

# **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

Mr. Richard L. Gregg Superintendent Christina School District Drew Educational Support Building, 600 N. Lombard Street Wilmington, DE 19801-4499

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

Dear Mr. Gregg:

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 Christina 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, Barbara Mazza, will be in contact with Dr. Michele Marinucci 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
 Michele Marinucci, Ed.D., Semior Director of Pupil Personnel Services
 Maria N. Locuniak, Ph.D., NCSP, Education Associate, Exceptional Children Resources
 Barbara Mazza, 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	H	$\geq$ 80% (compliance and results combined)	and	LEA may be engaged in a Corrective Action Plan.	and/or	If monitored on-site, LEA is engaged in Prong 1 or Prong 2 corrective action.	
Needs Assistance	=	60% to 79% (compliance and results combined)	and/or	LEA is engaged in an Intervention Plan.	and/or	Outstanding Noncompliance from On- Site Monitoring (beyond 1 year)	
Needs Intervention		$\leq$ 59% (compliance and results combined)	and/or	LEA is engaged in a Compliance Agreement.	and/or	Outstanding Noncompliance from On- Site Monitoring (beyond 2 years)	

Christina 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%	39.18%	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%	>95%	1	1			
Grade 7		95.00%	>95%	>95%	1	1			
Grade 8		95.00%	>95%	92.17%	0	1			
Grade 11		95.00%	89.05%	72.87%	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%	>95%	1	1			
Grade 7		95.00%	>95%	>95%	1	1			
Grade 8		95.00%	>95%	90.79%	0	1			
Grade 11		95.00%	89.05%	72.87%	0	1			
Indicator 3C: Proficiency Rate-ELA									
Grade 3		32.70%	23.92%	14.73%	0	1			
Grade 4		32.70%	20.95%	13.24%	0	1			
Grade 5		32.70%	22.97%	14.93%	0	1			
Grade 6	2016-2017	32.70%	16.11%	12.67%	0	1			
Grade 7		32.70%	17.49%	10.11%	0	1			
Grade 8		32.70%	16.46%	9.91%	0	1			
Grade 11		32.70%	13.57%	10.64%	0	1			
Indicator 3C: Proficiency Rate-MATH	-								
Grade 3		29.20%	25.90%	17.77%	0	1			
Grade 4		29.20%	21.05%	12.59%	0	1			
Grade 5		29.20%	14.94%	11.94%	0	1			
Grade 6	2016-2017	29.20%	12.56%	9.87%	0	1			
Grade 7		29.20%	13.42%	5.88%	0	1			
Grade 8		29.20%	11.82%	11.59%	0	1			
Grade 11		29.20%	8.46%	12.77%	0	1			
Indicator 4A: Significant Discrepancy in the Rate of Long-Term									

# **Christina School District**

Indicator 4A: Significant Discrepancy in the Rate of Long-Term						
Suspensions and Expulsions of Students with Disabilities				Target Not		
Note: Indicator 4A is based on school year 2015 2016 data	2015-2016	Rate Ratio 1.20	NA	Met	0	1
with a Rate Ratio of 1.20.						

	-					
Results Indicators Continued	Data From: (Time Period)	SPP Target 2016	State Data	LEA Data	LEA Score	Possible Points
Indicator 5A: Percent of Children Aged 6 -21 Served Inside the Class 80% of the Day		70.00%	65.72%	47.67%	0	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%	30.41%	0	1
Indicator 5C: Percent of Children Aged 6 -21 Served in Separate Schools, Residential Facilities and Homebound/Hospital Placements		4.50%	5.46%	8.44%	0	1
Indicator 7A. Early Childhood Outcomes- Positive						
Social/Emotional Skills						
Percent Increase Rate of Growth	2016-2017	88.60%	89.89%	89.52%	1	1
Percent Within Age Expectation	2016-2017	58.00%	51.26%	49.30%	0	1
Indicator 7B. Early Childhood Outcomes-Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills						
Percent Increase Rate of Growth		91.10%	87.36%	84.96%	0	1
Percent Within Age Expectation	2016-2017	52.70%	48.60%	47.18%	0	1
Indicator 7C. Early Childhood Outcomes- Use of Appropriate		0217070				-
Behaviors						
Percent Increase Rate of Growth	1	90.20%	88.19%	85.32%	0	1
Percent Within Age Expectation	2016-2017	65.30%	64.31%	69.01%	1	1
reitent within Age Expectation		05.5070	04.5170	05.0170	-	Ĩ
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	Target Not Met	0	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%	1	1
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition from Part C to Part B	2016-2017	100.00%	>95%	>95%	1	1
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition	2016-2017	100.00%	>95%	>95%	0	1
Determination Summary			Ann	ual Determir	nation:	
Compliance Indicators Score	4			eds Interven		
Possible Points:	6					
Results Indicators Score	13	Intervon	tion Plan /Corr	nliance Agroc	ment	No
		interven		ipilatice Agree	entent.	NU
Possible Points:	40	4				
Score Total	17	l				
Out of a Possible:	46					
Out of a Possible: Percentage:	46 36.96%					2 o

# **Christina School District**

Graduation Rat	te						
Indicator 1	<u>School Year</u>	State Target	<u>State Data</u>	Number Eli	gible Number Graduated	LEA Data <u>% SWD Who</u> <u>Graduated</u>	Met Target?
	2015-2016	74.10%	67.15%	171	67	39.18%	No
Note: Percent	of youth with IEPs g	raduating from high scl	hool with a regular high	school diploma within 4-year adjusted cohort			
Drop-Out Rate							
						LEA Data	
Indicator 2	<u>School Year</u> 2015-2016	<u>State Target</u> 4.60%	<u>State Data</u> 2.91%	<u>Number En</u> 689	olled <u>Number of Drop-Outs</u>	<u>% SWD who Dropped</u> <u>Out</u> < 5%	Met Target? Yes
Note:							

		State	State					LEA Data	
Indicator 3B	School Year	<b>Target</b>	<u>Data</u>	Grade	Subject	Number Eligible	Number Tested	Percent Tested	Met Target?
	2016-2017	95.00%	98.15%	3	ELA	302	292	> 95%	Yes
	2016-2017	95.00%	98.45%	4	ELA	297	287	> 95%	Yes
	2016-2017	95.00%	97.93%	5	ELA	276	268	> 95%	Yes
	2016-2017	95.00%	97.03%	6	ELA	227	221	> 95%	Yes
	2016-2017	95.00%	97.34%	7	ELA	194	188	> 95%	Yes
	2016-2017	95.00%	95.77%	8	ELA	230	212	92.17%	No
	2016-2017	95.00%	89.05%	11	ELA	129	94	72.87%	No

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

		State	State					LEA Data	
Indicator 3B	School Year	<b>Target</b>	<u>Data</u>	Grade	<u>Subject</u>	Number Eligible	Number Tested	Percent Tested	Met Target?
	2016-2017	95.00%	97.67%	3	MATH	300	287	> 95%	Yes
	2016-2017	95.00%	98.13%	4	MATH	297	286	> 95%	Yes
	2016-2017	95.00%	97.87%	5	MATH	276	268	> 95%	Yes
	2016-2017	95.00%	96.69%	6	MATH	227	223	> 95%	Yes
	2016-2017	95.00%	96.62%	7	MATH	194	187	> 95%	Yes
	2016-2017	95.00%	95.28%	8	MATH	228	207	90.79%	No
	2016-2017	95.00%	89.05%	11	MATH	129	94	72.87%	No
Note:									

Christina	School	District
-----------	--------	----------

<b>Proficiency Rat</b>	te on the State Asses	sment - ELA						LEA Data	
		State	State					% of SWD Meeting	
Indicator 3C	School Year	Target	Data	<u>Grade</u>	Subject	Number Tested	Number Meets	Proficiency	Met Target?
	2016-2017	32.70%	23.92%	3	ELA	292	43	14.73%	No
	2016-2017	32.70%	20.95%	4	ELA	287	38	13.24%	No
	2016-2017	32.70%	22.97%	5	ELA	268	40	14.93%	No
	2016-2017	32.70%	16.11%	6	ELA	221	28	12.67%	No
	2016-2017	32.70%	17.49%	7	ELA	188	19	10.11%	No
	2016-2017	32.70%	16.46%	8	ELA	212	21	9.91%	No
	2016-2017	32.70%	13.57%	11	ELA	94	-	10.64%	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>	Subject	Number Tested	Number Meets	Proficiency	Met Target?
	2016-2017	29.20%	25.90%	3	MATH	287	51	17.77%	No
	2016-2017	29.20%	21.05%	4	MATH	286	36	12.59%	No
	2016-2017	29.20%	14.94%	5	MATH	268	32	11.94%	No
	2016-2017	29.20%	12.56%	6	MATH	223	22	9.87%	No
	2016-2017	29.20%	13.42%	7	MATH	187	-	5.88%	No
	2016-2017	29.20%	11.82%	8	MATH	207	24	11.59%	No
	2016-2017	29.20%	8.46%	11	MATH	94	-	12.77%	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> 2889	Non-SWD Enrollment 12664	SWD Suspended > 10 Days 50	Non-SWD Suspended > 10 Days 157	LEA Data (Rate Ratio) 1.40	<u>Met Target?</u> No
Note:	Indicator 4A is ba	ased on school year 201	.5- 2016 data with a	a Rate Ratio of > 1.20	and an N size of 15.				
	State data is a ca	lculation based on the	number of LEAs tha	at met the N Size comp	pared to the same LEAs tha	t exceeded rate ratio of 1	.20		
Significant Disc	crepancy in the Rate	e of Long-Term Suspens	ions and Expulsion	ns of Students with Dis	abilities by Race/Ethnicity	and Noncompliant Polici	es. Procedures, and Pra	actices	
						•			
- 0					,,	SWD Suspended > 10			
Indicator 4B	School Year	State Target	<u>State Data</u>	Race	SWD Enrolled	<u>SWD Suspended &gt; 10</u> <u>Days</u>	Compliant	LEA Data (Rate Ratio)	Met Target?
Ū		<b>.</b> .	·						Met Target? Yes
Ū	School Year	State Target	<u>State Data</u>	Race	SWD Enrolled	Days	Compliant	LEA Data (Rate Ratio)	
Ū	<u>School Year</u> 2015-2016	<u>State Target</u> 0.00	<u>State Data</u> 100.00%	<u>Race</u> Hispanic	SWD Enrolled 902	<u>Days</u> -	<u>Compliant</u> Yes	<u>LEA Data (Rate Ratio)</u> 0.24	Yes
Ū	<u>School Year</u> 2015-2016 2015-2016	<u>State Target</u> 0.00 0.00	<u>State Data</u> 100.00% 100.00%	<u>Race</u> Hispanic American Indian	SWD Enrolled 902	Days - -	<u>Compliant</u> Yes Yes	LEA Data (Rate Ratio) 0.24 0.00	Yes Yes
Ū	<u>School Year</u> 2015-2016 2015-2016 2015-2016	<u>State Target</u> 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00	<u>State Data</u> 100.00% 100.00% 100.00%	<u>Race</u> Hispanic American Indian African American	<u>SWD Enrolled</u> 902 - 1271	<u>Days</u> - - 44	<u>Compliant</u> Yes Yes No	LEA Data (Rate Ratio) 0.24 0.00 2.48	Yes Yes No
Ū	<u>School Year</u> 2015-2016 2015-2016 2015-2016 2015-2016	<u>State Target</u> 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00	<u>State Data</u> 100.00% 100.00% 100.00% 100.00%	<u>Race</u> Hispanic American Indian African American White	<u>SWD Enrolled</u> 902 - 1271 527	<u>Days</u> - - 44	<u>Compliant</u> Yes Yes No Yes	LEA Data (Rate Ratio) 0.24 0.00 2.48 0.41	Yes Yes No Yes
Ū	School Year 2015-2016 2015-2016 2015-2016 2015-2016 2015-2016	State Target           0.00           0.00           0.00           0.00           0.00           0.00           0.00           0.00           0.00	<u>State Data</u> 100.00% 100.00% 100.00% 100.00% 100.00%	<u>Race</u> Hispanic American Indian African American White Asian	<u>SWD Enrolled</u> 902 - 1271 527 87	<u>Days</u> - - 44 - -	Compliant Yes Yes No Yes Yes	LEA Data (Rate Ratio) 0.24 0.00 2.48 0.41 0.00	Yes Yes No 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

# Spring 2018 IDEA Annual Determination for FFY 2016 Christina School District

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> 2335	Number of SWD <u>In LRE A</u> 1113	LEA Data <u>% in LRE A</u> 47.67%	<u>Met Target?</u> No	
Note:									
Percent of Child	ren Aged 6 to 21 Ser	ved Inside the Regular	Class Less Than 40% of the Da	v					
r creent or ennu		veu morae the negular		1					
Indicator 5B	<u>School Year</u> 2016-2017	<u>State Target</u> 15.10%	<u>State Data</u> 14.96%		Number of SWD 2335	<u>Number of SWD In</u> <u>LRE B</u> 710	LRE Data % in LRE B 30.41%	<u>Met Target?</u> No	
Note:									
Percent of Child	ren Aged 6 to 21 Ser	ved In Senarate Schoo	ls Residential Facilities and in	Homebound/Hospital Placements					
Indicator 5C	<u>School Year</u> 2016-2017	State Target 4.50%	<u>State Data</u> 5.46%	nonesound, nospital i nechicito	Number of SWD 2335	Number of SWD In LRE C 197	LRE Data <u>% in LRE C</u> 8.44%	<u>Met Target?</u> No	
Note:									
Preschool Envir	onments: Percent of	Children Aged 3 to 5 A	Attending a Regular Farly Childl	nood Program and Receiving the Maj	ority of Special Educati	on and Related Services	in the Regular Farly Ch	ildhood	
Program Indicator 6A	<u>School Year</u> 2016-2017	State Target 48.50%	<u>State Data</u> 47.46%	, ,	Number of SWD 386	Number of SWD Receiving Services in the <u>Regular EC Program</u> 287	LEA Data Percent Receiving Services in the <u>Regular EC program</u> 74.35%	<u>Met Target?</u> Yes	
	2010-2017	48.30%	47.40%		380	207	74.3370	163	
Note:									
Preschool Envir	onments: Percent of	Children Aged 3 to 5 A	Attending a Separate Special Ed	ducation 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	State Target 33.50%	<u>State Data</u> 34.78%		Number of SWD 386	in Separate Setting 42	Separate Setting 10.88%	<u>Met Target?</u> Yes	
Note:									

# Spring 2018 IDEA Annual Determination for FFY 2016 Christina School District

Preschool Outco	omes: Percent of	Preschool Students Aged 3 t	o 5 Who Demons	strate Improved Skill	s in Positive Social/Emoti	ional Skills			
Indicator 7A		Positive Social/Emotional Skills : Percent Increased State of Growth State Target 88.60%	<u>State Data</u> 89.89%	<u>LEA Data</u> 89.52%	<u>Met Target</u> Yes	Positive Social/Emotional Skills : Percent Within Age Expectation State Target 58.00%	<u>State Data</u> 51.26%	<u>LEA Data</u> 49.30%	<u>Met Target</u> No
Note:									
Preschool Outco	omes: Percent of	Preschool Students Aged 3 t	o 5 Who Demons	strate Improved Skill	s in Acquisition and Use of	of Knowledge and Skills			
Indicator 7B	<u>School Year</u> 2016-2017	Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills: Percent Increased Rate of Growth State Target 91.10%	<u>State Data</u> 87.36%	<u>LEA Data</u> 84.96%	<u>Met Target</u> No	Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills: Percent Within Age Expectation State Target 52.70%	<u>State Data</u> 48.60%	<u>LEA Data</u> 47.18%	<u>Met Target</u> No
Note:									
Preschool Outco	omes: Percent of	Preschool Students Aged 3 t	o 5 Who Demons	strate Improved Skill	s in Use of Appropriate B	ehaviors			
Indicator 7C	<u>School Year</u> 2016-2017	<u>Use of Appropriate</u> <u>Behaviors: Percent</u> <u>Increased Rate of Growth</u> <u>State Target</u> 90.20%	<u>State Data</u> 88.19%	<u>LEA Data</u> 85.32%	<u>Met Target</u> No	<u>Use of Appropriate</u> <u>Behaviors: Percent</u> <u>Within Age Expectation</u> <u>State Target</u> 65.30%	<u>State Data</u> 64.31%	<u>LEA Data</u> 69.01%	<u>Met Target</u> Yes
Note:									
Percent of Pare	nts with a Child R	Receiving Special Education S	ervices Who Rep	ort That School Faci	itated Parent Involvemen	nt as a Means of Improving	Services and Results for	Children with Diisa	bilities
Indicator Q	School Voor	State	State		Total Number of		Number Disease	LEA Data	Mot Torget2
Indicator 8	<u>School Year</u> 2016-2017	<u>Target</u> 88.00%	<u>Data</u> 89.18%		<u>Respondents</u> 214	<u>Number Agree</u> 187	Number Disagree 24	<u>% Agree</u> 87.80%	<u>Met Target?</u> No
Nata									
Note:	Unsure = 2,	No Response = 1							

### **Christina School District**

	Christina School District									
Disproportionate Representation of Racial and Ethnic Groups in Special Education and Related Services That is a Result of Inappropriate Identification										
	School Year									
Indicator 9		State Target	State Data			LEA Data Compliant		Met Target?		
	2016-2017	0.00%	17.50%			Yes		Yes		
Note: State da	ta reflects % of dist	ricts with Disproportio	nate Representation as a res	ult of inappropriate identification.						
Disproportiona	te Representation o	of Racial and Ethnic Gr	oups in Specific Disability Cat	egories That is a Result of Inappropria	ate Identification					
la di sata a 10	School Year	Chata Tanat						Mark 7		
Indicator 10	2016-2017	State Target 0.00%	<u>State Data</u> 18.92%			LEA Data Compliant Yes		<u>Met Target?</u> Yes		
	2010-2017	0.0070	10.9270			163		163		
Note: State da	ta reflects % of dist	ricts with Disproportio	nate Representation as a res	ult of inappropriate identification.						
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							
<b>Evaluations Co</b>	nducted Within 45 S	chool Days or 90 Caler	ndar Days, Whichever is Shor	er, of Receiving Parent Consent for In	itial Evaluation					
				-						
				Total Number of Initial	Number Within	Number Not Within	% LEA Data Within			
Indicator 11	School Year	State Target	State Data	Evaluations	Timelines	Timelines	Timelines	Met Target?		
	2016-2017			-	-					
	2016-2017	100.00%	98.97%	-		0	> 95%	Yes		
Note:	2016-2017 NA			-	-					
Note:				-	-					
Note:				-	-					
	NA	100.00%	98.97%		-	0	> 95%			
	NA	100.00%	98.97%	-	-	0	> 95%			
	NA	100.00%	98.97%	-	-	0	> 95%			
	NA	100.00%	98.97%	-	-	0	> 95%			
	NA	100.00%	98.97%	-	- no Have an IEP Develope	0	> 95%	Yes		
	NA	100.00%	98.97%	- Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Wh	- no Have an IEP Develope <u>Number of Students</u>	0 ed and Implemented by <sup>-</sup> s Referred Minus Not	> 95% Their Third Birthday <u>LEA Data % Who</u> <u>Received Services by</u>	Yes		
Early Childhood	NA d Transitions: Percer	100.00%	98.97%	- Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Wh <u>Total Number of SWD</u>	- no Have an IEP Develope <u>Number of Students</u> <u>Eligible and/or</u>	0	> 95% Their Third Birthday LEA Data % Who	Yes		
Early Childhood	NA d Transitions: Percer <u>School Year</u>	100.00% nt of Children Referred <u>State Target</u>	98.97% by Part C Prior to Age 3 Who <u>State Data</u>	- Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Wh <u>Total Number of SWD</u> <u>Who Turned Age 3</u>	- no Have an IEP Develope <u>Number of Students</u> <u>Eligible and/or</u>	0 ed and Implemented by <sup>-</sup> <u>s Referred Minus Not</u> <u>Parent Refusals</u>	> 95% Their Third Birthday LEA Data % Who Received Services by Age <u>3</u>	Yes Met Target?		
Early Childhood	NA d Transitions: Percer <u>School Year</u>	100.00% nt of Children Referred <u>State Target</u>	98.97% by Part C Prior to Age 3 Who <u>State Data</u>	- Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Wh <u>Total Number of SWD</u> <u>Who Turned Age 3</u>	- no Have an IEP Develope <u>Number of Students</u> <u>Eligible and/or</u>	0 ed and Implemented by <sup>-</sup> <u>s Referred Minus Not</u> <u>Parent Refusals</u>	> 95% Their Third Birthday LEA Data % Who Received Services by Age <u>3</u>	Yes Met Target?		
Early Childhood	NA d Transitions: Percer <u>School Year</u>	100.00% nt of Children Referred <u>State Target</u>	98.97% by Part C Prior to Age 3 Who <u>State Data</u>	- Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Wh <u>Total Number of SWD</u> <u>Who Turned Age 3</u>	- no Have an IEP Develope <u>Number of Students</u> <u>Eligible and/or</u>	0 ed and Implemented by <sup>-</sup> <u>s Referred Minus Not</u> <u>Parent Refusals</u>	> 95% Their Third Birthday LEA Data % Who Received Services by Age <u>3</u>	Yes Met Target?		
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% by Part C Prior to Age 3 Who <u>State Data</u> 98.55%	- Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Wh <u>Total Number of SWD</u> <u>Who Turned Age 3</u>	no Have an IEP Develope <u>Number of Students</u> <u>Eligible and/or</u>	0 ed and Implemented by 7 <u>8 Referred Minus Not</u> <u>Parent Refusals</u> 33	> 95% Their Third Birthday <u>LEA Data % Who</u> <u>Received Services by</u> <u>Age 3</u> > 95%	Yes Met Target?		
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% by Part C Prior to Age 3 Who <u>State Data</u> 98.55%	• Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Wh <u>Total Number of SWD</u> <u>Who Turned Age 3</u> 115	no Have an IEP Develope <u>Number of Students</u> <u>Eligible and/or</u>	0 ed and Implemented by 7 <u>8 Referred Minus Not</u> <u>Parent Refusals</u> 33	> 95% Their Third Birthday <u>LEA Data % Who</u> <u>Received Services by</u> <u>Age 3</u> > 95%	Yes Met Target?		
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% by Part C Prior to Age 3 Who <u>State Data</u> 98.55%	• Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Wh <u>Total Number of SWD</u> <u>Who Turned Age 3</u> 115 e. Annual IEP Goals and Transition Ser	no Have an IEP Develope <u>Number of Students</u> <u>Eligible and/or</u>	0 ed and Implemented by 7 <u>3 Referred Minus Not</u> <u>Parent Refusals</u> 33 able Enable the Student f	> 95% Their Third Birthday <u>LEA Data % Who</u> <u>Received Services by</u> <u>Age 3</u> > 95% to Meet	Yes Met Target?		
Early Childhood Indicator 12 Note: Percent of Your the Post-Secon	NA d Transitions: Percent School Year 2016-2017 th Age 14 and Above dary Goals	100.00% nt of Children Referred <u>State Target</u> 100.00%	98.97% by Part C Prior to Age 3 Who <u>State Data</u> 98.55%	• Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Wh <u>Total Number of SWD</u> <u>Who Turned Age 3</u> 115 e. Annual IEP Goals and Transition Ser <u>Total Number of IEPs</u>	no Have an IEP Develope <u>Number of Students</u> <u>Eligible and/or</u> s rvices That Will Reasons	0 ed and Implemented by 7 <u>3 Referred Minus Not</u> <u>Parent Refusals</u> 33 able Enable the Student f	> 95% Their Third Birthday <u>LEA Data % Who</u> <u>Age 3</u> > 95% to Meet <u>LEA Data % Meeting</u>	Yes <u>Met Target?</u> Yes		
Early Childhood Indicator 12 Note: Percent of Yout	NA d Transitions: Percen <u>School Year</u> 2016-2017 th Age 14 and Above dary Goals <u>School Year</u>	100.00% nt of Children Referred <u>State Target</u> 100.00% e with an IEP That Inclu <u>State Target</u>	98.97% by Part C Prior to Age 3 Who <u>State Data</u> 98.55% udes Coordinated, Measurabl	• Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Wh <u>Total Number of SWD</u> <u>Who Turned Age 3</u> 115 e. Annual IEP Goals and Transition Ser <u>Total Number of IEPs</u> <u>Reviewed</u>	no Have an IEP Develope <u>Number of Students</u> <u>Eligible and/or</u> svices That Will Reasons <u>Number of IEPs Meetin</u> <u>Standard</u>	0 ed and Implemented by 7 <u>3 Referred Minus Not</u> <u>Parent Refusals</u> 33 able Enable the Student f	> 95% Their Third Birthday <u>LEA Data % Who</u> <u>Age 3</u> > 95% to Meet <u>LEA Data % Meeting</u> <u>Standard</u>	Yes Met Target? Yes Met Target?		
Early Childhood Indicator 12 Note: Percent of Your the Post-Secon	NA d Transitions: Percent School Year 2016-2017 th Age 14 and Above dary Goals	100.00% nt of Children Referred <u>State Target</u> 100.00%	98.97% by Part C Prior to Age 3 Who <u>State Data</u> 98.55%	• Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Wh <u>Total Number of SWD</u> <u>Who Turned Age 3</u> 115 e. Annual IEP Goals and Transition Ser <u>Total Number of IEPs</u>	no Have an IEP Develope <u>Number of Students</u> <u>Eligible and/or</u> s rvices That Will Reasons	0 ed and Implemented by 7 <u>3 Referred Minus Not</u> <u>Parent Refusals</u> 33 able Enable the Student f	> 95% Their Third Birthday <u>LEA Data % Who</u> <u>Age 3</u> > 95% to Meet <u>LEA Data % Meeting</u>	Yes <u>Met Target?</u> Yes		
Early Childhood Indicator 12 Note: Percent of Your the Post-Secon	NA d Transitions: Percen <u>School Year</u> 2016-2017 th Age 14 and Above dary Goals <u>School Year</u>	100.00% nt of Children Referred <u>State Target</u> 100.00% e with an IEP That Inclu <u>State Target</u>	98.97% by Part C Prior to Age 3 Who <u>State Data</u> 98.55% udes Coordinated, Measurabl	• Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Wh <u>Total Number of SWD</u> <u>Who Turned Age 3</u> 115 e. Annual IEP Goals and Transition Ser <u>Total Number of IEPs</u> <u>Reviewed</u>	no Have an IEP Develope <u>Number of Students</u> <u>Eligible and/or</u> svices That Will Reasons <u>Number of IEPs Meetin</u> <u>Standard</u>	0 ed and Implemented by 7 <u>3 Referred Minus Not</u> <u>Parent Refusals</u> 33 able Enable the Student f	> 95% Their Third Birthday <u>LEA Data % Who</u> <u>Age 3</u> > 95% to Meet <u>LEA Data % Meeting</u> <u>Standard</u>	Yes Met Target? Yes Met Target?		

#### **Christina School District**

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	Total Number of Exiters	<b>Respondents</b>	Group A Respondents	LEA Data % Group A	Met Target?		
	2016-2017	33.00%	49.47%	99	36	-	30.56%	No		
		<u>State Target</u> 64.00%	<u>State Data</u> 82.59%			Group B Respondents 19	LEA Data % Group B 52.78%	<u>Met Target?</u> No		
Note:		<u>State Target</u> 100.00%	<u>State Data</u> 86.20%			Group C Respondents 31	<u>LEA Data % Group C</u> 86.11%	<u>Met Target?</u> No		