

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. Charles Taylor Head of School Providence Creek Academy Charter School 273 West Duck Creek Road P.O. Box 265 Clayton, DE 19938

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

Dear Mr. Taylor:

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 Providence Creek Academy Charter School FFY 2016 LEA Determination Under the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Page 2

Based on a review of your LEA's data, the Department has determined your LEA <u>Needs Assistance</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, Maria Locuniak, will be in contact with you to provide technical assistance and discuss next steps, including the development of a Corrective Action Plan. In the interim, please do not hesitate to contact me by phone at (302) 735-4210, or by e-mail <u>maryann.mieczkowski@doe.k12.de.us</u>.

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Mieczkowski Director, Exceptional Children Resources

MAM/ANB

Attachment

 cc: Susan S. Bunting, Ed.D., Secretary of Education Audrey Erschen, Principal Marjorie Knorr-Hayden, Special Services Coordinator Denise Stouffer, Education Associate, Charter School Office Maria N. Locuniak, Ph.D., NCSP, Education Associate, Exceptional Children Resources

IDEA General Supervision & Reporting Requirements

The Department's General Monitoring Duties Under the IDEA

By way of background, the IDEA requires the Department to monitor the implementation of Part B of the IDEA in the LEAs throughout the State, and to annually report to the public on the performance of the State and each LEA. The Department's monitoring activities must primarily focus on: (1) improving educational results and functional outcomes for all children with disabilities; and (2) ensuring that public agencies meet the program requirements of Part B, with a particular emphasis on the requirements most closely related to improving educational results for children with disabilities. The Department is responsible for monitoring LEAs using quantifiable indicators in certain priority areas, and for using qualitative indicators to allow an adequate measure of performance in each area. IDEA regulations outline the three priority areas as: (1) the provision of FAPE in the least restrictive environment; (2) the State's exercise of general supervision, including child find, effective monitoring, the use of resolution meetings, mediation, and a system of transition services; and (3) disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services, to the extent such representation is the result of inappropriate identification.

The State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Reports

The IDEA further requires the State to have a performance plan in place that evaluates the State's efforts to implement the requirements and purposes of Part B of the IDEA, and describes how the State will improve the implementation of Part B. As part of its State Performance Plan (SPP), the State must establish measurable and rigorous targets for various indicators under the three priority areas mentioned above. The SPP currently has seventeen indicators, and the State must report annually to the U.S. Department of Education on the performance of the State under the SPP.

In addition to its federal submission, the Department is responsible for reporting annually to the public on the performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets described in the SPP. On an annual basis, each LEA must use the targets established in the SPP, and the three priority areas mentioned above, to analyze and report on its local performance to the Department. In turn, the Department will review the LEA's performance and assign a determination level.

Based on the Department's analysis of data provided by each LEA, and information obtained through audits, monitoring visits, administrative complaints, due process proceedings, and any other publicly available information, the Department assigns one of the following determination levels: Meets the requirements and purposes of IDEA; Needs Assistance in implementing the requirements of IDEA; Needs Intervention in implementing the requirements of IDEA; or Needs Substantial Intervention in implementing the requirements of IDEA.

Federal and state regulations addressing the SPP, APR, and the LEA's reporting obligations can be found at 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.600-602, 646 and 14 DE Admin Code §§ 927.1.0 through 8.0, and §§ 40.0 through 46.0.

FFY 2016 determinations were made based on a combination of the following compliance and results indicators:

• Results:

٠

0	Indicator 1	Graduate Rate
0	Indicator 2	Drop-Out Rate
0	Indicator 3B	Participation Rate in the State Assessment
0	Indicator 3C	Proficiency Rate on the State Assessment
0	Indicator 4A	Significant Discrepancy in the Rate of Long-Term Suspension and Expulsions of Students with Disabilities
0	Indicator 5	Education Environments (Children 6-21)
0	Indicator 7	Early Childhood Outcomes: Positive Social-Emotional Skills, Acquisition and Use
		of Knowledge and Skills, and Use of Appropriate Behaviors
Сог	npliance:	
0	Indicator 4B	Significant Discrepancy in the Rate of Long-Term Suspensions and Expulsions of
		Students with Disabilities by Race/Ethnicity and Noncompliant Policies,
		Procedures, and Practices
0	Indiantona 0 P 10	Disproportionate Depresentation Balated to Identification
-	Indicators 9 & 10	Disproportionate Representation Related to Identification
0	Indicator 11	Timely Initial Evaluations
0		

• Indicator 13 Transition Planning in the IEP

Meets Requirements	H	\geq 80% (compliance and results combined)	and	LEA may be engaged in a Corrective Action Plan.	and/or	If monitored on-site, LEA is engaged in Prong 1 or Prong 2 corrective action.
Needs Assistance	=	60% to 79% (compliance and results combined)	and/or	LEA is engaged in an Intervention Plan.	and/or	Outstanding Noncompliance from On- Site Monitoring (beyond 1 year)
Needs Intervention		\leq 59% (compliance and results combined)	and/or	LEA is engaged in a Compliance Agreement.	and/or	Outstanding Noncompliance from On- Site Monitoring (beyond 2 years)

Results Indicators	Data From: (Time Period)	SPP Target 2016	State Data	LEA Data	LEA Score	Possible Point
ndicator 1: Graduation Rate	2015-2016	74.10%	67.15%	NA	NA	NA
ndicator 2: Drop Out Rate	2015-2016	4.60%	<5%	NA	NA	NA
ndicator 3B: Participation Rate-ELA						
Grade 3	3	95.00%	>95%	>95%	1	1
Grade 4		95.00%	>95%	>95%	1	1
Grade 5	5	95.00%	>95%	>95%	1	1
Grade 6	2016-2017	95.00%	>95%	>95%	1	1
Grade 7	7	95.00%	>95%	>95%	1	1
Grade 8		95.00%	>95%	80.00%	0	1
Grade 11		95.00%	89.05%	NA	NA	NA
ndicator 3B: Participation Rate-MATH						
Grade 3	3	95.00%	>95%	>95%	1	1
Grade 4	ŀ	95.00%	>95%	>95%	1	1
Grade 5	5	95.00%	>95%	>95%	1	1
Grade 6	2016-2017	95.00%	>95%	>95%	1	1
Grade 7	7	95.00%	>95%	>95%	1	1
Grade 8	3	95.00%	>95%	80.00%	0	1
Grade 11		95.00%	89.05%	NA	NA	NA
ndicator 3C: Proficiency Rate-ELA						
Grade 3	3	32.70%	23.92%	<5%	0	1
Grade 4		32.70%	20.95%	33.33%	1	1
Grade 5)	32.70%	22.97%	33.33%	1	1
Grade 6	2016-2017	32.70%	16.11%	<5%	0	1
Grade 7	7	32.70%	17.49%	<5%	0	1
Grade 8	3	32.70%	16.46%	25.00%	0	1
Grade 11		32.70%	13.57%	NA	NA	NA
ndicator 3C: Proficiency Rate-MATH						
Grade	3	29.20%	25.90%	<5%	0	1
Grade 4		29.20%	21.05%	33.33%	1	1
Grade 5		29.20%	14.94%	<5%	0	1
Grade 6		29.20%	12.56%	<5%	0	1
Grade 7		29.20%	13.42%	<5%	0	1
Grade 8		29.20%	11.82%	25.00%	0	1
Grade 11	-	29.20%	8.46%	NA	NA	NA

Providence Creek Academy Charter School

NA

Suspensions and Expulsions of Students with Disabilities --

1

	•	•				
Results Indicators Continued	Data From: (Time Period)	SPP Target 2016	State Data	LEA Data	LEA Score	Possible Points
Indicator 5A: Percent of Children Aged 6 -21 Served Inside the		70.00%	65.72%	91.89%	1	1
Class 80% of the Day Indicator 5B: Percent of Children Aged 6 -21 Served Inside the Class Less Than 40% of the Day	2016-2017	15.10%	14.96%	<5%	1	1
Indicator 5C: Percent of Children Aged 6 -21 Served in Separate Schools, Residential Facilities and Homebound/Hospital Placements	2010 2017	4.50%	5.46%	<5%	1	1
Indicator 7A. Early Childhood Outcomes- Positive						
Social/Emotional Skills						
Percent Increase Rate of Growth	2016 2017	88.60%	89.89%	NA	NA	NA
Percent Within Age Expectation	2016-2017	58.00%	51.26%	NA	NA	NA
Indicator 7B. Early Childhood Outcomes-Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills						
Percent Increase Rate of Growth		91.10%	87.36%	NA	NA	NA
Percent Within Age Expectation	2016-2017	52.70%	48.60%	NA	NA	NA
Indicator 7C. Early Childhood Outcomes- Use of Appropriate Behaviors		52.70%	1010070			
Percent Increase Rate of Growth		90.20%	88.19%	NA	NA	NA
	2016-2017	65.30%	64.31%	NA	NA	NA
Percent Within Age Expectation		05.30%	64.31%	NA	NA	NA
Compliance Indicators	Data From: (Time Period)	SPP Target 2016	State Data	LEA Data	LEA Score	Possible Points
Indicator 4B: Significant Discrepancy in the Rate of Long-Term Suspensions and Expulsions of Students with Disabilities by Race/Ethnicity and Noncompliant Policies, Procedures, and Practices. Indicator 4B is based on school year 2015-2016 data with a Rate Ratio of 1.20.		Rate Ratio 1.20	NA	Met Target	1	1
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation						
All Disabilities	2016-2017	0.00%	17.50%	Met Targets	1	1
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation Specific Disabilities	2016-2017	0.00%	18.92%	Met Targets	1	1
Indicator 11: Initial Evaluations Conducted Within Timeline	2016-2017	100.00%	>95%	>95%	1	1
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition from Part C to Part B	2016-2017	100.00%	>95%	NA	NA	NA
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition	2016-2017	100.00%	>95%	>95%	1	1
Determination Summary			Ann	ual Determin	ation:	
Compliance Indicators Score	5		N	leeds Assista	nce	
Possible Points:	5					
Results Indicators Score	17	Interven	tion Plan /Com	npliance Agree	ement:	No
Possible Points:	28					
	-	1				
Score Total	22	4				
Out of a Possible:	33					
Development and a	CC C=01	1				
Percentage:	66.67%					2 o

Providence Creek Academy Charter School

Graduation Rat	te							
Indicator 1	<u>School Year</u> 2015-2016	<u>State Target</u> 74.10%	<u>State Data</u> 67.15%		<u>Number Eligible</u> NA	<u>Number Graduated</u> NA	LEA Data <u>% SWD Who</u> <u>Graduated</u> NA	<u>Met Target?</u> NA
Note: Percent	of youth with IEPs g	raduating from high sc	hool with a regular high	hool diploma within 4-year adjusted coh	ort			
Drop-Out Rate								
Indicator 2	<u>School Year</u> 2015-2016	<u>State Target</u> 4.60%	<u>State Data</u> 2.91%		<u>Number Enrolled</u> NA	<u>Number of Drop-Outs</u> NA	LEA Data <u>% SWD who Dropped</u> <u>Out</u> NA	<u>Met Target?</u> NA
Note:								

		State	State					LEA Data	
Indicator 3B	School Year	Target	<u>Data</u>	Grade	Subject	Number Eligible	Number Tested	Percent Tested	Met Target?
	2016-2017	95.00%	98.15%	3	ELA	-	-	> 95%	Yes
	2016-2017	95.00%	98.45%	4	ELA	-	-	> 95%	Yes
	2016-2017	95.00%	97.93%	5	ELA	-	-	> 95%	Yes
	2016-2017	95.00%	97.03%	6	ELA	-	-	> 95%	Yes
	2016-2017	95.00%	97.34%	7	ELA	-	-	> 95%	Yes
	2016-2017	95.00%	95.77%	8	ELA	-	-	80.00%	No
	2016-2017	95.00%	89.05%	11	ELA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Participation Rate in the State Assessment - MATH

		State	State					LEA Data	
Indicator 3B	School Year	Target	<u>Data</u>	Grade	Subject	Number Eligible	Number Tested	Percent Tested	Met Target?
	2016-2017	95.00%	97.67%	3	MATH	-	-	> 95%	Yes
	2016-2017	95.00%	98.13%	4	MATH	-	-	> 95%	Yes
	2016-2017	95.00%	97.87%	5	MATH	-	-	> 95%	Yes
	2016-2017	95.00%	96.69%	6	MATH	-	-	> 95%	Yes
	2016-2017	95.00%	96.62%	7	MATH	-	-	> 95%	Yes
	2016-2017	95.00%	95.28%	8	MATH	-	-	80.00%	No
	2016-2017	95.00%	89.05%	11	MATH	NA	NA	NA	NA
Note:									

Providence Creek Academy Charter School

		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	-	-	< 5%	No
	2016-2017	32.70%	20.95%	4	ELA	-	-	33.33%	Yes
	2016-2017	32.70%	22.97%	5	ELA	-	-	33.33%	Yes
	2016-2017	32.70%	16.11%	6	ELA	-	-	< 5%	No
	2016-2017	32.70%	17.49%	7	ELA	-	-	< 5%	No
	2016-2017	32.70%	16.46%	8	ELA	-	-	25.00%	No
	2016-2017	32.70%	13.57%	11	ELA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Proficiency Rate on the State Assessment - MATH

								LEA Data	
		State	State					% of SWD Meeting	
Indicator 3C	School Year	Target	<u>Data</u>	Grade	Subject	Number Tested	Number Meets	Proficiency	Met Target?
	2016-2017	29.20%	25.90%	3	MATH	-	-	< 5%	No
	2016-2017	29.20%	21.05%	4	MATH	-	-	33.33%	Yes
	2016-2017	29.20%	14.94%	5	MATH	-	-	< 5%	No
	2016-2017	29.20%	12.56%	6	MATH	-	-	< 5%	No
	2016-2017	29.20%	13.42%	7	MATH	-	-	< 5%	No
	2016-2017	29.20%	11.82%	8	MATH	-	-	25.00%	No
	2016-2017	29.20%	8.46%	11	MATH	NA	NA	NA	NA
Note:									

Note:

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

Indicator 4A	<u>School Year</u>	State Target	State Data	SWD Enrollment	Non-SWD Enrollment	<u>SWD Suspended > 10</u> <u>Days</u>	<u>Non-SWD Suspended</u> > 10 Days	LEA Data (Rate Ratio)	Met Target?
	2015-2016	0.00%	66.67%	35	655	-	-	0.00	Yes
Note:		ased on school year 201							
	State data is a ca	lculation based on the	number of LEAs tha	at met the N Size comp	pared to the same LEAs that	t exceeded rate ratio of 1	.20		
Significant Dis	crepancy in the Rate	e of Long-Term Suspens	sions and Expulsion	is of Students with Dis	abilities by Race/Ethnicity	and Noncompliant Polici	es, Procedures, and Pr	actices	
						SWD Suspended > 10			
Indicator 4B	School Year	State Target	State Data	Race	SWD Enrolled	<u>SWD Suspended > 10</u> <u>Days</u>	<u>Compliant</u>	LEA Data (Rate Ratio)	Met Target?
Indicator 4B	<u>School Year</u> 2015-2016	<u>State Target</u> 0.00	<u>State Data</u> 100.00%	<u>Race</u> Hispanic	SWD Enrolled 23		<u>Compliant</u> Yes	LEA Data (Rate Ratio) 0.00	<u>Met Target?</u> Yes
Indicator 4B						Days			
Indicator 4B	2015-2016	0.00	100.00%	Hispanic	23	Days -	Yes	0.00	Yes
<u>Indicator 4B</u>	2015-2016 2015-2016	0.00 0.00	100.00% 100.00%	Hispanic American Indian	23	Days - -	Yes Yes	0.00 0.00	Yes Yes
<u>Indicator 4B</u>	2015-2016 2015-2016 2015-2016	0.00 0.00 0.00	100.00% 100.00% 100.00%	Hispanic American Indian African American	23	<u>Days</u> - - -	Yes Yes Yes	0.00 0.00 0.00	Yes Yes Yes
<u>Indicator 4B</u>	2015-2016 2015-2016 2015-2016 2015-2016	0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00	100.00% 100.00% 100.00% 100.00%	Hispanic American Indian African American White	23	<u>Days</u> - - -	Yes Yes Yes Yes	0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00	Yes Yes Yes Yes
<u>Indicator 4B</u>	2015-2016 2015-2016 2015-2016 2015-2016 2015-2016	0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00	100.00% 100.00% 100.00% 100.00%	Hispanic American Indian African American White Asian	23	<u>Days</u> - - - -	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes

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

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

Providence Creek Academy Charter School

Percent of Child	dren Aged 6 to 21 Se	erved Inside the Regula	r 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> 37	Number of SWD <u>In LRE A</u> 34	LEA Data <u>% in LRE A</u> 91.89%	<u>Met Target?</u> Yes
Note:								
Percent of Child	dren Aged 6 to 21 Se	erved Inside the Regula	r Class Less Than 40% of th	Day				
Indicator 5B	<u>School Year</u> 2016-2017	<u>State Target</u> 15.10%	<u>State Data</u> 14.96%		<u>Number of SWD</u> 37	<u>Number of SWD In</u> <u>LRE B</u> -	<u>LRE Data % in LRE B</u> < 5%	<u>Met Target?</u> Yes
Note:								
Percent of Child	dren Aged 6 to 21 Se	erved In Separate Schoo	ols, Residential Facilities, a	d in Homebound/Hospital Placements				
Indicator 5C	<u>School Year</u> 2016-2017	<u>State Target</u> 4.50%	<u>State Data</u> 5.46%		<u>Number of SWD</u> 37	Number of SWD In LRE C -	LRE Data <u>% in LRE C</u> < 5%	<u>Met Target?</u> Yes
Note:								
	onments: Percent o	of Children Aged 3 to 5	Attending a Regular Early (ildhood Program and Receiving the Ma	ajority of Special Educat	ion and Related Services	in the Regular Early Ch	ildhood
Program Indicator 6A	<u>School Year</u> 2016-2017	<u>State Target</u> 48.50%	<u>State Data</u> 47.46%		Number of SWD	Number of SWD Receiving Services in the <u>Regular EC Program</u>	LEA Data Percent Receiving Services in the <u>Regular EC program</u> > 95%	<u>Met Target?</u> Yes
Note:								
Preschool Environments: Percent of Children Aged 3 to 5 Attending a Separate Special Education Class, Separate School, or Residential Facility								
Indicator 6B	School Year 2016-2017	<u>State Target</u> 33.50%	<u>State Data</u> 34.78%	n Education Class, Separate SChool, or	Number of SWD	Number of SWD Receiving Services in Separate Setting	LEA Data Percent Receiving Services in <u>Separate Setting</u> < 5%	<u>Met Target?</u> Yes
Note:								

Providence Creek Academy Charter School

Preschool Outcome	es: Percent of	Preschool Students Aged 3 to	5 Who Demonst	trate improved Skills	s in Positive Social/Emot	ional Skills			
2		Positive Social/Emotional Skills : Percent Increased Rate of Growth State Target 88.60%	<u>State Data</u> 89.89%	<u>LEA Data</u> NA	<u>Met Target</u> NA	Positive Social/Emotional Skills : Percent Within Age Expectation State Target 58.00%	<u>State Data</u> 51.26%	<u>LEA Data</u> NA	<u>Met Target</u> NA
Note:									
Preschool Outcome	es: Percent of	Preschool Students Aged 3 to	o 5 Who Demonst	trate Improved Skills	s in Acquisition and Use	of Knowledge and Skills			
	<mark>School Year</mark> 2016-2017	Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills: Percent Increased Rate of Growth State Target 91.10%	<u>State Data</u> 87.36%	<u>LEA Data</u> NA	<u>Met Target</u> NA	Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills: Percent Within Age Expectation State Target 52.70%	<u>State Data</u> 48.60%	<u>LEA Data</u> NA	<u>Met Target</u> NA
Note:									
Preschool Outcome	es: Percent of	Preschool Students Aged 3 to	o 5 Who Demonst	trate Improved Skills	s in Use of Appropriate E	Behaviors			
2	<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> NA	<u>Met Target</u> NA	Use of Appropriate Behaviors: Percent Within Age Expectation State Target 65.30%	<u>State Data</u> 64.31%	<u>LEA Data</u> NA	<u>Met Target</u> NA
Note:									
Percent of Parents	with a Child F	Receiving Special Education So State	ervices Who Repo State	ort That School Facil	itated Parent Involveme Total Number of	nt as a Means of Improving	Services and Results for	Children with Diisa LEA Data	bilities
Indicator 8 S	School Year	Target	Data		Respondents	Number Agree	Number Disagree	<u>% Agree</u>	Met Target?
	2016-2017	88.00%	89.18%		-	-	-	> 95%	Yes
Note: N	NA								

Providence Creek Academy Charter School

Providence Creek Academy Charter School										
Disproportionate Representation of Racial and Ethnic Groups in Special Education and Related Services That is a Result of Inappropriate Identification										
Indicator 9	School Year	State Target	State Data			LEA Data Compliant		Met Target?		
<u>indicator 9</u>	2016-2017	0.00%	17.50%			Yes		Yes		
	2010-2017	0.0078	17.50%			165		163		
Note: State da	ata reflects % of dist	ricts with Disproportio	nate Representation as a re	sult of inappropriate identification.						
Note: State data reflects % of districts with Disproportionate Representation as a result of inappropriate identification.										
Disproportiona	ate Representation o	of Racial and Ethnic Gr	oups in Specific Disability Ca	ategories That is a Result of Inappropria	te Identification					
	School Year									
Indicator 10		State Target	State Data			LEA Data Compliant		Met Target?		
	2016-2017	0.00%	18.92%			Yes		Yes		
Note: State da	ata reflects % of dist	ricts with Disproportio	nate Representation as a re	sult of inappropriate identification.						
Evaluations Co	nducted Within 45 S	chool Days or 90 Calen	ndar Days, Whichever is Sho	rter, of Receiving Parent Consent for Ini	tial Evaluation					
	Cohool Voor			Total Number of Initial	Number Within	Number Not Within	<u>% LEA Data Within</u>			
Indicator 11	School Year	State Target	State Data	Evaluations	Timelines	Timelines	<u>Timelines</u>	Met Target?		
Indicator 11	2016-2017	<u>State Target</u> 100.00%	<u>State Data</u> 98.97%				<u>Timelines</u> > 95%	Met Target? Yes		
	2016-2017					Timelines				
Indicator 11 Note:						Timelines				
	2016-2017					Timelines				
Note:	2016-2017	100.00%	98.97%	Evaluations -	<u>Timelines</u> -	<u>Timelines</u> 0	> 95%			
Note:	2016-2017	100.00%	98.97%		<u>Timelines</u> -	<u>Timelines</u> 0	> 95%			
Note:	2016-2017	100.00%	98.97%	Evaluations -	<u>Timelines</u> -	<u>Timelines</u> 0	> 95%			
Note:	2016-2017	100.00%	98.97%	Evaluations -	<u>Timelines</u> -	<u>Timelines</u> 0	> 95%			
Note:	2016-2017	100.00%	98.97%	Evaluations -	<u>Timelines</u> - o Have an IEP Develope	<u>Timelines</u> 0 ed and Implemented by 1	> 95% Their Third Birthday LEA Data % Who	Yes		
Note: Early Childhoo	2016-2017 NA d Transitions: Perce	100.00%	98.97%	Evaluations - no Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Who <u>Total Number of SWD</u>	<u>Timelines</u> - o Have an IEP Develope <u>Number of Students</u>	Timelines 0 ed and Implemented by 1 <u>s Referred Minus Not</u>	> 95% Their Third Birthday <u>LEA Data % Who</u> <u>Received Services by</u>	Yes		
Note:	2016-2017	100.00%	98.97%	Evaluations -	<u>Timelines</u> - o Have an IEP Develope <u>Number of Students</u> <u>Eligible and/or</u>	<u>Timelines</u> 0 ed and Implemented by 1	> 95% Their Third Birthday LEA Data % Who	Yes		
Note: Early Childhoo	2016-2017 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 Wh <u>State Data</u>	Evaluations - no Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Who <u>Total Number of SWD</u> <u>Who Turned Age 3</u>	<u>Timelines</u> - o Have an IEP Develope <u>Number of Students</u> <u>Eligible and/or</u>	Timelines 0 ed and Implemented by 1 <u>Referred Minus Not</u> Parent Refusals	> 95% Their Third Birthday <u>LEA Data % Who</u> <u>Received Services by</u> <u>Age 3</u>	Yes <u>Met Target?</u>		
Note: Early Childhoo	2016-2017 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 Wh <u>State Data</u>	Evaluations - no Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Who <u>Total Number of SWD</u> <u>Who Turned Age 3</u>	<u>Timelines</u> - o Have an IEP Develope <u>Number of Students</u> <u>Eligible and/or</u>	Timelines 0 ed and Implemented by 1 <u>Referred Minus Not</u> Parent Refusals	> 95% Their Third Birthday <u>LEA Data % Who</u> <u>Received Services by</u> <u>Age 3</u>	Yes <u>Met Target?</u>		
Note: Early Childhoo Indicator 12 Note:	2016-2017 NA d Transitions: Percer <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 Wh <u>State Data</u> 98.55%	Evaluations 	Timelines - o Have an IEP Develope <u>Number of Students Eligible and/or</u> N	Timelines 0 ed and Implemented by T s Referred Minus Not Parent Refusals	> 95% Their Third Birthday <u>LEA Data % Who</u> <u>Received Services by</u> <u>Age 3</u> NA	Yes <u>Met Target?</u>		
Note: Early Childhoo Indicator 12 Note: Percent of You	2016-2017 NA d Transitions: Percent School Year 2016-2017	100.00% nt of Children Referred <u>State Target</u> 100.00%	98.97% by Part C Prior to Age 3 Wh <u>State Data</u> 98.55%	Evaluations - no Are Found Eligible for Part B, and Who <u>Total Number of SWD</u> <u>Who Turned Age 3</u>	Timelines - o Have an IEP Develope <u>Number of Students Eligible and/or</u> N	Timelines 0 ed and Implemented by T s Referred Minus Not Parent Refusals	> 95% Their Third Birthday <u>LEA Data % Who</u> <u>Received Services by</u> <u>Age 3</u> NA	Yes <u>Met Target?</u>		
Note: Early Childhoo Indicator 12 Note:	2016-2017 NA d Transitions: Percent School Year 2016-2017	100.00% nt of Children Referred <u>State Target</u> 100.00%	98.97% by Part C Prior to Age 3 Wh <u>State Data</u> 98.55%	Evaluations 	Timelines - o Have an IEP Develope <u>Number of Students Eligible and/or</u> N	Timelines 0 ed and Implemented by T s Referred Minus Not Parent Refusals	> 95% Their Third Birthday <u>LEA Data % Who</u> <u>Received Services by</u> <u>Age 3</u> NA	Yes <u>Met Target?</u>		
Note: Early Childhoo Indicator 12 Note: Percent of You the Post-Secor	2016-2017 NA d Transitions: Percer <u>School Year</u> 2016-2017 th Age 14 and Above	100.00% nt of Children Referred <u>State Target</u> 100.00% e with an IEP That Inclu	98.97% by Part C Prior to Age 3 Wh <u>State Data</u> 98.55%	Evaluations 	Timelines o Have an IEP Develope <u>Number of Students</u> Eligible and/or N vices That Will Reasona	Timelines 0 ed and Implemented by T <u>Referred Minus Not</u> Parent Refusals IA	> 95% Their Third Birthday <u>LEA Data % Who</u> <u>Received Services by</u> <u>Age 3</u> NA	Yes <u>Met Target?</u> NA		
Note: Early Childhoo Indicator 12 Note: Percent of You	2016-2017 NA d Transitions: Percer <u>School Year</u> 2016-2017 th Age 14 and Above idary 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 Wh <u>State Data</u> 98.55% udes Coordinated. Measural	Evaluations 	Timelines o Have an IEP Develope <u>Number of Students</u> Eligible and/or N	Timelines 0 ed and Implemented by T <u>Referred Minus Not</u> Parent Refusals IA	> 95% Their Third Birthday <u>LEA Data % Who Received Services by</u> <u>Age 3</u> NA to Meet <u>LEA Data % Meeting</u> <u>Standard</u>	Yes Met Target? NA		
Note: Early Childhoo Indicator 12 Note: Percent of You the Post-Secor	2016-2017 NA d Transitions: Percer <u>School Year</u> 2016-2017 th Age 14 and Above	100.00% nt of Children Referred <u>State Target</u> 100.00% e with an IEP That Inclu	98.97% by Part C Prior to Age 3 Wh <u>State Data</u> 98.55%	Evaluations Evaluations Total Number of SWD Who Turned Age 3 NA NA Dele, Annual IEP Goals and Transition Servent Total Number of IEPS	Timelines o Have an IEP Develope <u>Number of Students</u> Eligible and/or N vices That Will Reasona	Timelines 0 ed and Implemented by T <u>Referred Minus Not</u> Parent Refusals IA	> 95% Their Third Birthday <u>LEA Data % Who</u> <u>Received Services by</u> <u>Age 3</u> NA	Yes <u>Met Target?</u> NA		
Note: Early Childhoo Indicator 12 Note: Percent of You the Post-Secor	2016-2017 NA d Transitions: Percer <u>School Year</u> 2016-2017 th Age 14 and Above idary 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 Wh <u>State Data</u> 98.55% udes Coordinated. Measural	Evaluations Evaluations Total Number of SWD Who Turned Age 3 NA NA Dele, Annual IEP Goals and Transition Servent Total Number of IEPS	Timelines o Have an IEP Develope <u>Number of Students</u> Eligible and/or N vices That Will Reasona	Timelines 0 ed and Implemented by T <u>Referred Minus Not</u> Parent Refusals IA	> 95% Their Third Birthday <u>LEA Data % Who Received Services by</u> <u>Age 3</u> NA to Meet <u>LEA Data % Meeting</u> <u>Standard</u>	Yes Met Target? NA		

Providence Creek Academy Charter School

Post-School Outcomes-Percent of Youth Who Are No Longer In Secondary School, Had IEPs in Effect at the Time They Left School, and Were: Group A. Enrolled in Higher Education Within One Year of Leaving High School, Group B. Enrolled in Higher Education or Competitively Employed Within One Year of Leaving High School, or Group C. Enrolled in Higher Education or in Some Other Post-Secondary Education or Training Program; or Competitively Employed or in Some Other Employment Within One Year of Leaving

Indicator 14	<u>School Year</u> 2016-2017	<u>State Target</u> 33.00%	<u>State Data</u> 49.47%	<u>Total Number of Exiters</u> NA	<u>Total Number of</u> <u>Respondents</u> NA	<u>Group A Respondents</u> NA	<u>LEA Data % Group A</u> NA	<u>Met Target?</u> NA
		State Target 64.00%	<u>State Data</u> 82.59%			<u>Group B Respondents</u> NA	<u>LEA Data % Group B</u> NA	<u>Met Target?</u> NA
Note:		<u>State Target</u> 100.00%	<u>State Data</u> 86.20%			<u>Group C Respondents</u> NA	<u>LEA Data % Group C</u> NA	<u>Met Target?</u> NA