>State Data</u> 86.20%			Group B Respondents 18 Group C Respondents 19	LEA Data % Group B 90.00% LEA Data % Group C 95.00%	Met Target? Yes Met Target? No		
Note:										