

# **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

April 18, 2019

Dr. Mark Holodick Superintendent Brandywine School District 1311 Brandywine Boulevard Wilmington, DE 19809

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

Dear Dr. Holodick:

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. The State must monitor the implementation of Part B, enforce Part B in accordance with the provisions at 34 CFR 300.604(a)(1), and (a)(3), (b)(2)(i) and (b)(2(v), and (c)(2), and annually report on performance under Part B. The primary focus of the State's monitoring activities must be on:

- Improving educational results and functional outcomes for all children with disabilities; and
- Ensuring that public agencies meet the program requirements under Part B of the Act, with a particular emphasis on those requirements that are most closely related to improving educational results for children with disabilities.

For FFY 2017, 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

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.

April 18, 2019 Brandywine School District FFY 2017 LEA Determination Under the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Page 2

## • 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

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. As a result your LEA is required to analyze related data and develop a continuous improvement plan addressing areas identified in your determinations in order to improve outcomes for students with disabilities in your LEA.

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, Pamela Bauman, will be in contact with *Lisa Lawson, Ed.D, Director of Special Education* to provide technical assistance and discuss possible actions, including the development or revision of a Continuous Improvement 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/pb

Attachment cc: Susan S. Bunting, Ed.D., Secretary of Education Monica Gant, Ph.D., Associate Secretary Lisa Lawson, Ed.D, Director of Special Education Pamela Bauman, 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 2017 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
Co	mpliance:	
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

o 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)

Brandywine School District										
Results Indicators	Data From: (Time Period)	SPP Target 2017	State Data	LEA Data	LEA Score	Possible Points				
Indicator 1: Graduation Rate	2016-2017	77.80%	67.94%	54.17%	0	1				
Indicator 2: Drop Out Rate	2016-2017	4.30%	2.38%	-	0	1				
Indicator 3B: Participation Rate-ELA										
Grade 3		95.00%	98.00%	98.44%	1	1				
Grade 4	1	95.00%	96.17%	96.23%	1	1				
Grade 5	1	95.00%	97.85%	96.84%	1	1				
Grade 6	2017-2018	95.00%	97.25%	99.32%	1	1				
Grade 7		95.00%	96.64%	96.06%	1	1				
Grade 8		95.00%	96.80%	95.24%	1	1				
Grade 11		95.00%	84.40%	79.09%	0	1				
Indicator 3B: Participation Rate-MATH										
Grade 3		95.00%	97.64%	96.88%	1	1				
Grade 4		95.00%	96.34%	95.60%	1	1				
Grade 5		95.00%	97.80%	96.82%	1	1				
Grade 6	2017-2018	95.00%	96.63%	95.92%	1	1				
Grade 7		95.00%	96.24%	94.49%	0	1				
Grade 8		95.00%	96.79%	94.44%	0	1				
Grade 11		95.00%	83.84%	78.38%	0	1				
Indicator 3C: Proficiency Rate-ELA										
Grade 3		39.50%	12.28%	-	0	1				
Grade 4		39.50%	16.88%	-	0	1				
Grade 5		39.50%	15.59%	15.69%	0	1				
Grade 6	2017-2018	39.50%	11.07%	-	0	1				
Grade 7		39.50%	12.81%	-	0	1				
Grade 8		39.50%	13.30%	-	0	1				
Grade 11		39.50%	8.62%	-	0	1				
Indicator 3C: Proficiency Rate-MATH										
Grade 3		36.30%	16.92%	-	0	1				
Grade 4		36.30%	16.67%	-	0	1				
Grade 5		36.30%	9.40%	-	0	1				
Grade 6	2017-2018	36.30%	5.70%	-	0	1				
Grade 7		36.30%	5.05%	-	0	1				
Grade 8		36.30%	5.74%	-	0	1				
Grade 11		36.30%	2.83%	-	0	1				

Indicator 4A: Significant Discrepancy in the Rate of Long-Term Suspensions and Expulsions of Students with Disabilities	2016-2017	Rate Ratio 1.18 Cell Size 15	NA	Exceeded Thresholds	0	1
--	-----------	---------------------------------	----	------------------------	---	---

Results Indicators Continued	Data From: (Time Period)	SPP Target 2017	State Data	LEA Data	LEA Score	Possible Points
	renouj					
Indicator 5A: Percent of Children Aged 6 -21 Served Inside the Class 80% of the Day		71.00%	65.74%	74.85%	1	1
Indicator 5B: Percent of Children Aged 6 -21 Served Inside the Class Less Than 40% of the Day	2017-2018	14.90%	14.94%	-	1	1
Indicator 5C: Percent of Children Aged 6 -21 Served in Separate Schools, Residential Facilities and Homebound/Hospital Placements		4.00%	5.22%	-	1	1
Indicates 74 Fash, Childhead Outserson Desition						
Indicator 7A. Early Childhood Outcomes- Positive Social/Emotional Skills						
Percent Increase Rate of Growth		89.80%	91.25%	95.74%	1	1
Percent Within Age Expectation	2017-2018	59.30%	51.06%	39.58%	0	1
Indicator 7B. Early Childhood Outcomes-Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills						_
Percent Increase Rate of Growth		92.20%	88.14%	91.58%	0	1
Percent Within Age Expectation	2017-2018	53.70%	46.86%	34.38%	0	1
Indicator 7C. Early Childhood Outcomes- Use of Appropriate Behaviors						_
Percent Increase Rate of Growth		91.30%	89.60%	93.55%	1	1
Percent Within Age Expectation	2017-2018	65.40%	63.58%	60.00%	0	1
Compliance Indicators	Data From: (Time Period)	SPP Target 2017	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.	2016-2017	Rate Ratio 1.18 Cell Size 10	NA	Noncompliant	0	1
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation All Disabilities	2017-2018	0.00%	NA	Compliant	1	1
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation Specific Disabilities	2017-2018	0.00%	NA	Compliant	1	1
Indicator 11: Initial Evaluations Conducted Within Timeline	2017-2018	100.00%	99.36%	100.00%	1	1
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition from Part C to Part B	2017-2018	100.00%	89.11%	100.00%	1	1
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition	2017-2018	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	1	1
Determination Summary			Anı	nual Determina	ition:	]
Compliance Indicators Score	5		Ν	eeds Intervent	ion	
Possible Points:	6					
Results Indicators Score	15	Interver	ntion Plan /Co	mpliance Agreer	nent:	No
Possible Points:	40		-	-		I
Score Total	20					
Out of a Possible:	46					
Percentage:	43.48%					
		8				

# Brandywine School District

te			
<u>School Year</u> 2016-2017	<u>State Target</u> 77.80%	<u>State Data</u> 67.94%	LEA Data <u>% SWD Who</u> <u>Number Eligible</u> <u>Number Graduated</u> <u>Graduated</u> <u>Met Target?</u> 96 52 54.17%No
of youth with IEPs g	raduating from high sc	hool with a regular high s	ol diploma within 4-year adjusted cohort
<u>School Year</u> 2016-2017	<u>State Target</u> 4.30%	<u>State Data</u> 2.38%	LEA Data <u>% SWD who Dropped</u> Number EnrolledNumber of Drop-OutsOutMet Target?37219-No
	<u>School Year</u> 2016-2017 of youth with IEPs g <u>School Year</u>	School Year       State Target         2016-2017       77.80%         of youth with IEPs graduating from high scl         School Year       State Target	School Year       State Target       State Data         2016-2017       77.80%       67.94%         of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular high school       with a regular high school         School Year       State Target       State Data

		State	State					LEA Data	
Indicator 3B	School Year	Target	<u>Data</u>	Grade	Subject	Number Eligible	Number Tested	Percent Tested	Met Target?
	2017-2018	95.00%	98.00%	3	ELA	128	126	98.44%	Yes
	2017-2018	95.00%	96.17%	4	ELA	159	153	96.23%	Yes
	2017-2018	95.00%	97.85%	5	ELA	158	153	96.84%	Yes
	2017-2018	95.00%	97.25%	6	ELA	147	146	99.32%	Yes
	2017-2018	95.00%	96.64%	7	ELA	127	122	96.06%	Yes
	2017-2018	95.00%	96.80%	8	ELA	126	120	95.24%	Yes
	2017-2018	95.00%	84.40%	11	ELA	110	87	79.09%	No
Note:									

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

		State	State					LEA Data	
Indicator 3B	School Year	<b>Target</b>	<u>Data</u>	Grade	Subject	Number Eligible	Number Tested	Percent Tested	Met Target?
	2017-2018	95.00%	97.64%	3	MATH	128	124	96.88%	Yes
	2017-2018	95.00%	96.34%	4	MATH	159	152	95.60%	Yes
	2017-2018	95.00%	97.80%	5	MATH	157	152	96.82%	Yes
	2017-2018	95.00%	96.63%	6	MATH	147	141	95.92%	Yes
	2017-2018	95.00%	96.24%	7	MATH	127	120	94.49%	No
	2017-2018	95.00%	96.79%	8	MATH	126	119	94.44%	No
	2017-2018	95.00%	83.84%	11	MATH	111	87	78.38%	No
Note:									

	Brandywine School District													
<b>Proficiency Rat</b>	te on the State Asses		LEA Data											
		State	State					% of SWD Meeting						
Indicator 3C	School Year	<b>Target</b>	Data	Grade	Subject	Number Tested	Number Meets	Proficiency	Met Target?					
	2017-2018	39.50%	12.28%	3	ELA	126	-	-	No					
	2017-2018	39.50%	16.88%	4	ELA	153	20	-	No					
	2017-2018	39.50%	15.59%	5	ELA	153	24	15.69%	No					
	2017-2018	39.50%	11.07%	6	ELA	146	16	-	No					
	2017-2018	39.50%	12.81%	7	ELA	122	-	-	No					
	2017-2018	39.50%	13.30%	8	ELA	120	17	-	No					
	2017-2018	39.50%	8.62%	11	ELA	87	-	-	No					
Note:														

#### Brandywine School District

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

		State	State					LEA Data % of SWD Meeting	
Indicator 3C	School Year	<b>Target</b>	<u>Data</u>	Grade	<u>Subject</u>	Number Tested	Number Meets	Proficiency	Met Target?
	2017-2018	36.30%	16.92%	3	MATH	124	16	-	No
	2017-2018	36.30%	16.67%	4	MATH	152	22	-	No
	2017-2018	36.30%	9.40%	5	MATH	152	-	-	No
	2017-2018	36.30%	5.70%	6	MATH	141	-	-	No
	2017-2018	36.30%	5.05%	7	MATH	120	-	-	No
	2017-2018	36.30%	5.74%	8	MATH	119	-	-	No
	2017-2018	36.30%	2.83%	11	MATH	87	-	-	No
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	LEA Data (Rate Ratio)	<u>Under</u> <u>Threshold?</u>
	2016-2017	50.00%	100.00%	1569	8877	32	62	-	No
Note:		sed on school year 2016			and an N size of 15.				

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 1.18

Significant Discrepancy in the Rate of Long-Term Suspensions and Expulsions of Students with Disabilities by Race/Ethnicity and Noncompliant Policies, Procedures, and Practices

						SWD Suspended > 10			
Indicator 4B	School Year	State Target	State Data	Race	SWD Enrolled	Days	Met Target?	LEA Data (Rate Ratio)	Compliant?
	2016-2017	0%	50.00%	Hispanic	-	-	Yes	-	Yes
	2016-2017	0%	50.00%	American Indian	-	-	Yes	-	Yes
	2016-2017	0%	50.00%	African American	738	27	No	-	No
	2016-2017	0%	50.00%	White	-	-	Yes	-	Yes
	2016-2017	0%	50.00%	Asian	-	-	Yes	-	Yes
	2016-2017	0%	50.00%	Haw./P.I.	-	-	Yes	-	Yes
	2016-2017	0%	50.00%	Multiple	-	-	Yes	-	Yes

Note: Indicator 4B is based on school year 2016-2017 data with a Rate Ratio of > 1.18 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 1.18

<u>;</u>

Percent of Child	ren Aged 6 to 21 Ser	ved Inside the Regular	Class 80% or More of the Day							
Indicator 5A	<u>School Year</u> 2017-2018	<u>State Target</u> 71.00%	<u>State Data</u> 65.74%		Number of SWD 1535	Number of SWD In LRE A 1149	<b>LEA Data</b> <u>% in LRE A</u> 74.85%	<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							
Indicator 5B	<u>School Year</u> 2017-2018	<u>State Target</u> 14.90%	<u>State Data</u> 14.94%		Number of SWD 1535	<u>Number of SWD In</u> <u>LRE B</u> 178	<u>LRE Data % in LRE B</u> -	<u>Met Target?</u> Yes		
Note:										
Percent of Child	ren Aged 6 to 21 Ser	ved In Separate School	s, Residential Facilities, and in H	omebound/Hospital Placements						
Indicator 5C	<u>School Year</u> 2017-2018	<u>State Target</u> 4.00%	<u>State Data</u> 5.22%		Number of SWD 1535	Number of SWD In LRE C 33	LRE Data <u>% in LRE C</u> -	<u>Met Target?</u> Yes		
Note:										
Preschool Envir Program	onments: Percent of	Children Aged 3 to 5 At	ttending a Regular Early Childho	od Program and Receiving the Maj	ority of Special Educati	ion and Related Services	in the Regular Early Ch	ildhood		
Indicator 6A	School Year	State Target	State Data		Number of SWD	Number of SWD Receiving Services in the <u>Regular EC Program</u>	LEA Data Percent Receiving Services in the Regular EC program	Met Target?		
	2017-2018	49.00%	49.24%		223	185	82.96%	Yes		
Note:										
Preschool Envir	Preschool Environments: 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									
Indicator 6B	<u>School Year</u> 2017-2018	<u>State Target</u> 32.00%	<u>State Data</u> 34.59%		Number of SWD 223	Receiving Services in Separate Setting -	Services in Separate Setting -	<u>Met Target?</u> Yes		
Note:										

Preschool Outco	omes: Percent o	f Preschool Students Aged 3 t	o 5 Who Demons	trate Improved Skil	ls in Positive Social/Emot	tional Skills			
ndicator 7 <u>A</u>	<u>School Year</u> 2017-2018	Positive Social/Emotional Skills : Percent Increased Rate of Growth State Target 89.80%	<u>State Data</u> 91.25%	<u>LEA Data</u> -	<u>Met Target</u> Yes	Positive Social/Emotional Skills : Percent Within Age Expectation State Target 59.30%	<u>State Data</u> 51.06%	<u>LEA Data</u> -	<u>Met Targe</u> No
Note:									
Preschool Outco	mas: Parcant a	f Preschool Students Aged 3 t	o 5 Who Demons	trate Improved Skil	ls in Acquisition and Lise	of Knowledge and Skills			
Indicator 7B	<u>School Year</u> 2017-2018	Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills: Percent Increased Rate of Growth State Target 92.20%	<u>State Data</u> 88.14%	<u>LEA Data</u> -	<u>Met Target</u> No	Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills: Percent Within Age Expectation State Target 53.70%	<u>State Data</u> 46.86%	<u>LEA Data</u> -	<u>Met Target</u> No
Note:									
Preschool Outco	omes: Percent o	f Preschool Students Aged 3 t	o 5 Who Demons	trate Improved Skil	ls in Use of Appropriate F	Behaviors			
Indicator 7C Note:	<u>School Year</u> 2017-2018	<u>Use of Appropriate</u> <u>Behaviors: Percent</u> <u>Increased Rate of Growth</u> <u>State Target</u> 91.30%	<u>State Data</u> 89.60%	<u>LEA Data</u> -	<u>Met Target</u> Yes	<u>Use of Appropriate</u> <u>Behaviors: Percent</u> <u>Within Age Expectation</u> <u>State Target</u> 65.40%	<u>State Data</u> 63.58%	<u>LEA Data</u> -	<u>Met Targe</u> No
			ervices Who Rep	ort That School Faci	litated Parent Involveme	ent as a Means of Improving	Services and Results for	<sup>•</sup> Children with Disa	bilities
Percent of Pare	nts with a Child		·		Total Number of				
		State	State		Total Number of Respondents	Number Agree	Number Disagree	LEA Data % Agree	Met Target
Percent of Parer ndicator 8	nts with a Child <u>School Year</u> 2017-2018		·		Total Number of <u>Respondents</u> 138	<u>Number Agree</u> 121	<u>Number Disagree</u> -	<b>LEA Data <u>% Agree</u></b> 87.68%	<u>Met Targe</u> No

Disproportionate Representation of Racial and Ethnic Groups in Special Education and Related Services that is a Result of Inappropriate Identification Indicator 10 2007 Ves 100.00% Ves 10.00% Ves 10					Brandywine School District				
Indicator 3     State Target 2017-2018     State Target 0.00%     State Data 0.00%     It A Data Complaint Yes     Yes       Note: State data reflects % of districts with Disproportionate Representation as a result of inappropriate identification.     IEA Data Compliant Yes     Yes       Indicator 10     School Year 2017-2018     State Target 0.00%     State Target 2.278%     State Target 2.278%     IEA Data Compliant Yes       Note: State data reflects % of districts with Disproportionate Representation as a result of inappropriate identification.     IEA Data Compliant Yes     Met Target 7 Yes       Note: State data reflects % of districts with Disproportionate Representation as a result of inappropriate identification.     IEA Data Compliant Yes     Met Target 7 Yes       Indicator 11     School Year 2017-2018     State Target 300.00%     State Data 2.278%     Total Number of Initial Subulations 17     Number Within 100.00%     X IEA Data Within Yes       Indicator 11     School Year 2017-2018     State Target 100.00%     State Data 93.35%     Total Number of Initial Subulations 17     Number of Subulations 17     Number of Subulations 100.00%     Kean Park Yes       Indicator 12     School Year 2017-2018     State Target 300.00%     State Data 93.35%     Total Number of Subulations 17     Number of Subulations 100.00%     Kean Park Yes       Indicator 12     School Year 2017-2018     State Target 300.00%     State Data 300.00%     Total Number of Figs Who Turmed Age 3 100.0	Disproportiona	te Representation o	of Racial and Ethnic Gr	oups in Special Education a	nd Related Services That is a Result of Ina	appropriate Identificat	ion		
Indicator 3     State Target 2017-2018     State Target 0.00%     State Data 0.00%     It A Data Complaint Yes     Yes       Note: State data reflects % of districts with Disproportionate Representation as a result of inappropriate identification.     IEA Data Compliant Yes     Yes       Indicator 10     School Year 2017-2018     State Target 0.00%     State Target 2.278%     State Target 2.278%     IEA Data Compliant Yes       Note: State data reflects % of districts with Disproportionate Representation as a result of inappropriate identification.     IEA Data Compliant Yes     Met Target 7 Yes       Note: State data reflects % of districts with Disproportionate Representation as a result of inappropriate identification.     IEA Data Compliant Yes     Met Target 7 Yes       Indicator 11     School Year 2017-2018     State Target 300.00%     State Data 2.278%     Total Number of Initial Subulations 17     Number Within 100.00%     X IEA Data Within Yes       Indicator 11     School Year 2017-2018     State Target 100.00%     State Data 93.35%     Total Number of Initial Subulations 17     Number of Subulations 17     Number of Subulations 100.00%     Kean Park Yes       Indicator 12     School Year 2017-2018     State Target 300.00%     State Data 93.35%     Total Number of Subulations 17     Number of Subulations 100.00%     Kean Park Yes       Indicator 12     School Year 2017-2018     State Target 300.00%     State Data 300.00%     Total Number of Figs Who Turmed Age 3 100.0									
Indicator 3     State Target 2017-2018     State Target 0.00%     State Data 0.00%     It A Data Complaint Yes     Yes       Note: State data reflects % of districts with Disproportionate Representation as a result of inappropriate identification.     IEA Data Compliant Yes     Yes       Indicator 10     School Year 2017-2018     State Target 0.00%     State Target 2.278%     State Target 2.278%     IEA Data Compliant Yes       Note: State data reflects % of districts with Disproportionate Representation as a result of inappropriate identification.     IEA Data Compliant Yes     Met Target 7 Yes       Note: State data reflects % of districts with Disproportionate Representation as a result of inappropriate identification.     IEA Data Compliant Yes     Met Target 7 Yes       Indicator 11     School Year 2017-2018     State Target 300.00%     State Data 2.278%     Total Number of Initial Subulations 17     Number Within 100.00%     X IEA Data Within Yes       Indicator 11     School Year 2017-2018     State Target 100.00%     State Data 93.35%     Total Number of Initial Subulations 17     Number of Subulations 17     Number of Subulations 100.00%     Kean Park Yes       Indicator 12     School Year 2017-2018     State Target 300.00%     State Data 93.35%     Total Number of Subulations 17     Number of Subulations 100.00%     Kean Park Yes       Indicator 12     School Year 2017-2018     State Target 300.00%     State Data 300.00%     Total Number of Figs Who Turmed Age 3 100.0									
Indicator 3     State Target 2017-2018     State Target 0.00%     State Data 0.00%     It A Data Complaint Yes     Yes       Note: State data reflects % of districts with Disproportionate Representation as a result of inappropriate identification.     IEA Data Compliant Yes     Yes       Indicator 10     School Year 2017-2018     State Target 0.00%     State Target 2.278%     State Target 2.278%     IEA Data Compliant Yes       Note: State data reflects % of districts with Disproportionate Representation as a result of inappropriate identification.     IEA Data Compliant Yes     Met Target 7 Yes       Note: State data reflects % of districts with Disproportionate Representation as a result of inappropriate identification.     IEA Data Compliant Yes     Met Target 7 Yes       Indicator 11     School Year 2017-2018     State Target 300.00%     State Data 2.278%     Total Number of Initial Subulations 17     Number Within 100.00%     X IEA Data Within Yes       Indicator 11     School Year 2017-2018     State Target 100.00%     State Data 93.35%     Total Number of Initial Subulations 17     Number of Subulations 17     Number of Subulations 100.00%     Kean Park Yes       Indicator 12     School Year 2017-2018     State Target 300.00%     State Data 93.35%     Total Number of Subulations 17     Number of Subulations 100.00%     Kean Park Yes       Indicator 12     School Year 2017-2018     State Target 300.00%     State Data 300.00%     Total Number of Figs Who Turmed Age 3 100.0		School Year							
Note: State data reflects % of districts with Disproportionate Representation as a result of inappropriate identification. Disproportionate Representation of Racial and Ethnic Groups in Specific Disability Categories That is a Result of Inappropriate identification Indicator 10 2017-2018 State Target 2.78% Note: State data reflects % of districts with Disproportionate Representation as a result of inappropriate identification. Evaluations Conducted Within 45 School Days or 90 Calendar Days, Whichever is Shorter, of Receiving Parent Consent for Initial Evaluation Indicator 11 2017-2018 School Days or 90 Calendar Days, Whichever is Shorter, of Receiving Parent Consent for Initial Evaluation Indicator 12 2017-2018 100.00% 99.36% Total Number of Initial Evaluations Conducted Within 45 School Days or 90 Calendar Days, Whichever is Shorter, of Receiving Parent Consent for Initial Evaluation Indicator 11 2017-2018 100.00% 99.36% Total Number of Initial Evaluations Indicator 12 School Year State Target State Data 99.36% Total Number of Initial Interviews 100.00% 99.36% Total Number of Initial Interviews 100.00% Parent Consent for Initial Evaluation Indicator 12 School Year State Target State Data 99.36% Total Number of Initial Interviews 2017-2018 100.00% Parent of Children Referred by Part C Prior to Age 3 Who Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Who Have an IEP Developed and Implemented by Their Third Birthday Indicator 12 School Year State Target State Data 99.31% Note: Percent of Youth Age 14 and Above with an IEP That Includes Coordinated. Measurable. Annual IEP Goals and Transition Services That Will Reasonable Enable the Students to Meet Interview Present Process 100.00% Present Process 100.00% School Year State Target State Data 100.00% Present of Youth Age 14 and Above with an IEP That Includes Coordinated. Measurable. Annual IEP Goals and Transition Services That Will Reasonable Enable the Students to Meet Interview of IEPs Meetting. 100.00% Present of Youth Age 14 and Above with an	Indicator 9								
Disproportionate Representation of Racial and Ethnic Groups in Specific Disability Categories That is a Result of Inappropriate Identification          Indicator 10       School Year       State Target       State Data       IEA Data Compliant       Met Target?         Yes       Yes       Yes       Yes       Yes       Yes         Note:       School Year       State Target       State Data       Yes       Yes         Indicator 11       School Year       State Target       State Data       Yes       Yes         Indicator 12       School Year       State Target       State Data       Total Number of Initial       Number Not Within       Yes       Yes         Indicator 12       School Year       State Target       State Data       Total Number of Initial       Number Not Within       Yes       Yes         Note:       0       Immelines       Immelines       Immelines       Yes       Yes         Indicator 12       School Year       State Target       State Data       Total Number of Students Referred Minus Not       Ket Data Yes       Yes         Note:       0       Immelines       Immelines       Immelines       Yes       Yes         Note:       0       Immelines       State Data       Yes       Yes       Yes       Yes		2017-2018	0.00%	0.00%			Yes		Yes
Disproportionate Representation of Racial and Ethnic Groups in Specific Disability Categories That is a Result of Inappropriate Identification          Indicator 10       School Year       State Target       State Data       IEA Data Compliant       Met Target?         Yes       Yes       Yes       Yes       Yes       Yes         Note:       School Year       State Target       State Data       Yes       Yes         Indicator 11       School Year       State Target       State Data       Yes       Yes         Indicator 12       School Year       State Target       State Data       Total Number of Initial       Number Not Within       Yes       Yes         Indicator 12       School Year       State Target       State Data       Total Number of Initial       Number Not Within       Yes       Yes         Note:       0       Immelines       Immelines       Immelines       Yes       Yes         Indicator 12       School Year       State Target       State Data       Total Number of Students Referred Minus Not       Ket Data Yes       Yes         Note:       0       Immelines       Immelines       Immelines       Yes       Yes         Note:       0       Immelines       State Data       Yes       Yes       Yes       Yes									
Indicator 10       School Year 2017-2018       State Target 0.00%       State Data 2.78%       Net Target 2.78%       Net Target Yes         Note:       School Year 2017-2018       State Target 2017-2018       State Target 100.00%       State Data State Data 2017-2018       State Target 100.00%       State Data 2.78%       Met Target Yes         Indicator 11 2017-2018       School Year 2017-2018       State Target 100.00%       State Data 99.36%       Total Number of Initial Evaluations       Number Not Within 100.00%       Number Not Within Yes       X LEA Data Within 100.00%       Met Target Yes         Note:       0       Immediate 100.00%       State Data 100.00%       Total Number of Students Referred Minus Not Eigible for Part B, and Who Have an IEP Developed and Implemented by Their Third Birthday       Yes         Indicator 12 2017-2018       State Target 100.00%       State Data State Data 100.00%       Total Number of Students Referred Minus Not Eigible and/or Parent Refusals       Kea 100.00%       Met Target Yes         Note:       Percent of Youth Ase 14 and Above with an IEP That Includes Coordinated, Measurable, Annual IEP Goals and Transition Services That Will Reasonable Enable the Student to Meet the Post-Secondary Goals       State Target 100.00%       State Data Yes         Note:       Intel State Target 2017-2018       State Target 100.00%       State Data 100.00%       Yes	Note: State da	ta reflects % of dist	ricts with Disproportio	nate Representation as a re	esult of inappropriate identification.				
Indicator 10       School Year 2017-2018       State Target 0.00%       State Data 2.78%       Net Target 2.78%       Net Target Yes         Note:       School Year 2017-2018       State Target 2017-2018       State Target 100.00%       State Data State Data 2017-2018       State Target 100.00%       State Data 2.78%       Met Target Yes         Indicator 11 2017-2018       School Year 2017-2018       State Target 100.00%       State Data 99.36%       Total Number of Initial Evaluations       Number Not Within 100.00%       Number Not Within Yes       X LEA Data Within 100.00%       Met Target Yes         Note:       0       Immediate 100.00%       State Data 100.00%       Total Number of Students Referred Minus Not Eigible for Part B, and Who Have an IEP Developed and Implemented by Their Third Birthday       Yes         Indicator 12 2017-2018       State Target 100.00%       State Data State Data 100.00%       Total Number of Students Referred Minus Not Eigible and/or Parent Refusals       Kea 100.00%       Met Target Yes         Note:       Percent of Youth Ase 14 and Above with an IEP That Includes Coordinated, Measurable, Annual IEP Goals and Transition Services That Will Reasonable Enable the Student to Meet the Post-Secondary Goals       State Target 100.00%       State Data Yes         Note:       Intel State Target 2017-2018       State Target 100.00%       State Data 100.00%       Yes									
Indicator Ju     State Data     Net Larget       2017-2018     0.00%     2.75%     Ves       Note: State data reflects % of districts with Disproportionate Representation as a result of inappropriate identification.     Ves       Evaluations Conducted Within 45 School Days or 90 Calendar Days, Whichever is Shorter, of Receiving Parent Consent for Initial Evaluation     Number of Initial     Number Not Within     % LEA Data Within     Met Target?       Indicator 11     School Year     State Target     State Data     Total Number of Initial     Number Not Within     % LEA Data Within     Met Target?       Note:     0     17     17     -     100.00%     Met Target?       Early Childhood Transitions: Percent of Children Referred by Part C Prior to Age 3 Who Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Who Have an IEP Developed and Implemented by Their Third Birthday     IEA Data % Who       Indicator 12     School Year     State Target     State Data       2017-2018     State Target     State Data     Total Number of SWD     Number of Students Referred Minus Not     Received Services by Yes       Indicator 12     School Year     State Target     State Data     Total Number of SWD     Number of Students Referred Minus Not     Received Services by Yes       Note:     2017-2018     100.00%     89.11%     67     45     100.00%     Yes       Note:     2017-2018	Disproportiona	te Representation o	of Racial and Ethnic Gr	oups in Specific Disability C	ategories That is a Result of Inappropriat	te Identification			
Indicator Ju     State Data     Net Larget       2017-2018     0.00%     2.75%     Ves       Note: State data reflects % of districts with Disproportionate Representation as a result of inappropriate identification.     Ves       Evaluations Conducted Within 45 School Days or 90 Calendar Days, Whichever is Shorter, of Receiving Parent Consent for Initial Evaluation     Number of Initial     Number Not Within     % LEA Data Within     Met Target?       Indicator 11     School Year     State Target     State Data     Total Number of Initial     Number Not Within     % LEA Data Within     Met Target?       Note:     0     17     17     -     100.00%     Met Target?       Early Childhood Transitions: Percent of Children Referred by Part C Prior to Age 3 Who Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Who Have an IEP Developed and Implemented by Their Third Birthday     IEA Data % Who       Indicator 12     School Year     State Target     State Data       2017-2018     State Target     State Data     Total Number of SWD     Number of Students Referred Minus Not     Received Services by Yes       Indicator 12     School Year     State Target     State Data     Total Number of SWD     Number of Students Referred Minus Not     Received Services by Yes       Note:     2017-2018     100.00%     89.11%     67     45     100.00%     Yes       Note:     2017-2018									
Indicator Ju     State Data     Net Larget       2017-2018     0.00%     2.75%     Ves       Note: State data reflects % of districts with Disproportionate Representation as a result of inappropriate identification.     Ves       Evaluations Conducted Within 45 School Days or 90 Calendar Days, Whichever is Shorter, of Receiving Parent Consent for Initial Evaluation     Number of Initial     Number Not Within     % LEA Data Within     Met Target?       Indicator 11     School Year     State Target     State Data     Total Number of Initial     Number Not Within     % LEA Data Within     Met Target?       Note:     0     17     17     -     100.00%     Met Target?       Early Childhood Transitions: Percent of Children Referred by Part C Prior to Age 3 Who Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Who Have an IEP Developed and Implemented by Their Third Birthday     IEA Data % Who       Indicator 12     School Year     State Target     State Data       2017-2018     State Target     State Data     Total Number of SWD     Number of Students Referred Minus Not     Received Services by Yes       Indicator 12     School Year     State Target     State Data     Total Number of SWD     Number of Students Referred Minus Not     Received Services by Yes       Note:     2017-2018     100.00%     89.11%     67     45     100.00%     Yes       Note:     2017-2018									
Ves     Ves       2017-2018     0.00%     2.78%     Ves       Note:     State data reflects % of districts with Disproportionate Representation as a result of inappropriate identification.     Ves       Evaluations Conducted Within 45 School Days or 90 Calendar Days, Whichever is Shorter, of Receiving Parent Consent for Initial Evaluation     Number Not Within Number Not Numet Not Number Not Number Not Numet Not Nu	Indicator 10	School Year	State Target	State Data			LEA Data Compliant		Mot Target?
Note: State data reflects % of districts with Disproportionate Representation as a result of inappropriate identification. Evaluations Conducted Within 45 School Days or 90 Calendar Days, Whichever is Shorter, of Receiving Parent Consent for Initial Evaluation Indicator 11 School Year 2017-2018 100.00% 99.36% 214te Data 177 17 17 17 17 10 10 1000% 14 EA Data Within Timelines 100.00% 19.36% 14 Target? Note: 0 Early Childhood Transitions: Percent of Children Referred by Part C Prior to Age 3 Who Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Who Have an IEP Developed and Implemented by Their Third Birthday Indicator 12 School Year State Target State Data 89.11% 100.00% 18.11% 100.00% 18.11% 100.00% 19.11% 100.00% 19.11% 19	malcator 10	2017-2018							
Evaluations Conducted Within 45 School Days or 90 Calendar Days, Whichever is Shorter, of Receiving Parent Consent for Initial Evaluation       Number Within       Number Not Within       % LEA Data Within       Met Target?         Indicator 11       School Year       State Target       State Data       Total Number of Initial       Number Within       Number Not Within       % LEA Data Within       Met Target?         Note:       0       17       100.00%       99.36%       17       17       100.00%       Met Target?         Indicator 12       School Year       State Target       State Data       Moto Age 3 Who Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Who Have an IEP Developed and Implemented by Their Third Birthday       Implemented Services by Age 3       Age 3       Met Target?         Indicator 12       School Year       State Target       State Data       Total Number of SWD       Number of Students Referred Minus Not Age 3       Received Services by Age 3       Met Target?         Indicator 12       School Year       State Target       State Data       Met Data % Moo Age 3       Number of SWD       Number of Students Referred Minus Not Age 3       Received Services by Age 3       Not services That Will Reasonable Enable the Student to Meet the Post-Secondary Goals       Age 3       100.00%       Not services That Will Reasonable Enable the Student to Meet the Post-Secondary Goals       ELA Data % Meeting Yees       Not target?		2017 2010							
Indicator 11       School Year 2017-2018       State Target 100.00%       State Data 99.36%       Total Number of Initial Evaluations 17       Number Within Timelines 17       Number Not Within Timelines 17       % LEA Data Within Timelines 100.00%       Met Target? Yes         Note:       0         Early Childhood Transitions: Percent of Children Referred by Part C Prior to Age 3 Who Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Who Have an IEP Developed and Implemented by Their Third Birthday       LEA Data % Who Received Services by Age 3 100.00%       Met Target? Wes         Indicator 12 2017-2018       School Year 2017-2018       State Target 100.00%       State Data 89.11%       Total Number of SWD 67       Number of Students Referred Minus Not Eligible and/or Parent Refusals 45       LEA Data % Who Received Services by Age 3 100.00%       Met Target? Yes         Note:       Percent of Youth Age 14 and Above with an IEP That Includes Coordinated, Measurable, Annual IEP Goals and Transition Services That Will Reasonable Enable the Student to Meet the Post-Secondary Goals       LEA Data % Meeting Standard 100.00%       Met Target? Yes	Note: State da	ta reflects % of dist	ricts with Disproportio	nate Representation as a re	esult of inappropriate identification.				
Indicator 11       School Year 2017-2018       State Target 100.00%       State Data 99.36%       Total Number of Initial Evaluations 17       Number Within Timelines 17       Number Not Within Timelines 17       % LEA Data Within Timelines 100.00%       Met Target? Yes         Note:       0         Early Childhood Transitions: Percent of Children Referred by Part C Prior to Age 3 Who Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Who Have an IEP Developed and Implemented by Their Third Birthday       LEA Data % Who Received Services by Age 3 100.00%       Met Target? Wes         Indicator 12 2017-2018       School Year 2017-2018       State Target 100.00%       State Data 89.11%       Total Number of SWD 67       Number of Students Referred Minus Not Eligible and/or Parent Refusals 45       LEA Data % Who Received Services by Age 3 100.00%       Met Target? Yes         Note:       Percent of Youth Age 14 and Above with an IEP That Includes Coordinated, Measurable, Annual IEP Goals and Transition Services That Will Reasonable Enable the Student to Meet the Post-Secondary Goals       LEA Data % Meeting Standard 100.00%       Met Target? Yes									
Indicator 11       School Year 2017-2018       State Target 100.00%       State Data 99.36%       Total Number of Initial Evaluations 17       Number Within Timelines 17       Number Not Within Timelines 17       % LEA Data Within Timelines 100.00%       Met Target? Yes         Note:       0         Early Childhood Transitions: Percent of Children Referred by Part C Prior to Age 3 Who Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Who Have an IEP Developed and Implemented by Their Third Birthday       LEA Data % Who Received Services by Age 3 100.00%       Met Target? Wes         Indicator 12 2017-2018       School Year 2017-2018       State Target 100.00%       State Data 89.11%       Total Number of SWD 67       Number of Students Referred Minus Not Eligible and/or Parent Refusals 45       LEA Data % Who Received Services by Age 3 100.00%       Met Target? Yes         Note:       Percent of Youth Age 14 and Above with an IEP That Includes Coordinated, Measurable, Annual IEP Goals and Transition Services That Will Reasonable Enable the Student to Meet the Post-Secondary Goals       LEA Data % Meeting Standard 100.00%       Met Target? Yes									
Indicator 11 2017-2018State Target 100.00%State Data 99.36%Evaluations 17Timelines 17Timelines 17Timelines 100.00%Timelines YesNote:0Early Childhood Transitions: Percent of Children Referred by Part C Prior to Age 3 Who Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Who Have an IEP Developed and Implemented by Their Third BirthdayLEA Data % Who Received Services by Age 3LEA Data % Who Received Services by Age 3Met Target2 YesIndicator 12 2017-2018School Year 100.00%State Target State Data 89.11%State Data 89.11%Total Number of SWD Who Turned Age 3 67Number of Students Referred Minus Not Eligible and/or Parent Refusals 45LEA Data % Who Received Services by Age 3 100.00%Met Target2 YesNote:Percent of Youth Age 14 and Above with an IEP That Includes Coordinated. Measurable. Annual IEP Goals and Transition Services That Will Reasonable Enable the Student to Meet the Post-Secondary GoalsLEA Data % Meeting Reviewed 601LEA Data % Meeting 45LEA Data % Meeting 100.00%Indicator 13 2017-2018School Year 100.00%State Target State Data 100.00%State Data State Data 100.00%Total Number of IEPs Reviewed 601Number of IEPs Meeting 601LEA Data % Meeting LEA Data % Meeting 100.00%	<b>Evaluations Co</b>	nducted Within 45 S	chool Days or 90 Caler	ndar Days, Whichever is Sho	orter, of Receiving Parent Consent for Init	tial Evaluation			
Indicator 11 2017-2018State Target 100.00%State Data 99.36%Evaluations 17Timelines 17Timelines 17Timelines 100.00%Timelines YesNote:0Early Childhood Transitions: Percent of Children Referred by Part C Prior to Age 3 Who Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Who Have an IEP Developed and Implemented by Their Third BirthdayLEA Data % Who Received Services by Age 3LEA Data % Who Received Services by Age 3Met Target2 YesIndicator 12 2017-2018School Year 100.00%State Target State Data 89.11%State Data 89.11%Total Number of SWD Who Turned Age 3 67Number of Students Referred Minus Not Eligible and/or Parent Refusals 45LEA Data % Who Received Services by Age 3 100.00%Met Target2 YesNote:Percent of Youth Age 14 and Above with an IEP That Includes Coordinated. Measurable. Annual IEP Goals and Transition Services That Will Reasonable Enable the Student to Meet the Post-Secondary GoalsLEA Data % Meeting Reviewed 601LEA Data % Meeting 45LEA Data % Meeting 100.00%Indicator 13 2017-2018School Year 100.00%State Target State Data 100.00%State Data State Data 100.00%Total Number of IEPs Reviewed 601Number of IEPs Meeting 601LEA Data % Meeting LEA Data % Meeting 100.00%									
Indicator 11 2017-2018State Target 100.00%State Data 99.36%Evaluations 17Timelines 17Timelines 17Timelines 100.00%Timelines YesNote:0Early Childhood Transitions: Percent of Children Referred by Part C Prior to Age 3 Who Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Who Have an IEP Developed and Implemented by Their Third BirthdayLEA Data % Who Received Services by Age 3LEA Data % Who Received Services by Age 3Met Target2 YesIndicator 12 2017-2018School Year 100.00%State Target State Data 89.11%State Data 89.11%Total Number of SWD Who Turned Age 3 67Number of Students Referred Minus Not Eligible and/or Parent Refusals 45LEA Data % Who Received Services by Age 3 100.00%Met Target2 YesNote:Percent of Youth Age 14 and Above with an IEP That Includes Coordinated. Measurable. Annual IEP Goals and Transition Services That Will Reasonable Enable the Student to Meet the Post-Secondary GoalsLEA Data % Meeting Reviewed 601LEA Data % Meeting 45LEA Data % Meeting 100.00%Indicator 13 2017-2018School Year 100.00%State Target State Data 100.00%State Data State Data 100.00%Total Number of IEPs Reviewed 601Number of IEPs Meeting 601LEA Data % Meeting LEA Data % Meeting 100.00%									
Indicator 11 2017-2018State Target 100.00%State Data 99.36%Evaluations 17Inmelines 17Inmelines 17Inmelines 17Inmelines 17Inmelines 17Inmelines 17Inmelines 100.00%Met Target2 YesNote:0Early Childhood Transitions: Percent of Children Referred by Part C Prior to Age 3 Who Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Who Have an IEP Developed and Implemented by Their Third BirthdayIndicator 12 2017-2018State Target 100.00%State Data 89.11%Indicator of SWD Who Turned Age 3 67Number of Students Referred Minus Not Eligible and/or Parent Refusals 45IEA Data % Who Received Services by Age 3 100.00%Met Target2 Who Turned Age 3 67Note:Percent of Youth Age 14 and Above with an IEP That Includes Coordinated, Measurable, Annual IEP Goals and Transition Services That Will Reasonable Enable the Student to Meet the Post-Secondary GoalsIEA Data % Meet Age 3 100.00%Met Target2 YesIndicator 13 2017-2018State Target 100.00%State Data State Data 100.00%Indicator of IEPs Reviewed 601Number of IEPs Meeting Standard 601IEA Data % Meeting Yes		School Voor			Total Number of Initial	Number Within	Number Not Within	<u>% LEA Data Within</u>	
Note:       0         Early Childhood Transitions: Percent of Children Referred by Part C Prior to Age 3 Who Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Who Have an IEP Developed and Implemented by Their Third Birthday         Indicator 12       School Year       State Target       State Data       Mot Turned Age 3       Number of Students Referred Minus Not Eligible and/or Parent Refusals       Image 3       Met Target 2         Note:       Percent of Youth Are 14 and Above with an IEP That Includes Coordinated. Measurable. Annual IEP Goals and Transition Services That Will Reasonable Enable the Student to Meet the Post-Secondary Goals       Total Number of IEPs Meeting Reviewed       Image 3       Met Target 2         Indicator 13       School Year       State Target 100.00%       State Data 81.11%       Total Number of IEPs Meeting 100.00%       Number of IEPs Meeting 601       Image 3       Met Target 2	Indicator 11	School Year	State Target	State Data	<b>Evaluations</b>	<b>Timelines</b>	<b>Timelines</b>	<b>Timelines</b>	Met Target?
Indicator 12       School Year       State Target       State Data       Total Number of SWD       Number of Students Referred Minus Not       LEA Data % Who.         Indicator 12       School Year       State Target       State Data       Mumber of SWD       Number of Students Referred Minus Not       Received Services by       Met Target?         Note:		2017-2018	100.00%	99.36%	17	17	-	100.00%	Yes
Indicator 12       School Year       State Target       State Data       Total Number of SWD       Number of Students Referred Minus Not       LEA Data % Who.         Indicator 12       School Year       State Target       State Data       Mumber of SWD       Number of Students Referred Minus Not       Received Services by       Met Target?         Note:									
Indicator 12 2017-2018State Target 100.00%State Data 89.11%Total Number of SWD Who Turned Age 3 67Number of Students Referred Minus Not Eligible and/or Parent Refusals 45LEA Data % Who Received Services by Age 3 100.00%Met Target? YesNote:Percent of Youth Age 14 and Above with an IEP That Includes Coordinated, Measurable, Annual IEP Goals and Transition Services That Will Reasonable Enable the Student to Meet the Post-Secondary GoalsLEA Data % Meeting 100.00%LEA Data % Meeting YesIndicator 13 2017-2018State Target 100.00%State Data 100.00%State Data 100.00%Number of IEPs Reviewed 601Number of IEPs Meeting 601LEA Data % Meeting 100.00%Met Target? Yes	Note:	0							
Indicator 12 2017-2018State Target 100.00%State Data 89.11%Total Number of SWD Who Turned Age 3 67Number of Students Referred Minus Not Eligible and/or Parent Refusals 45LEA Data % Who Received Services by Age 3 100.00%Met Target? YesNote:Percent of Youth Age 14 and Above with an IEP That Includes Coordinated, Measurable, Annual IEP Goals and Transition Services That Will Reasonable Enable the Student to Meet the Post-Secondary GoalsLEA Data % Meeting 100.00%LEA Data % Meeting YesIndicator 13 2017-2018State Target 100.00%State Data 100.00%State Data 100.00%Number of IEPs Reviewed 601Number of IEPs Meeting 601LEA Data % Meeting 100.00%Met Target? Yes									
Indicator 12 2017-2018State Target 100.00%State Data 89.11%Total Number of SWD Who Turned Age 3 67Number of Students Referred Minus Not Eligible and/or Parent Refusals 45LEA Data % Who Received Services by Age 3 100.00%Met Target? YesNote:Percent of Youth Age 14 and Above with an IEP That Includes Coordinated, Measurable, Annual IEP Goals and Transition Services That Will Reasonable Enable the Student to Meet the Post-Secondary GoalsLEA Data % Meeting 100.00%LEA Data % Meeting YesIndicator 13 2017-2018State Target 100.00%State Data 100.00%State Data 100.00%Number of IEPs Reviewed 601Number of IEPs Meeting 601LEA Data % Meeting 100.00%Met Target? Yes									
Indicator 12 2017-2018State Target 100.00%State Data 89.11%Total Number of SWD Who Turned Age 3 67Number of Students Referred Minus Not Eligible and/or Parent Refusals 45Received Services by Age 3 100.00%Met Target? YesNote:Percent of Youth Age 14 and Above with an IEP That Includes Coordinated, Measurable, Annual IEP Goals and Transition Services That Will Reasonable Enable the Student to Meet the Post-Secondary GoalsTotal Number of IEPs ReviewedLEA Data % Meeting Standard 100.00%LEA Data % Meeting YesIndicator 13 2017-2018State Target 100.00%State Data 100.00%Total Number of IEPs Reviewed 601Number of IEPs Meeting 601LEA Data % Meeting Standard 100%Met Target? Yes	Early Childhood	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 IEP Develope	ed and Implemented by T	heir Third Birthday	
Indicator 12 2017-2018State Target 100.00%State Data 89.11%Total Number of SWD Who Turned Age 3 67Number of Students Referred Minus Not Eligible and/or Parent Refusals 45Received Services by Age 3 100.00%Met Target? YesNote:Percent of Youth Age 14 and Above with an IEP That Includes Coordinated, Measurable, Annual IEP Goals and Transition Services That Will Reasonable Enable the Student to Meet the Post-Secondary GoalsTotal Number of IEPs ReviewedLEA Data % Meeting Standard 100.00%LEA Data % Meeting YesIndicator 13 2017-2018State Target 100.00%State Data 100.00%Total Number of IEPs Reviewed 601Number of IEPs Meeting 601LEA Data % Meeting Standard 100%Met Target? Yes									
Indicator 12 2017-2018State Target 100.00%State Data 89.11%Total Number of SWD Who Turned Age 3 67Number of Students Referred Minus Not Eligible and/or Parent Refusals 45Received Services by Age 3 100.00%Met Target? YesNote:Percent of Youth Age 14 and Above with an IEP That Includes Coordinated, Measurable, Annual IEP Goals and Transition Services That Will Reasonable Enable the Student to Meet the Post-Secondary GoalsTotal Number of IEPs ReviewedLEA Data % Meeting Standard 100.00%LEA Data % Meeting YesIndicator 13 2017-2018State Target 100.00%State Data 100.00%Total Number of IEPs Reviewed 601Number of IEPs Meeting 601LEA Data % Meeting Standard 100%Met Target? Yes									
Indicator 12 2017-2018State Target 100.00%State Data 89.11%Who Turned Age 3 67Eligible and/or Parent Refusals 45Age 3 100.00%Met Target? YesNote:Percent of Youth Age 14 and Above with an IEP That Includes Coordinated. Measurable. Annual IEP Goals and Transition Services That Will Reasonable Enable the Student to Meet the Post-Secondary GoalsLEA Data % Meeting Standard 601LEA Data % Meeting 601Met Target? Yes								LEA Data % Who	
2017-2018100.00%89.11%6745100.00%YesNote:Percent of Youth Age 14 and Above with an IEP That Includes Coordinated, Measurable, Annual IEP Goals and Transition Services That Will Reasonable Enable the Student to Meet the Post-Secondary GoalsIndicator 13School YearState Target 100.00%State Data 100.00%Number of IEPs Meeting 601LEA Data % Meeting Standard 100%Met Target? Yes					Total Number of SWD			Received Services by	
Note: Percent of Youth Age 14 and Above with an IEP That Includes Coordinated. Measurable, Annual IEP Goals and Transition Services That Will Reasonable Enable the Student to Meet the Post-Secondary Goals Indicator 13 School Year State Target State Data State Data 100.00% State Data 100.00% State Data 601 Standard 601 Standard 601 Yes	Indicator 12	School Year	State Target	State Data	Who Turned Age 3	Eligible and/or	Parent Refusals	Age 3	Met Target?
Percent of Youth Age 14 and Above with an IEP That Includes Coordinated, Measurable, Annual IEP Goals and Transition Services That Will Reasonable Enable the Student to Meet the Post-Secondary Goals         Indicator 13       School Year       State Target       State Data       Meet Data       Meet Target?         2017-2018       100.00%       100.00%       100.00%       601       601       100%       Yes		2017-2018	100.00%	89.11%	67	4	15	100.00%	Yes
Percent of Youth Age 14 and Above with an IEP That Includes Coordinated, Measurable, Annual IEP Goals and Transition Services That Will Reasonable Enable the Student to Meet the Post-Secondary Goals         Indicator 13       School Year       State Target       State Data       Meet Data       Meet Target?         2017-2018       100.00%       100.00%       100.00%       601       601       100%       Yes									
Indicator 13       School Year       State Target       State Data       Met Target       Met Targ	Note:								
Indicator 13       School Year       State Target       State Data       Met Target       Met Targ	-								
Indicator 13School YearState TargetState DataIndicator DataNumber of IEPsNumber of IEPs MeetingLEA Data % Meeting2017-2018100.00%100.00%601601100%Yes			e with an IEP That Inclu	udes Coordinated, Measura	ble, Annual IEP Goals and Transition Serv	vices That Will Reasona	ible Enable the Student t	o Meet	
Indicator 13School YearState TargetState DataReviewedStandardStandardMet Target?2017-2018100.00%100.00%601601100%Yes	the Post-Secon	uary Goals							
2017-2018 100.00% 100.00% 601 601 100% Yes							<u>g</u>		
	Indicator 12	School Vear	State Target	State Data	Reviewed	Standard		Standard	Met Target?
Note:	mulcator 15								
Note:	Indicator 15					601		100%	
						601		100%	

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												
					Total Number of							
Indicator 14	School Year	State Target	State Data	<b>Total Number of Exiters</b>	<b>Respondents</b>	Group A Respondents	LEA Data % Group A	Met Target?				
	2016-2017	37.00%	41.39%	83	46	-	-	No				
		State Target 68.00%	<u>State Data</u> 62.16%			Group B Respondents 23	LEA Data % Group B 50.00%	<u>Met Target?</u> No				
Note:		<u>State Target</u> 100.00%	<u>State Data</u> 81.56%			Group C Respondents 31	LEA Data % Group C 67.39%	<u>Met Target?</u> No				