



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

Final Determination Letter

June 21, 2024

Honorable Mark Holodick
Secretary of Education
Delaware Department of Education
401 Federal Street, Suite 2
Dover, DE 19901

Dear Secretary Holodick:

I am writing to advise you of the U.S. Department of Education's (Department) 2024 determination under Section 616 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The Department has determined that Delaware needs assistance in implementing the requirements of Part B of the IDEA. This determination is based on the totality of Delaware's data and information, including the Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2022 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), other State-reported data, and other publicly available information.

Delaware's 2024 determination is based on the data reflected in its "2024 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix" (RDA Matrix). The RDA Matrix is individualized for each State and Entity and consists of:

- (1) a Compliance Matrix that includes scoring on Compliance Indicators and other compliance factors;
- (2) a Results Matrix that includes scoring on Results Elements;
- (3) a Compliance Score and a Results Score;
- (4) an RDA Percentage based on both the Compliance Score and the Results Score; and
- (5) the State's or Entity's Determination.

The RDA Matrix is further explained in a document, entitled "[How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616\(d\) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2024: Part B](#)" (HTDMD).

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) is continuing to use both results data and compliance data in making determinations in 2024, as it did for Part B determinations in 2014-2023. (The specifics of the determination procedures and criteria are set forth in the HTDMD document and reflected in the RDA Matrix for Delaware).

In making Part B determinations in 2024, OSEP continued to use results data related to:

- (1) the participation and performance of CWD on the most recently administered (school year 2021-2022) National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), as applicable (For the 2024 determinations, OSEP using results data on the participation and performance of children with disabilities on the NAEP for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. OSEP used the available NAEP data for Puerto Rico in making Puerto Rico's 2024 determination as it did for Puerto Rico's 2023 determination. OSEP did not use NAEP data in making the BIE's 2024 determination because the NAEP data available for the BIE were not comparable to the NAEP data available for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico; specifically, the most recently administered NAEP for the BIE is 2019, whereas the most recently administered NAEP for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico is 2022.)
- (2) the percentage of CWD who graduated with a regular high school diploma; and
- (3) the percentage of CWD who dropped out.

For the 2024 IDEA Part B determinations, OSEP also considered participation of CWD on Statewide assessments (which include the regular assessment and the alternate assessment). While the participation rates of CWD on Statewide assessments were a factor in each State or Entity's 2024 Part B Results Matrix, no State or Entity received a Needs Intervention determination in 2024 due solely to this criterion. However, this criterion will be fully incorporated beginning with the 2025 determinations.

You may access the results of OSEP's review of Delaware's SPP/APR and other relevant data by accessing the EMAPS SPP/APR reporting tool using your Delaware-specific log-on information at <https://emaps.ed.gov/suite/>. When you access Delaware's SPP/APR on the site, you will find, in applicable Indicators 1 through 17, the OSEP Response to the indicator and any actions that Delaware is required to take. The actions that Delaware is required to take are in the "Required Actions" section of the indicator.

It is important for you to review the Introduction to the SPP/APR, which may also include language in the "OSEP Response" and/or "Required Actions" sections.

You will also find the following important documents in the Determinations Enclosures section:

- (1) Delaware's RDA Matrix;
- (2) the HTDMD [link](#);

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600
www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

- (3) "2024 Data Rubric Part B," which shows how OSEP calculated Delaware's "Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data" score in the Compliance Matrix; and
- (4) "Dispute Resolution 2022-2023," which includes the IDEA Section 618 data that OSEP used to calculate the Delaware's "Timely State Complaint Decisions" and "Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions" scores in the Compliance Matrix.

As noted above, Delaware's 2024 determination is Needs Assistance. A State's or Entity's 2024 RDA Determination is Needs Assistance if the RDA Percentage is at least 60% but less than 80%. A State or Entity's determination would also be Needs Assistance if its RDA Determination percentage is 80% or above but the Department has imposed Specific Conditions on the State's or Entity's last three IDEA Part B grant awards (for FFYs 2021, 2022, and 2023), and those Specific Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2024 determination.

Delaware's determination for 2023 was also Needs Assistance. In accordance with Section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a), if a State or Entity is determined to need assistance for two consecutive years, the Secretary must take one or more of the following actions:

- (1) advise the State or Entity of available sources of technical assistance that may help the State or Entity address the areas in which the State or Entity needs assistance and require the State or Entity to work with appropriate entities;
- (2) direct the use of State-level funds on the area or areas in which the State or Entity needs assistance; or
- (3) identify the State or Entity as a high-risk grantee and impose Specific Conditions on the State's or Entity's IDEA Part B grant award.

Pursuant to these requirements, the Secretary is advising Delaware of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers and resources at the following websites: [Monitoring and State Improvement Planning \(MSIP\) | OSEP Ideas That Work](#), [Individuals with Disabilities Education Act \(IDEA\) Topic Areas](#), and requiring Delaware to work with appropriate entities. In addition, Delaware should consider accessing technical assistance from other Department-funded centers such as the Comprehensive Centers with resources at the following link: <https://compcenternetwork.org/states>. The Secretary directs Delaware to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. We strongly encourage Delaware to access technical assistance related to those results elements and compliance indicators for which it received a score of zero. Delaware must report with its FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2025, on:

- (1) the technical assistance sources from which Delaware received assistance; and
- (2) the actions Delaware took as a result of that technical assistance.

As required by IDEA Section 616(e)(7) and 34 C.F.R. §300.606, Delaware must notify the public that the Secretary of Education has taken the above enforcement actions, including, at a minimum, by posting a public notice on its website and distributing the notice to the media and through public agencies.

IDEA determinations provide an opportunity for all stakeholders to examine State data as that data relate to improving outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. The Department encourages stakeholders to review State SPP/APR data and other available data as part of the focus on improving equitable outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. Key areas the Department encourages State and local personnel to review are access to high-quality intervention and instruction; effective implementation of individualized family service plans (IFSPs) and individualized education programs (IEPs), using data to drive decision-making, supporting strong relationship building with families, and actively addressing educator and other personnel shortages.

For 2025 and beyond, the Department is considering three criteria related to IDEA Part B determinations as part of the Department's continued efforts to incorporate equity and improve results for CWD. First, the Department is considering as a factor OSEP-identified longstanding noncompliance (i.e., unresolved findings issued by OSEP at least three or more years ago). This factor would be reflected in the determination for each State and Entity through the "longstanding noncompliance" section of the Compliance Matrix beginning with the 2025 determinations. In implementing this factor, the Department is also considering beginning in 2025 whether a State or Entity that would otherwise receive a score of Meets Requirements would not be able to receive a determination of Meets Requirements if the State or Entity had OSEP-identified longstanding noncompliance (i.e., unresolved findings issued by OSEP at least three or more years ago). Second, the Department is considering as potential additional factors the improvement in proficiency rates of CWD on Statewide assessments. Third, the Department is considering whether and how to continue including in its determinations criteria the participation and proficiency of CWD on the NAEP.

For the FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission due on February 1, 2025, OSEP is providing the following information about the IDEA Section 618 data. The 2023-24 IDEA Section 618 Part B data submitted as of the due date will be used for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR and the 2025 IDEA Part B Results Matrix and States and Entities will not be able to resubmit their IDEA Section 618 data after the due date. The 2023-24 IDEA Section 618 Part B data will automatically be prepopulated in the SPP/APR reporting platform for Part B SPP/APR Indicators 3, 5, and 6 (as they have in the past). Under EDFacts Modernization, States and Entities are expected to submit high-quality IDEA Section 618 Part B data that can be published and used by the Department as of the due date. States and Entities are expected to conduct data quality reviews prior to the applicable due date. OSEP expects States and Entities to take one of the following actions for all business rules that are triggered in the EDPass or EMAPS system prior to the applicable due date: 1) revise the uploaded data to address the edit; or 2) provide a data note addressing why the data submission triggered the business rule. States and Entities will be unable to submit the IDEA Section 618 Part B data without taking one of these two actions. There will not be a resubmission period for the IDEA Section 618 Part B data.

As a reminder, Delaware must report annually to the public, by posting on the State educational agency's (SEA's) website, the performance of each local educational agency (LEA) located in Delaware on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after Delaware's submission of its FFY 2022 SPP/APR. In addition, Delaware must:

- (1) review LEA performance against targets in the State's SPP/APR;

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

- (2) determine if each LEA “meets the requirements” of Part B, or “needs assistance,” “needs intervention,” or “needs substantial intervention” in implementing Part B of the IDEA;
- (3) take appropriate enforcement action; and
- (4) inform each LEA of its determination.

Further, Delaware must make its SPP/APR available to the public by posting it on the SEA’s website. Within the upcoming weeks, OSEP will be finalizing a State Profile that:

- (1) includes Delaware’s determination letter and SPP/APR, OSEP attachments, and all State or Entity attachments that are accessible in accordance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; and
- (2) will be accessible to the public via the ed.gov website.

OSEP appreciates Delaware’s efforts to improve results for children and youth with disabilities and looks forward to working with Delaware over the next year as we continue our important work of improving the lives of children with disabilities and their families. Please contact your OSEP State Lead if you have any questions, would like to discuss this further, or want to request technical assistance.

Sincerely,

Valerie C. Williams
Director
Office of Special Education Programs

cc: Delaware Director of Special Education

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600
www.ed.gov

The Department of Education’s mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

**For reporting on
FFY 2022**

Delaware



PART B DUE February 1, 2024

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

Introduction

Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) has always required states to focus our efforts and resources on our general supervision responsibilities of procedural compliance through rigorous monitoring and extensive reporting procedures. OSEP's accountability framework, called Results Driven Accountability (RDA), brings into focus the educational results and functional outcomes for children with disabilities while balancing those results with the compliance requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The purpose is to help close the achievement gap for students with disabilities, improve outcomes for our children while preparing them to have a range of college and career options appropriate to their individual needs and preferences, move away from a one-size-fits-all compliance focused approach and to craft a more balanced system that looks at how well students are being educated in addition to continued efforts to protect their rights. In addition, children with disabilities are to be a part of, not separate from, the general population. Thus, Special Education Accountability should strengthen and compliment other general education initiatives, including the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

The Delaware Department of Education (DDOE) Exceptional Children Resources (ECR) Workgroup has developed a Multi-Tiered System of Accountability to improve results for children while ensuring compliance with IDEA within our general supervision responsibilities. All Local Education Agencies (LEAs) are monitored through data analysis, desk audits, self-assessments, review of policies and procedures, review of student records, on-site visits and/or student observations for the compliance and results requirements under IDEA. DDOE utilizes a risk-based analysis process to identify increased or targeted monitoring. In addition, DDOE engages in ongoing monitoring activities for fiscal requirements, equitable services for parentally placed students with disabilities, MOE, and Excess Costs.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

The Delaware Department of Education (DDOE) uses a longitudinal data system to collect and maintain detailed, quality student and staff level data on all students who attend public K-12 local education agencies. All of Delaware's LEAs are required to use PowerSchool's eSchoolPLUS and PSIEP applications to collect these data, provided by DDOE. eSchoolPLUS contains demographic, academic, and performance historical data on every student in Delaware. PSIEP maintains Individualized Education Program (IEP) data for special education students. PSIEP is integrated with eSchoolPLUS thus providing DDOE robust student data for reporting and analysis. Through this longitudinal data system, the DDOE ensures that data collected and reported are accurate, valid and reliable.

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

42

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that the IDEA Part B requirements are met (e.g., integrated monitoring activities; data on processes and results; the SPP/APR; fiscal management; policies, procedures, and practices resulting in effective implementation; and improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions).

The DDOE has established a Multi-Tiered System of Accountability to improve early intervention and educational results and functional outcomes for children with disabilities and their families, to ensure that LEAs are meeting compliance and results requirements of the IDEA and to ensure that data collected and reported are accurate, valid, and reliable.

COMPLIANCE

Tier I:
All LEAs are monitored through data analysis, desk audits, self-assessments, review of LEA policies and procedures, review of student records, on-site visits, interviews, and/or student observations for the following:
Significant Discrepancy/Suspension & Expulsion (Indicator 4b)
Disproportionate Representation in Special Education (Indicators 9 & 10)
Initial Evaluation Timelines (Indicator 11)
Transition of Part C to Part B (Indicator 12)
Secondary Transition (Indicator 13)
Compliance of IEP Process
Proportionate Share Parentally Placed Private School Student
Significant Disproportionality
Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services
IDEA Consolidated Grant Approval Process including General Education Provisions Act
Fiscal Monitoring including MOE, Excess Costs, and Single Audits
If noncompliance is identified, the LEA moves to Tier II.

Tier II:
The LEA is required to correct all individual student noncompliance, conduct a Root Cause Analysis in the area(s) of noncompliance, and develop a Corrective Action Plan including provision of professional development for staff, review of policies and procedures, improvement activities, benchmarks, and a timeline for submitting deliverables and status updates. Following the completion of these activities and utilizing updated data, DDOE verifies the correction of individual student noncompliance, in addition to reviewing new randomly selected student files, again utilizing updated data, to verify systemic compliance and that the LEA is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements under IDEA. DDOE monitors the status of the Corrective Action Plan and provides TA as requested. If continued noncompliance exists, the LEA moves to Tier III.

In addition, Tier II includes Focused Monitoring of LEAs on a cyclical basis. Districts are monitored every 5 years and charters every three years. ECR also conducts a Risk-Based Analysis during which multiple data are reviewed including, but not limited to, Equitable Services, Proportionate Share, use of IDEA funds, use of CCEIS/CEIS funds, administrative complaints, and due process. An LEA may be identified for Focused Monitoring based on risk factors. If noncompliance is identified, the LEA moves to Tier III.

Tier III

LEA and DDOE driven. The LEA is required to correct individual noncompliance. The LEA and DDOE conduct a Self- Assessment, including data analysis and a Root Cause Analysis in the area(s) of noncompliance. The LEA and DDOE develop an Intervention Plan to include provision of professional development for staff, review of policies and procedures, improvement activities, benchmarks, and timeline for submitting deliverables and status updates. Following the completion of these activities and utilizing updated data, DDOE verifies the correction of individual student noncompliance, in addition to reviewing new randomly selected student files, again utilizing updated data, to verify systemic compliance and that the LEA is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements under IDEA. DDOE monitors the status of the Intervention Plan and TA is provided by DDOE or other entity. If continued noncompliance exists, the LEA moves to Tier IV.

Tier IV

DDOE driven. The LEA is required to correct individual noncompliance. DDOE and the LEA conduct a Root Cause Analysis in the area(s) of noncompliance. DDOE develops a Compliance Agreement and the LEA and DDOE enter into the Compliance Agreement which includes required improvement activities, benchmarks, PD, TA, and timeline for submitting deliverables and status updates. Utilizing updated data, DDOE verifies the correction of individual student noncompliance, in addition to reviewing new randomly selected student files, again utilizing updated data, to verify systemic compliance and that the LEA is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements under IDEA. DDOE monitors the status of the Compliance Agreement and TA is provided by DDOE or other entity. Possible sanctions include, but are not limited to, direction of IDEA funds.

RESULTS

Tier I

All Local Education Agencies (LEAs) are monitored through data analysis, desk audits, self-assessments, review of LEA policies and procedures, review of student records, on-site visits, interviews, and/or student observations for the following:

State Assessment Participation and Performance (Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, 3D)

Significant Discrepancy/Suspension and Expulsion (Indicator 4a)

Early Childhood Outcomes (Indicator 7)

Graduation Rate (Indicator 1)

Drop-out Rate (Indicator 2)

Provision of FAPE in the Least Restrictive Environment (Indicator 5)

LRE Preschool (Indicator 6)

If an LEA does not meet targets for identified indicators, the LEA moves to Tier II.

Tier II

The LEA is required to conduct a Root Cause Analysis in the area(s) in which they did not meet targets and develop a Continuous Improvement Plan including improvement activities, benchmarks, and a timeline for submitting deliverables and status updates. DDOE provides TA as requested and monitors through the status of the Continuous Improvement Plan.

If progress toward benchmarks is not evidenced, the LEA moves to Tier III.

Tier III

LEA and DDOE driven. The LEA and DDOE conduct a Self- Assessment, including an analysis of data, review of policies and procedures, a Root Cause Analysis in the area(s) of unmet targets, and develop a Continuous Improvement Plan including improvement activities, benchmarks, and a timeline for submitting deliverables and status updates. DDOE monitors through analysis of LEA data and progress/status updates of the Continuous Improvement Plan. TA is provided by DDOE or other entity. If progress toward benchmarks is not evidenced, the LEA moves to Tier IV.

Tier IV

DDOE driven. DDOE and the LEA conduct a Root Cause Analysis in the area(s) of noncompliance. DDOE develops a Compliance Agreement and the LEA and DDOE enter into the Compliance Agreement which includes required improvement activities, benchmarks, PD, TA, and timeline for submitting deliverables and status updates. DDOE monitors the status of the Compliance Agreement and TA is provided by DDOE or other entity. Possible sanctions include, but are not limited to, direction of IDEA funds.

To support LEAs in improving results outcomes, and following the issuance of LEA annual determinations in spring, 2023, the DDOE implemented a strategy to engage LEAs in a cross-LEA collaborative process. In August, 2023, LEA Special Education Directors and their teams met in small groups, facilitated by ECR staff, during which they shared the results of their root cause analysis and improvement activities they designed to address contributing factors to not meeting targets. Each LEA then had the opportunity to pose questions to the group and receive feedback including strategies that were successful in other LEAs. This collaborative process continued throughout the school year during Special Education Director County meetings and Special Education Director Charter meetings where LEAs shared updates on improvement activities, received positive feedback and engaged the group in problem solving around challenges. ECR has received positive feedback from Special Education Directors regarding implementation of this collaborative process.

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidence-based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

Technical Assistance

The DDOE has developed a comprehensive technical assistance framework that moves beyond short-term, episodic training and support to a community of practice that is sustainable and builds LEA capacity to improve results for students with disabilities. Within the framework, each ECR staff member serves as a liaison to a certain number of LEAs to provide intensive technical assistance and support on a daily basis. In addition, the DDOE engages in an analysis of state-level, as well as LEA level data and in meaningful discussions with LEA leadership to identify LEAs in need of technical assistance. Once identified, technical assistance is provided through a variety of formats including individual conversations, peer to peer discussions, group training, on-site/online coaching, and consultation. Technical assistance is provided on an ongoing basis and includes DDOE and stakeholder-initiated topics such as IDEA regulations, procedural safeguards, policies, procedures, and practices, legislative updates, policy issues, State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report, State Systemic Improvement Plan, fiscal, updates from agency providers, and other current issues in special education both national and those specific to Delaware.

Under the IDEA, the Department is required to review the performance of local education agencies (LEAs) on the targets identified in the State's Performance Plan (SPP) and make annual determinations on LEA performance. DDOE issues LEA annual determinations based on a combination of the following compliance and results indicators:

Compliance:

Indicator 4a: Disproportionate Suspension & Expulsion Ethnicity
Indicators 9 & 10: Disproportionate Representation in Special Education
Indicator 11: Initial Evaluation Timelines
Indicator 12: Transition of Part C to Part B
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition
Timely and Accurate Data

Results:

Indicator 1: Graduation Rate
Indicator 2: Drop-out Rate
Indicator 3: State Assessment Participation and Performance
Indicator 4b: Significant Discrepancy Suspension and Expulsion
Indicator 5: LRE Provision of FAPE in the Least Restrictive Environment
Indicator 6: LRE Preschool
Indicator 7: Early Childhood Outcomes

After receiving their annual determinations, LEAs must engage in a Continuous Improvement Planning Process including data analysis, engaging stakeholders in a root cause analysis and development of a Continuous Improvement Plan to actively improve results for students with disabilities. DDOE provides technical assistance to support each LEA in this process.

Following the issuance of LEA annual determinations in spring, 2023, the DDOE implemented a strategy to engage LEAs in a cross-LEA collaborative process. In August, 2023, LEA Special Education Directors and their teams met in small groups, facilitated by ECR staff, during which they shared the results of their root cause analysis and improvement activities they designed to address contributing factors to not meeting targets. Each LEA then had the opportunity to pose questions to the group and receive feedback including strategies that were successful in other LEAs. This collaborative process continued throughout the school year during Special Education Director County meetings and Special Education Director Charter meetings where LEAs shared updates on improvement activities, received positive feedback and engaged the group in problem solving around challenges. ECR has received positive feedback from Special Education Directors regarding implementation of this collaborative process.

Under Delaware's Multi-Tiered System of Accountability, DDOE provides technical assistance to LEAs through each tier by:

Tier I: If an LEA is found noncompliant or they have not met the targets for results, the LEA moves to Tier II. Data from all compliance and results indicators, along with other factors, are considered when identifying the movement of an LEA to Tier II. In addition to the schedule of LEA on-site monitoring, the DDOE conducts a Risk Based Analysis to identify specific LEAs for monitoring, technical assistance, and support by DDOE.

Tier II: If an LEA is found to continue in the areas of noncompliance, they have not completed the activities in their Corrective Action Plan or they have not met the targets for results for another year, the LEA moves to Tier III. Again, the DDOE conducts a Risk Based Analysis to identify LEAs for on-site monitoring each year. Data from all compliance and results indicators, along with additional data, are considered when identifying the movement to Tier III. Tier III is driven by both LEA and DDOE. TA is provided to LEA by DDOE support throughout the year.

Tier III: For Tier III, the LEA and the DDOE work together to develop an Intervention Plan. TA is provided to LEA by DDOE throughout the year and progress updates are provided by the LEA to the DDOE. If an LEA continues to be noncompliant, the LEA moves into Tier IV. and enters into a Compliance Agreement with DDOE. DDOE leads a Root Cause Analysis with the LEA in the area(s) of noncompliance and develops the Compliance Agreement which is signed by both parties.

Tier IV: For Tier IV issues, the LEA and DDOE enter into a Compliance Agreement. DDOE leads a Root Cause Analysis with the LEA in the area(s) of noncompliance and develops the Compliance Agreement which is signed by both parties and monitors the Compliance Agreement closely. Corrective actions are required at both the systems level and building level and include mandatory staff attendance for targeted professional development in the areas of noncompliance, revision of policies and procedures, implementation of strategies to address the root causes, etc. If the DDOE is able to verify correction of noncompliance in all of the regulatory areas, the DDOE will close out the findings of noncompliance that are corrected and notify the LEA in writing. If, however, findings of noncompliance remain open in specific regulatory areas, additional actions will be necessary. Depending on the results of the DDOE's verification activities, the DDOE may increase its enforcement actions in accordance with its authority.

In addition to the support within the Liaison framework, DDOE provides technical assistance to all LEAs through a variety of formats including the following: Special Education Leadership meetings, meetings held throughout the year with County and Charter Special Education Directors, monthly Literacy Coalition and Cadre meetings, monthly Math Cadre meetings, DE-Positive Behavior Support Cadre meetings, monthly Delaware Transition Cadre meetings, Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), Access to the General Education Advisory Committee meetings, monthly Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) meetings, Early Childhood Transition Collaborative meetings, ECSE Itinerant Teacher Community of Practice, Early Childhood Inclusion Committee meetings, and Developmental Screening Community of Practice meetings. In addition, further technical assistance and resources are provided through the DDOE website, Schoology platform, professional learning opportunities, MTSS Technical Assistance Center website.

To ensure alignment of efforts across the DDOE, ECR staff also serve as liaisons to other work groups within the DDOE including Office of Equity and Innovation, Assessment and Accountability, Career and Technical Education, Educator Excellence, Curriculum/Instruction/Professional Development, Title Programs, Charter School Office, Licensure and Certification Professional Standards, School Support Services, World Language and Technology/Data.

ECR has also provided training and technical assistance for district and charter Chief Finance Officers and Special Education Directors around use of IDEA funds and the fiscal monitoring process.

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for children with disabilities.

The DDOE has developed a comprehensive professional development system that moves beyond short-term, episodic training to a community of practice that is sustainable and builds LEA capacity to improve results for students with disabilities. The system focuses on implementation of a Multi-tiered System of Support for both academic and behavioral/social/emotional supports.

DDOE's approach to professional learning is focused on strengthening multi-tiered systems of support at the district/systems and school levels, responsive to the needs of district and school staff, seamlessly aligned with Delaware's ESSA Plan and state and district initiatives/priorities. DDOE staff engages in ongoing data analysis and evaluation of all professional development, coaching and technical assistance to ensure fidelity of implementation of evidenced-based strategies and attainment of measurable outcomes and to drive future technical assistance. The DDOE evaluates professional development and technical assistance using the Guskey's Five Critical Levels of Professional Development: Participants' Reactions, Participants' Learning, Organization Support and Change, Use of New Knowledge and Skills, and Student Learning Outcomes. In addition, other measures are utilized such as coaching rubrics and coaching fidelity checklists based on Participatory Adult Learning Strategy (PALS).

The DDOE engages in an analysis of state-level, as well as LEA level data and in meaningful discussions with LEA leadership to identify LEAs in need of professional development and technical assistance. Once identified, the LEA and the DDOE enter into a Memorandum of Understanding, which outlines the roles and responsibilities of both the LEA and the Department. Technical assistance is provided through a variety of formats including group training, on-site/online coaching, and consultation.

To ensure alignment of efforts across the DDOE, ECR staff also serve as liaisons to other work groups within the DDOE including Office of Equity and Innovation, Assessment and Accountability, Career and Technical Education, Educator Excellence, Curriculum/Instruction/Professional Development, Title Programs, Charter School Office, Licensure and Certification Professional Standards, School Support Services, World Language and Technology/Data.

Following are examples of the professional development and coaching provided:

Integrated Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS): ECR continues to facilitate and collaborate across the DDOE to lead efforts in supporting LEAs around MTSS for both academics and non-academics, including Mental Health Literacy, through tiered supports. Professional learning/coaching/dissemination of resources are provided to LEAs and families.

Equity: To support DDOE and LEA efforts around equity, ECR has established an Equity Professional Learning Community (PLC) of diverse stakeholders which focuses on Addressing the Equity Requirements in IDEA. Educators from LEAs come together bi-monthly during the school year to discuss a variety of topics to improve outcomes for students with disabilities in these areas including disproportionality discipline and identification, MTSS, Root Cause Analysis, and identifying bias. In addition, professional learning has been provided across the state by bringing in national experts on topics such as discipline, identification, placement, and instruction.

Systematic Processes for Enhancing and Assessing Communication Supports (SPEACS): The SPEACS initiative collaborates with educators to create communication rich classrooms through research-based literacy strategies for students with the most significant disabilities. SPEACS provides professional learning and coaching on literacy and communication strategies to teams of educators. Support is tailored to each educator team through the use of observations, modeling, online learning, experiences, book studies, lesson studies and technical assistance.

Early Childhood Outcomes: Professional learning has been created, based on training modules developed by the ECTA Center, for LEA personnel targeting all components of Child Outcomes, including fidelity of rating scale at entry and exit.

Universal Design for Learning: Open to all LEA staff with a focus on universal design, differentiated instructional and engagement strategies to support the rigor of the Delaware State Standards. LEAs participate in a UDL Community of Practice to collaborate with other Delaware schools focusing on implementation of UDL and to proactively remove barriers to ensure student learning and cultivate expert learners. Participating LEAs engage in a multi-year collaboration with the DDOE to improve systems and practices that support effective teaching strategies to improve student learning. Professional learning is provided through professional learning communities and coaching sessions with a focus on instructional planning, includes coaching sessions, modeling of instructional strategies, and facilitation of teacher self-reflection.

Optimizing World Language Learning for All: ECR partnered with the DDOE World Language Work Group to provide an opportunity for LEAs to receive a grant which provides funding and guided professional learning to LEA teams in how to plan for and design their curriculum based on a framework for inclusive language learning. Professional learning includes essential structures needed for students to be successful in learning a new language, maintaining a culturally responsive education mindset that intentionally acknowledges/values the diversity, contributions and experiences of every learner, and instructional strategies that address each student's levels of readiness, interest and learning profile.

Educational Benefit Review Project: ESR has established the Educational Benefit Review Project which introduces a systemic approach to reviewing students' IEPs across three consecutive years. LEAs engage in self-reflective protocols to determine whether the design of the IEP was reasonably calculated for the student to receive meaningful educational benefit. This analysis allows the LEA to determine identify areas in need of targeted professional learning for staff.

Transition Cadre: ECR continues to meet monthly with parents, students, LEA staff, state agencies and cross-DDOE groups from Higher Education and Career/Technical Education to engage in data analysis and review of improvement activities around graduation rate, dropout rate, transition planning and post-school outcomes.

Delaware IEP Initiative: This initiative focuses on empowering teams to engage in a four phased approach to IEP development and implementation: Phase 1/Data-Based Decision-Making focuses on IDEA and FAPE, data mining and data-based individualization, parent/student involvement and feedback, post-secondary transition, and identifying present levels of performance; Phase 2/Identifying Strengths/Needs/Barriers focuses on unpacking standards and competencies, considering data, and articulating impact statements that are correlated to clearly identified domains of need; Phase 3/Adapting the General Education Curriculum focuses on development of SMART goals and progress monitoring mechanisms that will be intentional, replicable, and relevant to demonstrated student progress; and Phase 4/Implementing Specially Designed Instruction focuses on how intentionally aligned adaptations and specially-designed instruction allow for enhanced access to general education competencies and grade-level skills.

DDOE has created a report entitled: Improving Outcomes for Students with Disabilities FFY 2022 Improvement Activities Report to increase stakeholder and the public awareness and understanding of DDOE's/ECR's initiatives supporting improved outcomes for students with disabilities. <https://www.doe.k12.de.us/Page/3829>

Stakeholder Engagement:

The mechanisms for broad stakeholder engagement, including activities carried out to obtain input from, and build the capacity of, a diverse group of parents to support the implementation activities designed to improve outcomes, including target setting and any subsequent revisions to targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

Delaware embraces authentic stakeholder engagement throughout all areas of our work. Members of ECR have engaged in Leading by Convening training through NCSI and IDC, our national technical assistance centers, to enhance our stakeholder involvement. We believe to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, we must embrace and value our learning partnerships with parents, educators, advisory/advocacy groups, and community members. ECR realized that in order to broaden our stakeholder involvement, we also needed to deepen the levels of interactions among stakeholders. The DDOE has built a strong relationship with Delaware Parent Information Center (PIC), our IDEA PTI, to advance our engagement with parents. We partnered with PIC to embrace the four levels of interaction in Leading by Convening: informing (sharing information with others who care about the issue), networking (asking others what they think about the issue and listening to what they say), collaborating (engaging people in trying to do something by working together about the issue) and transforming (doing things The Partnership Way: leading by convening, cross-stakeholder engagement, shared leadership and consensus building). As we prepared to engage stakeholders in the process of data analysis and target setting for the new SPP/APR, PIC provided us with the support and strategies to involve many more parents in this process, focusing on increasing the appropriate

breadth of representation and depth of interactions.

For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, as members of ECR prepared to engage stakeholders in analyzing Delaware data, setting targets and identifying improvement strategies and activities, each staff member utilized the Delaware Stakeholder Engagement Analysis Tool to ensure all demographics were addressed when inviting stakeholders (e.g.: race/ethnicity/ geographic locations/disability categories/advocacy groups/advisory groups/parents/families/etc.). 59 individual indicator stakeholder meetings took place that included sharing data, rich discussions regarding data analysis, target setting and improvement strategies.

During monthly meetings with Governor's Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens (GACEC), state IDEA advisory panel, as a whole council, as well as with council subcommittees, ECR engages with the council in data analysis and discussion of improvement activities around individual indicators. In addition, individual members represent GACEC on each specific indicator stakeholder committees. ECR also presented to and engaged all stakeholders/parents from the GACEC in discussion on indicator data analysis, input/feedback on target setting, and input/feedback on improvement activities and provided GACEC an additional opportunity to ask questions/provide input during an evening Q and A session designed specifically for them. GACEC provided DDOE with written input by the end of December. Presentations, data analysis, target setting discussions and improvement activities also took place at all County Special Ed Leadership Meetings to promote LEA Special Ed Directors and additional educators in the process of providing input/feedback as indicated above.

ECR staff, in cooperation with PIC, developed one-page, parent friendly fact sheets for each SPP/APR indicator and partnered with PIC to share with all 42 LEA Parent Councils for Special Education, and to the PIC parent distribution list of over 5,000 families. PIC utilized their social media platform to invite all parents to engage in Lunch and Learn Facebook Live sessions, where each ECR member presented their indicator information, engaged in a data analysis discussion, presented target proposals and improvement strategies. These sessions were scheduled both during the day and in the evening to ensure further opportunities for parent participation. In addition, ECR staff created individual indicator surveys to gather further input from parent stakeholders which was communicated during the "Lunch and Learn" sessions. Both the one-page fact sheets and surveys were translated from English into Spanish and Haitian Creole to reach a wide range of families. To centralize all this information and to gain even further public input, ECR created an IDEA SPP/APR webpage which contains the one-page fact sheets for each indicator, a live link for individual surveys to gain additional input/feedback, the power point presentation used during stakeholder presentations and a copy of the previous SPP/APR, for reference.

(<https://www.doe.k12.de.us/Page/4541>) DDOE utilized social media, such as the DDOE Facebook Page, to share this information statewide, in addition to posting info and live links in the Principals' Weekly Newsletter. To support this effort, PIC created a similar webpage which links to DDOE's webpage. To support the Informing stage of Leading by Convening, DDOE collected data to support the efforts on increasing the appropriate breadth of representation and depth of interactions from stakeholders through social media and websites. In addition, DDOE collected data on Networking, Collaborating and Transforming efforts.

Number of stakeholders who were reached by DDOE/PIC through Informing on social media and websites: 30,902

Number of stakeholders who were engaged by DDOE/PIC by Informing on social media and websites: 1,035

Number of stakeholders who were engaged with DDOE/PIC by Networking, Collaborating and Transforming through completing surveys and participating in meetings: 1,191

For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the DDOE continued to utilize Leading by Convening to meet with and engage stakeholders in analyzing data, developing strategies to support improvement activities, and evaluating progress toward targets for each indicator. Stakeholder groups include, but are not limited to, the GACEC, PIC, Access to the General Education Curriculum Committee, MTSS Leadership/Advisory, Special Education Leadership, Special Education Director County meetings, Special Education Director Charter meetings, Equity Professional Learning Community, and the Equity in IDEA Stakeholder Committee, Transition Cadre, Transition Advisory Group, Early Childhood Inclusion Committee, and Early Childhood Special Education Committee. ECR staff regularly engage stakeholders in activities to build capacity and deepen knowledge and understanding of the indicator/indicator data resulting in rich discussion around progress and evaluation of improvement activities.

For example, the DDOE was selected for a 4-year partnership with the SWIFT Center which will provide coaching and technical assistance for LEAs to support changes within systems, policies and practices that result in meaningful engagement in general education. ECR also engaged stakeholders in data analysis and discussions around improvement activities during Special Education Leadership meetings focusing on topics such as Significant Disproportionality, Transition Planning, Equity, Mediation, Universal Design for Learning, Accessible Instructional Materials and Child Find.

Apply stakeholder engagement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)

YES

Number of Parent Members:

1,876

Parent Members Engagement:

Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, as members of ECR prepared to engaged parents in analyzing Delaware data, setting targets for the new APR and identifying improvement strategies and activities, each staff member utilized the Delaware Stakeholder Engagement Analysis Tool to ensure all demographics were addressed when inviting parents (e.g.: race/ethnicity/ geographic locations/disability categories/advocacy groups/advisory groups/parents/families/etc.). 59 individual indicator stakeholder meetings took place that included sharing data, rich discussions regarding data analysis, target setting and improvement strategies.

Throughout the year, DDOE ECR meets monthly with Governor's Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens, state IDEA advisory panel, as a whole council, as well as meeting with council subcommittees that focus on specific areas of the education of children with disabilities including parent engagement. During monthly meetings, ECR engages with the council as well as with parent members on the GACEC in data analysis and discussion of improvement activities around individual indicators. In addition, individual members represented GACEC on each specific indicator stakeholder committees.

ECR staff, in cooperation with Parent Information Center, developed one-page, parent friendly fact sheets for each APR indicator and partnered with Parent Information Center to share with all 42 LEA Parent Councils for Special Education, and to the PIC parent distribution list of over 5,000 families. PIC utilized their social media platform to invite all parents to engage in Lunch and Learn Facebook Live sessions, where each ECR member presented their indicator information, engaged in a data analysis discussion, presented target proposals and improvement strategies. These sessions were scheduled both during the day and in the evening to ensure further opportunities for parent participation. In addition, ECR staff created individual indicator surveys to gather further input from parent stakeholders which was communicated during the Lunch and Learn sessions. Both the one-page fact sheets and surveys were translated from English into Spanish and Haitian Creole to reach a wide range of families. To centralize all this information and to gain even further public input, ECR created an IDEA APR webpage which contains the one-page fact sheets for each indicator, a live link for individual surveys to gain additional input/feedback, the power point presentation used during stakeholder presentations and a copy of the previous APR, for reference. (<https://www.doe.k12.de.us/Page/4541>) DDOE utilized social media, such as the DDOE Facebook Page, to share this information

statewide, in addition to posting info and live links in the Principals' Weekly Newsletter. To support this effort, Parent Information Center created a similar webpage which links to DDOE's webpage.

To support the Informing (sharing information with others who care about the issue) stage of Leading by Convening, DDOE collected data to support the efforts on increasing the appropriate breadth of representation and depth of interactions from stakeholders through social media and websites. In addition, DDOE collected data on Networking (asking others what they think about the issue and listening to what they said), Collaborating (engaging people in trying to do something by working together about the issue) and Transforming (doing things The Partnership Way: leading by convening, cross-stakeholder engagement, shared leadership and consensus building) efforts through actual completing surveys and participating in meetings.

Out of the total number of stakeholders, the number of parents who were reached by DDOE/PIC through Informing on social media and websites: 7220

Out of the total number of stakeholders, the number of parents who were engaged by DDOE/PIC by Informing on social media and websites: 335

Out of the total number of stakeholders, the number of parents who were engaged with DDOE/PIC by Networking, Collaborating and Transforming through completing surveys and participating in meetings: 191

For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, ECR continued to focus on parent engagement, by partnering with the GACEC and PIC to engage in problem solving around barriers and strategies to increase parent engagement and specifically of underrepresented groups. ECR has also implemented improvement activities to increase capacity of diverse groups of parents. For example, ECR partnered with LEAs to schedule parent nights to address topics such as Systematic Process for Enhancing and Assessing Communication Supports and has continued to work with PIC and other contracted services to develop Partnering with Families within MTSS for LEAs and with PIC to engage with parents around APR indicators via Lunch and Learn sessions. DDOE also developed the At Home Guide to Delivering Strong Early Readers which is a guide that provides an overview of how families and caregivers can support literacy development at home.

In addition, ECR has also partnered with PIC to establish a Parent Mentor Program designed to train a community of parents, caregivers and community members on special education processes, advocacy, and conflict resolution strategies, and to serve as mentors, and resources for families of children and youth suspected of, or currently receiving services under IDEA. The goal of the Parent Mentor Program is to increase the capacity of families' ability to advocate for their children, assist families who are navigating the special education process, and connecting them to resources within the schools and community.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, ECR staff, in cooperation with Parent Information Center, developed one-page, parent friendly fact sheets for each APR indicator and partnered with Parent Information Center to share with all 42 LEA Parent Councils for Special Education, and to the PIC parent distribution list of over 5,000 families. PIC utilized their social media platform to invite all parents to engage in Lunch and Learn Facebook Live sessions, where each ECR member presented their indicator information, engaged in a data analysis discussion, presented target proposals and improvement strategies. These sessions were scheduled both during the day and in the evening to ensure further opportunities for parent participation. In addition, ECR staff created individual indicator surveys to gather further input from parent stakeholders which was communicated during the Lunch and Learn sessions. Both the one-page fact sheets and surveys were translated from English into Spanish and Haitian Creole to reach a wide range of families. To centralize all this information and to gain even further public input, ECR created an IDEA APR webpage which contains the one-page fact sheets for each indicator, a live link for individual surveys to gain additional input/feedback, the power point presentation used during stakeholder presentations and a copy of the previous APR, for reference. DDOE utilized social media, such as the DDOE Facebook Page, to share this information statewide, in addition to posting info and live links in the Principals' Weekly Newsletter. To support this effort, Parent Information Center created a similar webpage which links to DDOE's webpage.

For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the DDOE continued utilize Leading by Convening to meet with and engage stakeholders in analyzing data, developing strategies to support improvement activities, and evaluating progress toward targets for each indicator. Stakeholder groups include, but are not limited to, the GACEC, PIC, Access to the General Education Curriculum Committee, DE-Positive Behavior Support Project Cadre, MTSS Leadership/Advisory, Special Education Leadership, Special Education Director County meetings, Equity Professional Learning Community, and the Equity in IDEA Stakeholder Committee, Transition Cadre, Transition Advisory Group, Early Childhood Inclusion Committee, Early Childhood Special Education Committee, Special Education Leadership, and Special Education Directors County Meetings. ECR staff regularly engage stakeholders in activities to build and deepen knowledge and understanding of the indicator/indicator data resulting in rich discussion around progress and evaluation of improvement activities.

For example, at Special Education Director County and Charter meetings, ECR led Directors through an analysis of their state assessment participation and proficiency data for students with disabilities and engaged in discussion around improvement strategies. ECR also engaged multiple groups of stakeholders in discussion relating to Indicator 4 methodology and at state-wide 619 coordinator meetings, data is regularly analyzed around Indicator 12 to determine root causes of noncompliance and strategies to address the root causes

In addition, following the issuance of LEA annual determinations in spring, 2023, the DDOE implemented a strategy to engage LEAs in a cross-LEA collaborative process. In August, 2023, LEA Special Education Directors and their teams met in small groups, facilitated by ECR staff, during which they shared the results of their root cause analysis and improvement activities they designed to address contributing factors to not meeting targets. Each LEA then had the opportunity to pose questions to the group and receive feedback including strategies that were successful in other LEAs. This collaborative process continued throughout the school year during Special Education Director County meetings and Special Education Director Charter meetings where LEAs shared updates on improvement activities, received positive feedback and engaged the group in problem solving around challenges. ECR has received positive feedback from Special Education Directors regarding implementation of this collaborative process.

In 2022, the DDOE established an Early Literacy Advisory Group to guide and support implementation of early literacy legislation and to gain insight and feedback to further support LEAs and charter schools with selection of high-quality instructional materials, aligned professional learning to support evidence-based reading instruction, the selection and implementation of universal screeners, diagnostic tools, and reading interventions. The Advisory Group included representatives from the DDOE Academic Support Team and ECR, LEAs, and other partners.

The DDOE has also created The Delaware Literacy Plan to ensure schools and school system leaders have the tools, resources, and guidance for strengthening early literacy in our state and alignment between our initiatives.

Soliciting Public Input:

The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

To gain even further public input and to centralize all this information, ECR created an IDEA APR webpage which contains the one-page fact sheets for each indicator, a live link for individual surveys to gain additional input/feedback, the power point presentation used during stakeholder presentations and a copy of the previous APR, for reference. The webpage was open for public input from December 10, 2021 through January 28, 2022. DDOE communicated the request for public input through an announcement on the DDOE website and social media including multiple informational posts on Facebook and Twitter. Both the one-page fact sheets and surveys were translated from English into Spanish and Haitian Creole to reach a wide range of families. DDOE utilized social media, such as the DDOE Facebook Page, to share this information statewide, in addition to posting info and live links in the Principals' Weekly Newsletter. To support this effort, Parent Information Center created a similar webpage which links to DDOE's webpage.

In spring, 2023, ECR held 3 public meetings (1 in each county) to engage in review of data and identifying improvement activities for Delaware's IDEA grant. In addition, ECR held public meetings and also disseminated information via social media and email to elicit public feedback regarding state regulations for students with disabilities.

Also, ECR has partnered with DDOE's Curriculum, Instruction and Professional Development work group to participate in and support the efforts of the Delaware Literacy Alliance to focus on providing a more equitable landscape and enhancing the quality of life for Delaware residents. Through a facilitated process of bringing together statewide stakeholders, efforts have formed a comprehensive literacy ecosystem that promotes literacy for all. Public meetings are held during which the DDOE has presented the Delaware Literacy Framework.

Making Results Available to the Public:

The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.

DDOE has created a report entitled: IDEA State Annual Determination and State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is posted on the DDOE website and also on PIC's website to increase parent access. In addition, DDOE has created a report entitled: Improving Outcomes for Students with Disabilities FFY 2021 Improvement Activities Report to increase stakeholders and public awareness and understanding of DDOE's/ECR's initiatives supporting improved outcomes for students with disabilities. This report is also provided to stakeholders during Special Education Leadership meetings and Special Education Director County/Charter meetings. An updated Improving Outcomes for Students with Disabilities FFY 2022 Improvement Activities Report will be posted following the February 1, 2024 submission of the SPP/APR. Both reports may be accessed at the following: <https://www.doe.k12.de.us/Page/3829>

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2021 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2021 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revisions if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2021 APR in 2023, is available.

DDOE posted their FFY 2021 APR Report and FFY 2021 LEA Annual Determinations on the DDOE ECR webpage at <https://www.doe.k12.de.us/Page/3829> for all the public to review. In addition, Delaware's Parent Information Center posted the FFY 2021 APR Report for all families to view.

As soon as the FFY 2022 IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is posted by OSEP, it will be posted on the Delaware Department of Education website. As soon as the FFY 2022 LEA Annual Determinations are issued and not later than 120 days after submitting the FFY 2022 Annual Performance Report, the LEA reports will be posted on the Department website.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2022 and 2023 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2023 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2024, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

In order to accomplish a multi-tiered system of accountability to improve results for children and ensure compliance with IDEA, OSEP identified Delaware as Needs Assistance and has provided Delaware with TA supports/resources through National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), the IDEA Data Center (IDC), the Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR), the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT:C), Early Childhood TA Center and Early Childhood Data Center (DaSy), Center for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education's (CADRE) Written State Complaint Intensive Technical Assistance Workgroup. Delaware Department of Education, Exceptional Children Resources Workgroup, greatly appreciates all the technical assistance and support that OSEP has provided, especially regarding Continuous Improvement Process, Suspension and Expulsion, Secondary Transition, Significant Disproportionality, Comprehensive Early Intervening Services, Timely and Accurate Data, Early Childhood, Fiscal Monitoring and Dispute Resolution.

ECR has engaged in numerous TA opportunities, sought specific resources/support to address our needs and will continue to accept the support provided to improve results and compliance for Delaware's children with disabilities. The following are TA activities of which DDOE has taken the opportunities:

IDEA Data Center: To address timely and accurate state reported data, the DDOE enlisted the support of the IDEA Data Center (IDC) to provide a series of technical assistance days for a combined group of Exceptional Children Resources, the Data Management and Governance, Technology and Assessment Workgroups. This technical assistance has included developing and strengthening policies and procedures using the protocols from the Part B IDEA 618 Data Processes Toolkit for each indicator. IDC provides continuous support as we refine each protocol. In addition, IDC has provided technical assistance regarding the enhancement of a Continuous Improvement Process for LEAs. DDOE has sought the support of IDC to conduct a workshop for three LEAs regarding the enhancement of a Continuous Improvement Process for LEAs through an accurate data collection process utilizing LEA data protocols. ECR staff engage in the IDC Cross-Role Data Quality Peer Group and Problem of Practice Group to support our data collections and data reporting and the Discipline Partnership with IDC. Staff from IDC are extremely responsive to all our technical assistance needs.

Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR): In prior years, the DDOE sought support from the Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR) to develop a new

workbook for MOE, Excess Costs calculations under IDEA and improve the consolidated grant process including allocations. DDOE continues to take part in the CIFR Community of Practice to address their fiscal responsibilities. ECR staff also participate in CIFR's Problem of Practice CoP and Part B Communities of Practice groups. Again, staff from CIFR are extremely responsive to all our technical assistance needs.

The National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI): In prior years, NCSI has been an integral part in the development of Delaware's IDEA State Systemic Improvement Plan and the establishment of the Delaware Early Literacy Initiative to improve results for students with disabilities. Currently, NCSI is supporting DDOE's work on the Continuous Improvement Process. DDOE has utilized the support to revamp the Continuous Improvement Process for LEAs to address the results of their Annual Determinations. Staff are also engaged in SEAL, a group supporting State Directors of Special Ed, and Significant Disproportionality Peer to Peer Group and Results Driven Accountability Learning Collaborative. ECR also participates in the NCSI DMS SIG-Cohorts 3, 4, 5 group. Staff from NCSI provide numerous supports to Delaware throughout the year regarding all indicators, including the Results Based Accountability TA.

The National TA Center on Intensive Intervention (NCII): NCII has supported the DDOE in developing the Multi-Tiered System of Support framework, which is the foundation of our State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG). DDOE is implementing a professional learning initiative, TA, resources and/or coaching to all LEAs in Delaware.

Delaware receives technical assistance from the National Alliance for Partnerships in Equity (NAPE) through the DDOE's PIPEline for Career Success for Students with Disabilities (PIPEline). NAPE is collaborating with DDOE, other state agencies and national organizations that serve SWD to modify a proven change process to increase positive educational and employment outcomes for SWD to address these disparities. NAPE's Program Improvement Process for Equity™ (PIPE) has been successfully implemented with school districts across the country to close gender gaps in CTE career pathways leading to nontraditional career fields. PIPE engages teams of educators, community members, and other stakeholders to: use data to conduct a performance and participation gap analysis; learn about the research literature on root causes for these gaps; conduct action research to identify the root causes in play at their institution; select and implement an aligned intervention that directly addresses the identified root causes; and evaluate their success. This iterative process is being applied to the context of SWD to increase the enrollment, matriculation, graduation, and transition to postsecondary education and competitive employment of SWD through CTE career pathways. A team of subject matter experts and instructional designers are modifying the PIPEline curriculum and tools and creating new tools in the context of SWDs. DDOE is currently implementing this process in Delaware schools to implement the PIPEline to Career Success for Students with Disabilities (PIPEline) project, to determine its efficacy, and to inform modifications or refinements.

NTACT:C has provided support to the DDOE with TA around Indicators 1, 2, 13 and 14 through emails, phone calls, face to face and virtual meetings, informational resources, and guidance for moving from compliance to best practice. Delaware also participated in the NTACT State Capacity Building Institute and Delaware continues to be one of the states who receives intensive technical assistance with secondary transition. DDOE then provides support and TA to LEAs to improve results and compliance in this area. Delaware Transition Team also engages with the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: Collaborative (NTACT:C): Alternative Diploma Workgroup, Service Delivery Solutions Peer Network, SPED/CTE/VR Peer Network, Complex Support Needs Community of Practice, Center for Advancing Policy on Employment for Youth (CAPE-Youth), Transition Indicator group and National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) for support.

Delaware is a member of the Center for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education's (CADRE) Written State Complaint Intensive Technical Assistance Workgroup. Delaware was one of nine states selected to participate in this intensive technical assistance. Delaware has completed a self-assessment, engaged in a two-day workshop completed a logic model, provides quarterly progress reports, engages in quarterly workgroup calls, networking, and resource sharing, and accessing individual state technical assistance as needed.

Delaware takes part in all OSEP monthly support meetings with our liaison, monthly TA calls and monthly DMS calls. Delaware wants to thank OSEP for the opportunities of all valuable and productive technical assistance. This support is certainly assisting Delaware in improving outcomes for students with disabilities.

Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2022 and 2023 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to Section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 23, 2023 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2024, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.

Intro - Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2023 and 2024 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2024 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2025, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in ED*Facts* file specification FS009.

Measurement

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	80.62%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	77.80%	67.30%	68.50%	80.62%	81.12%
Data	67.94%	69.07%	73.34%	80.62%	80.97%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	81.62%	82.12%	82.62%	83.12%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Delaware embraces authentic stakeholder engagement throughout all areas of our work. Members of ECR have engaged in Leading by Convening training through NCSI and IDC, our national technical assistance centers, to enhance our stakeholder involvement. We believe to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, we must embrace and value our learning partnerships with parents, educators, advisory/advocacy groups, and community members. ECR realized that in order to broaden our stakeholder involvement, we also needed to deepen the levels of interactions among stakeholders. The DDOE has built a strong relationship with Delaware Parent Information Center (PIC), our IDEA PTI, to advance our engagement with parents. We partnered with PIC to embrace the four levels of interaction in Leading by Convening: informing (sharing information with others who care about the issue), networking (asking others what they think about the issue and listening to what they say), collaborating (engaging people in trying to do something by working together about the issue) and transforming (doing things The Partnership Way: leading by convening, cross-stakeholder engagement, shared leadership and consensus building). As we prepared to engage stakeholders in the process of data analysis and target setting for the new SPP/APR, PIC provided us with the support and strategies to involve many more parents in this process, focusing on increasing the appropriate breadth of representation and depth of interactions.

For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, as members of ECR prepared to engage stakeholders in analyzing Delaware data, setting targets and identifying improvement strategies and activities, each staff member utilized the Delaware Stakeholder Engagement Analysis Tool to ensure all demographics were addressed when inviting stakeholders (e.g.: race/ethnicity/ geographic locations/disability categories/advocacy groups/advocacy groups/parents/families/etc.). 59 individual indicator stakeholder meetings took place that included sharing data, rich discussions regarding data analysis, target setting and improvement strategies.

During monthly meetings with Governor's Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens (GACEC), state IDEA advisory panel, as a whole council, as well as with council subcommittees, ECR engages with the council in data analysis and discussion of improvement activities around individual indicators. In addition, individual members represent GACEC on each specific indicator stakeholder committees. ECR also presented to and engaged all stakeholders/parents from the GACEC in discussion on indicator data analysis, input/feedback on target setting, and input/feedback on improvement activities and provided GACEC an additional opportunity to ask questions/provide input during an evening Q and A session designed specifically for them. GACEC provided DDOE with written input by the end of December. Presentations, data analysis, target setting discussions and improvement activities also took place at all County Special Ed Leadership Meetings to promote LEA Special Ed Directors and additional educators in the process of providing input/feedback as indicated above.

ECR staff, in cooperation with PIC, developed one-page, parent friendly fact sheets for each SPP/APR indicator and partnered with PIC to share with all 42 LEA Parent Councils for Special Education, and to the PIC parent distribution list of over 5,000 families. PIC utilized their social media platform to

invite all parents to engage in Lunch and Learn Facebook Live sessions, where each ECR member presented their indicator information, engaged in a data analysis discussion, presented target proposals and improvement strategies. These sessions were scheduled both during the day and in the evening to ensure further opportunities for parent participation. In addition, ECR staff created individual indicator surveys to gather further input from parent stakeholders which was communicated during the "Lunch and Learn" sessions. Both the one-page fact sheets and surveys were translated from English into Spanish and Haitian Creole to reach a wide range of families. To centralize all this information and to gain even further public input, ECR created an IDEA SPP/APR webpage which contains the one-page fact sheets for each indicator, a live link for individual surveys to gain additional input/feedback, the power point presentation used during stakeholder presentations and a copy of the previous SPP/APR, for reference.

(<https://www.doe.k12.de.us/Page/4541>) DDOE utilized social media, such as the DDOE Facebook Page, to share this information statewide, in addition to posting info and live links in the Principals' Weekly Newsletter. To support this effort, PIC created a similar webpage which links to DDOE's webpage. To support the Informing stage of Leading by Convening, DDOE collected data to support the efforts on increasing the appropriate breadth of representation and depth of interactions from stakeholders through social media and websites. In addition, DDOE collected data on Networking, Collaborating and Transforming efforts.

Number of stakeholders who were reached by DDOE/PIC through Informing on social media and websites: 30,902

Number of stakeholders who were engaged by DDOE/PIC by Informing on social media and websites: 1,035

Number of stakeholders who were engaged with DDOE/PIC by Networking, Collaborating and Transforming through completing surveys and participating in meetings: 1,191

For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the DDOE continued to utilize Leading by Convening to meet with and engage stakeholders in analyzing data, developing strategies to support improvement activities, and evaluating progress toward targets for each indicator. Stakeholder groups include, but are not limited to, the GACEC, PIC, Access to the General Education Curriculum Committee, MTSS Leadership/Advisory, Special Education Leadership, Special Education Director County meetings, Special Education Director Charter meetings, Equity Professional Learning Community, and the Equity in IDEA Stakeholder Committee, Transition Cadre, Transition Advisory Group, Early Childhood Inclusion Committee, and Early Childhood Special Education Committee. ECR staff regularly engage stakeholders in activities to build capacity and deepen knowledge and understanding of the indicator/indicator data resulting in rich discussion around progress and evaluation of improvement activities.

For example, the DDOE was selected for a 4-year partnership with the SWIFT Center which will provide coaching and technical assistance for LEAs to support changes within systems, policies and practices that result in meaningful engagement in general education. ECR also engaged stakeholders in data analysis and discussions around improvement activities during Special Education Leadership meetings focusing on topics such as Significant Disproportionality, Transition Planning, Equity, Mediation, Universal Design for Learning, Accessible Instructional Materials and Child Find.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	1,330
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	103
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	14
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	209

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
1,330	1,656	80.97%	81.62%	80.31%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Graduation Conditions

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

Delaware Graduation information can be found within:

Delaware Regulations: Administrative Code : Title 14
500 Curriculum and Instruction

505 High School Graduation Requirements and Diplomas

505.5 Credit Requirements for State of Delaware Diploma - Beginning with the Graduation Class of 2019 (Freshman Class of 2015-2016)

5.1 Beginning with the graduating class of 2019, a public school student shall be granted a State of Delaware Diploma when such student has successfully completed a minimum of twenty-four (24) credits to graduate including: four (4) credits in English Language Arts, four (4) credits in Mathematics, three (3) credits in Science, three (3) credits in Social Studies, two (2) credits in a World Language, one (1) credit in Physical Education, one-half (1/2) credit in Health Education, three (3) credits in a Career Pathway, and three and one-half (3 ½) credits in elective courses.

5.1.1 The student shall earn credit upon completion of Mathematics course work that includes no less than the equivalent of the traditional requirements of Geometry, Algebra I and Algebra II courses. The student shall complete an Algebra II or Integrated Mathematics III course as one of the Mathematics credits.

5.1.2 Scientific investigations related to the State Science Standards shall be included in all three (3) Science course requirements. The student shall complete a Biology course as one (1) of the Science credits.

5.1.3 The student shall complete a U. S. History course as one (1) of the Social Studies credits.

5.1.4 During the senior year the student shall maintain a credit load each semester that earns the student at least a majority of credits that could be taken that semester. A credit in Mathematics shall be earned during the senior year. Further provided, a student participating in a dual enrollment course or dual credit course, as defined in 14 DE Admin. Code 506 Policies for Dual Enrollment and Awarding Dual Credit, shall be considered to be meeting the majority of credits, as long as a credit in Mathematics is earned during the senior year.

5.1.4.1 Senior year credits shall include regular High School course offerings, the options available in Section 8.0, or a combination of both.

5.2 World Language:

5.2.1 Students may fulfill the two (2) credit World Language requirement by either:

5.2.1.1 Earning a minimum of two (2) World Language credits in the same language; or

5.2.1.2 Demonstrating Novice-high or higher proficiency level on a nationally recognized assessment of language proficiency, except English, in the skill areas of oral or signed expressive and receptive communication, reading and writing, that uses the levels of proficiency as identified by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Language, or as approved for use by the Delaware Department of Education.

5.2.2 Any student enrolling in a Delaware public High School from an out-of-state school or nonpublic Delaware High School between and including October 1st of the 11th grade year and September 30th of the 12th grade year with one (1) World Language credit from a previous school shall be required to earn the second credit in that language unless the language is not offered at the enrolling school. In such case, the student shall earn one (1) credit in an additional language for a total of two (2) credits or pursue available options in Section 8.0 to earn the second credit of the original language.

5.2.3 Any student enrolling in a Delaware public High School from an out-of-state school or nonpublic Delaware High School between and including October 1st of the 11th grade year and September 30th of the 12th grade year with no World Language credits shall be required to earn at least one (1) World Language credit prior to graduation. Provided further, the minimum twenty-four (24) total credits outlined in this section shall still be met, or any other credit requirements pursuant to Section 8.0.

5.2.4 Any student enrolling in a Delaware public High School from an out-of-state school or nonpublic Delaware High School on or after October 1st of the 12th grade year, the World Language requirement shall be waived. Provided further, the minimum twenty-four (24) total credits outlined in this section shall still be met, or any other credit requirements pursuant to Section 8.0.

5.2.5 Any student transferring between Delaware public schools with one (1) World Language credit from a previous school shall be required to earn the second credit in that language unless the language is not offered at the enrolling school. In such case, the student shall pursue available options in Section 8.0 to earn the second credit of the original language or earn one (1) credit in an additional language for a total of two (2) credits.

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Reminder: Delaware reset baseline due to OSEP's revision of the data source for this indicator leading to the need to establish a new baseline. Historical data reflected in this indicator was based on OSEP's previously approved measurement which was documented in previous APR reports. Data for the FFY '20 APR was based off of the new OSEP approved measurement which is described in the FFY '20 APR measurement/instructions for this indicator.

DDOE ensures that this data is complete, accurate, reliable, and valid for Indicator 1. DDOE continues to consider and problem solve around impact relating to COVID. COVID-19 did not have any impact on the data collection since the SEA and LEA utilize a state data system which is available electronically from any location.

Delaware embraces authentic stakeholder engagement and continues to work with stakeholders in analyzing data related to secondary transition, developing strategies to support improvement activities and evaluating progress toward targets including the following. DDOE's Exceptional Children Resources Work Group (ECR) has established strong partnerships across the Department as well as with families, state agencies, community members and local education agencies.

The Statewide Transition Cadre, continues to meet monthly and includes parents, students, LEA staff, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (DVR), Division of the Visually Impaired (DVI), Division of Developmental Disability Services (DDDS), Prison Education, Governor's Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens (GACEC), Parent Information Center of Delaware (PIC), Autism Delaware, Delaware Workforce Development Board, and cross-DDOE staff from Higher Education, Career/Technical Education (CTE), Autism Resources, etc.). Topics address graduation rate, dropout rate, transition planning and post-school outcomes.

ECR continues to engage in collaborative efforts with DDOE's CTE work group, DVR, DDDDS, and DVI to provide and expand PIPEline to Career Success for Students with Disabilities to increase equity for students with disabilities in CTE. This multigenerational team initiative works in the context of students with disabilities to increase the enrollment, matriculation, graduation, and transition to postsecondary education and competitive employment of students with disabilities through CTE career pathways. The Student-Led PIPEline leadership program is a combination of Work-Based Learning and

leadership development, offering a way for students to support their schools by recommending equity-building tools for their districts.

ECR continues to partner with Project Search which is a business-led, school-to-work program to support students in preparing for and transitioning to post high school life. Students develop competitive, marketable, and transferable skills in areas such as communication, teamwork, and problem solving to prepare them for employment in an integrated setting.

ECR continues to support training through the Customized Employment Boot Camp. This course has been designed as a "hit the ground running" experience for employment professionals and school personnel interested in a non-traditional approach to job development, known as Customized Employment (CE) to enhance opportunities of employment for individuals with moderate/significant disabilities.

ECR continues to support and collaborate with the GACEC to create resources for students and families, in multi-media formats, focused on transition throughout a student's educational career.

ECR has established a Transition Advisory Group/NTACT team focused on building capacity of LEA staff. In May, 2023, under the leadership of ECR, Delaware sent a team to NTACT:C's Post Secondary Transition Capacity Building Institute including parents, students, and representatives from LEAs, DVR, Community Integrated Services, PIC and the DDOE. The team worked collaboratively to develop a plan to guide Post Secondary Transition in Delaware and continues to meet monthly focused on the following goals:

- Increase Student Engagement in IEP and the Post Secondary Transition Process
- Increase and sustain youth Involvement and voice long-term
- Reach students and families in all areas and racial/minority identities
- Deliver concise and effective messaging to students and families about post-secondary transition
- Promote effective collaboration across agencies/schools/educators

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in ED Facts file specification FS009.

Measurement

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the section 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	8.57%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	4.30%	4.00%	3.70%	8.57%	8.27%
Data	2.38%	2.60%	2.07%	8.57%	9.99%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	7.97%	7.67%	7.37%	7.07%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Delaware embraces authentic stakeholder engagement throughout all areas of our work. Members of ECR have engaged in Leading by Convening training through NCSI and IDC, our national technical assistance centers, to enhance our stakeholder involvement. We believe to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, we must embrace and value our learning partnerships with parents, educators, advisory/advocacy groups, and community members. ECR realized that in order to broaden our stakeholder involvement, we also needed to deepen the levels of interactions among stakeholders. The DDOE has built a strong relationship with Delaware Parent Information Center (PIC), our IDEA PTI, to advance our engagement with parents. We partnered with PIC to embrace the four levels of interaction in Leading by Convening: informing (sharing information with others who care about the issue), networking (asking others what they think about the issue and listening to what they say), collaborating (engaging people in trying to do something by working together about the issue) and transforming (doing things The Partnership Way: leading by convening, cross-stakeholder engagement, shared leadership and consensus building). As we prepared to engage stakeholders in the process of data analysis and target setting for the new SPP/APR, PIC provided us with the support and strategies to involve many more parents in this process, focusing on increasing the appropriate breadth of representation and depth of interactions.

For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, as members of ECR prepared to engage stakeholders in analyzing Delaware data, setting targets and identifying improvement strategies and activities, each staff member utilized the Delaware Stakeholder Engagement Analysis Tool to ensure all demographics were addressed when inviting stakeholders (e.g.: race/ethnicity/ geographic locations/disability categories/advocacy groups/advisory groups/parents/families/etc.). 59 individual indicator stakeholder meetings took place that included sharing data, rich discussions regarding data analysis, target setting and improvement strategies.

During monthly meetings with Governor's Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens (GACEC), state IDEA advisory panel, as a whole council, as well as with council subcommittees, ECR engages with the council in data analysis and discussion of improvement activities around individual indicators. In addition, individual members represent GACEC on each specific indicator stakeholder committees. ECR also presented to and engaged all stakeholders/parents from the GACEC in discussion on indicator data analysis, input/feedback on target setting, and input/feedback on improvement activities and provided GACEC an additional opportunity to ask questions/provide input during an evening Q and A session designed specifically for them. GACEC provided DDOE with written input by the end of December. Presentations, data analysis, target setting discussions and improvement activities also took place at all County Special Ed Leadership Meetings to promote LEA Special Ed Directors and additional educators in the process of providing input/feedback as indicated above.

ECR staff, in cooperation with PIC, developed one-page, parent friendly fact sheets for each SPP/APR indicator and partnered with PIC to share with all 42 LEA Parent Councils for Special Education, and to the PIC parent distribution list of over 5,000 families. PIC utilized their social media platform to invite all parents to engage in Lunch and Learn Facebook Live sessions, where each ECR member presented their indicator information, engaged in a data analysis discussion, presented target proposals and improvement strategies. These sessions were scheduled both during the day and in the

evening to ensure further opportunities for parent participation. In addition, ECR staff created individual indicator surveys to gather further input from parent stakeholders which was communicated during the "Lunch and Learn" sessions. Both the one-page fact sheets and surveys were translated from English into Spanish and Haitian Creole to reach a wide range of families. To centralize all this information and to gain even further public input, ECR created an IDEA SPP/APR webpage which contains the one-page fact sheets for each indicator, a live link for individual surveys to gain additional input/feedback, the power point presentation used during stakeholder presentations and a copy of the previous SPP/APR, for reference. (<https://www.doe.k12.de.us/Page/4541>) DDOE utilized social media, such as the DDOE Facebook Page, to share this information statewide, in addition to posting info and live links in the Principals' Weekly Newsletter. To support this effort, PIC created a similar webpage which links to DDOE's webpage. To support the Informing stage of Leading by Convening, DDOE collected data to support the efforts on increasing the appropriate breadth of representation and depth of interactions from stakeholders through social media and websites. In addition, DDOE collected data on Networking, Collaborating and Transforming efforts.

Number of stakeholders who were reached by DDOE/PIC through Informing on social media and websites: 30,902

Number of stakeholders who were engaged by DDOE/PIC by Informing on social media and websites: 1,035

Number of stakeholders who were engaged with DDOE/PIC by Networking, Collaborating and Transforming through completing surveys and participating in meetings: 1,191

For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the DDOE continued to utilize Leading by Convening to meet with and engage stakeholders in analyzing data, developing strategies to support improvement activities, and evaluating progress toward targets for each indicator. Stakeholder groups include, but are not limited to, the GACEC, PIC, Access to the General Education Curriculum Committee, MTSS Leadership/Advisory, Special Education Leadership, Special Education Director County meetings, Special Education Director Charter meetings, Equity Professional Learning Community, and the Equity in IDEA Stakeholder Committee, Transition Cadre, Transition Advisory Group, Early Childhood Inclusion Committee, and Early Childhood Special Education Committee. ECR staff regularly engage stakeholders in activities to build capacity and deepen knowledge and understanding of the indicator/indicator data resulting in rich discussion around progress and evaluation of improvement activities.

For example, the DDOE was selected for a 4-year partnership with the SWIFT Center which will provide coaching and technical assistance for LEAs to support changes within systems, policies and practices that result in meaningful engagement in general education. ECR also engaged stakeholders in data analysis and discussions around improvement activities during Special Education Leadership meetings focusing on topics such as Significant Disproportionality, Transition Planning, Equity, Mediation, Universal Design for Learning, Accessible Instructional Materials and Child Find.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	1,330
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	103
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	14
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	209

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
209	1,656	9.99%	7.97%	12.62%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The DDOE engaged with stakeholders to analyze data and identify possible root causes for the dropout rate. Stakeholders alluded to increased job opportunities and students choosing to focus on employment rather than completing graduation requirements and earning a state diploma as well as students/families not wanting to return to in-person learning and a high rate of mental health issues including anxiety from being placed back into structured environments after being "self-paced" for the better part of 1 ½ years. Feedback also indicated some individuals were continuing to have concerns about COVID-19 and the return to in-person learning.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth

Delaware Criteria for being identified as a dropout:

- A student who completed the previous school year and who did not reach their 16th birthday by the beginning of the current school and did not attend any days of the current school year is considered dropout underage from the receiving school. This student should be coded in eSchoolPLUS as Dropout-Underage. This underage dropout should have a withdrawal date that is the same as the entry date (i.e., first day of school of the reporting year).
- A student who completed the previous school year and who did reach their 16th birthday by the beginning of the current school and did not attend any

days of the current school year is considered dropout-truancy from the receiving school. This student should be coded in eSchoolPLUS as Dropout-Truancy. This dropout should have a withdrawal date that is the same as the entry date (i.e., first day of school of the reporting year).

- If a student has moved and there is no official documentation that he or she has transferred to another school, he or she is counted as a dropout and coded in eSchoolPLUS as Dropout-Underage or Dropout-Truancy depending on age.
- A student who transfers to James H. Groves Adult High School during the current school year and is not in attendance (enrolled) by September 30 of the next school year, is counted as Dropout-Academic from the home school.
- A student who transfers to James H. Groves Adult Basic Education (ABE) programs during the current school year is counted as Dropout-Academic from the home school.
- An expelled student is counted as a dropout if he or she does not return at the end of the disciplinary period. This student should be coded in eSchoolPLUS as Dropout-Behavior.
- A school leaver who has joined the military is counted as a dropout. This student should be coded in eSchoolPLUS as Dropout-Military.
- A school leaver who has joined Job Corps is counted as a dropout. This student should be coded in eSchoolPLUS as Dropout-Employment.
- A student withdrawn because of truancy is counted as a dropout. This student shall be coded in eSchoolPLUS as Dropout-Underage or Dropout-Truancy depending on age. (A student with an active truancy case with the Justice of the Peace Court shall not be withdrawn from eSchoolPLUS.)

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Reminder: Delaware reset baseline due to OSEP's revision of the data source for this indicator leading to the need to establish a new baseline. Historical data reflected in this indicator was based on OSEP's previously approved measurement which was documented in previous APR reports. Data for the FFY '20 APR was based off of the new OSEP approved measurement which is described in the FFY '20 APR measurement/instructions for this indicator.

DDOE ensures that this data is complete, accurate, reliable, and valid for Indicator 2. DDOE continues to consider and problem solve around impact relating to COVID. COVID-19 did not have any impact on the data collection since the SEA and LEA utilize a state data system which is available electronically from any location.

Delaware embraces authentic stakeholder engagement and continues to work with stakeholders in analyzing data related to secondary transition, developing strategies to support improvement activities and evaluating progress toward targets including the following. DDOE's Exceptional Children Resources Work Group (ECR) has established strong partnerships across the Department as well as with families, state agencies, community members and local education agencies.

The Statewide Transition Cadre, continues to meet monthly and includes parents, students, LEA staff, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (DVR), Division of the Visually Impaired (DVI), Division of Developmental Disability Services (DDDS), Prison Education, Governor's Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens (GACEC), Parent Information Center of Delaware (PIC), Autism Delaware, Delaware Workforce Development Board, and cross-DDOE staff from Higher Education, Career/Technical Education (CTE), Autism Resources, etc.). Topics address graduation rate, dropout rate, transition planning and post-school outcomes.

ECR continues to engage in collaborative efforts with DDOE's CTE work group, DVR, DDDDS, and DVI to provide and expand PIPEline to Career Success for Students with Disabilities to increase equity for students with disabilities in CTE. This multigenerational team initiative works in the context of students with disabilities to increase the enrollment, matriculation, graduation, and transition to postsecondary education and competitive employment of students with disabilities through CTE career pathways. The Student-Led PIPEline leadership program is a combination of Work-Based Learning and leadership development, offering a way for students to support their schools by recommending equity-building tools for their districts.

ECR continues to partner with Project Search which is a business-led, school-to-work program to support students in preparing for and transitioning to post high school life. Students develop competitive, marketable, and transferable skills in areas such as communication, teamwork, and problem solving to prepare them for employment in an integrated setting.

ECR continues to support training through the Customized Employment Boot Camp. This course has been designed as a "hit the ground running" experience for employment professionals and school personnel interested in a non-traditional approach to job development, known as Customized Employment (CE) to enhance opportunities of employment for individuals with moderate/significant disabilities.

ECR continues to support and collaborate with the GACEC to create resources for students and families, in multi-media formats, focused on transition throughout a student's educational career.

ECR has established a Transition Advisory Group/NTACT team focused on building capacity of LEA staff. In May, 2023, under the leadership of ECR, Delaware sent a team to NTACT:C's Post Secondary Transition Capacity Building Institute including parents, students, and representatives from LEAs, DVR, Community Integrated Services, PIC and the DDOE. The team worked collaboratively to develop a plan to guide Post Secondary Transition in Delaware and continues to meet monthly focused on the following goals:

- Increase Student Engagement in IEP and the Post Secondary Transition Process
- Increase and sustain youth Involvement and voice long-term
- Reach students and families in all areas and racial/minority identities
- Deliver concise and effective messaging to students and families about post-secondary transition
- Promote effective collaboration across agencies/schools/educators

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3A. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using *EDFacts* file specifications FS185 and 188.

Measurement

A. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3A - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2018	98.16%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2018	95.70%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2018	74.76%
Math	A	Grade 4	2018	98.06%
Math	B	Grade 8	2018	95.38%
Math	C	Grade HS	2018	74.68%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Delaware embraces authentic stakeholder engagement throughout all areas of our work. Members of ECR have engaged in Leading by Convening training through NCSI and IDC, our national technical assistance centers, to enhance our stakeholder involvement. We believe to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, we must embrace and value our learning partnerships with parents, educators, advisory/advocacy groups, and community members. ECR realized that in order to broaden our stakeholder involvement, we also needed to deepen the levels of interactions among stakeholders. The DDOE has built a strong relationship with Delaware Parent Information Center (PIC), our IDEA PTI, to advance our engagement with parents. We partnered with PIC to embrace the four levels of interaction in Leading by Convening: informing (sharing information with others who care about the issue), networking (asking others what they think about the issue and listening to what they say), collaborating (engaging people in trying to do something by working together about the issue) and transforming (doing things The Partnership Way: leading by convening, cross-stakeholder engagement, shared leadership and consensus building). As we prepared to engage stakeholders in the process of data analysis and target setting for the new SPP/APR, PIC provided us with the support and strategies to involve many more parents in this process, focusing on increasing the appropriate breadth of representation and depth of interactions.

For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, as members of ECR prepared to engage stakeholders in analyzing Delaware data, setting targets and identifying improvement strategies and activities, each staff member utilized the Delaware Stakeholder Engagement Analysis Tool to ensure all demographics were addressed when inviting stakeholders (e.g.: race/ethnicity/ geographic locations/disability categories/advocacy groups/advisory groups/parents/families/etc.). 59 individual indicator stakeholder meetings took place that included sharing data, rich discussions regarding data analysis, target setting and improvement strategies.

During monthly meetings with Governor's Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens (GACEC), state IDEA advisory panel, as a whole council, as well as with council subcommittees, ECR engages with the council in data analysis and discussion of improvement activities around individual indicators. In addition, individual members represent GACEC on each specific indicator stakeholder committees. ECR also presented to and engaged all stakeholders/parents from the GACEC in discussion on indicator data analysis, input/feedback on target setting, and input/feedback on improvement activities and provided GACEC an additional opportunity to ask questions/provide input during an evening Q and A session designed specifically for them. GACEC provided DDOE with written input by the end of December. Presentations, data analysis, target setting discussions and improvement activities also took place at all County Special Ed Leadership Meetings to promote LEA Special Ed Directors and additional educators in the process of providing input/feedback as indicated above.

ECR staff, in cooperation with PIC, developed one-page, parent friendly fact sheets for each SPP/APR indicator and partnered with PIC to share with all 42 LEA Parent Councils for Special Education, and to the PIC parent distribution list of over 5,000 families. PIC utilized their social media platform to invite all parents to engage in Lunch and Learn Facebook Live sessions, where each ECR member presented their indicator information, engaged in a data analysis discussion, presented target proposals and improvement strategies. These sessions were scheduled both during the day and in the evening to ensure further opportunities for parent participation. In addition, ECR staff created individual indicator surveys to gather further input from parent stakeholders which was communicated during the "Lunch and Learn" sessions. Both the one-page fact sheets and surveys were translated from English into Spanish and Haitian Creole to reach a wide range of families. To centralize all this information and to gain even further public input, ECR created an IDEA SPP/APR webpage which contains the one-page fact sheets for each indicator, a live link for individual surveys to gain additional input/feedback, the power point presentation used during stakeholder presentations and a copy of the previous SPP/APR, for reference.

(<https://www.doe.k12.de.us/Page/4541>) DDOE utilized social media, such as the DDOE Facebook Page, to share this information statewide, in addition to posting info and live links in the Principals' Weekly Newsletter. To support this effort, PIC created a similar webpage which links to DDOE's webpage. To support the Informing stage of Leading by Convening, DDOE collected data to support the efforts on increasing the appropriate breadth of representation and depth of interactions from stakeholders through social media and websites. In addition, DDOE collected data on Networking, Collaborating and Transforming efforts.

Number of stakeholders who were reached by DDOE/PIC through Informing on social media and websites: 30,902

Number of stakeholders who were engaged by DDOE/PIC by Informing on social media and websites: 1,035

Number of stakeholders who were engaged with DDOE/PIC by Networking, Collaborating and Transforming through completing surveys and participating in meetings: 1,191

For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the DDOE continued to utilize Leading by Convening to meet with and engage stakeholders in analyzing data, developing strategies to support improvement activities, and evaluating progress toward targets for each indicator. Stakeholder groups include, but are not limited to, the GACEC, PIC, Access to the General Education Curriculum Committee, MTSS Leadership/Advisory, Special Education Leadership, Special Education Director County meetings, Special Education Director Charter meetings, Equity Professional Learning Community, and the Equity in IDEA Stakeholder Committee, Transition Cadre, Transition Advisory Group, Early Childhood Inclusion Committee, and Early Childhood Special Education Committee. ECR staff regularly engage stakeholders in activities to build capacity and deepen knowledge and understanding of the indicator/indicator data resulting in rich discussion around progress and evaluation of improvement activities.

For example, the DDOE was selected for a 4-year partnership with the SWIFT Center which will provide coaching and technical assistance for LEAs to support changes within systems, policies and practices that result in meaningful engagement in general education. ECR also engaged stakeholders in data analysis and discussions around improvement activities during Special Education Leadership meetings focusing on topics such as Significant Disproportionality, Transition Planning, Equity, Mediation, Universal Design for Learning, Accessible Instructional Materials and Child Find.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	2,084	1,969	1,412
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	448	493	265

c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	1,455	1,238	842
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	119	101	108

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	2,082	1,962	1,412
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	373	349	265
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	1,527	1,379	842
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	120	101	109

(1) The children with IEPs who are English learners and took the ELP in lieu of the regular reading/language arts assessment are not included in the prefilled data in this indicator.

(2) The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

(3) The term "regular assessment" is an aggregation of the following types of assessments, as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	2,022	2,084	95.64%	95.00%	97.02%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	1,832	1,969	90.10%	95.00%	93.04%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	1,215	1,412	81.08%	95.00%	86.05%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	2,020	2,082	95.40%	95.00%	97.02%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	1,829	1,962	89.95%	95.00%	93.22%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	1,216	1,412	81.22%	95.00%	86.12%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities

participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

The FFY 2022 public reports of disaggregated state assessment reports for students with disabilities are posted at the following link:
<https://www.doe.k12.de.us/Page/3829>

Suppression Rules:

Pursuant to the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) (34 CFR §99), the DDOE applies the following statistical methods to avoid disclosure of personally identifiable information in aggregate reporting.

1. For all data, counts for groups or subgroups with 15 or fewer students are suppressed and represented by “-” in data reports. Complementary suppression of one or more non-sensitive cells in a table may be required so that the values of the suppressed cells may not be calculated by subtracting the reported values from the row and column totals.

Percentages are suppressed when the underlying student counts can be derived for groups or subgroups with 15 or fewer students (i.e., if the number tested and proficient are reported, then the percentage may need to be suppressed).

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

DDOE ensures that this data is complete, accurate, reliable, and valid for Indicator 3A.

The DDOE has been focused on meeting the ESSA requirement that no more than 1% of the total number of students in the state be administered alternate assessments. The goal of the 1% threshold federal regulations is to mitigate disproportionality concerns related to the possible over identification of students participating in statewide alternate assessments. DDOE's ongoing efforts to meet the 1% cap continue to show positive effects by decreased numbers of students taking the alternative assessments. Students with the most pervasive cognitive impairments remain on the alternative assessment and students with less pervasive cognitive challenges transition to the more rigorous regular assessment, negatively impacting scores for both assessments. Students transitioning to the regular assessment, struggle with the demands of grade level expectations. Delaware will continue to implement professional development and technical assistance with stakeholder feedback related to the 1% cap and move forward with enacting a balanced system of assessments.

The DDOE engaged with stakeholders to review historical data, discuss targets and identify improvement activities for proficiency of students with disabilities on the state assessment. Based on stakeholder input, the baseline was set using FFY 2018 data as this reflected pre-pandemic trends. Stakeholders included LEA Special Education Directors, Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Advisory Council, parents from across the state, school psychologists, teachers, administrators and DDOE staff. Feedback from stakeholders to improve proficiency rates for Indicator 3 included: enrichment opportunities in evenings and on weekends, additional support materials, clear communication with parents, and addressing needs of Multilingual Learners (MLL).

DDOE meets with Special Education leadership and Directors throughout the state, six times a year, and reviews relevant Indicator 3 improvement activities and outcome data. The DDOE continues to share Indicator 3 data with the MTSS Advisory Council, which focuses on implementation of a multi-tiered academic and behavioral framework with priority on high quality Tier1 instruction for all students. Discussions include addressing the needs of multilingual learners, math standards, quality instruction and initiatives that focus on MTSS for academic and social emotional/behavioral needs. Delaware MTSS regulations were enacted in 2021 that include high quality instructional materials and practices in collaboration with early identification and data based decision making. DDOE participates in technical assistance from OSEP providers including webinars, meetings, peer-to-peer discussions, collaboration and sharing of resources through IDC, Signetwork, IDEA Data Center, CCSSO, and NCSI.

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response

3A - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using *EDFacts* file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2017	16.30%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2017	10.01%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2017	10.21%
Math	A	Grade 4	2017	15.52%
Math	B	Grade 8	2017	4.21%
Math	C	Grade HS	2017	3.46%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	25.48%	28.54%	31.60%	34.66%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	20.93%	24.57%	28.21%	31.85%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	21.07%	24.69%	28.31%	31.93%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	24.91%	28.04%	31.17%	34.30%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	16.69%	20.85%	25.01%	29.17%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	16.15%	20.38%	24.61%	28.84%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Delaware embraces authentic stakeholder engagement throughout all areas of our work. Members of ECR have engaged in Leading by Convening training through NCSI and IDC, our national technical assistance centers, to enhance our stakeholder involvement. We believe to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, we must embrace and value our learning partnerships with parents, educators, advisory/advocacy groups, and community members. ECR realized that in order to broaden our stakeholder involvement, we also needed to deepen the levels of interactions among stakeholders. The DDOE has built a strong relationship with Delaware Parent Information Center (PIC), our IDEA PTI, to advance our engagement with parents. We partnered with PIC to embrace the four levels of interaction in Leading by Convening: informing (sharing information with others who care about the issue), networking (asking others what they think about the issue and listening to what they say), collaborating (engaging people in trying to do something by working together about the issue) and transforming (doing things The Partnership Way: leading by convening, cross-stakeholder engagement, shared leadership and consensus building). As we prepared to engage stakeholders in the process of data analysis and target setting for the new SPP/APR, PIC provided us with the support and strategies to involve many more parents in this process, focusing on increasing the appropriate breadth of representation and depth of interactions.

For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, as members of ECR prepared to engage stakeholders in analyzing Delaware data, setting targets and identifying improvement strategies and activities, each staff member utilized the Delaware Stakeholder Engagement Analysis Tool to ensure all demographics were addressed when inviting stakeholders (e.g.: race/ethnicity/ geographic locations/disability categories/advocacy groups/advisory groups/parents/families/etc.). 59 individual indicator stakeholder meetings took place that included sharing data, rich discussions regarding data analysis, target setting and improvement strategies.

During monthly meetings with Governor’s Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens (GACEC), state IDEA advisory panel, as a whole council, as well as with council subcommittees, ECR engages with the council in data analysis and discussion of improvement activities around individual indicators. In addition, individual members represent GACEC on each specific indicator stakeholder committees. ECR also presented to and engaged all stakeholders/parents from the GACEC in discussion on indicator data analysis, input/feedback on target setting, and input/feedback on improvement activities and provided GACEC an additional opportunity to ask questions/provide input during an evening Q and A session designed specifically for them. GACEC provided DDOE with written input by the end of December. Presentations, data analysis, target setting discussions and improvement activities also took place at all County Special Ed Leadership Meetings to promote LEA Special Ed Directors and additional educators in the process of providing input/feedback as indicated above.

ECR staff, in cooperation with PIC, developed one-page, parent friendly fact sheets for each SPP/APR indicator and partnered with PIC to share with all 42 LEA Parent Councils for Special Education, and to the PIC parent distribution list of over 5,000 families. PIC utilized their social media platform to invite all parents to engage in Lunch and Learn Facebook Live sessions, where each ECR member presented their indicator information, engaged in a data analysis discussion, presented target proposals and improvement strategies. These sessions were scheduled both during the day and in the evening to ensure further opportunities for parent participation. In addition, ECR staff created individual indicator surveys to gather further input from parent stakeholders which was communicated during the "Lunch and Learn" sessions. Both the one-page fact sheets and surveys were translated from English into Spanish and Haitian Creole to reach a wide range of families. To centralize all this information and to gain even further public input, ECR created an IDEA SPP/APR webpage which contains the one-page fact sheets for each indicator, a live link for individual surveys to gain additional input/feedback, the power point presentation used during stakeholder presentations and a copy of the previous SPP/APR, for reference.

(<https://www.doe.k12.de.us/Page/4541>) DDOE utilized social media, such as the DDOE Facebook Page, to share this information statewide, in addition to posting info and live links in the Principals’ Weekly Newsletter. To support this effort, PIC created a similar webpage which links to DDOE’s webpage. To support the Informing stage of Leading by Convening, DDOE collected data to support the efforts on increasing the appropriate breadth of representation and depth of interactions from stakeholders through social media and websites. In addition, DDOE collected data on Networking, Collaborating and Transforming efforts.

Number of stakeholders who were reached by DDOE/PIC through Informing on social media and websites: 30,902

Number of stakeholders who were engaged by DDOE/PIC by Informing on social media and websites: 1,035

Number of stakeholders who were engaged with DDOE/PIC by Networking, Collaborating and Transforming through completing surveys and participating in meetings: 1,191

For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the DDOE continued to utilize Leading by Convening to meet with and engage stakeholders in analyzing data, developing strategies to support improvement activities, and evaluating progress toward targets for each indicator. Stakeholder groups include, but are not limited to, the GACEC, PIC, Access to the General Education Curriculum Committee, MTSS Leadership/Advisory, Special Education Leadership, Special Education Director County meetings, Special Education Director Charter meetings, Equity Professional Learning Community, and the Equity in IDEA Stakeholder Committee, Transition Cadre, Transition Advisory Group, Early Childhood Inclusion Committee, and Early Childhood Special Education Committee. ECR staff regularly engage stakeholders in activities to build capacity and deepen knowledge and understanding of the indicator/indicator data resulting in rich discussion around progress and evaluation of improvement activities.

For example, the DDOE was selected for a 4-year partnership with the SWIFT Center which will provide coaching and technical assistance for LEAs to support changes within systems, policies and practices that result in meaningful engagement in general education. ECR also engaged stakeholders in data analysis and discussions around improvement activities during Special Education Leadership meetings focusing on topics such as Significant Disproportionality, Transition Planning, Equity, Mediation, Universal Design for Learning, Accessible Instructional Materials and Child Find.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	1,903	1,731	1,107
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	159	73	26
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	73	66	73

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	1,900	1,728	1,107
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	153	34	7
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	108	27	17

(1)The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	232	1,903	13.42%	25.48%	12.19%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	139	1,731	8.62%	20.93%	8.03%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	99	1,107	8.04%	21.07%	8.94%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

From FFY 2021 to FFY 2022, the percentage of students with disabilities proficient on the 4th Grade Reading assessment decreased by 1.23 percentage points. In addition, the FFY 2022 participation rate for 4th-grade students with disabilities increased by 5.55% or 100 students. The increase in participation also affected the proficiency rate by having a similar number of students who scored proficient out of a larger N size. When analyzing the statewide data by subgroups, Multi-lingual Learners and students identified as Low-income also decreased in proficiency while Students with Disabilities showed the highest rate of decrease in proficiency. Feedback from stakeholders, including LEA Special Education Directors, GACEC, and PIC, indicated COVID-19 as an ongoing influence on decreasing proficiency rates as 4th-grade students were virtual during foundational skills instruction. Delaware has also experienced a shortage of teachers, impacting the consistency of core instruction. The DDOE continues to support LEAS in recruiting and retaining teachers. Lack of consistent instruction due to teacher vacancies and virtual instruction during foundational years characterized by unfinished learning contributed to the overall decrease in proficiency rates, causing slippage.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

From FFY 2021 to FFY 2022, the percentage of students with disabilities proficient on the 8th Grade Reading Assessment decreased by 0.59 percentage points. The FFY 2022 participation rate for 8th-grade students with disabilities increased by 2.94% or 49 students. The slight increase in participation also affected the proficiency rate by having a similar number of students who scored proficient out of a larger N size. When analyzing the statewide data by subgroups, Multi-Lingual Learners and students identified as Low-income also decreased in proficiency while Students with Disabilities showed the highest rate of decrease in proficiency. Feedback from stakeholders, including LEA Special Education Directors, GACEC, and PIC, indicated COVID-19 as an ongoing influence on decreasing proficiency rates. These 8th-grade students reflected in the data had their 5th – 7th-grade years impacted by COVID-19, which are critical transitional years moving from elementary to middle school expectations academically and socially. Delaware has also experienced a shortage of teachers, impacting the consistency of core instruction. Virtual instruction during the transition from elementary to middle school, the national and local teacher shortage, and unfinished learning are possible contributors to the slippage in proficiency rates.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	261	1,900	13.12%	24.91%	13.74%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	61	1,728	3.45%	16.69%	3.53%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	24	1,107	2.44%	16.15%	2.17%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

From FFY 2021 to FFY 2022, the proficiency rate for students with disabilities taking the High School Math Assessment decreased by 0.27 percentage points. The FFY 2022 participation rate for students with disabilities taking the High School Math Assessment increased by 12.61% or 124 students from the previous year. The increased participation rate affected the proficiency rate by having the same number of students who scored proficient out of a larger N size. DDOE continues to address the 1% Cap by ensuring only the students with the most significant cognitive disabilities take the Alternate Achievement Standards Assessment. As the number of students taking the Alternate Achievement Standards Assessment decreases, those students are transitioned to the regular assessment. It is understandable that these efforts would negatively impact proficiency scores while improving our 1% Cap data. This population of students shifted from receiving instruction on the alternate achievement academic standards to grade-level academic achievement standards, therefore negatively impacting proficiency rates due to the increased demand of the grade level assessment. Delaware has also experienced a shortage of teachers. As a result, many teaching positions are vacant, and schools are struggling to provide consistent core instruction. The DDOE continues to support LEAS in recruiting and retaining teachers. The impact of COVID-19-related challenges, such as virtual instruction during the transition years of students moving from middle school to high school, unfinished learning, and the shift of students from the alternate achievement academic standards assessment to the grade level academic achievement assessment are possible contributors to the slippage of proficiency rates.

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

The FFY 2022 public reports of disaggregated state assessment reports for students with disabilities are posted at the following link: <https://www.doe.k12.de.us/Page/3829>

Suppression Rules:

Pursuant to the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) (34 CFR §99), the DDOE applies the following statistical methods to avoid disclosure of personally identifiable information in aggregate reporting.

1. For all data, counts for groups or subgroups with 15 or fewer students are suppressed and represented by “-” in data reports. Complementary suppression of one or more non-sensitive cells in a table may be required so that the values of the suppressed cells may not be calculated by subtracting the reported values from the row and column totals.

Percentages are suppressed when the underlying student counts can be derived for groups or subgroups with 15 or fewer students (i.e., if the number tested and proficient are reported, then the percentage may need to be suppressed).

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

DDOE ensures that this data is complete, accurate, reliable, and valid for Indicator?3B.

The DDOE has been focused on meeting the ESSA requirement that no more than 1% of the total number of students in the state be administered alternate assessments. The goal of the 1% threshold federal regulations is to mitigate disproportionality concerns related to the possible over identification of students participating in statewide alternate assessments. DDOE’s ongoing efforts to meet the 1% cap continue to show positive effects by decreased numbers of students taking the alternative assessments. Students with the most pervasive cognitive impairments remain on the alternative assessment and students with less pervasive cognitive challenges transition to the more rigorous regular assessment, negatively impacting scores for both assessments. Students transitioning to the regular assessment, struggle with the demands of grade level expectations. Delaware will continue to implement professional development and technical assistance with stakeholder feedback related to the 1% cap and move forward with enacting a balanced system of assessments.

The DDOE engaged with stakeholders to review historical data, discuss targets and identify improvement activities for proficiency of students with disabilities on the state assessment. Based on stakeholder input, the baseline was set using FFY 2017 data as this reflected pre-pandemic trends. Stakeholders included LEA Special Education Directors, Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Advisory Council, parents from across the state, school psychologists, teachers, administrators and DDOE staff. Feedback from stakeholders to improve proficiency rates for Indicator 3 included: enrichment opportunities in evenings and on weekends, additional support materials, clear communication with parents, and addressing needs of Multilingual Learners (MLL).

DDOE meets with Special Education leadership and Directors throughout the state, six times a year, and reviews relevant Indicator 3 improvement activities and outcome data. The DDOE continues to share Indicator 3 data with the MTSS Advisory Council, which focuses on implementation of a multi-tiered academic and behavioral framework with priority on high quality Tier 1 instruction for all students. Discussions include addressing the needs of multilingual learners, math standards, quality instruction and initiatives that focus on MTSS for academic and social emotional/behavioral needs. Delaware MTSS regulations were enacted in 2021 that include high quality instructional materials and practices in collaboration with early identification and data-based decision making. DDOE participates in technical assistance from OSEP providers including webinars, meetings, peer-to-peer discussions, collaboration and sharing of resources through IDC, Signetwork, IDEA Data Center, CCSSO, and NCSI.

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using ED*Facts* file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3C - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2017	23.53%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2017	42.41%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2017	41.42%
Math	A	Grade 4	2017	30.15%
Math	B	Grade 8	2017	18.89%
Math	C	Grade HS	2017	8.98%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	30.76%	33.17%	35.58%	37.99%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	44.48%	45.17%	45.86%	46.55%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	43.76%	44.54%	45.32%	46.10%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	35.55%	37.35%	39.15%	40.95%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	27.38%	30.21%	33.04%	35.87%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	20.17%	23.90%	27.63%	31.36%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Delaware embraces authentic stakeholder engagement throughout all areas of our work. Members of ECR have engaged in Leading by Convening training through NCSI and IDC, our national technical assistance centers, to enhance our stakeholder involvement. We believe to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, we must embrace and value our learning partnerships with parents, educators, advisory/advocacy groups, and community members. ECR realized that in order to broaden our stakeholder involvement, we also needed to deepen the levels of interactions among stakeholders. The DDOE has built a strong relationship with Delaware Parent Information Center (PIC), our IDEA PTI, to advance our engagement with parents. We partnered with PIC to embrace the four levels of interaction in Leading by Convening: informing (sharing information with others who care about the issue), networking (asking others what they think about the issue and listening to what they say), collaborating (engaging people in trying to do something by working together about the issue) and transforming (doing things The Partnership Way: leading by convening, cross-stakeholder engagement, shared leadership and consensus building). As we prepared to engage stakeholders in the process of data analysis and target setting for the new SPP/APR, PIC provided us with the support and strategies to involve many more parents in this process, focusing on increasing the appropriate breadth of representation and depth of interactions.

For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, as members of ECR prepared to engage stakeholders in analyzing Delaware data, setting targets and identifying improvement strategies and activities, each staff member utilized the Delaware Stakeholder Engagement Analysis Tool to ensure all demographics were addressed when inviting stakeholders (e.g.: race/ethnicity/ geographic locations/disability categories/advocacy groups/advisory groups/parents/families/etc.). 59 individual indicator stakeholder meetings took place that included sharing data, rich discussions regarding data analysis, target setting and improvement strategies.

During monthly meetings with Governor’s Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens (GACEC), state IDEA advisory panel, as a whole council, as well as with council subcommittees, ECR engages with the council in data analysis and discussion of improvement activities around individual indicators. In addition, individual members represent GACEC on each specific indicator stakeholder committees. ECR also presented to and engaged all stakeholders/parents from the GACEC in discussion on indicator data analysis, input/feedback on target setting, and input/feedback on improvement activities and provided GACEC an additional opportunity to ask questions/provide input during an evening Q and A session designed specifically for them. GACEC provided DDOE with written input by the end of December. Presentations, data analysis, target setting discussions and improvement activities also took place at all County Special Ed Leadership Meetings to promote LEA Special Ed Directors and additional educators in the process of providing input/feedback as indicated above.

ECR staff, in cooperation with PIC, developed one-page, parent friendly fact sheets for each SPP/APR indicator and partnered with PIC to share with all 42 LEA Parent Councils for Special Education, and to the PIC parent distribution list of over 5,000 families. PIC utilized their social media platform to invite all parents to engage in Lunch and Learn Facebook Live sessions, where each ECR member presented their indicator information, engaged in a data analysis discussion, presented target proposals and improvement strategies. These sessions were scheduled both during the day and in the evening to ensure further opportunities for parent participation. In addition, ECR staff created individual indicator surveys to gather further input from parent stakeholders which was communicated during the "Lunch and Learn" sessions. Both the one-page fact sheets and surveys were translated from English into Spanish and Haitian Creole to reach a wide range of families. To centralize all this information and to gain even further public input, ECR created an IDEA SPP/APR webpage which contains the one-page fact sheets for each indicator, a live link for individual surveys to gain additional input/feedback, the power point presentation used during stakeholder presentations and a copy of the previous SPP/APR, for reference.

(<https://www.doe.k12.de.us/Page/4541>) DDOE utilized social media, such as the DDOE Facebook Page, to share this information statewide, in addition to posting info and live links in the Principals’ Weekly Newsletter. To support this effort, PIC created a similar webpage which links to DDOE’s webpage. To support the Informing stage of Leading by Convening, DDOE collected data to support the efforts on increasing the appropriate breadth of representation and depth of interactions from stakeholders through social media and websites. In addition, DDOE collected data on Networking, Collaborating and Transforming efforts.

Number of stakeholders who were reached by DDOE/PIC through Informing on social media and websites: 30,902

Number of stakeholders who were engaged by DDOE/PIC by Informing on social media and websites: 1,035

Number of stakeholders who were engaged with DDOE/PIC by Networking, Collaborating and Transforming through completing surveys and participating in meetings: 1,191

For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the DDOE continued to utilize Leading by Convening to meet with and engage stakeholders in analyzing data, developing strategies to support improvement activities, and evaluating progress toward targets for each indicator. Stakeholder groups include, but are not limited to, the GACEC, PIC, Access to the General Education Curriculum Committee, MTSS Leadership/Advisory, Special Education Leadership, Special Education Director County meetings, Special Education Director Charter meetings, Equity Professional Learning Community, and the Equity in IDEA Stakeholder Committee, Transition Cadre, Transition Advisory Group, Early Childhood Inclusion Committee, and Early Childhood Special Education Committee. ECR staff regularly engage stakeholders in activities to build capacity and deepen knowledge and understanding of the indicator/indicator data resulting in rich discussion around progress and evaluation of improvement activities.

For example, the DDOE was selected for a 4-year partnership with the SWIFT Center which will provide coaching and technical assistance for LEAs to support changes within systems, policies and practices that result in meaningful engagement in general education. ECR also engaged stakeholders in data analysis and discussions around improvement activities during Special Education Leadership meetings focusing on topics such as Significant Disproportionality, Transition Planning, Equity, Mediation, Universal Design for Learning, Accessible Instructional Materials and Child Find.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	119	101	108
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate	45	13	14

standards scored at or above proficient			
---	--	--	--

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	120	101	109
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	12	11	6

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	45	119	41.12%	30.76%	37.82%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	13	101	27.50%	44.48%	12.87%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	14	108	22.14%	43.76%	12.96%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

From FFY 2021 to FFY 2022, the percentage of students proficient on the 8th grade ELA Alternate Achievement Standards Assessment decreased by 14.63 percentage points. DDOE continues to address the 1% Cap by ensuring only the students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are taking the Alternate Achievement Standards Assessment. This is evident in a decrease of 19 or 15.83% of students taking this assessment from the previous year. DDOE defines a student with significant cognitive disabilities as "A student with a significant cognitive disability is one whose disability pervasively impacts his/her intellectual functioning and adaptive behavior. Significant deficits in intellectual functioning result in the student requiring extensive direct instruction and substantial supports in order to make measurable educational gains." With testing only students with the most impactful challenges, it is understandable that these efforts would negatively impact proficiency scores while improving our 1% Cap data. When analyzing the 8th grade Alternate Achievement Standard assessment data, the N size is too small year to year to make meaningful conclusions within more granular subsets. Feedback from stakeholders, including LEA Special Education Directors, GACEC, and PIC, indicated COVID -19 as an ongoing influence on the decrease in proficiency scores. These 8th grade students reflected in the data had their 5th – 7th grade years impacted by Covid which are critical transitional years moving from elementary to middle school expectations both academically and socially. LEAs are still focusing on the pandemic recovery from unfinished learning. Stakeholders also shared that teacher shortages may have impacted consistency of instruction. The DDOE continues to work with LEAs around strategies for teacher recruitment and retention. The ongoing impact of Covid-19 challenges, effective steps related to achieving the 1% Cap, and teacher shortages are likely contributors to slippage.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

From FFY 2021 to FFY 2022, the percentage of students proficient on the High School ELA Alternate Achievement Standards Assessment decreased by 9.18 percentage points. DDOE continues to address the 1% Cap by ensuring only the students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are taking the Alternate Achievement Standards Assessment. This is evident in a decrease of 23 students taking this assessment from the previous year. DDOE defines a student with significant cognitive disabilities as "A student with a significant cognitive disability is one whose disability pervasively impacts his/her intellectual functioning and adaptive behavior. Significant deficits in intellectual functioning result in the student requiring extensive direct instruction and substantial supports in order to make measurable educational gains." With testing only students with the most impactful challenges, it is understandable that these efforts would negatively impact proficiency scores while improving our 1% Cap data. When analyzing the High School Alternate Achievement Standard assessment data, the N size is too small year to year to make meaningful conclusions within more granular subsets. Feedback from stakeholders, including LEA Special Education Directors, GACEC, and PIC, indicated COVID -19 as an ongoing influence on the decrease in proficiency scores. LEAs are still focusing on the pandemic recovery from unfinished learning. These high school students reflected in the data had their 8th – 10th grade years impacted by Covid which are critical transitional years moving from middle school to high school expectations both academically and socially. Stakeholders also shared that teacher shortages may have impacted consistency of instruction. The DDOE continues to work with LEAs around strategies for teacher recruitment and retention. The ongoing impact of Covid-19 challenges, effective steps related to achieving the 1% Cap, and teacher shortages are likely contributors to slippage.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	12	120	11.21%	35.55%	10.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	11	101	15.83%	27.38%	10.89%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	6	109	6.02%	20.17%	5.50%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

From FFY 2021 to FFY 2022, the percentage of students proficient on the 8th grade Math Alternate Achievement Standards Assessment decreased by 4.94 percentage points. DDOE continues to address the 1% Cap by ensuring only the students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are taking the Alternate Achievement Standards Assessment. This is evident in a decrease of 19 students or 15.83% of students taking this assessment from the previous year. When analyzing the 8th grade Alternate Achievement Standard assessment data, the N size is too small year to year to make meaningful conclusions within more granular subsets. DDOE continues to address the 1% Cap by ensuring only the students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are taking the Alternate Achievement Standards Assessment. DDOE defines a student with significant cognitive disabilities as “A student with a significant cognitive disability is one whose disability pervasively impacts his/her intellectual functioning and adaptive behavior. Significant deficits in intellectual functioning result in the student requiring extensive direct instruction and substantial supports in order to make measurable educational gains.” With testing only students with the most impactful challenges, it is understandable that these efforts would negatively impact proficiency scores while improving our 1% Cap data. Feedback from stakeholders, including LEA Special Education Directors, GACEC, and PIC, indicated COVID -19 as an ongoing influence on the decrease in proficiency scores. LEAs are still focusing on the pandemic recovery from unfinished learning. These 8th grade students reflected in the data had their 5th – 7th grade years impacted by Covid which are critical transitional years moving from elementary to middle school expectations both academically and socially. Stakeholders also shared that teacher shortages may have impacted consistency of instruction. The DDOE continues to work with LEAs around strategies for teacher recruitment and retention. The ongoing impact of Covid-19 challenges, effective steps related to achieving the 1% Cap, and teacher shortages are likely contributors to slippage.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

From FFY 2021 to FFY 2022, the percentage of students proficient on the High School Math Alternate Achievement Standards Assessment decreased by 0.52 percentage points. DDOE continues to address the 1% Cap by ensuring only the students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are taking the Alternate Achievement Standards Assessment. This is evident in a decrease of 24 students or 18.05% of students taking this assessment from the previous year. When analyzing the high school Alternate Achievement Standard assessment data, the N size is too small year to year to make meaningful conclusions within more granular subsets. DDOE continues to address the 1% Cap by ensuring only the students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are taking the Alternate Achievement Standards Assessment. DDOE defines a student with significant cognitive disabilities as “A student with a significant cognitive disability is one whose disability pervasively impacts his/her intellectual functioning and adaptive behavior. Significant deficits in intellectual functioning result in the student requiring extensive direct instruction and substantial supports in order to make measurable educational gains.” With testing only students with the most impactful challenges, it is understandable that these efforts would negatively impact proficiency scores while improving our 1% Cap data. Feedback from stakeholders, including LEA Special Education Directors, GACEC, and PIC, indicated COVID -19 as an ongoing influence on the decrease in proficiency scores. LEAs are still focusing on the pandemic recovery from unfinished learning. These high school students reflected in the data had their 8th – 10th grade years impacted by Covid which are critical transitional years moving from middle school to high school expectations both academically and socially. Stakeholders also shared that teacher shortages may have impacted consistency of instruction. The DDOE continues to work with LEAs around strategies for teacher recruitment and retention. The ongoing impact of Covid-19 challenges, effective steps related to achieving the 1% Cap, and teacher shortages are likely contributors to slippage.

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

The FFY 2022 public reports of disaggregated state assessment reports for students with disabilities are posted at the following link: <https://www.doe.k12.de.us/Page/3829>

Suppression Rules:

Pursuant to the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) (34 CFR §99), the DDOE applies the following statistical methods to avoid disclosure of personally identifiable information in aggregate reporting.

1. For all data, counts for groups or subgroups with 15 or fewer students are suppressed and represented by “-” in data reports. Complementary suppression of one or more non-sensitive cells in a table may be required so that the values of the suppressed cells may not be calculated by subtracting the reported values from the row and column totals.

Percentages are suppressed when the underlying student counts can be derived for groups or subgroups with 15 or fewer students (i.e., if the number tested and proficient are reported, then the percentage may need to be suppressed).

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

DDOE ensures that this data is complete, accurate, reliable, and valid for Indicator 3C.

The DDOE has been focused on meeting the ESSA requirement that no more than 1% of the total number of students in the state be administered alternate assessments. The goal of the 1% threshold federal regulations is to mitigate disproportionality concerns related to the possible over identification of students participating in statewide alternate assessments. DDOE's ongoing efforts to meet the 1% cap continue to show positive effects by decreased numbers of students taking the alternative assessments. Students with the most pervasive cognitive impairments remain on the alternative assessment and students with less pervasive cognitive challenges transition to the more rigorous regular assessment, negatively impacting scores for both assessments. Students transitioning to the regular assessment, struggle with the demands of grade level expectations. Delaware will continue to implement professional development and technical assistance with stakeholder feedback related to the 1% cap and move forward with enacting a balanced system of assessments.

The DDOE engaged with stakeholders to review historical data, discuss targets and identify improvement activities for proficiency of students with disabilities on the state assessment. Based on stakeholder input, the baseline was set using FFY 2017 data as this reflected pre-pandemic trends. Stakeholders included LEA Special Education Directors, Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Advisory Council, parents from across the state, school psychologists, teachers, administrators and DDOE staff. Feedback from stakeholders to improve proficiency rates for Indicator 3 included: enrichment opportunities in evenings and on weekends, additional support materials, clear communication with parents, and addressing needs of Multilingual Learners (MLL).

DDOE meets with Special Education leadership and Directors throughout the state, six times a year, and reviews relevant Indicator 3 improvement activities and outcome data. The DDOE continues to share Indicator 3 data with the MTSS Advisory Council, which focuses on implementation of a multi-tiered academic and behavioral framework with priority on high quality Tier1 instruction for all students. Discussions include addressing the needs of multilingual learners, math standards, quality instruction and initiatives that focus on MTSS for academic and social emotional/behavioral needs. Delaware MTSS regulations were enacted in 2021 that include high quality instructional materials and practices in collaboration with early identification and data based decision making. DDOE participates in technical assistance from OSEP providers including webinars, meetings, peer-to-peer discussions, collaboration and sharing of resources through IDC, Signetwork, IDEA Data Center, CCSSO, and NCSI.

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3D. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using *EDFacts* file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3D - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2017	33.23
Reading	B	Grade 8	2017	43.24
Reading	C	Grade HS	2017	39.97
Math	A	Grade 4	2017	34.96
Math	B	Grade 8	2017	34.94
Math	C	Grade HS	2017	25.28

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	28.70	27.19	25.68	24.17
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	37.33	35.36	33.39	31.42
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	34.51	32.69	30.87	29.05
Math	A <=	Grade 4	30.19	28.60	27.01	25.42
Math	B <=	Grade 8	30.17	28.58	26.99	25.40
Math	C <=	Grade HS	21.83	20.68	19.53	18.38

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Delaware embraces authentic stakeholder engagement throughout all areas of our work. Members of ECR have engaged in Leading by Convening training through NCSI and IDC, our national technical assistance centers, to enhance our stakeholder involvement. We believe to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, we must embrace and value our learning partnerships with parents, educators, advisory/advocacy groups, and community members. ECR realized that in order to broaden our stakeholder involvement, we also needed to deepen the levels of interactions among stakeholders. The DDOE has built a strong relationship with Delaware Parent Information Center (PIC), our IDEA PTI, to advance our engagement with parents. We partnered with PIC to embrace the four levels of interaction in Leading by Convening: informing (sharing information with others who care about the issue), networking (asking others what they think about the issue and listening to what they say), collaborating (engaging people in trying to do

something by working together about the issue) and transforming (doing things The Partnership Way: leading by convening, cross-stakeholder engagement, shared leadership and consensus building). As we prepared to engage stakeholders in the process of data analysis and target setting for the new SPP/APR, PIC provided us with the support and strategies to involve many more parents in this process, focusing on increasing the appropriate breadth of representation and depth of interactions.

For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, as members of ECR prepared to engage stakeholders in analyzing Delaware data, setting targets and identifying improvement strategies and activities, each staff member utilized the Delaware Stakeholder Engagement Analysis Tool to ensure all demographics were addressed when inviting stakeholders (e.g.: race/ethnicity/ geographic locations/disability categories/advocacy groups/advisory groups/parents/families/etc.). 59 individual indicator stakeholder meetings took place that included sharing data, rich discussions regarding data analysis, target setting and improvement strategies.

During monthly meetings with Governor’s Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens (GACEC), state IDEA advisory panel, as a whole council, as well as with council subcommittees, ECR engages with the council in data analysis and discussion of improvement activities around individual indicators. In addition, individual members represent GACEC on each specific indicator stakeholder committees. ECR also presented to and engaged all stakeholders/parents from the GACEC in discussion on indicator data analysis, input/feedback on target setting, and input/feedback on improvement activities and provided GACEC an additional opportunity to ask questions/provide input during an evening Q and A session designed specifically for them. GACEC provided DDOE with written input by the end of December. Presentations, data analysis, target setting discussions and improvement activities also took place at all County Special Ed Leadership Meetings to promote LEA Special Ed Directors and additional educators in the process of providing input/feedback as indicated above.

ECR staff, in cooperation with PIC, developed one-page, parent friendly fact sheets for each SPP/APR indicator and partnered with PIC to share with all 42 LEA Parent Councils for Special Education, and to the PIC parent distribution list of over 5,000 families. PIC utilized their social media platform to invite all parents to engage in Lunch and Learn Facebook Live sessions, where each ECR member presented their indicator information, engaged in a data analysis discussion, presented target proposals and improvement strategies. These sessions were scheduled both during the day and in the evening to ensure further opportunities for parent participation. In addition, ECR staff created individual indicator surveys to gather further input from parent stakeholders which was communicated during the "Lunch and Learn" sessions. Both the one-page fact sheets and surveys were translated from English into Spanish and Haitian Creole to reach a wide range of families. To centralize all this information and to gain even further public input, ECR created an IDEA SPP/APR webpage which contains the one-page fact sheets for each indicator, a live link for individual surveys to gain additional input/feedback, the power point presentation used during stakeholder presentations and a copy of the previous SPP/APR, for reference.

(<https://www.doe.k12.de.us/Page/4541>) DDOE utilized social media, such as the DDOE Facebook Page, to share this information statewide, in addition to posting info and live links in the Principals’ Weekly Newsletter. To support this effort, PIC created a similar webpage which links to DDOE’s webpage. To support the Informing stage of Leading by Convening, DDOE collected data to support the efforts on increasing the appropriate breadth of representation and depth of interactions from stakeholders through social media and websites. In addition, DDOE collected data on Networking, Collaborating and Transforming efforts.

Number of stakeholders who were reached by DDOE/PIC through Informing on social media and websites: 30,902

Number of stakeholders who were engaged by DDOE/PIC by Informing on social media and websites: 1,035

Number of stakeholders who were engaged with DDOE/PIC by Networking, Collaborating and Transforming through completing surveys and participating in meetings: 1,191

For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the DDOE continued to utilize Leading by Convening to meet with and engage stakeholders in analyzing data, developing strategies to support improvement activities, and evaluating progress toward targets for each indicator. Stakeholder groups include, but are not limited to, the GACEC, PIC, Access to the General Education Curriculum Committee, MTSS Leadership/Advisory, Special Education Leadership, Special Education Director County meetings, Special Education Director Charter meetings, Equity Professional Learning Community, and the Equity in IDEA Stakeholder Committee, Transition Cadre, Transition Advisory Group, Early Childhood Inclusion Committee, and Early Childhood Special Education Committee. ECR staff regularly engage stakeholders in activities to build capacity and deepen knowledge and understanding of the indicator/indicator data resulting in rich discussion around progress and evaluation of improvement activities.

For example, the DDOE was selected for a 4-year partnership with the SWIFT Center which will provide coaching and technical assistance for LEAs to support changes within systems, policies and practices that result in meaningful engagement in general education. ECR also engaged stakeholders in data analysis and discussions around improvement activities during Special Education Leadership meetings focusing on topics such as Significant Disproportionality, Transition Planning, Equity, Mediation, Universal Design for Learning, Accessible Instructional Materials and Child Find.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED Facts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (ED Facts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	10,094	10,533	9,181
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	1,903	1,731	1,107
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	3,641	4,097	3,821
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	390	255	243

e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	159	73	26
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	73	66	73

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	10,163	10,577	9,181
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	1,900	1,728	1,107
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	3,501	2,480	2,003
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	475	95	100
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	153	34	7
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	108	27	17

(1)The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	12.19%	39.93%	27.10	28.70	27.74	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	8.03%	41.32%	33.04	37.33	33.29	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	8.94%	44.27%	39.09	34.51	35.32	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	13.74%	39.12%	22.22	30.19	25.39	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	3.53%	24.35%	20.10	30.17	20.82	Met target	No Slippage

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
C	Grade HS	2.17%	22.91%	21.84	21.83	20.74	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

DDOE ensures that this data is complete, accurate, reliable, and valid for Indicator 3D.

The DDOE has been focused on meeting the ESSA requirement that no more than 1% of the total number of students in the state be administered alternate assessments. The goal of the 1% threshold federal regulations is to mitigate disproportionality concerns related to the possible over identification of students participating in statewide alternate assessments. DDOE's ongoing efforts to meet the 1% cap continue to show positive effects by decreased numbers of students taking the alternative assessments. Students with the most pervasive cognitive impairments remain on the alternative assessment and students with less pervasive cognitive challenges transition to the more rigorous regular assessment, negatively impacting scores for both assessments. Students transitioning to the regular assessment, struggle with the demands of grade level expectations. Delaware will continue to implement professional development and technical assistance with stakeholder feedback related to the 1% cap and move forward with enacting a balanced system of assessments.

The DDOE engaged with stakeholders to review historical data, discuss targets and identify improvement activities for proficiency of students with disabilities on the state assessment. Based on stakeholder input, the baseline was set using FFY 2017 data as this reflected pre-pandemic trends. Stakeholders included LEA Special Education Directors, Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Advisory Council, parents from across the state, school psychologists, teachers, administrators and DDOE staff. Feedback from stakeholders to improve proficiency rates for Indicator 3 included: enrichment opportunities in evenings and on weekends, additional support materials, clear communication with parents, and addressing needs of Multilingual Learners (MLL).

DDOE meets with Special Education leadership and Directors throughout the state, six times a year, and reviews relevant Indicator 3 improvement activities and outcome data. The DDOE continues to share Indicator 3 data with the MTSS Advisory Council, which focuses on implementation of a multi-tiered academic and behavioral framework with priority on high quality Tier1 instruction for all students. Discussions include addressing the needs of multilingual learners, math standards, quality instruction and initiatives that focus on MTSS for academic and social emotional/behavioral needs. Delaware MTSS regulations were enacted in 2021 that include high quality instructional materials and practices in collaboration with early identification and data based decision making. DDOE participates in technical assistance from OSEP providers including webinars, meetings, peer-to-peer discussions, collaboration and sharing of resources through IDC, Signetwork, IDEA Data Center, CCSSO, and NCSI.

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

3D - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates of suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEAs.

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon LEAs that met the minimum n and/or cell size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2017	100.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	50.00%	50.00%	40.00%	40.00%	32.00%
Data	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target ≤	32.00%	32.00%	32.00%	32.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Delaware embraces authentic stakeholder engagement throughout all areas of our work. Members of ECR have engaged in Leading by Convening training through NCSI and IDC, our national technical assistance centers, to enhance our stakeholder involvement. We believe to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, we must embrace and value our learning partnerships with parents, educators, advisory/advocacy groups, and community members. ECR realized that in order to broaden our stakeholder involvement, we also needed to deepen the levels of interactions among stakeholders. The DDOE has built a strong relationship with Delaware Parent Information Center (PIC), our IDEA PTI, to advance our engagement with parents. We partnered with PIC to embrace the four levels of interaction in Leading by Convening: informing (sharing information with others who care about the issue), networking (asking others what they think about the issue and listening to what they say), collaborating (engaging people in trying to do something by working together about the issue) and transforming (doing things The Partnership Way: leading by convening, cross-stakeholder engagement, shared leadership and consensus building). As we prepared to engage stakeholders in the process of data analysis and target setting for the new SPP/APR, PIC provided us with the support and strategies to involve many more parents in this process, focusing on increasing the appropriate breadth of representation and depth of interactions.

For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, as members of ECR prepared to engage stakeholders in analyzing Delaware data, setting targets and identifying improvement strategies and activities, each staff member utilized the Delaware Stakeholder Engagement Analysis Tool to ensure all demographics were addressed when inviting stakeholders (e.g.: race/ethnicity/ geographic locations/disability categories/advocacy groups/advisory groups/parents/families/etc.). 59 individual indicator stakeholder meetings took place that included sharing data, rich discussions regarding data analysis, target setting and improvement strategies.

During monthly meetings with Governor’s Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens (GACEC), state IDEA advisory panel, as a whole council, as well as with council subcommittees, ECR engages with the council in data analysis and discussion of improvement activities around individual indicators. In addition, individual members represent GACEC on each specific indicator stakeholder committees. ECR also presented to and engaged all stakeholders/parents from the GACEC in discussion on indicator data analysis, input/feedback on target setting, and input/feedback on improvement activities and provided GACEC an additional opportunity to ask questions/provide input during an evening Q and A session designed specifically for them. GACEC provided DDOE with written input by the end of December. Presentations, data analysis, target setting discussions and improvement activities also took place at all County Special Ed Leadership Meetings to promote LEA Special Ed Directors and additional educators in the process of providing input/feedback as indicated above.

ECR staff, in cooperation with PIC, developed one-page, parent friendly fact sheets for each SPP/APR indicator and partnered with PIC to share with all 42 LEA Parent Councils for Special Education, and to the PIC parent distribution list of over 5,000 families. PIC utilized their social media platform to invite all parents to engage in Lunch and Learn Facebook Live sessions, where each ECR member presented their indicator information, engaged in a data analysis discussion, presented target proposals and improvement strategies. These sessions were scheduled both during the day and in the evening to ensure further opportunities for parent participation. In addition, ECR staff created individual indicator surveys to gather further input from parent stakeholders which was communicated during the "Lunch and Learn" sessions. Both the one-page fact sheets and surveys were translated from English into Spanish and Haitian Creole to reach a wide range of families. To centralize all this information and to gain even further public input, ECR created an IDEA SPP/APR webpage which contains the one-page fact sheets for each indicator, a live link for individual surveys to gain additional input/feedback, the power point presentation used during stakeholder presentations and a copy of the previous SPP/APR, for reference.

(<https://www.doe.k12.de.us/Page/4541>) DDOE utilized social media, such as the DDOE Facebook Page, to share this information statewide, in addition to posting info and live links in the Principals’ Weekly Newsletter. To support this effort, PIC created a similar webpage which links to DDOE’s webpage. To support the Informing stage of Leading by Convening, DDOE collected data to support the efforts on increasing the appropriate breadth of representation and depth of interactions from stakeholders through social media and websites. In addition, DDOE collected data on Networking, Collaborating and Transforming efforts.

Number of stakeholders who were reached by DDOE/PIC through Informing on social media and websites: 30,902

Number of stakeholders who were engaged by DDOE/PIC by Informing on social media and websites: 1,035

Number of stakeholders who were engaged with DDOE/PIC by Networking, Collaborating and Transforming through completing surveys and participating in meetings: 1,191

For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the DDOE continued to utilize Leading by Convening to meet with and engage stakeholders in analyzing data, developing strategies to support improvement activities, and evaluating progress toward targets for each indicator. Stakeholder groups include, but are not limited to, the GACEC, PIC, Access to the General Education Curriculum Committee, MTSS Leadership/Advisory, Special Education Leadership, Special Education Director County meetings, Special Education Director Charter meetings, Equity Professional Learning Community, and the Equity in IDEA Stakeholder Committee, Transition Cadre, Transition Advisory Group, Early Childhood Inclusion Committee, and Early Childhood Special Education Committee. ECR staff regularly engage stakeholders in activities to build capacity and deepen knowledge and understanding of the indicator/indicator data resulting in rich discussion around progress and evaluation of improvement activities.

For example, the DDOE was selected for a 4-year partnership with the SWIFT Center which will provide coaching and technical assistance for LEAs to support changes within systems, policies and practices that result in meaningful engagement in general education. ECR also engaged stakeholders in data analysis and discussions around improvement activities during Special Education Leadership meetings focusing on topics such as Significant Disproportionality, Transition Planning, Equity, Mediation, Universal Design for Learning, Accessible Instructional Materials and Child Find.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
1	9	0.00%	32.00%	11.11%	Met target	No Slippage

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))

The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The DDOE reviewed data from all LEAs. The DDOE defines "significant discrepancy" as those LEAs with a rate ratio which exceeds the "State bar," and for which the number of students with disabilities suspended or expelled greater than 10 days equals or exceeds 15 students (state established cell size). Delaware's state bar or threshold is a static rate ratio of 2.0, with a state-established cell size of 15 for Indicator 4A. The DDOE calculates the LEAs' rate ratio by dividing the percentage of students with disabilities suspended or expelled greater than 10 days by the percentage of general education students suspended or expelled greater than 10 days within each LEA. To identify Significant Discrepancy, the DDOE examines three consecutive years of data. If an LEA meets the n size and rate ratio for each of three consecutive years, the LEA is identified with Significant Discrepancy. The DDOE also reviews data for LEAs that exceed the rate ratio of 2.0 by a significant margin but do not meet the cell size of 15 as they are more likely to suspend students with disabilities, as compared to students without disabilities. In addition, any LEA that has an cell size of 5 or more and exceeds the rate ratio of 5.0 within one year will be identified with Significant Discrepancy.

The range of longitudinal data is reviewed over three years to provide LEAs the opportunity to evaluate and revise their MTSS systems over time, as well as monitor fidelity of implementation. In addition, reviewing three years of data allows the DDOE to identify consistent systemic issues that may be impacting outcomes for students with disabilities.

Any LEA identified with Significant Discrepancy must conduct a review of policies, procedures and practices to identify the root cause(s) for the Significant Discrepancy and identify improvement activities to address the identified root causes.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The DDOE is revising the methodology for Significant Discrepancy for FFY23. The rate ratio threshold will become a 3.0 in one year with no minimum n and/or cell size. The DDOE calculates the LEAs' rate ratio by dividing the percentage of students with disabilities suspended or expelled greater than 10 days by the percentage of general education students suspended or expelled greater than 10 days within each LEA. If the LEA is over 3.0 they will be identified with Significant Discrepancy. This new methodology was done in conjunction with OSEP TA providers as well as OSEP to ensure we are meeting the requirements. DDOE held stakeholder meetings to have them provide input on this new methodology. This included The Governors Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens (DDOE's IDEA advisory group), Special Education Directors, DE-MTSS Cadre and DDOE's Equity PLC which includes educators in various roles throughout the state.

DDOE ensures that this data is complete, accurate, reliable, and valid for Indicator 4A. DDOE continues to consider and problem solve around impact relating to COVID. This includes providing professional learning and training in the DE-MTSS Cadre and special education director leadership meetings as well as meeting individually with LEAs to engage in problem solving, reviewing/analyzing data and supporting the LEA's implementation of Multi-Tiered Systems of Behavioral and Academic Supports. DDOE also provides LEAs with technical assistance and coaching through the DE-MTSS TA Center. COVID-19 did not have any impact on the data collection process since the SEA and LEA utilize a state data system which is available electronically from any location.

The DDOE continues to actively engage with stakeholders to review data and inform improvement activities. Stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the Governor's Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens, MTSS Leadership, Special Education Leadership, Special Education Director County meetings, Equity Professional Learning Community, and the Equity in IDEA stakeholder committee.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

The state reviews all LEA data. After that review, one LEA met the state bar and was over the rate ratio of 5.0 for one year. The state conducted a review of 1 LEAs policies, procedures and practices relating to the development of IEPs, the use of positive behavior interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. The DDOE found them to be out of compliance. The DDOE ensured this LEA revised their policies, procedures and practices to comply with regulations and best practices for positive behavior, interventions and supports.

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

If YES, select one of the following:

The State DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

The DDOE had the LEA submit all professional learning conducted to address the discrepancy and non-compliance. The policies, practices and procedures were revised to ensure that they were in compliance with all regulatory requirements.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to the rates of suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2017	50.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

35

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
3	1	7	0.00%	0%	14.29%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if not applicable

There was an LEA identified with non-compliance with policies, procedures and practices that contributed to Significant Discrepancy. We needed to identify them and have their LEA revise these policies and procedures and ensure each individual student suspended or expelled met the requirements of FAPE. Their non-compliance was related to how the LEA provided services to students with disabilities after the 10th day of removal, the manifestation determination process, and how the removal of students is considered a change of placement. These areas needed to be addressed by the LEA and thus caused slippage for this indicator.

For FFY22, 3 LEAs met the minimum cell size and exceeded the state defined rate ratio of 5.0 in one year. In prior years, suspension and expulsion rates for students with disabilities was lower because most LEAs were closed due to the pandemic. The data for the 2021-2022 school year reflect the first year back in the school buildings after a traumatic event like the pandemic. Students were dysregulated and there were additional mental health challenges.

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))

The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The DDOE reviewed data from all LEAs of all race and ethnicities. For FY22, The DDOE defines "significant discrepancy" as those LEAs with a rate ratio which exceeds the "State bar," and for which the number of students with disabilities suspended or expelled greater than 10 days equals or exceeds 10 students (state established cell size). Delaware's state bar or threshold is a static rate ratio of 2.0, with a state-established cell size of 10 for Indicator 4B. The DDOE calculates the LEAs' rate ratio by dividing the percentage of students by race or ethnicity with disabilities suspended or expelled greater than 10 days by the percentage of general education students suspended or expelled greater than 10 days within each LEA. To identify Significant Discrepancy, the DDOE examines three consecutive years of data. If an LEA meets the cell size and rate ratio for each of three consecutive years, the LEA is identified with Significant Discrepancy. The DDOE also reviews data for LEAs that exceed the rate ratio of 2.0 by a significant margin but do not meet the cell size of 10 as they are more likely to suspend students with disabilities, as compared to students without disabilities. In addition, any LEA that has a cell size of 5 or more and exceeds the rate ratio of 5.0 within one year will be identified with Significant Discrepancy.

The range of longitudinal data is reviewed over three years to provide LEAs the opportunity to evaluate and revise their MTSS systems over time, as well as monitor fidelity of implementation. In addition, reviewing three years of data allows the DDOE to identify consistent systemic issues that may be

impacting outcomes for students with disabilities.

Any LEA identified with Significant Discrepancy must conduct a review of policies, procedures and practices to identify the root cause(s) for the Significant Discrepancy and identify improvement activities to address the identified root causes.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The DDOE is revising the methodology for Significant Discrepancy for FFY23. The rate ratio threshold will become a 3.0 in one year with a cell size of 3. The DDOE calculates the LEAs' rate ratio by dividing the percentage of students by race or ethnicity with disabilities suspended or expelled greater than 10 days by the percentage of general education students suspended or expelled greater than 10 days within each LEA. If the LEA is over 3.0 they will be identified with Significant Discrepancy. This new methodology was done in conjunction with OSEP TA providers as well as OSEP to ensure we are meeting the requirements. DDOE held stakeholder meetings to have them provide input on this new methodology. This included The Governors Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens (DDOE's IDEA advisory group), Special Education Directors, DE-MTSS Cadre and DDOE's Equity PLC which includes educators in various roles throughout the state.

DDOE ensures that this data is complete, accurate, reliable, and valid for Indicator 4B. DDOE continues to consider and problem solve around impact relating to COVID. This includes providing professional learning and training in the DE-MTSS Cadre and special education director leadership meetings as well as meeting individually with LEAs to engage in problem solving, reviewing/analyzing data and supporting the LEA's implementation of Multi-Tiered Systems of Behavioral and Academic Supports. DDOE also provides LEAs with technical assistance and coaching through the DE-MTSS TA Center. COVID-19 did not have any impact on the data collection process since the SEA and LEA utilize a state data system which is available electronically from any location.

The DDOE continues to actively engage with stakeholders to review data and inform improvement activities. Stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the Governor's Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens, MTSS Leadership, Special Education Leadership, Special Education Director County meetings, Equity Professional Learning Community, and the Equity in IDEA stakeholder committee.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

The state reviews all LEA data. After that review, three LEA met the state bar and was over the rate ratio of 5.0 for one year. The state conducted a review of 3 LEAs policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavior interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. The DDOE found one of them to be out of compliance. The DDOE ensured this LEA revised their policies, procedures and practices to comply with regulations and best practices for positive behavior, interventions and supports.

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

If YES, select one of the following:

The State DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

The DDOE had the LEA submit all professional learning conducted to address the discrepancy and non-compliance. The policies, practices and procedures were revised to ensure that they were in compliance with all regulatory requirements.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2022 have corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data, such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in ED Facts file specification FS002.

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2020	Target >=	71.00%	72.00%	72.00%	64.54%	65.54%
A	64.54%	Data	65.74%	64.98%	64.25%	64.54%	64.95%
B	2020	Target <=	14.90%	14.70%	14.70%	15.09%	14.59%
B	15.09%	Data	14.94%	14.61%	14.80%	15.09%	15.11%
C	2020	Target <=	4.00%	3.50%	3.50%	4.93%	4.73%
C	4.93%	Data	5.22%	4.91%	4.83%	4.93%	4.77%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	66.54%	67.54%	68.54%	69.54%
Target B <=	14.09%	13.59%	13.09%	12.59%
Target C <=	4.43%	4.03%	3.53%	3.03%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Delaware embraces authentic stakeholder engagement throughout all areas of our work. Members of ECR have engaged in Leading by Convening training through NCSI and IDC, our national technical assistance centers, to enhance our stakeholder involvement. We believe to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, we must embrace and value our learning partnerships with parents, educators, advisory/advocacy groups, and community members. ECR realized that in order to broaden our stakeholder involvement, we also needed to deepen the levels of interactions among stakeholders. The DDOE has built a strong relationship with Delaware Parent Information Center (PIC), our IDEA PTI, to advance our engagement with parents. We partnered with PIC to embrace the four levels of interaction in Leading by Convening: informing (sharing information with others who care about the issue), networking (asking others what they think about the issue and listening to what they say), collaborating (engaging people in trying to do something by working together about the issue) and transforming (doing things The Partnership Way: leading by convening, cross-stakeholder engagement, shared leadership and consensus building). As we prepared to engage stakeholders in the process of data analysis and target setting for the new SPP/APR, PIC provided us with the support and strategies to involve many more parents in this process, focusing on increasing the appropriate breadth of representation and depth of interactions.

For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, as members of ECR prepared to engage stakeholders in analyzing Delaware data, setting targets and identifying improvement strategies and activities, each staff member utilized the Delaware Stakeholder Engagement Analysis Tool to ensure all demographics were addressed when inviting stakeholders (e.g.: race/ethnicity/ geographic locations/disability categories/advocacy groups/advisory groups/parents/families/etc.). 59 individual indicator stakeholder meetings took place that included sharing data, rich discussions regarding data

analysis, target setting and improvement strategies.

During monthly meetings with Governor’s Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens (GACEC), state IDEA advisory panel, as a whole council, as well as with council subcommittees, ECR engages with the council in data analysis and discussion of improvement activities around individual indicators. In addition, individual members represent GACEC on each specific indicator stakeholder committees. ECR also presented to and engaged all stakeholders/parents from the GACEC in discussion on indicator data analysis, input/feedback on target setting, and input/feedback on improvement activities and provided GACEC an additional opportunity to ask questions/provide input during an evening Q and A session designed specifically for them. GACEC provided DDOE with written input by the end of December. Presentations, data analysis, target setting discussions and improvement activities also took place at all County Special Ed Leadership Meetings to promote LEA Special Ed Directors and additional educators in the process of providing input/feedback as indicated above.

ECR staff, in cooperation with PIC, developed one-page, parent friendly fact sheets for each SPP/APR indicator and partnered with PIC to share with all 42 LEA Parent Councils for Special Education, and to the PIC parent distribution list of over 5,000 families. PIC utilized their social media platform to invite all parents to engage in Lunch and Learn Facebook Live sessions, where each ECR member presented their indicator information, engaged in a data analysis discussion, presented target proposals and improvement strategies. These sessions were scheduled both during the day and in the evening to ensure further opportunities for parent participation. In addition, ECR staff created individual indicator surveys to gather further input from parent stakeholders which was communicated during the "Lunch and Learn" sessions. Both the one-page fact sheets and surveys were translated from English into Spanish and Haitian Creole to reach a wide range of families. To centralize all this information and to gain even further public input, ECR created an IDEA SPP/APR webpage which contains the one-page fact sheets for each indicator, a live link for individual surveys to gain additional input/feedback, the power point presentation used during stakeholder presentations and a copy of the previous SPP/APR, for reference.

(<https://www.doe.k12.de.us/Page/4541>) DDOE utilized social media, such as the DDOE Facebook Page, to share this information statewide, in addition to posting info and live links in the Principals’ Weekly Newsletter. To support this effort, PIC created a similar webpage which links to DDOE’s webpage. To support the Informing stage of Leading by Convening, DDOE collected data to support the efforts on increasing the appropriate breadth of representation and depth of interactions from stakeholders through social media and websites. In addition, DDOE collected data on Networking, Collaborating and Transforming efforts.

Number of stakeholders who were reached by DDOE/PIC through Informing on social media and websites: 30,902

Number of stakeholders who were engaged by DDOE/PIC by Informing on social media and websites: 1,035

Number of stakeholders who were engaged with DDOE/PIC by Networking, Collaborating and Transforming through completing surveys and participating in meetings: 1,191

For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the DDOE continued to utilize Leading by Convening to meet with and engage stakeholders in analyzing data, developing strategies to support improvement activities, and evaluating progress toward targets for each indicator. Stakeholder groups include, but are not limited to, the GACEC, PIC, Access to the General Education Curriculum Committee, MTSS Leadership/Advisory, Special Education Leadership, Special Education Director County meetings, Special Education Director Charter meetings, Equity Professional Learning Community, and the Equity in IDEA Stakeholder Committee, Transition Cadre, Transition Advisory Group, Early Childhood Inclusion Committee, and Early Childhood Special Education Committee. ECR staff regularly engage stakeholders in activities to build capacity and deepen knowledge and understanding of the indicator/indicator data resulting in rich discussion around progress and evaluation of improvement activities.

For example, the DDOE was selected for a 4-year partnership with the SWIFT Center which will provide coaching and technical assistance for LEAs to support changes within systems, policies and practices that result in meaningful engagement in general education. ECR also engaged stakeholders in data analysis and discussions around improvement activities during Special Education Leadership meetings focusing on topics such as Significant Disproportionality, Transition Planning, Equity, Mediation, Universal Design for Learning, Accessible Instructional Materials and Child Find.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	25,141
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	16,325
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	3,824
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	1,015
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	27
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	144

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	16,325	25,141	64.95%	66.54%	64.93%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	3,824	25,141	15.11%	14.09%	15.21%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1,186	25,141	4.77%	4.43%	4.72%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

DDOE met with stakeholders from the Access to General Education Curriculum Committee and Special Education Leadership from LEAs throughout the state to discuss historical and baseline data, targets, and improvement activities. FFY 2020 was established as a new baseline due to the addition of 5-year-old children with disabilities enrolled in kindergarten.

DDOE ensures that this data is complete, accurate, reliable, and valid for Indicator 5. DDOE continues to provide guidance and technical assistance to LEAs on Least Restrictive Environments (LRE). Technical assistance includes guidance documents, professional development and training at Access to the General Education Committee meetings, LEA Special Education Director Leadership meetings, and Hearing Officer meetings. In addition, DDOE meets individually with LEAs to problem solve, review/analyze data and support the implementation of best practices relating to LRE.

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.
- C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in ED*Facts* file specification FS089.

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (*e.g.*, 75-85%).

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under IDEA section 618, explain.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data (Individual) – 6A, 6B, 6C

Part	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A1	Target >=				26.86%	36.70%
A1	Data				26.86%	32.42%
A2	Target >=				28.52%	41.10%
A2	Data				28.52%	36.36%
A3	Target >=				35.54%	44.30%
A3	Data				35.54%	36.33%
B1	Target <=				55.32%	40.40%
B1	Data				55.32%	50.78%
B2	Target <=				50.72%	40.40%
B2	Data				50.72%	47.97%
B3	Target <=				41.81%	38.90%
B3	Data				41.81%	48.55%
C1	Target <=				0.00%-1.80%	0.00%-1.80%

C1	Data				1.06%	0.91%
C2	Target <=				0.00%-0.80%	0.00%-0.80%
C2	Data				0.29%	0.47%
C3	Target <=				0.00%-0.60%	0.00%-0.60%
C3	Data				0.35%	0.96%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Delaware embraces authentic stakeholder engagement throughout all areas of our work. Members of ECR have engaged in Leading by Convening training through NCSI and IDC, our national technical assistance centers, to enhance our stakeholder involvement. We believe to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, we must embrace and value our learning partnerships with parents, educators, advisory/advocacy groups, and community members. ECR realized that in order to broaden our stakeholder involvement, we also needed to deepen the levels of interactions among stakeholders. The DDOE has built a strong relationship with Delaware Parent Information Center (PIC), our IDEA PTI, to advance our engagement with parents. We partnered with PIC to embrace the four levels of interaction in Leading by Convening: informing (sharing information with others who care about the issue), networking (asking others what they think about the issue and listening to what they say), collaborating (engaging people in trying to do something by working together about the issue) and transforming (doing things The Partnership Way: leading by convening, cross-stakeholder engagement, shared leadership and consensus building). As we prepared to engage stakeholders in the process of data analysis and target setting for the new SPP/APR, PIC provided us with the support and strategies to involve many more parents in this process, focusing on increasing the appropriate breadth of representation and depth of interactions.

For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, as members of ECR prepared to engage stakeholders in analyzing Delaware data, setting targets and identifying improvement strategies and activities, each staff member utilized the Delaware Stakeholder Engagement Analysis Tool to ensure all demographics were addressed when inviting stakeholders (e.g.: race/ethnicity/ geographic locations/disability categories/advocacy groups/advisory groups/parents/families/etc.). 59 individual indicator stakeholder meetings took place that included sharing data, rich discussions regarding data analysis, target setting and improvement strategies.

During monthly meetings with Governor’s Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens (GACEC), state IDEA advisory panel, as a whole council, as well as with council subcommittees, ECR engages with the council in data analysis and discussion of improvement activities around individual indicators. In addition, individual members represent GACEC on each specific indicator stakeholder committees. ECR also presented to and engaged all stakeholders/parents from the GACEC in discussion on indicator data analysis, input/feedback on target setting, and input/feedback on improvement activities and provided GACEC an additional opportunity to ask questions/provide input during an evening Q and A session designed specifically for them. GACEC provided DDOE with written input by the end of December. Presentations, data analysis, target setting discussions and improvement activities also took place at all County Special Ed Leadership Meetings to promote LEA Special Ed Directors and additional educators in the process of providing input/feedback as indicated above.

ECR staff, in cooperation with PIC, developed one-page, parent friendly fact sheets for each SPP/APR indicator and partnered with PIC to share with all 42 LEA Parent Councils for Special Education, and to the PIC parent distribution list of over 5,000 families. PIC utilized their social media platform to invite all parents to engage in Lunch and Learn Facebook Live sessions, where each ECR member presented their indicator information, engaged in a data analysis discussion, presented target proposals and improvement strategies. These sessions were scheduled both during the day and in the evening to ensure further opportunities for parent participation. In addition, ECR staff created individual indicator surveys to gather further input from parent stakeholders which was communicated during the "Lunch and Learn" sessions. Both the one-page fact sheets and surveys were translated from English into Spanish and Haitian Creole to reach a wide range of families. To centralize all this information and to gain even further public input, ECR created an IDEA SPP/APR webpage which contains the one-page fact sheets for each indicator, a live link for individual surveys to gain additional input/feedback, the power point presentation used during stakeholder presentations and a copy of the previous SPP/APR, for reference.

(<https://www.doe.k12.de.us/Page/4541>) DDOE utilized social media, such as the DDOE Facebook Page, to share this information statewide, in addition to posting info and live links in the Principals’ Weekly Newsletter. To support this effort, PIC created a similar webpage which links to DDOE’s webpage. To support the Informing stage of Leading by Convening, DDOE collected data to support the efforts on increasing the appropriate breadth of representation and depth of interactions from stakeholders through social media and websites. In addition, DDOE collected data on Networking, Collaborating and Transforming efforts.

Number of stakeholders who were reached by DDOE/PIC through Informing on social media and websites: 30,902

Number of stakeholders who were engaged by DDOE/PIC by Informing on social media and websites: 1,035

Number of stakeholders who were engaged with DDOE/PIC by Networking, Collaborating and Transforming through completing surveys and participating in meetings: 1,191

For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the DDOE continued to utilize Leading by Convening to meet with and engage stakeholders in analyzing data, developing strategies to support improvement activities, and evaluating progress toward targets for each indicator. Stakeholder groups include, but are not limited to, the GACEC, PIC, Access to the General Education Curriculum Committee, MTSS Leadership/Advisory, Special Education Leadership, Special Education Director County meetings, Special Education Director Charter meetings, Equity Professional Learning Community, and the Equity in IDEA Stakeholder Committee, Transition Cadre, Transition Advisory Group, Early Childhood Inclusion Committee, and Early Childhood Special Education Committee. ECR staff regularly engage stakeholders in activities to build capacity and deepen knowledge and understanding of the indicator/indicator data resulting in rich discussion around progress and evaluation of improvement activities.

For example, the DDOE was selected for a 4-year partnership with the SWIFT Center which will provide coaching and technical assistance for LEAs to support changes within systems, policies and practices that result in meaningful engagement in general education. ECR also engaged stakeholders in data analysis and discussions around improvement activities during Special Education Leadership meetings focusing on topics such as Significant Disproportionality, Transition Planning, Equity, Mediation, Universal Design for Learning, Accessible Instructional Materials and Child Find.

Targets

Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.

Individual Targets

Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.

Target Range is used

Baselines for Individual Targets option (A, B, C)

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A1, age 3	2020	26.86%
A2, age 4	2020	28.52%
A3, age 5	2020	35.54%
B1, age 3	2020	55.32%
B2, age 4	2020	50.72%
B3, age 5	2020	41.81%
C1, age 3	2020	1.06%
C2, age 4	2020	0.29%
C3, age 5	2020	0.35%

Individual Targets – 6A, 6B

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1, age 3 >=	36.80%	36.90%	37.00%	37.50%
Target B1, age 3 <=	40.00%	39.50%	39.00%	38.50%
Target A2, age 4 >=	41.90%	42.70%	43.50%	44.40%
Target B2, age 4 <=	40.00%	39.50%	39.00%	38.50%
Target A3, age 5 >=	46.00%	47.90%	49.80%	51.80%
Target B3, age 5 <=	38.00%	37.10%	36.20%	35.40%

Individual Targets (with Target Ranges) – 6C

FFY	2022 (low)	2022 (high)	2023 (low)	2023 (high)	2024 (low)	2024 (high)	2025 (low)	2025 (high)
Target C1, age 3 <=	0.00%	1.80%	0.00%	1.80%	0.00%	1.80%	0.00%	1.80%
Target C2, age 4 <=	0.00%	0.80%	0.00%	0.80%	0.00%	0.80%	0.00%	0.80%
Target C3, age 5 <=	0.00%	0.60%	0.00%	0.60%	0.00%	0.60%	0.00%	0.60%

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

08/30/2023

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	938	1,080	343	2,361

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	329	417	141	887
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	419	448	147	1,014
b2. Number of children attending separate school	37	39	9	85
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	0	0
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	4	0	2	6

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data for Age 3

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	329	938	32.42%	36.80%	35.07%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B1. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	456	938	50.78%	40.00%	48.61%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data for Age 3

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target (low)	FFY 2022 Target (high)	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Home	4	938	0.91%	0.00%	1.80%	0.43%	Met target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data for Age 4

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 4 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 4	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A2. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	417	1,080	36.36%	41.90%	38.61%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B2. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	487	1,080	47.97%	40.00%	45.09%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data for Age 4

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 4 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 4	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target(low)	FFY 2022 Target(high)	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
C2. Home	0	1,080	0.47%	0.00%	0.80%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data for Age 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A3. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	141	343	36.33%	46.00%	41.11%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B3. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	156	343	48.55%	38.00%	45.48%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data for Age 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target(low)	FFY 2022 Target(high)	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
C3. Home	2	343	0.96%	0.00%	0.60%	0.58%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The Part B 619 Coordinator holds a state-wide monthly Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) meeting with a broad representation of all LEAs, where data is routinely reviewed at the state and LEA levels around Indicator 6 to determine root causes of noncompliance and strategies to address the root causes. The information discussed at the ECSE meetings is shared at the quarterly County Meetings for Special Education Directors and quarterly Special Education Leadership meetings hosted by ECR. DDOE/Office of Early Childhood Intervention (OECI) staff engages with Head Start, DECC (Delaware Early Childhood Council), Early Hearing Detection and Intervention (EHDI) to receive stakeholder input to assist in planning for improvement and with the Office of Childcare Licensing to discuss inclusion in early childhood programs. DDOE/OECI staff educates stakeholders regarding the importance of inclusion in early childhood programs through presentations at statewide conferences including LEND, Nemours Audiology Conference, Making a Difference Conference and Family Childcare Conference as well as at quarterly Early Childhood Transition Collaborative meetings.

DDOE ensures that this data is complete, accurate, reliable, and valid for Indicator 6. DDOE provides on-going technical assistance through professional learning and training in the monthly Early Childhood Special Education meetings, quarterly Special Education Director County level meetings and quarterly Special Education Leadership meetings. In addition, DDOE meets individually with LEAs to provide technical assistance around problem solving, reviewing, and analyzing their data and for supporting the LEA's implementation of evidence-based practices. DDOE has also developed guidance documents and resources focused on preschool environments and provides professional learning and training through the DDOE supported online learning platform known as Schoology.

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by ((# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three Outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A1	2020	Target >=	89.80%	91.00%	91.00%	86.00%	86.50%
A1	86.00%	Data	91.25%	89.78%	85.99%	84.61%	85.59%

A2	2020	Target >=	59.30%	60.70%	60.70%	47.53%	48.42%
A2	47.53%	Data	51.06%	50.95%	46.63%	47.03%	53.86%
B1	2020	Target >=	92.20%	93.40%	93.40%	87.04%	87.27%
B1	87.04%	Data	88.14%	88.49%	86.84%	85.24%	85.73%
B2	2020	Target >=	53.70%	54.80%	54.80%	46.12%	46.62%
B2	46.12%	Data	46.86%	48.38%	44.97%	43.86%	49.83%
C1	2020	Target >=	91.30%	92.30%	92.30%	88.31%	88.65%
C1	88.31%	Data	89.60%	89.34%	87.73%	85.54%	85.59%
C2	2020	Target >=	65.40%	65.50%	65.50%	59.35%	59.65%
C2	59.35%	Data	63.58%	60.92%	59.14%	56.57%	61.94%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	87.20%	88.31%	89.00%	89.51%
Target A2 >=	49.32%	50.21%	51.11%	52.00%
Target B1 >=	87.49%	87.72%	87.94%	88.71%
Target B2 >=	47.12%	47.62%	48.12%	48.62%
Target C1 >=	88.99%	89.32%	89.66%	90.00%
Target C2 >=	59.95%	60.25%	60.55%	60.85%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Delaware embraces authentic stakeholder engagement throughout all areas of our work. Members of ECR have engaged in Leading by Convening training through NCSI and IDC, our national technical assistance centers, to enhance our stakeholder involvement. We believe to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, we must embrace and value our learning partnerships with parents, educators, advisory/advocacy groups, and community members. ECR realized that in order to broaden our stakeholder involvement, we also needed to deepen the levels of interactions among stakeholders. The DDOE has built a strong relationship with Delaware Parent Information Center (PIC), our IDEA PTI, to advance our engagement with parents. We partnered with PIC to embrace the four levels of interaction in Leading by Convening: informing (sharing information with others who care about the issue), networking (asking others what they think about the issue and listening to what they say), collaborating (engaging people in trying to do something by working together about the issue) and transforming (doing things The Partnership Way: leading by convening, cross-stakeholder engagement, shared leadership and consensus building). As we prepared to engage stakeholders in the process of data analysis and target setting for the new SPP/APR, PIC provided us with the support and strategies to involve many more parents in this process, focusing on increasing the appropriate breadth of representation and depth of interactions.

For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, as members of ECR prepared to engage stakeholders in analyzing Delaware data, setting targets and identifying improvement strategies and activities, each staff member utilized the Delaware Stakeholder Engagement Analysis Tool to ensure all demographics were addressed when inviting stakeholders (e.g.: race/ethnicity/ geographic locations/disability categories/advocacy groups/advisory groups/parents/families/etc.). 59 individual indicator stakeholder meetings took place that included sharing data, rich discussions regarding data analysis, target setting and improvement strategies.

During monthly meetings with Governor’s Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens (GACEC), state IDEA advisory panel, as a whole council, as well as with council subcommittees, ECR engages with the council in data analysis and discussion of improvement activities around individual indicators. In addition, individual members represent GACEC on each specific indicator stakeholder committees. ECR also presented to and engaged all stakeholders/parents from the GACEC in discussion on indicator data analysis, input/feedback on target setting, and input/feedback on improvement activities and provided GACEC an additional opportunity to ask questions/provide input during an evening Q and A session designed specifically for them. GACEC provided DDOE with written input by the end of December. Presentations, data analysis, target setting discussions and improvement activities also took place at all County Special Ed Leadership Meetings to promote LEA Special Ed Directors and additional educators in the process of providing input/feedback as indicated above.

ECR staff, in cooperation with PIC, developed one-page, parent friendly fact sheets for each SPP/APR indicator and partnered with PIC to share with all 42 LEA Parent Councils for Special Education, and to the PIC parent distribution list of over 5,000 families. PIC utilized their social media platform to invite all parents to engage in Lunch and Learn Facebook Live sessions, where each ECR member presented their indicator information, engaged in a data analysis discussion, presented target proposals and improvement strategies. These sessions were scheduled both during the day and in the evening to ensure further opportunities for parent participation. In addition, ECR staff created individual indicator surveys to gather further input from parent stakeholders which was communicated during the "Lunch and Learn" sessions. Both the one-page fact sheets and surveys were translated from English into Spanish and Haitian Creole to reach a wide range of families. To centralize all this information and to gain even further public input, ECR created an IDEA SPP/APR webpage which contains the one-page fact sheets for each indicator, a live link for individual surveys to gain additional input/feedback, the power point presentation used during stakeholder presentations and a copy of the previous SPP/APR, for reference.

(<https://www.doe.k12.de.us/Page/4541>) DDOE utilized social media, such as the DDOE Facebook Page, to share this information statewide, in addition to posting info and live links in the Principals’ Weekly Newsletter. To support this effort, PIC created a similar webpage which links to DDOE’s webpage. To support the Informing stage of Leading by Convening, DDOE collected data to support the efforts on increasing the appropriate breadth of representation and depth of interactions from stakeholders through social media and websites. In addition, DDOE collected data on Networking,

Collaborating and Transforming efforts.

Number of stakeholders who were reached by DDOE/PIC through Informing on social media and websites: 30,902

Number of stakeholders who were engaged by DDOE/PIC by Informing on social media and websites: 1,035

Number of stakeholders who were engaged with DDOE/PIC by Networking, Collaborating and Transforming through completing surveys and participating in meetings: 1,191

For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the DDOE continued to utilize Leading by Convening to meet with and engage stakeholders in analyzing data, developing strategies to support improvement activities, and evaluating progress toward targets for each indicator. Stakeholder groups include, but are not limited to, the GACEC, PIC, Access to the General Education Curriculum Committee, MTSS Leadership/Advisory, Special Education Leadership, Special Education Director County meetings, Special Education Director Charter meetings, Equity Professional Learning Community, and the Equity in IDEA Stakeholder Committee, Transition Cadre, Transition Advisory Group, Early Childhood Inclusion Committee, and Early Childhood Special Education Committee. ECR staff regularly engage stakeholders in activities to build capacity and deepen knowledge and understanding of the indicator/indicator data resulting in rich discussion around progress and evaluation of improvement activities.

For example, the DDOE was selected for a 4-year partnership with the SWIFT Center which will provide coaching and technical assistance for LEAs to support changes within systems, policies and practices that result in meaningful engagement in general education. ECR also engaged stakeholders in data analysis and discussions around improvement activities during Special Education Leadership meetings focusing on topics such as Significant Disproportionality, Transition Planning, Equity, Mediation, Universal Design for Learning, Accessible Instructional Materials and Child Find.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

903

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	29	3.21%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	118	13.07%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	336	37.21%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	259	28.68%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	161	17.83%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	595	742	85.59%	87.20%	80.19%	Did not meet target	Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	420	903	53.86%	49.32%	46.51%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	14	1.55%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	82	9.08%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	355	39.31%

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	372	41.20%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	80	8.86%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	727	823	85.73%	87.49%	88.34%	Met target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	452	903	49.83%	47.12%	50.06%	Met target	No Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	17	1.88%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	91	10.08%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	270	29.90%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	358	39.65%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	167	18.49%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	628	736	85.59%	88.99%	85.33%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	525	903	61.94%	59.95%	58.14%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A1	LEAs report that the number of children entering their programs with significant social-emotional delays and challenging behaviors are associated with adverse childhood experiences. Given the level of delays that children demonstrate upon entering the programs, making substantial progress in this outcome is difficult.
A2	Although there was slippage from FFY '21 to FFY '22, the slippage was minimal. LEAs report that the number of children entering their programs with significant social-emotional delays and challenging behaviors are associated with adverse childhood experiences. Given the level of delays that children demonstrate upon entering the programs, making substantial progress in this outcome is difficult.
C2	Although there was slippage from FFY '21 to FFY '22, the slippage was minimal. Given the increase of children entering programs with significantly delayed social-emotional skills, instructional time is often compromised in lieu of addressing the social-emotional components. These components are directly connected to making progress on using appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. Many children enter programs lacking the immediate foundational skills such that even though they make progress, it is not enough to be at age expectations upon exit from the program.

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process? (yes/no)

YES

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

The SEA has continued to permit using information reported from parents, observations, and records review if use of the other approved instruments, listed below are not practicable. Adaptive Behavior Assessment System (ABAS) • Ages and Stages Questionnaire-3 AND Ages and Stages SE-2 (referred to as ASQ on the COS Form)- ASQ only be used for children identified with Preschool Speech Delay OR receiving itinerant services (if the program is not already using another approved assessment). • Assessment of Basic Language and Learning Skills Revised (ABLLS-R) • Callier Azusa Scale • Carolina Curriculum Assessment for Infants and Toddlers with Special Needs • Carolina Curriculum Assessment for Preschoolers with Special Needs • Creative Curriculum • Developmental Assessment for Individuals with Severe Disabilities – 3rd Edition (DASH-3) • Early Learning Survey • Early Start Denver Model (ESDM) checklist (in conjunction with TSG) • Evaluation Summary Report (to be used for entry COS only) • Goldman Fristoe Test of Articulation (GFTA-3) For children identified with Preschool Speech Delay, if GFTA-3 is selected as the primary assessment, a secondary assessment must also be used so all 3 Outcomes are addressed. • Record Review for Transfers Only • The Ounce Scale • The Photo Articulation Test – 3rd Edition (PAT-3) – use for outcome #2 ONLY • Teaching Strategies GOLD • Verbal Behavior Milestones Assessment and Placement Program (VB-MAPP) • Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scale- 3rd Edition • Work Sampling

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The Part B 619 Coordinator holds a state-wide monthly Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) meeting with a broad representation of all LEAs, where data is routinely reviewed at the state and LEA levels around Indicator 7 to determine root causes of slippage at the local level and strategies to address the root causes. The information discussed at the ECSE meetings is shared at the quarterly County Meetings for Special Education Directors and quarterly Special Education Leadership meetings hosted by ECR.

Delaware has been selected to join the ECTA and DaSy Centers' Integrating Child Outcomes Measurement and Individualized Education Program Processes cohort. During this cohort, Delaware will explore and advance the integration of child outcomes and IEP processes. The key outcomes of this cohort are to improve the efficiency and quality of child outcomes measurement; for the SEA and LEA to increase confidence in child outcomes data for use with programmatic decision making and federal reporting; and to improve IEP development practices by advancing parent input, increasing emphasis on children's strengths, and maximizing development of functional IEP goals to assist in improving child outcomes.

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross-section of parents of children with disabilities.

Include in the State's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must consider race/ethnicity. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

8 - Indicator Data

Question	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Delaware embraces authentic stakeholder engagement throughout all areas of our work. Members of ECR have engaged in Leading by Convening training through NCSI and IDC, our national technical assistance centers, to enhance our stakeholder involvement. We believe to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, we must embrace and value our learning partnerships with parents, educators, advisory/advocacy groups, and community members. ECR realized that in order to broaden our stakeholder involvement, we also needed to deepen the levels of interactions among stakeholders. The DDOE has built a strong relationship with Delaware Parent Information Center (PIC), our IDEA PTI, to advance our engagement with parents. We partnered with PIC to embrace the four levels of interaction in Leading by Convening: informing (sharing information with others who care about the issue), networking (asking others what they think about the issue and listening to what they say), collaborating (engaging people in trying to do something by working together about the issue) and transforming (doing things The Partnership Way: leading by convening, cross-stakeholder engagement, shared leadership and consensus building). As we prepared to engage stakeholders in the process of data analysis and target setting for the new SPP/APR, PIC provided us with the support and strategies to involve many more parents in this process, focusing on increasing the appropriate breadth of representation and depth of interactions.

For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, as members of ECR prepared to engage stakeholders in analyzing Delaware data, setting targets and identifying improvement strategies and activities, each staff member utilized the Delaware Stakeholder Engagement Analysis Tool to ensure all demographics were addressed when inviting stakeholders (e.g.: race/ethnicity/ geographic locations/disability categories/advocacy groups/advisory groups/parents/families/etc.). 59 individual indicator stakeholder meetings took place that included sharing data, rich discussions regarding data analysis, target setting and improvement strategies.

During monthly meetings with Governor's Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens (GACEC), state IDEA advisory panel, as a whole council, as well as with council subcommittees, ECR engages with the council in data analysis and discussion of improvement activities around individual indicators. In addition, individual members represent GACEC on each specific indicator stakeholder committees. ECR also presented to and engaged all stakeholders/parents from the GACEC in discussion on indicator data analysis, input/feedback on target setting, and input/feedback on improvement activities and provided GACEC an additional opportunity to ask questions/provide input during an evening Q and A session designed specifically for them. GACEC provided DDOE with written input by the end of December. Presentations, data analysis, target setting discussions and improvement activities also took place at all County Special Ed Leadership Meetings to promote LEA Special Ed Directors and additional educators in the process of providing input/feedback as indicated above.

ECR staff, in cooperation with PIC, developed one-page, parent friendly fact sheets for each SPP/APR indicator and partnered with PIC to share with all 42 LEA Parent Councils for Special Education, and to the PIC parent distribution list of over 5,000 families. PIC utilized their social media platform to invite all parents to engage in Lunch and Learn Facebook Live sessions, where each ECR member presented their indicator information, engaged in a data analysis discussion, presented target proposals and improvement strategies. These sessions were scheduled both during the day and in the evening to ensure further opportunities for parent participation. In addition, ECR staff created individual indicator surveys to gather further input from parent stakeholders which was communicated during the "Lunch and Learn" sessions. Both the one-page fact sheets and surveys were translated from English into Spanish and Haitian Creole to reach a wide range of families. To centralize all this information and to gain even further public input, ECR created an IDEA SPP/APR webpage which contains the one-page fact sheets for each indicator, a live link for individual surveys to gain additional input/feedback, the power point presentation used during stakeholder presentations and a copy of the previous SPP/APR, for reference. (<https://www.doe.k12.de.us/Page/4541>) DDOE utilized social media, such as the DDOE Facebook Page, to share this information statewide, in addition to posting info and live links in the Principals' Weekly Newsletter. To support this effort, PIC created a similar webpage which links to DDOE's webpage. To support the Informing stage of Leading by Convening, DDOE collected data to support the efforts on increasing the appropriate breadth of representation and depth of interactions from stakeholders through social media and websites. In addition, DDOE collected data on Networking, Collaborating and Transforming efforts.

Number of stakeholders who were reached by DDOE/PIC through Informing on social media and websites: 30,902

Number of stakeholders who were engaged by DDOE/PIC by Informing on social media and websites: 1,035

Number of stakeholders who were engaged with DDOE/PIC by Networking, Collaborating and Transforming through completing surveys and participating in meetings: 1,191

For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the DDOE continued to utilize Leading by Convening to meet with and engage stakeholders in analyzing data, developing strategies to support improvement activities, and evaluating progress toward targets for each indicator. Stakeholder groups include, but are not limited to, the GACEC, PIC, Access to the General Education Curriculum Committee, MTSS Leadership/Advisory, Special Education Leadership, Special Education Director County meetings, Special Education Director Charter meetings, Equity Professional Learning Community, and the Equity in IDEA Stakeholder Committee, Transition Cadre, Transition Advisory Group, Early Childhood Inclusion Committee, and Early Childhood Special Education Committee. ECR staff regularly engage stakeholders in activities to build capacity and deepen knowledge and understanding of the indicator/indicator data resulting in rich discussion around progress and evaluation of improvement activities.

For example, the DDOE was selected for a 4-year partnership with the SWIFT Center which will provide coaching and technical assistance for LEAs to support changes within systems, policies and practices that result in meaningful engagement in general education. ECR also engaged stakeholders in data analysis and discussions around improvement activities during Special Education Leadership meetings focusing on topics such as Significant Disproportionality, Transition Planning, Equity, Mediation, Universal Design for Learning, Accessible Instructional Materials and Child Find.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2017	89.54%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	89.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.50%
Data	89.54%	93.50%	92.33%	94.07%	91.33%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	91.00%	91.50%	92.00%	92.50%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
1,739	1,884	91.33%	91.00%	92.30%	Met target	No Slippage

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

The DDOE distributes a parent survey to the families of ALL students with IEPs including both preschool and school aged children. LEAs are required to enter and maintain data, within Delaware's electronic statewide pupil accounting system, regarding special education and related services such as the date eligibility is determined, disability code, and IEP meeting, initiation, and end dates. By requiring all LEAs to enter information into the statewide pupil accounting system, the DDOE is able to identify both preschool and school aged children receiving special education and related services and include ALL families in the distribution of the parent survey. DDOE ensures that this data is complete, accurate, reliable, and valid for Indicator 8. This is ensured by the DDOE, in collaboration with LEAs, through procedures and practices instituted for data collection processes such as the December 1st child count.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

30,373

Percentage of respondent parents

6.20%

Response Rate

FFY	2021	2022
Response Rate	7.05%	6.20%

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

The DDOE conducted a comparison of the statewide demographic data for students receiving special education services with the demographic data of the survey respondents. A +/- 3 discrepancy analysis was performed to determine the representativeness of the survey respondents. A demographic group with a response rate greater than three percentage points above the statewide demographics, was considered overrepresented. Demographic groups with a response rate greater than three percentage points below the statewide demographics were considered underrepresented.

Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

The DDOE analyzed the survey response rate for families of children receiving special education/related services in comparison to state demographics in each race and ethnicity category.

Of children receiving special education/related services, families of African American students represent 35.82% of the special education population and Hispanic/Latino students represent 17.04%. The combined survey response rate for the families of African American students (21.28%) and Hispanic/Latino students (10.03%) with disabilities was 31.31%. Although this response rate was not representative of the statewide demographics, there was a slight increase in response rate when compared to FFY 21 (African American students/20.33%, Hispanic/Latino students/9.79%).

The DDOE met with stakeholders including Statewide Special Education Leadership and the Parent Information Center of Delaware (PIC), to identify an additional demographic category. Based on stakeholder input, the demographic category of disability category was selected.

Upon analysis of the survey response rate for families of children receiving special education/related services, all disability categories were representative of the state demographics except for Autism, Developmental Delay, Learning Disability, Other Health Impairment, and Speech/Language Impairment.

The disability category of Autism was overrepresented by 9.80% and Speech/Language Impairment was overrepresented by 5.71%.

Although the disability category of Learning Disability represents 39.19% of the statewide demographic, the survey response rate was 24.89%, thus underrepresented by 14.30%. In addition, while the disability category of Other Health Impairment represents 13.33% of the state demographics, the response rate was 5.84%, thus underrepresented by 7.49% and the disability category of Developmental Delay were also underrepresented when comparing state demographics of 11.24% while response rate was 6.05%.

The demographics of the children for whom parents are responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics

Based on stakeholder input including the PIC, Governor’s Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens, Statewide Special Education Leadership and Special Education Directors, the following strategies were implemented for the 2022-2023 and 2023-2024 school year:

- A flyer was created in collaboration with PIC to inform families of the survey and provide an example of the mailing envelope to assist in preventing the survey from being discarded as junk mail. The flyer also contained an updated message regarding the new option to take the survey after their child’s IEP meeting via the QR code. The flyers were distributed to 42 LEAs for dissemination to Parent Councils. While the survey is mailed to families twice a year based on their student’s annual IEP date, families also had the option to complete the electronic version of the survey after their IEP meeting using a QR scan code. ECR has also collaborated with PIC to create an informational video to inform families about survey, and its importance. Both the flyer and video have been distributed to LEA Special Education Directors to be shared via email, social media and posted on the LEA website.
- To extend the reach to underrepresented groups such as our African American and Hispanic families, the DDOE and PIC will continue to reach out to community centers to engage in identifying and eliminating barriers and increase response rate for underrepresented groups. The DDOE will also target activities to increase the response rate among the parents of children receiving special education and/or related services under disability categories that are underrepresented.
- The DDOE also engages in ongoing discussion and data analysis with LEA Special Education Directors/LEA staff at quarterly meetings in an effort to identify strategies to address barriers specific to the LEA demographics.

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

Based on stakeholder input including the PIC, Governor’s Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens (GACEC), Statewide Special Education Leadership and Special Education Directors, the following strategies were implemented for the 2022-2023 and 2023-2024 school year:

- A flyer was created in collaboration with PIC to inform families of the survey and provide an example of the mailing envelope to assist in preventing the survey from being discarded as junk mail. The flyer also contained an updated message regarding the new option to take the survey after their child’s IEP meeting via the QR code. The flyers were distributed to 42 LEAs for dissemination to Parent Councils. While the survey is mailed to families twice a year based on their student’s annual IEP date, families also had the option to complete the electronic version of the survey after their IEP meeting using a QR scan code. ECR has also collaborated with PIC to create an informational video to inform families about survey, and its

importance. Both the flyer and video have been distributed to LEA Special Education Directors to be shared via email, social media and posted on the LEA website.

- To extend the reach to underrepresented groups such as our African American and Hispanic families, the DDOE and PIC will continue to reach out to engage in identifying and eliminating barriers and increase response rates for underrepresented groups. The DDOE will also target activities to increase the response rate among the parents of children receiving special education and/or related services under the disability categories that were underrepresented.

These activities include the following:

1) Leadership Conference: The DDOE will facilitate a session at the PIC Family Leadership Conference. During the session, the DDOE will solicit feedback from families to identify barriers and investigate possible solutions.

2) The DDOE will also gather feedback from stakeholders such as the GACEC, LEA Special Education Leadership, and families regarding possible transition to a fully electronic survey delivery model. This would allow families to receive the survey via email and/or text message.

- The DDOE also engages in ongoing discussion and data analysis with LEA Special Education Directors/LEA staff at quarterly meetings and the GACEC to identify strategies to address barriers specific to the LEA demographics.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

The DDOE conducted an analysis of the survey response rate for parents of children in each race and ethnicity category compared to the statewide race and ethnicity categories for all students receiving special education services.

Race/Ethnicity

Hispanic/Latino: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 17.04%, Representation of survey respondents = 10.03%

American Indian/Alaskan Native: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 0.37%, Representation of survey respondents = 0.37% Black/African

American: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 35.82%, Representation of survey respondents = 21.28%

White/Caucasian: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 39.63%, Representation of survey respondents = 51.33%

Asian American: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 2.06%, Representation of survey respondents = 2.81%

Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 0.15%, Representation of survey respondents = 0.16%

Multi-Racial: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 4.94%, Representation of survey respondents = 12.37%

The DDOE analyzed the parent response rate by race/ethnicity and after stakeholder input also included disability category. The response rate of all race/ethnicity categories was representative of the statewide race/ethnicity demographics except for Black/African American, Caucasian, and Hispanic/Latino students.

Caucasian students were overrepresented by 11.70% while Black/African American students were underrepresented by 14.54% and Hispanic/Latino students were underrepresented by 7.01%. Upon further analysis, it is possible that the under representation of Black/African American and Hispanic/Latino students is connected to the over representation of students identified as Multi-Racial by 7.43%.

Disability Category

Autism: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 13.302%, Representation of survey respondents = 22.82%

Deaf/Blind: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 0.17%, Representation of survey respondents = 0.42%

Developmental Delay: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 11.24%, Representation of survey respondents = 6.05%

Emotional Disability: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 4.06%, Representation of survey respondents = 5.36%

Hearing Impairment: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 1.00%, Representation of survey respondents = 1.06%

Learning Disability: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 39.19%, Representation of survey respondents = 24.89%

Mild Intellectual Disability: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 3.85%, Representation of survey respondents = 3.87%

Moderate Intellectual Disability: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 1.60%, Representation of survey respondents = 1.75%

Severe Intellectual Disability: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 0.19%, Representation of survey respondents = 0.80%

Orthopedic Impairment: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 0.70%, Representation of survey respondents = 1.17%

Other Health Impairment: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 13.33%, Representation of survey respondents = 5.84%

Speech/Language Impairment: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 10.80%, Representation of survey respondents = 16.51%

Traumatic Brain Injury: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 0.31%, Representation of survey respondents = 0.48%

Blind/Visual Impairment: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 0.25%, Representation of survey respondents = 0.96%

The DDOE met with stakeholders including Statewide Special Education Leadership and the Parent Information Center of Delaware (PIC), to identify an additional demographic category. Based on stakeholder input, the demographic category of disability category was selected.

Upon analysis of the survey response rate for families of children receiving special education/related services, all disability categories were representative of the state demographics except for Autism, Developmental Delay, Learning Disability, Other Health Impairment, and Speech/Language Impairment.

The disability category of Autism was overrepresented by 9.80% and Speech/Language Impairment was overrepresented by 5.71%.

Although the disability category of Learning Disability represents 39.19% of the statewide demographic, the survey response rate was 24.89%, thus underrepresented by 14.30%. In addition, while the disability category of Other Health Impairment represents 13.33% of the state demographics, the response rate was 5.84%, thus underrepresented by 7.49% and the disability category of Developmental Delay were also underrepresented when comparing state demographics of 11.24% while response rate was 6.05%.

The DDOE worked closely with the Parent Information Center of Delaware and diverse groups of stakeholders to review the survey and analyze response rate data. In addition, the content of the questions in the survey were reviewed and analyzed for bias and found to not have impact on the response rate. Stakeholders identified the continued need to advertise the importance of the survey and the provision of equitable access to the survey. Based on stakeholder input, the following strategies were implemented for the 2022-2023 and 2024 school year: A video and flyer were created in collaboration with PIC to inform families of the survey and provide an example of the mailing envelope to assist in preventing the survey from being discarded as junk mail. The flyer also contained an updated message regarding the new option to take the survey after their child's IEP meeting via the QR code. The flyers were distributed to 42 LEAs for dissemination to Parent Councils. While the survey is mailed to families twice a year based on their

student's annual IEP date, families also had the option to complete the electronic version of the survey after their IEP meeting using a QR scan code.

To extend the reach to underrepresented groups such as our African American and Hispanic families, the DDOE and PIC reached out to community centers to engage in identifying and eliminating barriers for underrepresented groups. Community centers included the Boys and Girls Club, Latin American Community Center and the United Way. Feedback included strategies to reach African American and Hispanic families such as the inclusion of the survey information in newsletters in multiple languages, access to multilingual community members to answer questions informational displays and tables at school events that attract diverse families (Open House, graduation, and parent teacher conferences).

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

DDOE ensures that this data is complete, accurate, reliable, and valid for Indicator 8. This is ensured by the DDOE, in collaboration with LEAs, through procedures and practices instituted for data collection processes such as the December 1st child count.

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The DDOE analyzed the survey response rate for families of children receiving special education/related services in comparison to state demographics in each race and ethnicity category.

Of children receiving special education/related services, families of African American students represent 35.82% of the special education population and Hispanic/Latino students represent 17.04%. The combined survey response rate for the families of African American students (21.28%) and Hispanic/Latino students (10.03%) with disabilities was 31.31%. Although this response rate was not representative of the statewide demographics, there was a slight increase in response rate when compared to FFY 21 (African American students/20.33%, Hispanic/Latino students/9.79%).

The DDOE met with stakeholders including Statewide Special Education Leadership and the Parent Information Center of Delaware (PIC), to identify an additional demographic category. Based on stakeholder input, the demographic category of disability category was selected.

Upon analysis of the survey response rate for families of children receiving special education/related services, all disability categories were representative of the state demographics except for Autism, Developmental Delay, Learning Disability, Other Health Impairment, and Speech/Language Impairment.

The disability category of Autism was overrepresented by 9.80% and Speech/Language Impairment was overrepresented by 5.71%.

Although the disability category of Learning Disability represents 39.19% of the statewide demographic, the survey response rate was 24.89%, thus underrepresented by 14.30%. In addition, while the disability category of Other Health Impairment represents 13.33% of the state demographics, the response rate was 5.84%, thus underrepresented by 7.49% and the disability category of Developmental Delay were also underrepresented when comparing state demographics of 11.24% while response rate was 6.05%.

Based on stakeholder input including the PIC, Governor's Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens, Statewide Special Education Leadership and Special Education Directors, the following strategies were implemented for the 2022-2023 and 2023-2024 school year:

- A flyer was created in collaboration with PIC to inform families of the survey and provide an example of the mailing envelope to assist in preventing the survey from being discarded as junk mail. The flyer also contained an updated message regarding the new option to take the survey after their child's IEP meeting via the QR code. The flyers were distributed to 42 LEAs for dissemination to Parent Councils. While the survey is mailed to families twice a year based on their student's annual IEP date, families also had the option to complete the electronic version of the survey after their IEP meeting using a QR scan code. ECR has also collaborated with PIC to create an informational video to inform families about survey, and its importance. Both the flyer and video have been distributed to LEA Special Education Directors to be shared via email, social media and posted on the LEA website.
- To extend the reach to underrepresented groups such as our African American and Hispanic families, the DDOE and PIC will continue to reach out to community centers to engage in identifying and eliminating barriers and increase response rate for underrepresented groups. The DDOE will also target activities to increase the response rate among the parents of children receiving special education and/or related services under disability categories that are underrepresented.
- The DDOE also engages in ongoing discussion and data analysis with LEA Special Education Directors/LEA staff at quarterly meetings in an effort to identify strategies to address barriers specific to the LEA demographics.

8 - OSEP Response

8 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2023 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2021	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	5.13%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

1

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
1	0	41	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

The DDOE used December 1, 2022 data (submitted to OSEP in August 2023 for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission for this indicator. The relative risk ratio methodology is what Delaware uses to determine whether there is disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education. In the relative risk ratio method, the total enrollment of all students is compared to the number of special education students. The DDOE uses a minimum cell size of 15 students in this calculation. The data being reviewed is within a one-year period. Relative Risk Ratio - Calculated by comparing one ethnic group's risk of being identified for a disability with that of a comparison group (all other students)

Please see below:

Numerator: # of SWD in X ethnic/racial group

Total # X ethnic/racial group in the LEA population

Denominator: # all other Non-X SWD

Total # of Non-X in the LEA population

After the relative risk ratio is calculated, the ratio is compared to the state "bar", and if the LEA's risk ratio is greater than or equal to the state "bar", the LEA is identified as having disproportionate representation. For FFY 2021, the State "bar" is set at a relative risk ratio of 2.0.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

FFY 2022, 1 LEA exceeded the state bar and was required to complete a state developed self-assessment of their policies, procedures, and practices relating to the identification of students with disabilities specifically around child find and evaluation and eligibility determination. Once they conducted a self-assessment in those areas and submitted it to the DDOE, the DDOE assessed for compliance and also reviewed a sample of individual student records for compliance with federal and DDOE regulations. There were no LEAs non-compliant for Indicator 9.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

DDOE ensures that this data is complete, accurate, reliable, and valid for Indicator 9. DDOE provided the LEA with the data from the state system which the LEA utilized to conduct a self- assessment. DDOE reviewed the self-assessment, individual student records, and verified the data. COVID-19 did not have any impact on the data collection since the SEA and LEA utilize a state data system which is available electronically from any location. Professional learning, training and coaching is provided for all LEAs in Multi-Tiered Systems of Behavioral and Academic Supports (MTSS), Universal Design for Learning along with the opportunity to participate in the Delaware Early Literacy Initiative. DDOE also provided professional learning at special education director leadership meetings and meets individually with LEAs to engage in problem solving, review/analyze data and support the LEA's implementation of MTSS.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the section 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), (e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures). In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2021	2.44%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	2.70%	5.13%	2.63%	2.56%	2.44%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

2

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
17	4	40	2.44%	0%	10.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The Delaware Department of Education (DDOE) does a review of student files for each LEA identified with Disproportionate Representation. This year, during the review DDOE found non-compliance in the Evaluation Summary Reports for individual students at 4 LEAs. DDOE has directed each LEA to correct each individual case of non-compliance and will ensure the corrections occur within timeline. These particular areas of non-compliance which caused slippage were related to MTSS and the statement of assurance.

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

The DDOE used December 1, 2022 data (submitted to OSEP in August 2023) for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission for this indicator. Delaware uses the relative risk ratio method to determine whether there is disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification in special education. The DDOE uses a minimum cell size of 10 for the calculation of students with disabilities in racial/ethnic groups and disability categories. After the LEA data is populated and the relative risk ratio is calculated, the LEA data is then compared to the state bar of 2.0. The data being reviewed is within a one-year period. The calculation for determining the relative risk ratio is as follows:

Numerator:

of students in X ethnic/racial group in Y disability category

Total # of students in X ethnic/racial group in the LEA

Denominator:

of Other students in Y disability category

Total # of Other students in the LEA population

After the relative risk ratio is calculated, the ratio is compared to the State “bar,” and if the LEA’s risk ratio is greater than or equal to the State “bar,” the LEA is identified as having disproportionate representation. For FFY 2022, the State “bar” is set at a relative risk ratio of 2.0

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

FFY 2022, 17 LEAs exceeded the state bar and were required to complete a state developed self-assessment of their policies, procedures, and practices relating to the identification of students with disabilities specifically around child find and evaluation and eligibility determination. Once they conducted th self-assessment in those areas, the DDOE assessed for compliance and reviewed a sampling an individual student records for compliance with federal and DDOE regulations.

4 LEA was found non-compliant with an individual student record. They were notified and directed to correct the individual cases of non-compliance. These LEAs were given a corrective action plan and directed to provide professional learning in the area of non-compliance.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

DDOE ensures that this data is complete, accurate, reliable, and valid for Indicator 10. DDOE provided the LEA with the data from the state system which the LEA utilized to conduct a self- assessment. DDOE reviewed the self-assessment, individual student records, and verified the data. COVID-19 did not have any impact on the data collection since the SEA and LEA utilize a state data system which is available electronically from any location. Professional learning, training and coaching is provided for all LEAs in Multi-Tiered Systems of Behavioral and Academic Supports (MTSS), Universal Design for Learning along with the opportunity to participate in the Delaware Early Literacy Initiative. DDOE also provided professional learning at

special education director leadership meetings and meets individually with LEAs to engage in problem solving, review/analyze data and support the LEA's implementation of MTSS.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	0	0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Utilizing updated data, the DDOE verified compliance of policies, practices and procedures for the one LEA identified in FY21. The DDOE verified that the LEA was compliant and correctly implementing the regulatory requirements under IDEA.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

For FFY21, DDOE verified the correction of single instance of individual non-compliance for the one LEA. They corrected the non-compliance and DDOE ensured that the non-compliance was corrected.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the district identified in FFY 2021 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification is in compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

For FFY21, DDOE verified the correction of single instance of individual non-compliance for the one LEA. They corrected the non-compliance within and DDOE ensured that the non-compliance was corrected, and they had 100% compliance. Utilizing updated data, the DDOE verified compliance of policies, practices and procedures for the one LEA identified in FY21. The DDOE verified that the LEA was compliant and correctly implementing the regulatory requirements under IDEA.

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that the four districts identified in FFY 2022 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification [is/are] in compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

Measurement

a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.

b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	98.26%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.36%	99.24%	98.47%	98.26%	98.31%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
5,023	4,892	98.31%	100%	97.39%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)

131

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

The Delaware Department of Education (DDOE) reviewed data regarding timeline of initial evaluations and found 131 students in 16 LEAs that were noncompliant. Delaware's timeline for initial evaluations is forty-five (45) school days or ninety (90) calendar days, whichever is less, of receiving written parental consent for initial evaluation. The time frame described does not apply to a public agency if: a) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation or b) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the relevant time frame has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. The latter exemption applies only if the subsequent public agency is making sufficient progress to ensure a prompt completion of the evaluation, and the parent and subsequent public agency agree to a specific time when the evaluation will be completed. See 14 DE Admin Code § 925.2.3-2.5. The number of days that exceeded the state timeline of 45 school days or 90 calendar days, whichever is less, of receiving written parental consent for initial evaluations ranged from 1 to 90 plus days over the state timeline as some have yet to be completed (75 students fell within 1-10 days, 40 students fell within 10-50 days, 16 students fell within 50 plus days). Root causes that contributed to the noncompliance were identified as availability and scheduling of bilingual evaluators, staff shortage, scheduling difficulties, difficulty getting in touch with parents, lack of proper notice of meeting, miscounting the timeline, and needing more time to conduct additional assessments for other suspected disabilities.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted

What is the State's timeline for initial evaluations? If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b).

Delaware's timeline for initial evaluations is detailed in 14 DE Admin Code § 925.2.3-2.5: Within forty-five (45) school days or ninety (90) calendar days, whichever is less, of receiving written parental consent, the initial evaluation shall be conducted; and the child's eligibility for special education and related services must be determined at a meeting convened for that purpose. The time frame described does not apply to a public agency if: a) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation or b) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the relevant time frame has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. The latter exemption applies only if the subsequent public agency is making sufficient progress to ensure a prompt completion of the evaluation, and the parent and subsequent public agency agree to a specific time when the evaluation will be completed.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

LEAs are required to enter and maintain data within Delaware's electronic statewide pupil accounting system. LEAs enter the date on which the parent's informed written consent for initial evaluation is received and the date on which eligibility is determined. The eligibility date is the end date used in the calculation to determine whether initial evaluations are conducted within the State established timeline. By requiring all LEAs to enter information into the electronic state-wide pupil accounting system, DDOE monitors the timeliness of initial evaluations. The DDOE has received technical assistance from the IDEA Data Center for the development of the data protocol for Indicator 11. In turn, DDOE has developed guidance documents and provides technical assistance to LEAs on the accuracy of data entry procedures. In addition, the Exceptional Children Resources Workgroup works collaboratively with DDOE's Technology Operations Workgroup and Data Management Workgroup to ensure the validity and accuracy of the data. DDOE ensures that this data is complete, accurate, reliable, and valid for Indicator 11. DDOE mitigated the impact of COVID-19 by providing guidance and technical assistance for LEAs. Technical assistance includes professional learning and training at statewide Special Education Leadership meetings, making a webinar available to LEAs that they can access at their convenience, and meeting individually with LEAs to problem solve, review/analyze data and support with implementation of timelines and best practices relating to Child Find and initial evaluations.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The DDOE and LEAs continue to utilize a state data system which is available electronically from any location. DDOE provided the LEAs with the data from the state system which the LEAs utilized to conduct a self-assessment. DDOE reviewed the self-assessments from the LEAs and verified the date the LEA received informed parent consent for initial evaluation and the date eligibility was determined was within the State timeline (45 school days or 90 calendar days, whichever is less). Additional evidence is gathered through staff interviews, contact logs, meeting invitations and emails. The DDOE engaged in a review and analysis of initial evaluation data from FFY 2021 and FFY 2022. Data indicated an increase in the number of initial evaluations conducted in FFY 2022 (5023) in comparison to FFY 2021 (4083). It is likely that the increase in initial evaluations was due to gaps in learning that became more readily apparent to parents and teachers as students returned to in-person classroom instruction as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
69	69	0	0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

DDOE provided technical assistance to all LEAs regarding processes for timely evaluations. Targeted technical assistance regarding the timeline for initial evaluations was provided directly to the 11 LEAs identified with noncompliance. DDOE convened an internal committee to review the LEAs' root cause analysis and corrective action plans, which includes professional development activities. Utilizing updated data collected through the state's data system, DDOE reviewed additional randomly selected student records, within each of the 11 LEAs found noncompliant, and verified that 100% of the 11 LEAs identified with noncompliance were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements under IDEA, regarding timely evaluations, within the one-year period.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

After LEAs corrected their noncompliance, utilizing updated data collected through the State data system, DDOE conducted a review of the 69 individual student records which contributed to the noncompliance. DDOE verified that each instance of noncompliance was 100% corrected. Evidence of correction included verification of Evaluation Summary Report documents, as well as staff interviews, review of communication to parents, contact logs, meeting invitations and emails. DDOE instructed the identified LEAs to conduct a root cause analysis and develop a corrective action plan. The DDOE provides the LEAs with a Corrective Action Plan template to complete and submit to the DDOE. The template includes a section where the LEA is to detail their root cause analysis, action steps, baseline data, method of progress monitoring, and report to DDOE on their progress with implementation.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

DDOE provided technical assistance to all LEAs regarding processes for timely evaluations. Targeted technical assistance regarding the timeline for initial evaluations was provided directly to the 11 LEAs identified with noncompliance. DDOE convened an internal committee to review the LEAs' root cause analysis and corrective action plans, which includes professional development activities. Utilizing updated data collected through the state's data system, DDOE reviewed additional randomly selected student records, within each of the 11 LEAs found noncompliant, and verified that 100% of the 11 LEAs identified with noncompliance were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements under IDEA, regarding timely evaluations, within the one-year period.

After LEAs corrected their noncompliance, utilizing updated data collected through the State data system, DDOE conducted a review of the 69 individual student records which contributed to the noncompliance. DDOE verified that each instance of noncompliance was 100% corrected. Evidence of correction included verification of Evaluation Summary Report documents, as well as staff interviews, review of communication to parents, contact logs, meeting invitations and emails. DDOE instructed the identified LEAs to conduct a root cause analysis and develop a corrective action plan. The DDOE provides the LEAs with a Corrective Action Plan template to complete and submit to the DDOE. The template includes a section where the LEA is to detail their root cause analysis, action steps, baseline data, method of progress monitoring, and report to DDOE on their progress with implementation.

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2)

has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: 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 birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	81.60%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	89.11%	93.68%	91.56%	95.75%	97.43%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	1,286
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	105

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	816
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	303
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	37
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
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 birthdays.	816	841	97.43%	100%	97.03%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Number of children who served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f

25

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

It is important to note that the number of children referred by Part C to Part B for FFY'22 increased by 255 from FFY'21. The range of days beyond the third birthday went from 2 days to 238 days. Reasons provided by the LEAs for eligibility determined and IEP developed past the third birthday included a lack of sufficient numbers of school psychologists or bilingual school psychologists to conduct initial evaluations, meetings being scheduled 30 days or less from the third birthday, staff unavailability or parent cancelling or not coming to the meeting. Of the 25 found to be out of compliance, 15 were from one district that experienced significant staff turnover. The SEA has provided information from the ECTA Center related to completion of initial evaluations and has recommended various strategies to LEAs such as forming partnerships to share evaluators or using video conferencing platforms to increase capacity of evaluation slots. The SEA has and will continue to provide general and targeted technical assistance to the LEAs to assure smooth, timely and compliant transitions from Part C to Part B. Two SEA Early Childhood Transition Coordinators continue focused training and technical assistance as Delaware strives to reach 100% on this indicator.

Attach PDF table (optional)

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Data are collected in a state created data collection report and include data for the entire reporting year. LEAs enter child level data throughout the year in the state data system (ESchoolPlus) which includes referral date to Part B, parent consent to evaluate, initial evaluation date, IEP eligibility meeting date and IEP implementation date. At the end of the school year, LEAs generate an Indicator 12 report and import that data into the DDOE developed B12 data collection worksheet. This worksheet also includes data from the state generated transition notification report (TNR) sent from Part C, which is sent via encrypted email to LEAs monthly. LEAs submit their completed data worksheet to the SEA for review. The SEA completes an in-depth analysis of the LEA submitted data. The SEA assures Indicator 12 data submitted in this SPP/APR is valid for completeness, timeliness, accuracy, and compliance status.

SEA staff follow up with the LEAs for additional supporting documentation of their data submission as needed. Delaware's process is detailed in the IDC Part B IDEA Data Processes Toolkit Protocol for Indicator 12 Early Childhood Transition.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

DDOE ensures that this data is complete, accurate, reliable, and valid for Indicator 12. DDOE provides on-going technical assistance through professional learning and training in the monthly Early Childhood Special Education meetings, quarterly Statewide Early Childhood Transition Collaborative meetings (whose participants include not only LEA personnel, but also Part C Service Coordinators and Early Intervention Practitioners), quarterly Special Education Director County level meetings and quarterly Special Education Leadership meetings. In addition, DDOE has developed guidance documents and resources focused on early childhood transition and engages collaboratively with our Part C colleagues on creation and dissemination of the information. The Early Childhood Transition Coordinators also work closely with the LEA 619 Coordinators, including meeting individually with them as well as via a new cohort model designed for new coordinators to engage in problem solving, reviewing, and analyzing of their data and supporting the timely and smooth transition for children to Part B.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
17	17	0	0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

After the verification of correction of all cases of individual child noncompliance and after professional development around non-compliant areas, utilizing updated data, the DDOE subsequently reviewed new randomly selected child records from each of the districts with instances of noncompliance and verified that 100% of LEAs identified with noncompliance are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements under IDEA within the one-year period.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

Each LEA was required to develop a Corrective Action Plan including a Root Cause Analysis, strategies to address the root causes, correct each case of child level noncompliance, and provide professional development in all regulatory areas of noncompliance. Utilizing updated data, DDOE reviewed and verified all individual corrections were made by reviewing individual child documents including parental consent to evaluate, Evaluation Summary Reports, the IEP and date of service initiation.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

After the verification of correction of all cases of individual child noncompliance and after professional development around non-compliant areas, utilizing updated data, the DDOE subsequently reviewed new randomly selected child records from each of the districts with instances of noncompliance and verified that 100% of LEAs identified with noncompliance are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements under IDEA within the one-year period.

Each LEA was required to develop a Corrective Action Plan including a Root Cause Analysis, strategies to address the root causes, correct each case of child level noncompliance, and provide professional development in all regulatory areas of noncompliance. Utilizing updated data, DDOE reviewed and verified all individual corrections were made by reviewing individual child documents including parental consent to evaluate, Evaluation Summary Reports, the IEP and date of service initiation.

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	98.85%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	96.50%	99.89%	98.85%	93.68%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
9,563	9,794	93.68%	100%	97.64%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Beginning with the 2014-2015 SY, based on stakeholder input, the DDOE moved from a cyclical monitoring process to monitoring all districts and charters having transition age (age 14 or in the 8th grade) annually for Indicator 13 to ensure state-wide representation.

Monitoring occurred in a two-phase process:

Phase 1 - LEA Self-Assessment

LEAs were required to conduct a self-assessment of all student records for students age 14 or in the 8th grade and above. DDOE utilizes the data from the December 1 count and provides LEAs with an electronic spreadsheet to capture all data requirements for Indicator 13. Through the self-assessment process, the LEA verifies that each student’s IEP is compliant IDEA and that transition services enable the student to meet post-school goals. The self-assessment is then submitted to the DDOE.

Phase 2 - DDOE validation of LEA submitted data

DDOE reviewed a randomly selected sample of students to verify that each student’s IEP was compliant. The data reviewed represented all schools within the LEA, all disability categories, all race/ethnicities and ages/grade levels. If noncompliance was identified, findings letters were issued with required corrective action including correction of all individual student noncompliance, Root Cause Analysis, provision of professional development in the areas of noncompliance and development of a Corrective Action Plan.

Question	Yes / No
Do the State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	YES
If yes, did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age?	YES
If yes, at what age are youth included in the data for this indicator	14

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Youth who are 14 or 8th grade and older are included in the data for this indicator.

DDOE ensures that this data is complete, accurate, reliable, and valid for Indicator 13. DDOE continues to consider and problem solve around impact relating to COVID and provide technical assistance, guidance and resources for LEAs. COVID-19 did not have any impact on the data collection since the SEA and LEA utilize a state data system which is available electronically from any location.

Delaware embraces authentic stakeholder engagement and continues to work with stakeholders in analyzing data related to secondary transition, developing strategies to support improvement activities and evaluating progress toward targets including the following. DDOE’s Exceptional Children Resources Work Group (ECR) has established strong partnerships across the Department as well as with families, state agencies, community members and local education agencies.

The Statewide Transition Cadre, continues to meet monthly and includes parents, students, LEA staff, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (DVR), Division of the Visually Impaired (DVI), Division of Developmental Disability Services (DDDS), Prison Education, Governor’s Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens (GACEC), Parent Information Center of Delaware (PIC), Autism Delaware, Delaware Workforce Development Board, and cross-DDOE staff from Higher Education, Career/Technical Education (CTE), Autism Resources, etc.). Topics address graduation rate, dropout rate, transition planning and post-school outcomes.

ECR has established Lunch and Learn sessions to provide LEA staff with targeted professional learning and technical assistance relating to conducting internal reviews of IEPs as part of a self-assessment around transition planning in the IEP. LEAs participate in discussion and activities focused on ensuring they are correctly implementing IDEA and research-based practices in assessment that leads to post-school goals, to develop transition activities around post-school goals for employment, education and independent living.

ECR continues to engage in collaborative efforts with DDOE’s CTE work group, DVR, DDDS, and DVI to provide and expand PIPEline to Career Success for Students with Disabilities to increase equity for students with disabilities in CTE. This multigenerational team initiative works in the context of students with disabilities to increase the enrollment, matriculation, graduation, and transition to postsecondary education and competitive employment of students with disabilities through CTE career pathways. The Student-Led PIPEline leadership program is a combination of Work-Based Learning and leadership development, offering a way for students to support their schools by recommending equity-building tools for their districts.

ECR continues to partner with Project Search which is a business-led, school-to-work program to support students in preparing for and transitioning to post high school life. Students develop competitive, marketable, and transferable skills in areas such as communication, teamwork, and problem solving to prepare them for employment in an integrated setting.

ECR continues to support training through the Customized Employment Boot Camp. This course has been designed as a “hit the ground running” experience for employment professionals and school personnel interested in a non-traditional approach to job development, known as Customized Employment (CE) to enhance opportunities of employment for individuals with moderate/significant disabilities.

ECR continues to support and collaborate with the GACEC to create resources for students and families, in multi-media formats, focused on transition throughout a student’s educational career.

ECR has established a Transition Advisory Group/NTACT team focused on building capacity of LEA staff. In May, 2023, under the leadership of ECR, Delaware sent a team to NTACT:C’s Post Secondary Transition Capacity Building Institute including parents, students, and representatives from LEAs, DVR, Community Integrated Services, PIC and the DDOE. The team worked collaboratively to develop a plan to guide Post Secondary Transition in Delaware and continues to meet monthly focused on the following goals:

- Increase Student Engagement in IEP and the Post Secondary Transition Process

- Increase and sustain youth Involvement and voice long-term
- Reach students and families in all areas and racial/minority identities
- Deliver concise and effective messaging to students and families about post-secondary transition
- Promote effective collaboration across agencies/schools/educators

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
8	8	0	0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

After the verification of correction of all individual noncompliance and at the conclusion of professional development around noncompliant areas, utilizing updated data, the DDOE subsequently reviewed new randomly selected student records to verify systemic compliance. The DDOE verified that all 8 LEAs were compliant and correctly implementing the regulatory requirements under IDEA within the one-year time frame.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

For FFY 2021, the DDOE identified 597 cases of individual student noncompliance in 8 LEAs related to secondary transition. Each LEA was required to develop a Corrective Action Plan including a Root Cause Analysis, provide professional development in all regulatory areas of noncompliance and correct all individual student noncompliance. Utilizing updated data, the DDOE reviewed all individual student files and verified that all areas of non-compliance were corrected in the LEA within the one-year timeframe.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2020	3	3	0

FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

After the verification of correction of all individual student noncompliance, utilizing updated data, the DDOE reviewed new randomly selected student records to verify systemic compliance and verified that all 3 LEAs were compliant and correctly implementing the regulatory requirements under IDEA.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

For FFY 2020, 3 LEAs were identified with noncompliance that was not corrected within the one-year timeline. All 3 LEAs were moved to Tier III within Delaware’s Multi-Tiered System of Accountability. Corrective action was LEA and DDOE driven. DDOE and the LEA conducted a new self-assessment and developed an Intervention Plan including further analysis of root causes, improvement activities, benchmarks and timelines. The DDOE provided targeted professional development in the areas of noncompliance and also provided ongoing technical assistance. Following the provision of targeted professional development, utilizing updated data the DDOE verified that all individual student noncompliance was corrected.

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the remaining three uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2020: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

For FFY 2021, the DDOE identified 597 cases of individual student noncompliance in 8 LEAs related to secondary transition. Each LEA was required to develop a Corrective Action Plan including a Root Cause Analysis, provide professional development in all regulatory areas of noncompliance and correct all individual student noncompliance. Utilizing updated data, the DDOE reviewed all individual student files and verified that all areas of non-compliance were corrected in the LEA within the one-year timeframe. After the verification of correction of all individual noncompliance and at the conclusion of professional development around noncompliant areas, utilizing updated data, the DDOE subsequently reviewed new randomly selected student records to verify systemic compliance. The DDOE verified that all 8 LEAs were compliant and correctly implementing the regulatory requirements under IDEA within the one-year time frame.

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

- A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
- C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2023 on students who left school during 2021-2022, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2021-2022 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

Enrolled in higher education as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment”:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

Some other employment as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services).

II. Data Reporting

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also

happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school *must* be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2020	Target >=	37.00%	41.00%	45.00%	44.14%	46.14%
A	44.14%	Data	41.39%	45.62%	53.41%	44.14%	51.09%
B	2020	Target >=	68.00%	72.00%	76.00%	64.82%	66.82%
B	64.82%	Data	62.16%	73.54%	73.44%	64.82%	63.99%
C	2020	Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	87.69%	100.00%
C	87.69%	Data	81.56%	81.01%	87.69%	80.37%	71.78%

FFY 2021 Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	48.14%	50.14%	52.14%	54.14%
Target B >=	68.82%	70.82%	72.82%	74.82%
Target C >=	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Delaware embraces authentic stakeholder engagement throughout all areas of our work. Members of ECR have engaged in Leading by Convening training through NCSI and IDC, our national technical assistance centers, to enhance our stakeholder involvement. We believe to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, we must embrace and value our learning partnerships with parents, educators, advisory/advocacy groups, and community members. ECR realized that in order to broaden our stakeholder involvement, we also needed to deepen the levels of interactions among stakeholders. The DDOE has built a strong relationship with Delaware Parent Information Center (PIC), our IDEA PTI, to advance our engagement with parents. We partnered with PIC to embrace the four levels of interaction in Leading by Convening: informing (sharing information with others who care about the issue), networking (asking others what they think about the issue and listening to what they say), collaborating (engaging people in trying to do something by working together about the issue) and transforming (doing things The Partnership Way: leading by convening, cross-stakeholder engagement, shared leadership and consensus building). As we prepared to engage stakeholders in the process of data analysis and target setting for the new SPP/APR, PIC provided us with the support and strategies to involve many more parents in this process, focusing on increasing the appropriate

breadth of representation and depth of interactions.

For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, as members of ECR prepared to engage stakeholders in analyzing Delaware data, setting targets and identifying improvement strategies and activities, each staff member utilized the Delaware Stakeholder Engagement Analysis Tool to ensure all demographics were addressed when inviting stakeholders (e.g.: race/ethnicity/ geographic locations/disability categories/advocacy groups/advisory groups/parents/families/etc.). 59 individual indicator stakeholder meetings took place that included sharing data, rich discussions regarding data analysis, target setting and improvement strategies.

During monthly meetings with Governor’s Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens (GACEC), state IDEA advisory panel, as a whole council, as well as with council subcommittees, ECR engages with the council in data analysis and discussion of improvement activities around individual indicators. In addition, individual members represent GACEC on each specific indicator stakeholder committees. ECR also presented to and engaged all stakeholders/parents from the GACEC in discussion on indicator data analysis, input/feedback on target setting, and input/feedback on improvement activities and provided GACEC an additional opportunity to ask questions/provide input during an evening Q and A session designed specifically for them. GACEC provided DDOE with written input by the end of December. Presentations, data analysis, target setting discussions and improvement activities also took place at all County Special Ed Leadership Meetings to promote LEA Special Ed Directors and additional educators in the process of providing input/feedback as indicated above.

ECR staff, in cooperation with PIC, developed one-page, parent friendly fact sheets for each SPP/APR indicator and partnered with PIC to share with all 42 LEA Parent Councils for Special Education, and to the PIC parent distribution list of over 5,000 families. PIC utilized their social media platform to invite all parents to engage in Lunch and Learn Facebook Live sessions, where each ECR member presented their indicator information, engaged in a data analysis discussion, presented target proposals and improvement strategies. These sessions were scheduled both during the day and in the evening to ensure further opportunities for parent participation. In addition, ECR staff created individual indicator surveys to gather further input from parent stakeholders which was communicated during the "Lunch and Learn" sessions. Both the one-page fact sheets and surveys were translated from English into Spanish and Haitian Creole to reach a wide range of families. To centralize all this information and to gain even further public input, ECR created an IDEA SPP/APR webpage which contains the one-page fact sheets for each indicator, a live link for individual surveys to gain additional input/feedback, the power point presentation used during stakeholder presentations and a copy of the previous SPP/APR, for reference.

(<https://www.doe.k12.de.us/Page/4541>) DDOE utilized social media, such as the DDOE Facebook Page, to share this information statewide, in addition to posting info and live links in the Principals’ Weekly Newsletter. To support this effort, PIC created a similar webpage which links to DDOE’s webpage. To support the Informing stage of Leading by Convening, DDOE collected data to support the efforts on increasing the appropriate breadth of representation and depth of interactions from stakeholders through social media and websites. In addition, DDOE collected data on Networking, Collaborating and Transforming efforts.

Number of stakeholders who were reached by DDOE/PIC through Informing on social media and websites: 30,902

Number of stakeholders who were engaged by DDOE/PIC by Informing on social media and websites: 1,035

Number of stakeholders who were engaged with DDOE/PIC by Networking, Collaborating and Transforming through completing surveys and participating in meetings: 1,191

For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the DDOE continued to utilize Leading by Convening to meet with and engage stakeholders in analyzing data, developing strategies to support improvement activities, and evaluating progress toward targets for each indicator. Stakeholder groups include, but are not limited to, the GACEC, PIC, Access to the General Education Curriculum Committee, MTSS Leadership/Advisory, Special Education Leadership, Special Education Director County meetings, Special Education Director Charter meetings, Equity Professional Learning Community, and the Equity in IDEA Stakeholder Committee, Transition Cadre, Transition Advisory Group, Early Childhood Inclusion Committee, and Early Childhood Special Education Committee. ECR staff regularly engage stakeholders in activities to build capacity and deepen knowledge and understanding of the indicator/indicator data resulting in rich discussion around progress and evaluation of improvement activities.

For example, the DDOE was selected for a 4-year partnership with the SWIFT Center which will provide coaching and technical assistance for LEAs to support changes within systems, policies and practices that result in meaningful engagement in general education. ECR also engaged stakeholders in data analysis and discussions around improvement activities during Special Education Leadership meetings focusing on topics such as Significant Disproportionality, Transition Planning, Equity, Mediation, Universal Design for Learning, Accessible Instructional Materials and Child Find.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	1,656
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	1,007
Response Rate	60.81%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	392
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	383
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	9
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	34

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	392	1,007	51.09%	48.14%	38.93%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	775	1,007	63.99%	68.82%	76.96%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	818	1,007	71.78%	100.00%	81.23%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	The DDOE engaged with stakeholders, including parents, adult agencies, community service providers and LEAs, feedback alluded to increased job opportunities and students choosing to focus on employment opportunities rather than continuing in higher education opportunities. Stakeholders indicated students more willing to engage in employment to assist their families economically. In addition, revised CTE programs now offered include dual enrollment opportunities prior to exiting k-12 education, as well as, opportunities for internships/apprenticeships as part of programming. These opportunities provide students with offers of employment with competitive wages upon exiting k-12 education.

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

Option 2: Report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Response Rate

FFY	2021	2022
Response Rate	55.47%	60.81%

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

The SEA uses a +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target groups.

Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

Disability Category

Learning Disability: Representation of SY 21-22 Exiters/55.5%, Representation of SY 21-22 Respondents/50.4%
Mild Intellectual Disability: Representation of SY 21-22 Exiters/5.5%, Representation of SY 21-22 Respondents/6.4%
Moderate Intellectual Disability: Representation of SY 21-22 Exiters/1.8%, Representation of SY 21-22 Respondents/2.8%
Severe Intellectual Disability: Representation of SY 21-22 Exiters/< 1%, Representation of SY 21-22 Respondents/< 1%

Emotional Disability: Representation of SY 21-22 Exitters/10%, Representation of SY 21-22 Respondents/6.8%
Other Health Impairment: Representation of SY 21-22 Exitters/16.7%, Representation of SY 21-22 Respondents/15.1%
Orthopedic Impairment: Representation of SY 21-22 Exitters/< 1%, Representation of SY 21-22 Respondents/< 1%
Hearing Impairment: Representation of SY 21-22 Exitters/1%, Representation of SY 21-22 Respondents/1%
Autism: Representation of SY 21-22 Exitters/7.8%, Representation of SY 21-22 Respondents/11.1%
Deaf/Blind: Representation of SY 21-22 Exitters/< 1%, Representation of SY 21-22 Respondents/< 1%
Blind-Visual Impairment: Representation of SY 21-22 Exitters/< 1%, Representation of SY 21-22 Respondents/< 1%
Speech/Language Impairment: Representation of SY 21-22 Exitters/< 1%, Representation of SY 21-22 Respondents/< 1%
Traumatic Brain Injury: Representation of SY 21-22 Exitters/< 1%, Representation of SY 21-22 Respondents/< 1%
For disability category, the response data were not consistent/within consistent range (+/- 3%) of statewide exiter representation of disability categories. There was an overrepresentation in the category of autism. There was an underrepresentation in the category of emotional disability and learning disability.

Race/Ethnicity

Hispanic/Latino: Representation of SY 21-22 Exitters/29.9%, Representation of SY 21-22 Respondents/25.5%
American Indian/Alaskan Native: Representation of SY 21-22 Exitters/< 1%, Representation of SY 21-22 Respondents/< 1%
Black/African American: Representation of SY 21-22 Exitters/35.5%, Representation of SY 21-22 Respondents/37.4%
White/Caucasian: Representation of SY 21-22 Exitters/31.3%, Representation of SY 21-22 Respondents/33.3%
Asian American: Representation of SY 21-22 Exitters/1%, Representation of SY 21-22 Respondents/1%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander: Representation of SY 21-22 Exitters/< 1%, Representation of SY 21-22 Respondents/0%
Multi-Racial: Representation of SY 21-22 Exitters/2%, Representation of SY 21-22 Respondents/1.8%
For race/ethnicity, the response data were not consistent/within consistent range (+/- 3%) of statewide exiter representation of race/ethnicity. There was an underrepresentation in Hispanic/Latino

Gender

Male: Representation of SY 21-22 Exitters/62.1%, Representation of SY 21-22 Respondents/61%
Female: Representation of SY 21-22 Exitters/37.9%, Representation of SY 21-22 Respondents/38.7%
For gender, the response data were consistent/within consistent range (+/- 3%) of statewide exiter representation of gender.

Exit Type

Regular High School Diploma: Representation of SY 21-22 Exitters/80.5%, Representation of SY 21-22 Respondents/85.1%
Certificate/Alternate Diploma: Representation of SY 21-22 Exitters/6.2%, Representation of SY 21-22 Respondents/8.8%
Age Out: Representation of SY 21-22 Exitters/1%, Representation of SY 21-22 Respondents/1.4%
Drop Out: Representation of SY 21-22 Exitters/12.5%, Representation of SY 21-22 Respondents/4.4%

For exit type, the response data were not consistent/within consistent range (+/- 3%) of statewide exiter representation of exit type. There was an underrepresentation of dropout and overrepresentation of regular high school diploma.

The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

The SEA will continue to engage stakeholders and agencies in discussions and analysis of data collection methods to ensure the possibility all response data will be consistent/within consistent range (+/- 3%) of statewide exiter representation. Focused attention will be placed on those under-represented categories. The SEA will continue discussion with sister agencies (Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, Division on Developmental Disabilities Services, Division for Visual Impairments) to examine respective data systems in an effort to better align systems and track individuals for post school outcomes data collection. DDOE will also partner with the Parent Information Center of Delaware to identify strategies to reach underrepresented groups. In addition, the SEA continues to investigate the potential of using social media, email, and text messaging as an additional methods to raise response rates and to ensure representativeness of exiters.

The SEA will also continue work with LEAs to ensure student contact information is correct/updated in Delaware's state-wide pupil accounting system before students exit the LEA.

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The SEA will continue to engage stakeholders and agencies in discussions and analysis of data collection methods to ensure opportunities to reach all IB.

Focused attention will be placed on those under-represented categories. The SEA will continue discussion with sister agencies (Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, Division on Developmental Disabilities Services, Division for Visual Impairments) to examine respective data systems in an effort to better align systems and track individuals for post school outcomes data collection. DDOE will also partner with the Parent Information Center of Delaware to identify strategies to reach underrepresented groups. In addition, the SEA is investigating the potential of using social media, email, and text messaging as additional methods to raise response rates and to ensure representativeness of exiters.

The SEA will also continue to work with LEAs to ensure student contact information is correct/updated in Delaware's state-wide pupil accounting system before students exit the LEA.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

The SEA uses multiple data collection processes in an effort to enhance the response rate of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. This includes DDOE's statewide pupil accounting system and data systems utilized by sister agencies. Through the analysis of responses and nonresponses, the data show nonrespondents who were attempted to be contacted had contact information where numbers were disconnected, there was no answer/returned called, or wrong number. In efforts to reduce any bias in the reporting data the SEA continues

working with sister agencies (Division of Vocation Rehabilitation, Division on Developmental Disabilities Services, Division for Visual Impairments) through data sharing agreements to collect post school outcomes data. The data sharing agreements allow DDOE to gather additional post-school outcomes data on exiters not reached through phone calls and/or surveys.

DDOE will continue to work with Parent Information on strategies (i.e. posting survey on website) to improve response rate and bias in respondents. DDOE is also investigating a mechanism to allow for email and text messaging to students and families.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

DDOE ensures that this data is complete, accurate, reliable, and valid for Indicator 1. DDOE continues to consider and problem solve around impact relating to COVID. COVID-19 did not have any impact on the data collection since the SEA and LEA utilize a state data system which is available electronically from any location.

Delaware embraces authentic stakeholder engagement and continues to work with stakeholders in analyzing data related to secondary transition, developing strategies to support improvement activities and evaluating progress toward targets including the following. DDOE’s Exceptional Children Resources Work Group (ECR) has established strong partnerships across the Department as well as with families, state agencies, community members and local education agencies.

The Statewide Transition Cadre, continues to meet monthly and includes parents, students, LEA staff, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (DVR), Division of the Visually Impaired (DVI), Division of Developmental Disability Services (DDDS), Prison Education, Governor’s Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens (GACEC), Parent Information Center of Delaware (PIC), Autism Delaware, Delaware Workforce Development Board, and cross-DDOE staff from Higher Education, Career/Technical Education (CTE), Autism Resources, etc.). Topics address graduation rate, dropout rate, transition planning and post-school outcomes.

ECR continues to engage in collaborative efforts with DDOE’s CTE work group, DVR, DDDS, and DVI to provide and expand PIPEline to Career Success for Students with Disabilities to increase equity for students with disabilities in CTE. This multigenerational team initiative works in the context of students with disabilities to increase the enrollment, matriculation, graduation, and transition to postsecondary education and competitive employment of students with disabilities through CTE career pathways. The Student-Led PIPEline leadership program is a combination of Work-Based Learning and leadership development, offering a way for students to support their schools by recommending equity-building tools for their districts.

ECR continues to partner with Project Search which is a business-led, school-to-work program to support students in preparing for and transitioning to post high school life. Students develop competitive, marketable, and transferable skills in areas such as communication, teamwork, and problem solving to prepare them for employment in an integrated setting.

ECR continues to support training through the Customized Employment Boot Camp. This course has been designed as a “hit the ground running” experience for employment professionals and school personnel interested in a non-traditional approach to job development, known as Customized Employment (CE) to enhance opportunities of employment for individuals with moderate/significant disabilities.

ECR continues to support and collaborate with the GACEC to create resources for students and families, in multi-media formats, focused on transition throughout a student’s educational career.

ECR has established a Transition Advisory Group/NTACT team focused on building capacity of LEA staff. In May, 2023, under the leadership of ECR, Delaware sent a team to NTACT:C’s Post Secondary Transition Capacity Building Institute including parents, students, and representatives from LEAs, DVR, Community Integrated Services, PIC and the DDOE. The team worked collaboratively to develop a plan to guide Post Secondary Transition in Delaware and continues to meet monthly focused on the following goals:

- Increase Student Engagement in IEP and the Post Secondary Transition Process
- Increase and sustain youth Involvement and voice long-term
- Reach students and families in all areas and racial/minority identities
- Deliver concise and effective messaging to students and families about post-secondary transition
- Promote effective collaboration across agencies/schools/educators

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The SEA continues to engage stakeholders and agencies in discussions and analysis of data collection methods to ensure opportunities to reach all exiters.

Attention continues to focus on the under-represented categories. The SEA has continued discussions with sister agencies (Division of Vocation Rehabilitation, Division on Developmental Disabilities Services, Division for Visual Impairments) to examine respective data systems in an effort to better align systems and track individuals for post school outcomes data collection. DDOE will continue to partner with the Parent Information Center of Delaware to identify strategies to reach underrepresented groups. The SEA also continues to investigate the potential of using social media, email, and text messaging as an additional methods to raise response rates and to ensure representativeness of exiters.

The SEA has also worked with LEAs to ensure student contact information is correct/updated in Delaware’s state-wide pupil accounting system before

students exit the LEA.

In addition, the SEA will be meeting with legislative, agency and university representatives to begin discussions around aligning data systems to better track student transition planning and outcomes.

14 - OSEP Response

14 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2023 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results Indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	10
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	1

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Delaware embraces authentic stakeholder engagement throughout all areas of our work. Members of ECR have engaged in Leading by Convening training through NCSI and IDC, our national technical assistance centers, to enhance our stakeholder involvement. We believe to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, we must embrace and value our learning partnerships with parents, educators, advisory/advocacy groups, and community members. ECR realized that in order to broaden our stakeholder involvement, we also needed to deepen the levels of interactions among stakeholders. The DDOE has built a strong relationship with Delaware Parent Information Center (PIC), our IDEA PTI, to advance our engagement with parents. We partnered with PIC to embrace the four levels of interaction in Leading by Convening: informing (sharing information with others who care about the issue), networking (asking others what they think about the issue and listening to what they say), collaborating (engaging people in trying to do something by working together about the issue) and transforming (doing things The Partnership Way: leading by convening, cross-stakeholder engagement, shared leadership and consensus building). As we prepared to engage stakeholders in the process of data analysis and target setting for the new SPP/APR, PIC provided us with the support and strategies to involve many more parents in this process, focusing on increasing the appropriate breadth of representation and depth of interactions.

For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, as members of ECR prepared to engage stakeholders in analyzing Delaware data, setting targets and identifying improvement strategies and activities, each staff member utilized the Delaware Stakeholder Engagement Analysis Tool to ensure all demographics were addressed when inviting stakeholders (e.g.: race/ethnicity/ geographic locations/disability categories/advocacy groups/advisory groups/parents/families/etc.). 59 individual indicator stakeholder meetings took place that included sharing data, rich discussions regarding data analysis, target setting and improvement strategies.

During monthly meetings with Governor's Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens (GACEC), state IDEA advisory panel, as a whole council, as well as with council subcommittees, ECR engages with the council in data analysis and discussion of improvement activities around individual indicators. In addition, individual members represent GACEC on each specific indicator stakeholder committees. ECR also presented to and engaged all stakeholders/parents from the GACEC in discussion on indicator data analysis, input/feedback on target setting, and input/feedback on improvement activities and provided GACEC an additional opportunity to ask questions/provide input during an evening Q and A session designed specifically for them. GACEC provided DDOE with written input by the end of December. Presentations, data analysis, target setting discussions and improvement activities also took place at all County Special Ed Leadership Meetings to promote LEA Special Ed Directors and additional educators in the process of providing input/feedback as indicated above.

ECR staff, in cooperation with PIC, developed one-page, parent friendly fact sheets for each SPP/APR indicator and partnered with PIC to share with all 42 LEA Parent Councils for Special Education, and to the PIC parent distribution list of over 5,000 families. PIC utilized their social media platform to invite all parents to engage in Lunch and Learn Facebook Live sessions, where each ECR member presented their indicator information, engaged in a data analysis discussion, presented target proposals and improvement strategies. These sessions were scheduled both during the day and in the evening to ensure further opportunities for parent participation. In addition, ECR staff created individual indicator surveys to gather further input from parent stakeholders which was communicated during the "Lunch and Learn" sessions. Both the one-page fact sheets and surveys were translated from

English into Spanish and Haitian Creole to reach a wide range of families. To centralize all this information and to gain even further public input, ECR created an IDEA SPP/APR webpage which contains the one-page fact sheets for each indicator, a live link for individual surveys to gain additional input/feedback, the power point presentation used during stakeholder presentations and a copy of the previous SPP/APR, for reference. (<https://www.doe.k12.de.us/Page/4541>) DDOE utilized social media, such as the DDOE Facebook Page, to share this information statewide, in addition to posting info and live links in the Principals' Weekly Newsletter. To support this effort, PIC created a similar webpage which links to DDOE's webpage. To support the Informing stage of Leading by Convening, DDOE collected data to support the efforts on increasing the appropriate breadth of representation and depth of interactions from stakeholders through social media and websites. In addition, DDOE collected data on Networking, Collaborating and Transforming efforts.

Number of stakeholders who were reached by DDOE/PIC through Informing on social media and websites: 30,902

Number of stakeholders who were engaged by DDOE/PIC by Informing on social media and websites: 1,035

Number of stakeholders who were engaged with DDOE/PIC by Networking, Collaborating and Transforming through completing surveys and participating in meetings: 1,191

For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the DDOE continued to utilize Leading by Convening to meet with and engage stakeholders in analyzing data, developing strategies to support improvement activities, and evaluating progress toward targets for each indicator. Stakeholder groups include, but are not limited to, the GACEC, PIC, Access to the General Education Curriculum Committee, MTSS Leadership/Advisory, Special Education Leadership, Special Education Director County meetings, Special Education Director Charter meetings, Equity Professional Learning Community, and the Equity in IDEA Stakeholder Committee, Transition Cadre, Transition Advisory Group, Early Childhood Inclusion Committee, and Early Childhood Special Education Committee. ECR staff regularly engage stakeholders in activities to build capacity and deepen knowledge and understanding of the indicator/indicator data resulting in rich discussion around progress and evaluation of improvement activities.

For example, the DDOE was selected for a 4-year partnership with the SWIFT Center which will provide coaching and technical assistance for LEAs to support changes within systems, policies and practices that result in meaningful engagement in general education. ECR also engaged stakeholders in data analysis and discussions around improvement activities during Special Education Leadership meetings focusing on topics such as Significant Disproportionality, Transition Planning, Equity, Mediation, Universal Design for Learning, Accessible Instructional Materials and Child Find.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2015	50.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	50.00% - 60.00%	50.00% - 60.00%	50.00%-60.00%	55.00%	55.00%
Data	100.00%	75.00%	66.67%	16.67%	33.33%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	55.00%	55.00%	55.00%	55.00%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
1	10	33.33%	55.00%	10.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

There were 10 resolution meetings held. One resulted in a resolution settlement agreement, 2 cases were fully adjudicated, and 7 were withdrawn or dismissed. The total number of resolution sessions held from year to year are relatively small so any number change makes a large impact on the overall percentage of resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The Delaware Department of Education (DDOE) ensures that this data is complete, accurate, valid, and reliable for Indicator 15. COVID-19 did not impact DDOE's ability to collect the data as the DDOE remains in close communication with the hearing officers as to the status of the resolution meetings and their outcome for each due process case that is filed. Delaware submitted an application and later engaged in an interview process to become members of the Center for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education's (CADRE) Written State Complaint Intensive Technical Assistance Work Group. Delaware was one of nine states selected to participate in this intensive technical assistance work group. Delaware completed a self-assessment and created an action plan with goals. Delaware submitted progress reports on the established goals, engaged in quarterly work group calls, participated in networking resource sharing, and accessing individual state technical assistance as needed. Although the work group ended in June 2022, Delaware remains engaged with CADRE through the DMS calls, and webinars that they provide. In addition, the DDOE partnered and contracted with the Conflict Resolution Program at the University of Delaware to develop 30 minute or less webinars that LEAs can

access to learn skills for engaging parents, families, and school staff in the IEP team meeting process. The courses are entitled: Effective Conflict Management Strategies, Communication Skills for Managing Conflict, Planning and Leading Effective IEP Team Meetings, The Role of an IEP Team Meeting Facilitator, Cultural Competency and Diversity, and Building Consensus in IEP Team Meetings.

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1 times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1 Mediations held	9
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	1
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	1

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Delaware embraces authentic stakeholder engagement throughout all areas of our work. Members of ECR have engaged in Leading by Convening training through NCSI and IDC, our national technical assistance centers, to enhance our stakeholder involvement. We believe to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, we must embrace and value our learning partnerships with parents, educators, advisory/advocacy groups, and community members. ECR realized that in order to broaden our stakeholder involvement, we also needed to deepen the levels of interactions among stakeholders. The DDOE has built a strong relationship with Delaware Parent Information Center (PIC), our IDEA PTI, to advance our engagement with parents. We partnered with PIC to embrace the four levels of interaction in Leading by Convening: informing (sharing information with others who care about the issue), networking (asking others what they think about the issue and listening to what they say), collaborating (engaging people in trying to do something by working together about the issue) and transforming (doing things The Partnership Way: leading by convening, cross-stakeholder engagement, shared leadership and consensus building). As we prepared to engage stakeholders in the process of data analysis and target setting for the new SPP/APR, PIC provided us with the support and strategies to involve many more parents in this process, focusing on increasing the appropriate breadth of representation and depth of interactions.

For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, as members of ECR prepared to engage stakeholders in analyzing Delaware data, setting targets and identifying improvement strategies and activities, each staff member utilized the Delaware Stakeholder Engagement Analysis Tool to ensure all demographics were addressed when inviting stakeholders (e.g.: race/ethnicity/ geographic locations/disability categories/advocacy groups/advisory groups/parents/families/etc.). 59 individual indicator stakeholder meetings took place that included sharing data, rich discussions regarding data analysis, target setting and improvement strategies.

During monthly meetings with Governor's Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens (GACEC), state IDEA advisory panel, as a whole council, as well as with council subcommittees, ECR engages with the council in data analysis and discussion of improvement activities around individual indicators. In addition, individual members represent GACEC on each specific indicator stakeholder committees. ECR also presented to and engaged all stakeholders/parents from the GACEC in discussion on indicator data analysis, input/feedback on target setting, and input/feedback on improvement activities and provided GACEC an additional opportunity to ask questions/provide input during an evening Q and A session designed specifically for them. GACEC provided DDOE with written input by the end of December. Presentations, data analysis, target setting discussions and improvement activities also took place at all County Special Ed Leadership Meetings to promote LEA Special Ed Directors and additional educators in the process of providing input/feedback as indicated above.

ECR staff, in cooperation with PIC, developed one-page, parent friendly fact sheets for each SPP/APR indicator and partnered with PIC to share with all 42 LEA Parent Councils for Special Education, and to the PIC parent distribution list of over 5,000 families. PIC utilized their social media platform to invite all parents to engage in Lunch and Learn Facebook Live sessions, where each ECR member presented their indicator information, engaged in a data analysis discussion, presented target proposals and improvement strategies. These sessions were scheduled both during the day and in the

evening to ensure further opportunities for parent participation. In addition, ECR staff created individual indicator surveys to gather further input from parent stakeholders which was communicated during the "Lunch and Learn" sessions. Both the one-page fact sheets and surveys were translated from English into Spanish and Haitian Creole to reach a wide range of families. To centralize all this information and to gain even further public input, ECR created an IDEA SPP/APR webpage which contains the one-page fact sheets for each indicator, a live link for individual surveys to gain additional input/feedback, the power point presentation used during stakeholder presentations and a copy of the previous SPP/APR, for reference. (<https://www.doe.k12.de.us/Page/4541>) DDOE utilized social media, such as the DDOE Facebook Page, to share this information statewide, in addition to posting info and live links in the Principals' Weekly Newsletter. To support this effort, PIC created a similar webpage which links to DDOE's webpage. To support the Informing stage of Leading by Convening, DDOE collected data to support the efforts on increasing the appropriate breadth of representation and depth of interactions from stakeholders through social media and websites. In addition, DDOE collected data on Networking, Collaborating and Transforming efforts.

Number of stakeholders who were reached by DDOE/PIC through Informing on social media and websites: 30,902

Number of stakeholders who were engaged by DDOE/PIC by Informing on social media and websites: 1,035

Number of stakeholders who were engaged with DDOE/PIC by Networking, Collaborating and Transforming through completing surveys and participating in meetings: 1,191

For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the DDOE continued to utilize Leading by Convening to meet with and engage stakeholders in analyzing data, developing strategies to support improvement activities, and evaluating progress toward targets for each indicator. Stakeholder groups include, but are not limited to, the GACEC, PIC, Access to the General Education Curriculum Committee, MTSS Leadership/Advisory, Special Education Leadership, Special Education Director County meetings, Special Education Director Charter meetings, Equity Professional Learning Community, and the Equity in IDEA Stakeholder Committee, Transition Cadre, Transition Advisory Group, Early Childhood Inclusion Committee, and Early Childhood Special Education Committee. ECR staff regularly engage stakeholders in activities to build capacity and deepen knowledge and understanding of the indicator/indicator data resulting in rich discussion around progress and evaluation of improvement activities.

For example, the DDOE was selected for a 4-year partnership with the SWIFT Center which will provide coaching and technical assistance for LEAs to support changes within systems, policies and practices that result in meaningful engagement in general education. ECR also engaged stakeholders in data analysis and discussions around improvement activities during Special Education Leadership meetings focusing on topics such as Significant Disproportionality, Transition Planning, Equity, Mediation, Universal Design for Learning, Accessible Instructional Materials and Child Find.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2015	76.92%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	70.00% - 80.00%	70.00% - 80.00%	70.00%-80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
Data	88.89%	77.78%	80.00%	50.00%	60.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
1	1	9	60.00%	80.00%	22.22%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Slippage did not occur. Data did not meet the threshold of a total of 10.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The Delaware Department of Education (DDOE) ensures that this data is complete, accurate, valid, and reliable for Indicator 16. COVID-19 prevented in-person mediation. The Office of Conflict Resolution Program (CRP) at the University of Delaware (contracted vendor that provides Delaware's special education mediation services) swiftly moved to a remote platform by continuing to offer and provide mediation services virtually. In addition, steps were taken to mitigate the logistical impacts of COVID-19 by developing guidance documents and technical assistance which focused on technology use and best practices while engaging with others in a virtual realm. Data collection for this indicator was not impacted by COVID-19. The CRP and the Education Associate at DDOE that manages the dispute resolution system remained in close communication via email and phone to record the data and then conducted interrater reliability checks in completing Table 7. Delaware submitted an application and later engaged in an interview process to become members of the Center for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education's (CADRE) Written State Complaint Intensive Technical Assistance Work Group. Delaware was one of nine states selected to participate in this intensive technical assistance work group. Delaware completed a self-assessment and created an action plan with goals. Delaware submitted progress reports on the established goals, engaged in quarterly work

group calls, participated in networking resource sharing, and accessing individual state technical assistance as needed. Although the work group ended in June 2022, Delaware remains engaged with CADRE through the DMS calls webinars that they provide.

DDOE is actively partnering with our mediation contractors and the Parent Information Center Inc. to collaborate in promoting mediation services to parents and LEAs. Through this partnership we have offered webinars and technical assistance resources focusing on culturally responsive mediation. Currently, we are engaged in completing the Cultural and Linguistic Competence self-assessment provided by CADRE. In addition, we have received technical assistance and support from CADRE as we journey through this process. In addition, the DDOE partnered and contracted with the Conflict Resolution Program at the University of Delaware to develop 30 minute or less webinars that LEAs can access to learn skills for engaging parents, families, and school staff in the IEP team meeting process. The courses are entitled: Effective Conflict Management Strategies, Communication Skills for Managing Conflict, Planning and Leading Effective IEP Team Meetings, The Role of an IEP Team Meeting Facilitator, Cultural Competency and Diversity, and Building Consensus in IEP Team Meetings.

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2022. The State is not required to meet its targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

Instructions

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) (SiMR) for Children with Disabilities.

Targets: In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2022 through February 2027, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which, in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates)) outlined above):

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which, in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates)) outlined above):

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, (e.g., a logic model) of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., February 1, 2023). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

To increase the literacy proficiency of SWD in K-3rd grade, as measured by a decrease in the percentage of third grade SWD scoring below proficiency on Delaware’s reading statewide assessments (Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) and the Delaware System of Student Assessment-Alternate (DeSSA-ALT)).

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State’s theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

<https://www.doe.k12.de.us/cms/lib/DE01922744/Centricity/Domain/78/SSIP%20Phase%20I%20TOA%201.24.22.pdf>

Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2017	87.72%

Targets

FFY	Current Relationship	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	Data must be less than or equal to the target	81.72%	79.72%	77.72%	75.72%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of 3rd Grade Students with Disabilities Not Proficient on SBAC or DeSSA-ALT	Number of 3rd Grade Students with Disabilities Tested on SBAC or DeSSA-ALT	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
1,691	2,008	82.39%	81.72%	84.21%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide the data source for the FFY 2022 data.

Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) reading assessment and the reading component of the Delaware System of Student Assessment Alternative (DeSSA - Alt) for third grade SWD.

Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.

The DDOE Office of Assessment is responsible for collecting, analyzing, and reporting on the SBAC and DeSSA - Alt results. This analysis includes but is not limited to gender, race, MLL students, and low-income groups. These comparisons are completed at a state and LEA level and involve stakeholders including LEAs, parents, and partners. The data are then reviewed by the DE SSIP Core Team to interpret the results for SSIP reporting.

Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)

YES

Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.

The Student Success Block Grant (SSBG) Reading Interventionist (RI) Program provides funding to Delaware 36 schools to fund a Reading Interventionist to work with students requiring tiered interventions. After the fall and spring administration of each school's universal screening assessment, the RIs provide data on the percentage of students they served who scored well below screening benchmarks, below the benchmark, and at, or above the screening benchmark, for students in kindergarten through fifth grade. They provided disaggregated data for SWD and MLL students. As schools use different universal screening assessments, the RIs were told to use scoring guides from their particular assessment and their professional judgment to determine which category best fit students' performance. iReady Diagnostic was the most used universal screening instrument (n=16). Thirteen RIs reported using the Bookworms Informal Decoding Inventory (IDI) or DIBELS 8 instrument. Nine RIs used DIBELS Next/Acadience Reading and eight used a curriculum-based measure.

For all students, between fall 2022 and spring 2023, there was a decrease of 10% in the percentage of students in kindergarten through fifth grade served by RIs who scored well below the screening benchmark (73% in the fall – 63% in the spring) and an 8% increase in the percentage of students who met or exceeded the screening benchmarks (5% in the fall – 13% in the spring). Disaggregating these data by grade, the largest impact was for kindergarten students, with 37% meeting or exceeding the screening benchmark at the end of the year, an increase of 30% from the beginning of the year. Except for fifth grade students, students in all other grades showed progress in meeting or exceeding screening benchmarks between the beginning and end of the year.

For students with disabilities, there was minimal change in the percentage of SWD served who scored at each screening benchmark level. At the end of the year, 4% of SWD met or exceeded the screening benchmark, down slightly from 5% at the beginning of the year. Disaggregating these data by grade, there was a decrease in the percentage of SWD in kindergarten (-14%) and fifth grade (-8%) who met or exceeded the screening benchmark, between the beginning and end of the year. At the kindergarten level, there was a corresponding 21% increase in students scoring below the screening benchmark, with an 18% decrease in the percentage of SWD who scored well below the screening benchmark. SWD served by RIs in first grade classrooms who met or exceeded the screening benchmark increased by 6%. At second through fourth grade, the percentage of SWD who met or exceeded the screening benchmark demonstrated minimal, if any change, between the beginning and end of the year.

For all multilingual learners, there was a decrease of 13% in the percentage of MLL students served who scored well below the screening benchmark (86% in the fall – 73% in the spring) and a 6% increase in the percentage of MLL students who met or exceeded the screening benchmarks (3% in the fall – 9% in the spring). Disaggregating these data by grade, the largest impact was found for MLL students in kindergarten classrooms, where the percentage of MLL students who met or exceeded the screening benchmark increased from none (0%) at the beginning of the year, to 15% at the end of the year. Gains in the percentage of MLL students who met or exceeded the screening benchmark were also found at second grade (+4%), third grade (+13%), and fourth grade (+8%).

Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.

<https://www.doe.k12.de.us/cms/lib/DE01922744/Centricity/Domain/78/DE%20SSIP%20Project%20Level%20Evaluation%20Plan%201.24.22.pdf>

Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:

Three infrastructure improvement strategies were implemented in 2022-23. They included teaming, evidence-based professional learning, and stakeholder engagement.

Five teams were used to support the implementation of the DE SSIP Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) and early literacy infrastructure improvement strategies. This included a focus on governance, standards, accountability, and monitoring through collaborative teaming; professional learning; and family engagement.

TEAMING

MTSS Core Team

The DE MTSS Core Team consisted of 14 members from various DDOE offices. This group was responsible for direct oversight and support of MTSS and early literacy professional learning. The Core Team met 15 times during the 2022-23 school year.

MTSS Implementation Team:

The MTSS Implementation Team (LT) consisted of the MTSS Core Team members, plus representatives from the DE Parent Information Center (PIC), and the DE PBS and ACCESS Projects from the University of Delaware who focus on Positive Behavior Supports, Social Emotional Learning, and Universal Design for Learning. The Implementation Team provided the coordination and leadership to build the capacity of state, LEA, charter, and school personnel to implement an integrated MTSS framework. This included (1) a focus on multidirectional communication with stakeholders, including families, to increase capacity for MTSS implementation and (2) support for the alignment of initiatives to improve whole child outcomes and use data to continuously improve supports for LEAs, charters, schools, and families. The Implementation Team met five times during the 2022-23 school year.

MTSS Advisory Council

The MTSS Advisory Council (with approximately 65 stakeholders) provided advice on SSIP work related to governance, standards, accountability, and monitoring. No formal meetings were held during 2023-23. The MTSS Advisory Council included personnel from the DDOE, LEAs and schools, community agencies, SSIP staff, and family representatives. DDOE staff worked with individual Advisory Council members, such as the DE PIC, to

develop resources and tools to support MTSS and literacy efforts.

DE Literacy Plan Leadership Team

As the DE SSIP became directly aligned with the professional learning system supporting the DE Literacy Plan, it became apparent that a DE Literacy Plan Leadership Team was needed. The Team consisted of Paige Morgan, Elementary English Language Arts/Literacy Education Associate; Samantha Lougheed, Jalee Brown, from ECR; and Brent Garrett, the DE SSIP external evaluator. The Team provided oversight on the implementation of DE Literacy Plan professional learning, focusing on the inclusion of training and support related to SWD. The Team met formally on a quarterly basis, and informally as needed.

DE Early Literacy Advisory Group

In 2022, the DDOE established an Early Literacy Advisory Group to guide and support implementation of early literacy legislation. The Advisory Group was composed of representatives from the DDOE Academic Support Team and ECR, LEAs, and other partners. They met four times during 2022-23 (November, January, March, and May) to gain insight and feedback to further support LEAs and charter schools with selection of high-quality instructional materials, aligned professional learning to support evidence-based reading instruction, the selection and implementation of universal screeners, diagnostic tools, and reading interventions.

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING STRATEGIES

The completion of the DE State Personnel Development Grant a cohort model of professional learning in 2021-22 caused the DDOE to reexamine the improvement strategies necessary to impact the DE SSIP SiMR and related outcomes. Two original sets of related professional learning offerings were provided during 2022-23. They included five MTSS and five DELI training modules and the Delaware Literacy Coalition. The new improvement strategies, Student Success Block Grant (SSBG) Reading Interventionist (RI) Program, the DE Literacy Plan Training Series, and the Systematic Processes for Enhancing and Assessing Communication Supports (SPEACS) are discussed in the next section.

MTSS and DELI Modules

In September 2021, AIR staff, with review from DDOE staff, created five MTSS and five Delaware Early Literacy Initiative (DELI) training modules available to all Delaware Educators. The modules are housed on Schoology, a virtual platform available to all Delaware educators. The MTSS modules are (1) Delaware MTSS Overview, (2) Building an Effective Tier 1 System, (3) Universal Screening Process, (4) Tier 2 and Tier 3, and (5) Effective Progress Monitoring. The DELI modules are (1) Overview of Explicit Instruction, (2) Foundational Reading Skills, (3) Vocabulary and Comprehension, (4) Intensive Intervention in Reading, and (5) Effective Writing Instruction. At the end of the 2022-23 school year, 72 educators had completed the evaluation survey for all five MTSS modules and 34 educators had completed the evaluation survey for all five DELI modules.

Delaware Literacy Coalition

The Coalition is a Community of Practice (CoP) with a mission to ensure all Delaware students leave high school with levels of proficiency that will benefit them academically and in the workplace. The CoP included literacy supervisors/coordinators from Delaware public schools who lead, coordinate, and/or evaluate school and LEA literacy programs. The CoP also included representatives from post-secondary institutions, community organizations, and the DDOE. The Coalition meets monthly to learn and collaborate to improve and support K-12 ELA instructional practices. These efforts were further enhanced through Communication and Collaboration Network (CCN) monthly meetings of statewide LEA curriculum directors, supervisors, and leaders along with DDOE. CCN focuses on shared decision making on EESA implementation, legislation, and additional initiatives. Both groups provided valuable stakeholder input and collaboration for the SSIP and related endeavors.

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

The DE SSIP engaged stakeholders with the assistance of the DE PIC, and meetings with the Governor's Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens (GACEC). The DE PIC supported the SSIP family engagement activities to increase parents' understanding of MTSS and early literacy. The DE PIC continued to make accessible the numerous MTSS and literacy resources developed in previous years. In July 2022, the DE PIC and AIR staff provided a four-part webinar series on: Overview of Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), Partnering with Families within MTSS, Data-Based Decision Making, and High-Leverage Practices.

During this reporting period, the DDOE developed the At Home Guide TO Delivering Strong Early Readers. This guide is available from the DDOE and provides an overview of how families and caregivers can support their children's literacy development at home. Topics included comprehension, fluency, oral language, phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, and writing. A total of 63 people registered for the course.

Two SSIP presentations were made to the GACEC, addressing state assessment data and improvement strategies.

Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.

TEAMING

During the 2022-23 school year, no formal evaluation data were collected at any of the teaming events. Processes have been put in place to collect feedback data from teaming participants to inform further work on this improvement strategy. The number of meetings held were reported on in the previous section.

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING STRATEGIES

MTSS and DELI Modules

During the 2022-23 school year, 164 educators registered for the MTSS course and 109 (66%) completed the five modules. The number of educators who completed at least one of the five MTSS modules training evaluation surveys ranged from 149 for the first module to 72 for the fifth module. On average, across all modules, 97% of respondents reported the modules increased their knowledge of the MTSS content addressed, the information was useful for supporting MTSS implementation, and the modules were of high quality. Using data from the first module, general education teachers (n=44) and special education teachers (n=33) were most likely to have completed the MTSS course evaluation survey.

At the end of the 2022-23 school year, 149 educators registered for the DELI modules and 93 (62%) completed the five modules. The number of completed evaluation surveys for at least one of the five DELI modules ranged from 72 for the first module to 34 for the fifth module. The degree of participation with the DELI modules was much lower than with the MTSS modules. On average, across all DELI modules, 94% of respondents reported the modules increased their knowledge of the DELI content addressed, the information was useful for supporting the literacy development of students, and the modules were of high quality. Using data from the first module, general education teachers (n=21), LEA or school coaches/ instructional support (n=15), and special education teachers (n=9) were the most frequent respondents to the DELI course evaluation survey.

Information on the MTSS and DELI module outcomes were communicated with the MTSS Core and Leadership Teams. The outcomes addressed above relate to DE's professional development and technical assistance (TA) framework. As the number of educators implementing MTSS practices increases, this directly impacts Delaware's effort to scale up and sustain the use of MTSS.

Delaware Literacy Coalition

Administrators participating in the DE Literacy Coalition's Communication Collaboration Network (CCN) were surveyed during the 2022-23 school year to determine the status of MTSS implementation across Delaware EAs. Administrators from 11 LEAs or charter schools responded, using an instrument developed by CNN members. All respondents felt that they were at least at Stage 2 – Planning across the five MTSS components. The MTSS components LEAs most frequently reported being at Stage 2 were Planning for Data-Based Decision Making (5 5%), Team-Based Leadership (55%), and Resources, Supports, and Interventions (45%). The MTSS components LEAs most frequently reported being at Stage 3 were Implementing for

Tiered System of Support (55%) and Comprehensive Assessment Systems (45%). Across the five MTSS components, on average, 13% of the respondents felt their LEAs were in Stage 4 – Continuously Improving.

The results of the CCN survey were disseminated throughout the CCN and the Delaware Literacy Coalition, reaching each LEA in the state. The survey addressed the following systems framework components: governance, data, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development, and TA. The CCN and the Delaware Literacy Coalition support scale-up and sustainability efforts across the state.

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

For the SSIP, DDOE engaged a variety of stakeholder groups which included several MTSS teams, Access to the General Education Curriculum Committee (AGEC), collaborations with the Delaware PIC, Governor's Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens (GACEC-IDEA State Advisory Panel), and LEA Special Education Directors.

The AGEC has a variety of purposes including: (1) assistance in activities about access to general education curriculum; (2) advise and give recommendations to the DDOE; (3) review best practices; (4) network and share strategies; and (5) coordinate with other initiatives and activities. The AGEC includes 40 diverse members with representation from LEAs, the DE PIC, Institutes of Higher Learning, and advocacy partners. The AGEC meets several times a year to review data and discuss improvement strategies.

The DE PIC is a valuable partner of DDOE. Not only do their staff participate in numerous state initiatives, but they assist in the outreach to parents and community members. They have contributed by creating and sharing many academic and MTSS resources and co-facilitating trainings for parents on education topics.

The GACEC is the review board for policies, procedures, and practices related to the delivery of services for all Delaware residents with exceptionalities or disabilities. The GACEC also serves as the State Advisory Panel for agencies providing educational services and programs to children through the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The volunteer council and agency staff participate on over 60 councils, boards, or committees, such as the DOE AGEC, Developmental Disabilities Council (DDC), State Council for Persons with Disabilities (SCPD), and the Center for Disabilities Studies Community Advisory Council (CAC), etc. DDOE staff participate in their monthly public meetings. Two meetings last year were SSIP specific. GACEC partners in the data review and provided valuable input on improvement activities and progress.

DDOE staff met quarterly with LEA Special Education Directors. 125 directors and their teams meet by the county they serve. The meetings focused on reviewing targets, analyzing data, input on improvement activities, and collaboration around special education related items. The DDOE also started a Continuous Improvement Partnership with directors to discuss various indicators such as 3 and 17 and to share improvement strategies that are successful within the LEAs. This has been a valuable method of gathering and sharing stakeholder feedback while building capacity and sustainability of special education leadership within the state.

The outcomes related to stakeholder engagement activities were directly communicated with the Delaware PIC, the GACEC, and LEA Special Education Directors, as discussed above. The stakeholder engagement activities focused on governance, accountability/monitoring, and quality standards. Collaborating with these groups, each with a statewide focus will facilitate the DDOE's effort to support and sustain SSIP activities.

Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)

YES

Describe each new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved.

As discussed in last year's Indicator 17 report, modifications to the DE SSIP began in 2021-22, with the completion of Delaware's State Personnel Development Grant and a cohort method of professional learning. This allowed the DDOE to reexamine the improvement strategies necessary to impact our SiMR. The new improvement strategies aligned with the DE SSIP include the Student Success Block Grant (SSBG) Reading Interventionist (RI) Program, the DE Literacy Plan Training Series, and the Systematic Processes for Enhancing and Assessing Communication Supports (SPEACS). These new strategies were introduced in the 2023 Indicator 17 report, implemented in 2022-23, and are included in this report.

SSBG RI Program-To support the implementation of the DE Literacy Plan, the DDOE launched the SSBG RI program to fund one RI per elementary school with enrollments that are either at least 60% students experiencing poverty or 20 percent Multi-Lingual Learners (MLLs). A total of 38 schools participated in 2022-23. During 2022-23, there were eight meetings with the SSBG RIs. These meetings trained RIs on MTSS, MLL reading strategies, the use of tiered interventions, and data collection and analysis strategies. A total of 36 RIs responded to the 2023 RI Post-Survey, providing feedback on the impact of the professional learning provided in 2022-23. The most frequent responsibilities of the RIs were providing small group or individual intervention instruction to students (n=32) and leading or participating in MTSS meetings, managing and analyzing data, using a pull-out model, and administering assessments (all n=31). Next, RIs listed the MTSS topics covered that impacted their work directly with students, during conversations at Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), with decision-making at MTSS meetings, and/or conversations with buildings leaders. The most helpful aspects of the professional learning were the critical features of Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction (n=25), key considerations when selecting and evaluating evidence-based interventions (dosage, alignment, attention to transfer, comprehensiveness) and Regulation 508 (both, n=20). The RIs also provided data on the number of students they served in each Tier for all students and disaggregated data for SWD and MLL students. These data were also disaggregated by grade. Due to the character limitations in this report, we only provide data for SWD here. A full report is available from the DDOE. Almost two-thirds of the SWD served by RIs received Tier 3 support at the beginning (63%) and the end (64%) of the school year. There was a 5% increase between the beginning (12%) and the end of the year (17%) in the percent of SWD served who were receiving Tier 1 support. The RIs met most frequently with SWD in first through third grade and the least often with SWD in kindergarten classes.

DE Literacy Plan Professional Learning Opportunities-The DE Literacy Plan supports many professional learning opportunities that address early literacy from an educator's and administrator's perspective. The courses addressed reading, writing, assessment, and leadership. A summary of the four primary sets of courses and micro-credentials offered are below.

LETRS (Lexia)-The goal is for educators to complete the Volume 1, Volume 2, and the facilitator trainings. Educators who attain facilitator status can provide training within their LEA and across the state, serving as a capacity building mechanism. Participants interested in becoming a LETRS Facilitator Trainer to lead future LETRS trainings themselves must score 88% or higher on the LETRS post-test.

AIM Pathways-The goal is to increase the number of AIM Pathway facilitators in Delaware. Participants must complete the Pathways to Proficient Reading course, the Pathways to Structured Literacy course, and a practicum, prior to taking the AIM Pathway Facilitator training. Participants must score 85% on the knowledge inventory to move to the next level. A Pathways to Literacy Leadership course is offered in the summer to build principals' understanding of early literacy components.

University of Delaware School Success Center Courses-The School Success Center offers courses through the University of Delaware and are posted on the DDOE's Professional Development Management System (PDMS). These courses support educators exploring the micro-credential pathway and help to support their knowledge with the Science of Reading and Writing-Overview K-2 and Early Writing Course K-2.

Micro-credentials-There are 29 micro-credentials on DE's Digital DE Early Literacy website as part of a full complement of early literacy, Tier 1 instruction, and universal design for learning.

The following courses were offered during 2022-23, with the number of completers in parenthesis: LETRS K-5 Volume 1 (71) and Volume 2 (18), Pathways to Proficient Reading (40), Science of Reading (22), Science of Writing (14), Reading and Writing Connections (13), Cognitive Model of Reading Assessment (11), Understanding Text Complexity (11), Pathways to Structured Literacy (7). On average, the course ratings were very high. Using a four-point scale, with four indicating high agreement, respondents rated: (1) the impact on knowledge of the training content = 3.92; (2) the quality, relevance, and usefulness of the courses = 3.97; (3) the use of adult learning principles = 3.93; and (4) the quality of communication and virtual platform = 3.93.

SPEACS-SPEACS's goal is to improve communication, literacy, and educational services to students with complex communication needs who

participate in the DeSSA - Alt. It is built on the premise that all students communicate. The main objective of SPEACS is to assist school teams to progress students from pre-symbolic and emergent communication to symbolic communication, while also improving academic outcomes. This includes emerging literacy topics, such as alphabetic principles, emergent reading and writing skills, as well as conventional literacy topics including word study, reading comprehension, and writing.

Support is tailored to each educator team through observations, modeling, online learning experiences, book studies, lesson studies, and technical assistance. There were 68 SPEACS TA events during 2022-23. These ranged from large groups to individualized sessions with personnel from the Brandywine School District. No other LEAs participated.

Due to staffing changes, SPEACS did not begin working with Brandywine School District until December 2022. In December, team members focused on planning for the remainder of the 2022-23 school year. A pre-assessment, given in January 2023, helped to determine a baseline for participants foundational communication skills. Data from the pre-assessment found that participants had a wide range of experience with Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) and implementing AAC in the classroom. However, most classroom teachers who completed the survey had little to no experience with AAC in their classroom.

In February and May 2023, SPEACS coaches conducted pre/post observations on the use of literacy and communication strategies by the four SPEACS teachers. Visits were about 20 minutes and were held when ELA was taught. The observation form was adapted from ASHA's Classroom Profile for Integrated Communication Supports: A Framework to Support Augmentative and Alternative Communication Coaching Services in School Setting. The four literacy domains observed included the use of phonemic awareness or phonics, reading comprehension, vocabulary, and vocabulary fluency. In February and May, all teachers were observed to be in the emerging category. The most observed literacy practice was the use of phonemic awareness or phonics. In March, the use of AAC and/or communication supports to promote vocabulary fluency was not evident in the classroom visits. No teachers were exemplary in their use of AAC and/or communication devices during any visit.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

TEAMING

The DDOE was selected by the SWIFT Education center as an Intensive Model Demonstration Site Partner to collaborate over four years, focused on demonstrating how to move from inclusion toward rightful presence for students who are left out or kept at the margins of school. This new endeavor, along with the recently created DE-MTSS TA Center, will be governed by a MTSS Core team to manage the center and partner with grant staff, the MTSS Leadership Team which includes the addition of integrated group of DDOE directors that will guide the work of the MTSS Implementation Team to work alongside LEAs. With the repurposing of the existing MTSS teams, the MTSS Advisory Council will continue as a valuable stakeholder group as needed. The redesign of the different SSIP teams during 2022-23 has already improved the efficacy of these teams, with more frequent and consistent communication and coordination across the DDOE and among the stakeholder groups listed below.

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING STRATEGIES

MTSS and DELI (Delaware Early Literacy Initiative) Modules

The modules continue to be available to all Delaware educators through Schoology. The DDOE has added competency-based components to the modules, as part of our PLC Toolkit. The competencies are aligned to the Science of Reading and include a Facilitators Guide so they can be used as a professional learning option during LEA or schools PLCs. The importance of implementing evidence-based early literacy strategies for all students through an MTSS framework will continue to be emphasized. The primary outcomes of the modules will be increased capacity of Delaware educators to better implement MTSS practices across the state, impacting Delaware's effort to scale up and sustain the use of MTSS.

SSBG RI Program

On the 2023 spring report: RIs were also asked what additional information they would like regarding MLL students, MTSS, and any other topics. They were most interested in learning more about addressing socio-cultural factors, using meaningful assessments, and making cross-language connections to support MLL students. They wanted additional MTSS information on HB 304, key considerations when selecting and evaluating evidence-based interventions, comprehensive assessment systems, and Regulation 508. Other topics RIs were interested in learning more about included the selection of academic and non-academic resources, supports, and interventions; tiered systems of support; and team-based leadership. These will be DDOE's focus in the 2023-24 school year. As the RIs increase their capacity to support the use of tiered interventions, team-based leadership, and MTSS; and support of SWD and MLL students, the educators they support will enhance their skills in these areas, ultimately impacting the academic outcomes of all students.

DE Literacy Plan Professional Development Opportunities

The following professional development opportunities will continue for the 2023-2024 school year. These offerings are important factors in capacity building and sustainability. Participating educators will become more skilled to teach reading and writing and will develop the necessary leadership skills to support and sustain on going professional learning in reading and writing. The courses are advertised on DDOE website, mailings, social media, and during meetings.

LETRS (Lexia)

AIM Pathways

University of Delaware School Success Center (SSC)

Micro-credentials

SPEACS

Aligning SPEACS with the DE Literacy Plan professional learning activities will support literacy efforts for all Delaware students. SPEACS will expand within the current participating LEA and will add an additional LEA. A special interest group on Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) will be developed to address communication and literacy. The DDOE will focus on finalization and promotion of Schoology, a parent one-page infographic, and a parent webinar titled Communication is a Right. These professional learning activities will increase the capacity of low incidence teachers and other school staff to improve reading outcomes for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

Comprehensive Literacy for All Book Studies

Two book studies will be offered in two different sessions: one for Leaders and one for Parents and community members. The book studies will increase the capacity of school leaders to support reading, writing, language and communication instruction, as integrated part of comprehensive literacy instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities and complex communication needs.

Delaware Literacy Coalition

Literacy leaders will continue to meet and address literacy and curriculum topics under the guidance of the steering committee. In December 2022, the Steering Committee led the development of the Coalition's strategic plan to improve literacy achievement outcomes for students in grades 4-8. These additional goals will be added to the efforts for early literacy for 2023-24 school year. The ongoing support and collaboration with the Delaware Literacy Coalition will enhance cross-state communication, scale-up, and sustainability efforts related to reading instruction for all students, including SWD.

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

The DDOE values stakeholder engagement, particularly with families, and keeps it as a critical component in all early literacy efforts. This is evident through above mentioned book studies and webinars targeted to parents and community members as part of SPEACs. The DDOE will continue their partnership with the DE PIC to communicate and gather feedback from families regarding early literacy topics. The DE PIC will remain an active partner through the newly formed Early Literacy Advisory Group and the MTSS Advisory Group. This collaborative effort will assist our ongoing sustainability efforts. Similar to the outcomes for the Delaware Literacy Coalition, the ongoing support and collaboration with the stakeholder groups discussed in this report will improve cross-state communication, scale-up, and sustainability efforts related to reading instruction for all students, including SWD.

List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:

1. MTSS Implementation
2. Evidence-Based Early Literacy Instruction

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

MTSS Implementation

The DE-MTSS framework was designed to meet the needs of the whole child through an integrated, multilevel prevention system that optimizes team-based leadership and data-driven decision-making to meet the academic and nonacademic needs of all students. Educators provide high-quality, core academic instruction and nonacademic practices as universal supports to all children. School teams use a universal screening process to identify students who need additional help, and they deliver evidence-based interventions and supports that match student needs and are informed by ongoing progress monitoring and additional formative assessments. Like previous years, 2022-23 DE SSIP activities focused mainly on the implementation of professional learning offerings and resources to support MTSS implementation, to support the new MTSS regulations that went into effect in July 2021. More information on the implementation of the professional learning improvement strategies was addressed in the previous sections of this report.

Evidence-Based Early Literacy Instruction

DE SSIP early literacy instruction was based on reading research provided by the National Reading Panel (2000), National Literacy Panel (2006), and various What Works Clearinghouse practice guides (i.e., Baker et al., 2014; Gersten et al., 2007) that indicated the importance of explicit instruction in phonemic awareness, phonics, reading fluency, vocabulary, and reading comprehension. Additionally, the findings of Snow, Burns, & Griffin (1998) highlight the benefit of interactive literacy activities and oral language skills.

Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes.

MTSS Implementation

Improved MTSS processes will impact the SiMR by changing LEA policies to identify students in need of extra reading support and providing them with targeted interventions. Through the MTSS and DELI modules, the SSBG RI Program, and CCN dissemination activities, we expect to see LEAs and schools develop policies to support MTSS implementation, that lead to better teacher practices that improve student outcomes. The DDOE was selected by the SWIFT Education Center as an Intensive Model Demonstration Site Partner to move from inclusion toward rightful presence for students who are left out or kept at the margins of school. This new endeavor, along with the recently created DE-MTSS TA Center, are governed by the MTSS Core Team. This Team manages the Center and partners with grant staff and the MTSS Leadership Team to guide the work of the MTSS Implementation Team. With the repurposing of the existing MTSS teams, the MTSS Advisory Council will continue as a valuable partner for MTSS and literacy projects. These activities will improve teachers' instructional practices and ultimately improve outcomes.

SSBG RI Program – Tiered Instruction

On the beginning and end of the year Summary of Service Survey, RIs provided data on the number of all students they served in each Tier, and disaggregated data for SWD and MLL students. These data were also disaggregated by grade. Due to the character limitations in this report, we only provide data for SWD here. A full report is available from the DDOE.

Almost two-thirds of the SWD served by RIs received Tier 3 support at the beginning (63%) and the end (64%) of the year. There was a 5% increase between the beginning and the end of the year in the percentage of SWD served who received Tier 1 support. The RIs met most often with SWD in first through third grade and the least often with kindergarten SWD. These outcomes demonstrate that ongoing support of the SSBG RI Program will improve teachers' instructional practices, particularly related to tiered interventions, leading to improved student outcomes.

Communication Collaboration Network (CCN)

As discussed previously, administrators participating in the CCN were surveyed in the 2022-23 to learn the status of MTSS implementation in DE LEAs. Administrators from 11 LEAs or charter schools responded. All respondents felt that they were at least at Stage 2 – Planning across the five MTSS components. Most respondents felt their LEAs were at Stage 2 – Planning for Data-Based Decision Making (55%), Team-Based Leadership (55%), and Resources, Supports, and Interventions (45%). Most respondents felt their LEAs were at Stage 3 – Implementing for Tiered System of Support (55%) and Comprehensive Assessment Systems (45%). Across the five MTSS components, 13% of respondents felt their LEAs were in Stage 4 – Continuously Improving. While these results reflect only a sample of DE LEAs, they demonstrate progress in MTSS implementation and the use of data to support their implementation. The continued collaboration with CCN will improve LEAs' policies, procedures, and practices. These improved governance practices will lead to improved instructional practices, particularly related to tiered interventions, and ultimately will improve student outcomes.

Evidence-Based Early Literacy Instruction

Improved evidence-based literacy instruction will impact student outcomes by improving students' early literacy knowledge. The early literacy professional learning that supports the DE Literacy Plan Training series, the SSBG RI Program, and SPEACS; as well as CCN dissemination activities support the DE SiMR. Specific data on the impact of improved early literacy instruction were gathered through the SSBG RI Program and from state assessment results.

SSBG RI Program – Universal Screening Data

As stated earlier, after the fall and spring administration of each school's universal screening assessment, the RIs provided data on the number of students they served who scored well below benchmark, below the benchmark, and at, or above the benchmark, for students in grades K-5. They provided disaggregated data for SWD and MLL students. Due to the character limitations in this report, we only provide data for SWD here. A full report is available from the DDOE. As LEAs use different universal screening assessments, RIs were told to use scoring guides from their particular assessment and their professional judgment to determine which category best fit students' performance. Below is a summary of the results from the beginning and end of year Summary of Service survey. These outcomes highlight the need to continue SSIP support to improve teachers' use of data to inform their instruction, particularly related to tiered interventions, which will lead to improved student outcomes.

For students with disabilities, there was minimal change in the percentage of SWD served who scored at each benchmark level. At the end of the year, 4% of SWD met or exceeded the benchmark, down slightly from 5% at the beginning of the year. Disaggregating these data by grade, there was a decrease in the percentage of SWD in kindergarten (-14%) and 5th grade (-8%) who met or exceeded the screening benchmark, between the beginning and end of the year. At the kindergarten level, there was a corresponding 21% increase in students scoring below the screening benchmark, with an 18% decrease in the percentage of SWD who scored well below the screening benchmark. SWD served by RIs in 1st grade classrooms who met or exceeded the screening benchmark increased by 6%. At 2nd through 4th grade, the percentage of SWD who met or exceeded the screening benchmark demonstrated minimal, if any change, between the beginning and end of the year.

SSBG RI Program – Progress Monitoring Data

On the middle of the year Summary of Service Survey, RIs reported on the number of the students served who achieved differing levels of performance during the most recent progress monitoring cycle. Like the discussion above about universal screening data, with LEAs using different progress monitoring assessments, RIs used scoring guides from their particular assessment and their professional judgment to determine which category best fit students' performance.

The results were disaggregated by all students, SWD, and MLL students, however there was little variance in results across the 3 groups. For each group of students, a similar percentage (58% - 59%) made adequate progress across the progress monitoring cycle, but did not achieve their established benchmarks. The next largest group of students in each group (17% - 19%) made inadequate progress, followed by 12% of students in each group who made adequate progress and met their specified benchmarks.

State Assessment Data

As discussed earlier, SBAC and DeSSA - Alt data were used to inform our SiMR. Between the two assessments, 84.21% of Delaware's third grade SWD did not score in the proficient range. The target was for 81.72% of Delaware's third grade SWD to score below the proficient range, so our target was missed by 2.49%. DDOE continues to address the 1% Cap to ensure only the students with the most significant cognitive disabilities take the DeSSA. This is evident in the statewide decrease of students taking this assessment from the previous year. It is understandable these efforts would negatively impact proficiency scores while improving our 1% Cap data. Elementary students continue to be impacted by their foundational academic years being disrupted during the pandemic. The ongoing efforts to reach pre-pandemic levels of student success and effective steps related to achieving the 1% Cap are likely contributors to slippage. The ongoing focus on using data will ensure LEAs adopt policies and procedures to continually review their assessment results, so students with specific needs can receive the instruction and interventions necessary to improve their learning and assessment results.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

SSBG RI Program

Discussions are underway to determine an efficient and effective process for collecting and assessing fidelity of implementation data within the SSBG Reading Interventionist Program. Starting in spring 2024, RIs will complete a self-assessment each fall and spring, regarding their perceived skills to support students and teachers in the use of tiered interventions. In February 2024, we will convene a sample of the Reading Interventionist to help create the self-assessment.

SPEACS

In February and May 2023, SPEACS coaches conducted pre/post observations on the use of literacy and communication strategies by four participating teachers. Visits on average were 20 minutes and were conducted when ELA was taught. The lesson visit form that was used was Adapted from ASHA, The Classroom Profile for Integrated Communication Supports: A Framework to Support Augmentative and Alternative Communication Coaching Services in School Setting. The tool used a four-point scale: Not Observed, Emerging, Established, and Exemplary. The four literacy domains observed included the use of phonemic awareness or phonics, reading comprehension, vocabulary, and vocabulary fluency. In February and May, all teachers were emerging. The most observed literacy practice was the use of phonemic awareness or phonics. In March, the use of AAC and/or communication supports to promote vocabulary fluency was not evident in the four classroom visits. No teachers were exemplary in their use of AAC and/or communication devices in the 4 months of visits.

Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

Not applicable. All data collected has been discussed previously.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

MTSS Implementation

The DDOE has implemented an integrated DE-MTSS TA Center in partnership with the University of Delaware to provide professional learning and coaching in support of the academic and nonacademic development of all children. The newly formed center will include projects to support LEAs in their implementation of MTSS through UDL, SPEACS, MTSS Cadre, and various professional development opportunities for leaders and staff addressing the essential components of DE-MTSS. The DDOE was also selected by the SWIFT Education center as an Intensive Model Demonstration Site Partner to collaborate over four years focused on demonstrating how to move from inclusion toward rightful presence for students who are left out or kept at the margins of school. One of the goals of this partnership is to support LEA and school implementation teams to lead whole-system transformation through professional learning and coaching around equity based MTSS with a focus on our most challenging learners. These two new projects will be governed by a MTSS Core team to manage the center and partner with grant staff, MTSS Leadership which includes the addition of integrated group of DDOE directors that will guide the work of the MTSS Implementation Team to work alongside LEAs. Through the development of DE-MTSS TA Center and partnering with SWIFT, DDOE will focus on data driven planning around MTSS practices to improve outcomes for all students. This will include LEA support on universal design for learning through the DE UDL Project, communication and literacy strategies for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities through SPEACS, MTSS and positive behavior support training and support through the DE Positive Behavior Support group, and assistance with alternate assessment supports.

Evidence-Based Early Literacy Instruction

SSIP activities are now more aligned with activities under the Delaware Literacy Plan, allowing for more opportunities to scale up and sustain the evidence-based early literacy practices. The DDOE has also built and convened an advisory group called "The Delaware Literacy Plan Committee" to ensure schools and school system leaders have the tools, resources, and guidance for strengthening early literacy in our state and alignment between our initiatives. SPEACS will continue to recruit LEAs to receive targeted support while universally creating professional development and resources to support communication and literacy. These efforts will increase staff knowledge and skills leading to improved communication and literacy outcomes for student with disabilities. SSBG Reading Interventionist Program will move forward focusing on MTSS and continue to address data-based decision making through analysis of student data. Additional topics will be covered based on participant needs indicated through surveys. The more targeted professional learning initiatives will provide us with the best data to assess the impact of the training and coaching on the use of evidence-based practices and student outcomes.

Evidence-Based, Reading Instruction Curricula - To address the new Senate Bill 4, DDOE created a state-approved adoption list for evidence-based, reading instruction curricula for grades K-3. LEAs must adopt a curriculum from the list by the start of the 2027-2028 school year. The state is also supporting LEAs as they provide job-embedded, competency-based professional learning on their reading curricula to all personnel in a K-5 building providing reading instruction or coaching (grounded in the science of reading). Related to the new House Bill 304, there is a state list of universal reading screeners and literacy intervention approaches (K-3) that are aligned with the essential components of evidence-based reading instruction. This requires inclusion of curriculum and special education supervisors, as well as elementary school teachers and elementary special education teachers, from LEAs and charters in the development of the lists of aligned screeners and interventions. The lists of aligned screeners and interventions are available from DDOE. The DE Early Literacy Advisory Group, referenced earlier, played a critical role in the development of these resources.

Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.

The data presented in this report indicate that the SSIP improvement strategies developed to support the implementation of our two evidence-based practices are providing positive results. The results for the new improvement strategies are baseline, so will we not have more definitive results until the 2025 or 2026 SPP/APR.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

Delaware embraces authentic stakeholder engagement throughout all areas of our work. Members of ECR have engaged in Leading by Convening training through NCSI and IDC, our national technical assistance centers, to enhance our stakeholder involvement. We believe to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, we must embrace and value our learning partnerships with parents, educators, advisory/advocacy groups, and community members. ECR realized that in order to broaden our stakeholder involvement, we also needed to deepen the levels of interactions among stakeholders. The DDOE has built a strong relationship with Delaware Parent Information Center (PIC), our IDEA PTI, to advance our engagement with parents. We partnered with PIC to embrace the four levels of interaction in Leading by Convening: informing (sharing information with others who care about the issue), networking (asking others what they think about the issue and listening to what they say), collaborating (engaging people in trying to do something by working together about the issue) and transforming (doing things The Partnership Way: leading by convening, cross-stakeholder engagement, shared leadership and consensus building). As we prepared to engage stakeholders in the process of data analysis and target setting for the new SPP/APR, PIC provided us with the support and strategies to involve many more parents in this process, focusing on increasing the appropriate breadth of representation and depth of interactions.

For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, as members of ECR prepared to engage stakeholders in analyzing Delaware data, setting targets and identifying improvement strategies and activities, each staff member utilized the Delaware Stakeholder Engagement Analysis Tool to ensure all demographics were addressed when inviting stakeholders (e.g.: race/ethnicity/ geographic locations/disability categories/advocacy groups/advisory groups/parents/families/etc.). 59 individual indicator stakeholder meetings took place that included sharing data, rich discussions regarding data analysis, target setting and improvement strategies.

During monthly meetings with Governor's Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens (GACEC), state IDEA advisory panel, as a whole council, as well as with council subcommittees, ECR engages with the council in data analysis and discussion of improvement activities around individual indicators. In addition, individual members represent GACEC on each specific indicator stakeholder committees. ECR also presented to and engaged all stakeholders/parents from the GACEC in discussion on indicator data analysis, input/feedback on target setting, and input/feedback on improvement activities and provided GACEC an additional opportunity to ask questions/provide input during an evening Q and A session designed specifically for them. GACEC provided DDOE with written input by the end of December. Presentations, data analysis, target setting discussions and improvement activities also took place at all County Special Ed Leadership Meetings to promote LEA Special Ed Directors and additional educators in the process of providing input/feedback as indicated above.

ECR staff, in cooperation with PIC, developed one-page, parent friendly fact sheets for each SPP/APR indicator and partnered with PIC to share with all 42 LEA Parent Councils for Special Education, and to the PIC parent distribution list of over 5,000 families. PIC utilized their social media platform to invite all parents to engage in Lunch and Learn Facebook Live sessions, where each ECR member presented their indicator information, engaged in a data analysis discussion, presented target proposals and improvement strategies. These sessions were scheduled both during the day and in the evening to ensure further opportunities for parent participation. In addition, ECR staff created individual indicator surveys to gather further input from parent stakeholders which was communicated during the "Lunch and Learn" sessions. Both the one-page fact sheets and surveys were translated from English into Spanish and Haitian Creole to reach a wide range of families. To centralize all this information and to gain even further public input, ECR created an IDEA SPP/APR webpage which contains the one-page fact sheets for each indicator, a live link for individual surveys to gain additional input/feedback, the power point presentation used during stakeholder presentations and a copy of the previous SPP/APR, for reference.

(<https://www.doe.k12.de.us/Page/4541>) DDOE utilized social media, such as the DDOE Facebook Page, to share this information statewide, in addition to posting info and live links in the Principals' Weekly Newsletter. To support this effort, PIC created a similar webpage which links to DDOE's webpage. To support the Informing stage of Leading by Convening, DDOE collected data to support the efforts on increasing the appropriate breadth of representation and depth of interactions from stakeholders through social media and websites. In addition, DDOE collected data on Networking, Collaborating and Transforming efforts.

Number of stakeholders who were reached by DDOE/PIC through Informing on social media and websites: 30,902

Number of stakeholders who were engaged by DDOE/PIC by Informing on social media and websites: 1,035

Number of stakeholders who were engaged with DDOE/PIC by Networking, Collaborating and Transforming through completing surveys and participating in meetings: 1,191

For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the DDOE continued to utilize Leading by Convening to meet with and engage stakeholders in analyzing data, developing strategies to support improvement activities, and evaluating progress toward targets for each indicator. Stakeholder groups include, but are not limited to, the GACEC, PIC, Access to the General Education Curriculum Committee, MTSS Leadership/Advisory, Special Education Leadership, Special Education Director County meetings, Special Education Director Charter meetings, Equity Professional Learning Community, and the Equity in IDEA Stakeholder Committee, Transition Cadre, Transition Advisory Group, Early Childhood Inclusion Committee, and Early Childhood Special Education Committee. ECR staff regularly engage stakeholders in activities to build capacity and deepen knowledge and understanding of the indicator/indicator data resulting in rich discussion around progress and evaluation of improvement activities.

For example, the DDOE was selected for a 4-year partnership with the SWIFT Center which will provide coaching and technical assistance for LEAs to support changes within systems, policies and practices that result in meaningful engagement in general education. ECR also engaged stakeholders in data analysis and discussions around improvement activities during Special Education Leadership meetings focusing on topics such as Significant Disproportionality, Transition Planning, Equity, Mediation, Universal Design for Learning, Accessible Instructional Materials and Child Find.

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

The DE SSIP engaged stakeholders with the assistance of the DE PIC, Access to the General Education Curriculum Committee (AGEC), and meetings with the Governor's Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens (GACEC). The DE PIC supported the SSIP family engagement activities to increase parents' understanding of MTSS and early literacy. The DE PIC continued to make accessible the numerous MTSS and literacy resources developed in previous years. In July 2022, the DE PIC and AIR staff provided a four-part webinar series on: Overview of Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), Partnering with Families within MTSS, Data-Based Decision Making, and High-Leverage Practices.

During this reporting period, the DDOE developed the At Home Guide TO Delivering Strong Early Readers. This guide is available from the DDOE and provided an overview of how families and caregivers can support their children's literacy development at home. Topics included comprehension, fluency, oral language, phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, and writing. A total of 63 people registered for the course.

The AGEC has a variety of purposes including: (1) assistance and support in activities about access to general education curriculum; (2) advise and give recommendations to the Delaware Department of Education; (3) review best practices; (4) network and share strategies; and (5) coordinate with other initiatives and activities. The AGEC includes 40 diverse members with representation from LEAs, PIC, Institutes of Higher Learning, and advocacy

partners. The AGEC meets several times a year to review data and discuss improvement strategies.

Two SSIP presentations were presented to the GACEC, addressing state assessment data and improvement strategies. Discussion with this committee did not yield any new suggestions related to improvement activities at this time. Members of this committee also participated in numerous other stakeholder groups, developed to enable stakeholders a variety of opportunities to actively engage on SSIP topics.

The SSBG Reading Interventionist Program was the primary improvement effort that provided direct support to educators and students. During 2022-23, a greater effort was put into data collection efforts which resulted in the large amounts of data in this report from the SSBG Reading Interventionist Program. To ensure we were collecting the most appropriate data in a manner that minimized burden on the already large workload of the participating Reading Interventionists, we convened two sets of informal focus groups with participating Reading Interventionists. The focus groups of three to four RIs were used to gather input on the structure and content of the three Summary of Service Surveys administered during 2022-23. The beginning and end of year Summary of Service Survey collected data on universal screening results, the percentage of students receiving support at each Tier, and other demographic data. The middle of the year Summary of Service Survey collected data on the results from the most recently completed progress monitoring cycle. The input of the focus group members helped in improving the Summary of Service Surveys, as well as gaining buy-in from all Reading Interventionists.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

NO

Additional Implementation Activities

List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

Not applicable. All planned activities have already been discussed.

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

Not applicable.

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

Not applicable.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

EMAPS did not provide the option for data to be less than or equal to the target. As a result, "Met Target" and "No Slippage" were indicated above for FFY '22 which is incorrect. FFY '22 data (84.21) was not equal to or less than the FFY '22 target (81.72). Therefore, the FFY '22 target was not met and slippage occurred.

Reason for slippage:

From FFY 2021 to FFY 2022, the percentage of students with disabilities (SWD) not proficient on the third-grade reading assessment increased by 1.82 percentage points. Delaware has also experienced a shortage of teachers. As a result, many teaching positions were vacant or filled by substitute teachers. DDOE continues to address the 1% Cap by ensuring only the students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are taking the Alternate Achievement Standards Assessment. It is understandable that these efforts would negatively impact proficiency scores while improving our 1% Cap data. In FFY21, Delaware had 832 students (1.17%) assessed on the alternative assessment and in FFY22 those numbers decreased to 759 students (1.06% statewide). Feedback from stakeholders included COVID -19 as an ongoing influence on the decrease in proficiency rates as third grade students were virtual part of kindergarten, all of first grade, and experienced disruptions of instruction due to continued quarantines in second grade affecting student learning during the instruction of foundational skills. LEAs are still focusing on pandemic recovery of unfinished learning. When analyzing the data, it is noted that third grade has the lowest proficiency rate statewide for grades 3-8 except for sixth grade. Since third grade is a student's initial state assessment experience, this is not surprising. Low income, multilingual learners (MLL), African American, and Hispanic subgroups continue to have the lowest proficiency scores. DDOE, with stakeholder input, is continuing to address these students' unique needs through identifying systemic inequities and determining support needs.

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

17 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name:

Dale W Matusevich

Title:

Director, Exceptional Children Resources

Email:

dale.matusevich@doe.k12.de.us

Phone:

13027354210

Submitted on:

04/25/24 3:49:42 PM

Determination Enclosures

RDA Matrix

Delaware 2024 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination (1)

Percentage (%)	Determination
75.00%	Needs Assistance

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

Section	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	20	11	55.00%
Compliance	20	19	95.00%

(1) For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2024: Part B."

2024 Part B Results Matrix

Reading Assessment Elements

Reading Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment (2)	Grade 4	97%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 8	93%	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	20%	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	94%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	27%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	94%	1

Math Assessment Elements

Math Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 4	97%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 8	93%	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	32%	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	93%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	12%	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	92%	1

(2) Statewide assessments include the regular assessment and the alternate assessment.

Exiting Data Elements

Exiting Data Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out	13	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma**	80	2

**When providing exiting data under section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to report on the number of students with disabilities who exited an educational program through receipt of a regular high school diploma. These students meet the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As explained in 34 C.F.R. §300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect June 30, 2017, “the term regular high school diploma means the standard high school diploma awarded to the preponderance of students in the State that is fully aligned with State standards, or a higher diploma, except that a regular high school diploma shall not be aligned to the alternate academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA. A regular high school diploma does not include a recognized equivalent of a diploma, such as a general equivalency diploma, certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, or similar lesser credential.”

2024 Part B Compliance Matrix

Part B Compliance Indicator (3)	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021 (4)	Score
Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.	14.29%	N/A	1
Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.	10.00%	YES	2
Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation	97.39%	YES	2
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday	97.03%	YES	2
Indicator 13: Secondary transition	97.64%	YES	2
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	100.00%		2
Timely State Complaint Decisions	100.00%		2
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	100.00%		2
Longstanding Noncompliance			2
Programmatic Specific Conditions	None		
Uncorrected identified noncompliance	None		

(3) The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at: https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2024_Part-B_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf

(4) This column reflects full correction, which is factored into the scoring only when the compliance data are >=5% and <10% for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, and >=90% and <95% for Indicators 11, 12, and 13.

Data Rubric

Delaware

FFY 2022 APR (1)

Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data

APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total
1	1	1
2	1	1
3A	1	1
3B	1	1
3C	1	1
3D	1	1
4A	1	1
4B	1	1
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	1
8	1	1
9	1	1
10	1	1
11	1	1
12	1	1
13	1	1
14	1	1
15	1	1
16	1	1
17	1	1

APR Score Calculation

Subtotal	21
Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2022 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
Grand Total - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	26

(1) In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table.

618 Data (2)

Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/ Ed Envs Due Date: 8/30/23	1	1	1	3
Personnel Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
Discipline Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
State Assessment Due Date: 1/10/24	1	1	1	3
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/15/23	1	1	1	3
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/3/23	1	1	1	3

618 Score Calculation

Subtotal	21
Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.23809524) =	26.00

(2) In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a '0'. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.23809524 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.

Indicator Calculation

A. APR Grand Total	26
B. 618 Grand Total	26.00
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	52.00
Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0
Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0.00
Denominator	52.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator) (3) =	1.0000
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	100.00

(3) Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.23809524.

APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

DATE: February 2024 Submission

SPP/APR Data

1) Valid and Reliable Data - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

Part B 618 Data

1) Timely – A State will receive one point if it submits all *EDFacts* files or the entire *EMAPS* survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

618 Data Collection	EDFacts Files/ EMAPS Survey	Due Date
Part B Child Count and Educational Environments	C002 & C089	8/30/2023
Part B Personnel	C070, C099, C112	2/21/2024
Part B Exiting	C009	2/21/2024
Part B Discipline	C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144	2/21/2024
Part B Assessment	C175, C178, C185, C188	1/10/2024
Part B Dispute Resolution	Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in <i>EMAPS</i>	11/15/2023
Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services	Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in <i>EMAPS</i>	5/3/2023

2) Complete Data – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all files, permitted values, category sets, subtotals, and totals associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. The data submitted to *EDFacts* aligns with the metadata survey responses provided by the state in the State Supplemental Survey IDEA (SSS IDEA) and Assessment Metadata survey in *EMAPS*. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

3) Passed Edit Check – A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection

Dispute Resolution

IDEA Part B

Delaware

School Year: 2022-23

A zero count should be used when there were no events or occurrences to report in the specific category for the given reporting period. Check "Missing" if the state did not collect or could not report a count for the specific category. Please provide an explanation for the missing data in the comment box at the top of the page.

Section A: Written, Signed Complaints

(1) Total number of written signed complaints filed.	11
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued.	7
(1.1) (a) Reports with findings of noncompliance	6
(1.1) (b) Reports within timelines	7
(1.1) (c) Reports within extended timelines	0
(1.2) Complaints pending.	1
(1.2) (a) Complaints pending a due process hearing.	0
(1.3) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	3

Section B: Mediation Requests

(2) Total number of mediation requests received through all dispute resolution processes.	21
(2.1) Mediations held.	9
(2.1) (a) Mediations held related to due process complaints.	6
(2.1) (a) (i) Mediation agreements related to due process complaints.	1
(2.1) (b) Mediations held not related to due process complaints.	3
(2.1) (b) (i) Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints.	1
(2.2) Mediations pending.	2
(2.3) Mediations withdrawn or not held.	10

Section C: Due Process Complaints

(3) Total number of due process complaints filed.	28
(3.1) Resolution meetings.	10
(3.1) (a) Written settlement agreements reached through resolution meetings.	1
(3.2) Hearings fully adjudicated.	5
(3.2) (a) Decisions within timeline (include expedited).	1
(3.2) (b) Decisions within extended timeline.	4
(3.3) Due process complaints pending.	2
(3.4) Due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed (including resolved without a hearing).	21

Section D: Expedited Due Process Complaints (Related to Disciplinary Decision)

(4) Total number of expedited due process complaints filed.	3
(4.1) Expedited resolution meetings.	1
(4.1) (a) Expedited written settlement agreements.	1
(4.2) Expedited hearings fully adjudicated.	0
(4.2) (a) Change of placement ordered	0
(4.3) Expedited due process complaints pending.	1
(4.4) Expedited due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	2

State Comments:

Errors:

Please note that the data entered result in the following relationships which violate edit checks:

State error comments:

This report shows the most recent data that was entered by:

Delaware

These data were extracted on the close date:

11/15/2023

How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP's IDEA Website. How the Department Made Determinations in 2024 will be posted in June 2024. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/>