

<p>FAPE in the LRE</p> <p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma compared to percent of all youth in state graduating with a regular diploma.</p>	<p>This indicator is addressed on pages 47 and 48 of the APR.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the data in the current APR provide a measure for the new State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators? 	<p>Yes</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the proposed targets in the current APR measure the new SPP indicators? If yes, are the targets set at a reasonable expectation level? If no, what changes are needed? 	<p>To a degree, but the outlined targets are not projected out six years</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the future activities in the current APR appropriate and sufficient to make change to meet the SPP targets for the next six years? If no, what changes are needed? 	<p>The activities are appropriate, but targets are not established to the year 2011.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How and to what extent should stakeholders be involved in changes/additions to the future activities for the SPP? 	<p>Current practices seem to provide satisfactory stakeholder involvement. Need to continue to involve SEAP, regional hearings or meetings, etc.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the state dropping out of high school.</p>	<p>This indicator is addressed on pages 45 through 50 of the APR</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the data in the current APR provide a measure for the new State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators? 	<p>Yes; however, there does not appear to be a narrative defining "dropping out" and an explanation for the differences in the calculations between disabled and non-disabled students.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the proposed targets in the current APR measure the new SPP indicators? If yes, are the targets set at a reasonable expectation level? If no, what changes are needed? 	<p>Targets are not projected out six years. Specific benchmarks were not identified for the 2003-2004 school year.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the future activities in the current APR appropriate and sufficient to make change to meet the SPP targets for the next six years? If no, what changes are needed? 	<p>Not entirely. Effective strategies to increase graduation rates need to be different from effective strategies to encourage post-secondary transition. Strategies designed to assist special needs students meet higher standards and increased graduation requirements must be developed to positively impact the completion rates of special need youth.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How and to what extent should stakeholders be involved in changes/additions to the future activities for the SPP? 	<p>The stakeholders (parents, teachers and students) need to examine the reasons cited for dropping out. An effort needs to be made to identify the unmet needs of students electing to drop out of school. Further, the examination should assess the post-school activities of the drop-outs to determine whether students sought</p>

	alternative means of completing (i.e. GED, trade school, apprenticeships, etc.)
<p>3. A. Percent of Districts meeting the States AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternative assessment against grade level standards; alternative assessment against alternative achievement standards.</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternative achievement standards.</p>	This indicator is addressed on pages 58 through 70 of the APR.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the data in the current APR provide a measure for the new State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators? 	A great deal of data related to the MAP is presented in the APR. The Department should review to determine whether the data meets and/or exceeds the requirements of the SSP.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the proposed targets in the current APR measure the new SPP indicators? If yes, are the targets set at a reasonable expectation level? If no, what changes are needed? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the future activities in the current APR appropriate and sufficient to make change to meet the SPP targets for the next six years? If no, what changes are needed? 	The timeline does not extend to 2011.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How and to what extent should stakeholders be involved in changes/additions to the future activities for the SPP? 	Current practices seem to provide satisfactory stakeholder involvement. Need to continue to involve SEAP, regional hearings or meetings, etc.
<p>4. Percent of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year in which the review of policies, procedures and practices resulted in the need for revision to policies, procedures and practice.</p>	This indicator is addressed on pages 51 through 57 of the APR.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the data in the current APR provide a measure for the new State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators? 	Yes pg 51
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the proposed targets in the current APR measure the new SPP indicators? If yes, are the targets set at a reasonable expectation level? If no, what changes are needed? 	Yes, the targets allow comparison between all children and those with disabilities pg 54
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the future activities in the current APR appropriate and sufficient to make change to meet the SPP targets for the next 	The timelines do not go till 2011. pg 55

<p>six years? If no, what changes are needed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How and to what extent should stakeholders be involved in changes/additions to the future activities for the SPP? 	<p>Stakeholders should be involved in discussions and input on this issue. It appears that the percent of expulsion of disabled children is higher than non-disabled. However, the percentage is based on the fact that there are less disabled children the disabled.</p>
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs ages 6 through 21:</p> <p>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</p> <p>B. Removed from the regular class greater than 60% of the day.</p> <p>C. Served in either public/private separate schools or in residential placements.</p>	<p>This indicator is addressed on pages 71 through 80 of the APR.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the data in the current APR provide a measure for the new State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators? 	<p>yes</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the proposed targets in the current APR measure the new SPP indicators? If yes, are the targets set at a reasonable expectation level? If no, what changes are needed? 	<p>yes</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the future activities in the current APR appropriate and sufficient to make change to meet the SPP targets for the next six years? If no, what changes are needed? 	<p>Outlined targets are not projected out six years. The targets are not measurable.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How and to what extent should stakeholders be involved in changes/additions to the future activities for the SPP? 	<p>Stakeholder involvement needs to include SEAP, regional hearings or meetings, etc.</p>
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who receive special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (e.g. early childhood settings and home).</p>	<p>This indicator is addressed on pages 71 through 80 of the APR.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the data in the current APR provide a measure for the new State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators? 	<p>yes</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the proposed targets in the current APR measure the new SPP indicators? If yes, are the targets set at a reasonable expectation level? If no, what changes are needed? 	<p>Targets do not set expectation levels and do not appear to be measurable. The current APR targets are to "continue to increase...."</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the future activities in the current APR appropriate and sufficient to make change to meet the SPP targets for the next six years? If no, what changes are needed? 	<p>The activities are appropriate, but targets are not established to the year 2011.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How and to what extent should stakeholders be involved in 	<p>The improvement plan should include stakeholders with a training</p>

changes/additions to the future activities for the SPP?	and input plan developed.
7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); acquire and use knowledge and skills (including early language / communication and early literacy); and demonstrate appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.	This indicator is addressed on pages 81 through 83 of the APR.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the data in the current APR provide a measure for the new State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators? 	Yes pg 81
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the proposed targets in the current APR measure the new SPP indicators? If yes, are the targets set at a reasonable expectation level? If no, what changes are needed? 	Yes, the Improvement Strategies are focused on training teachers to administrate the profile and anylazy the results. Pg 83
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the future activities in the current APR appropriate and sufficient to make change to meet the SPP targets for the next six years? If no, what changes are needed? 	No, the timeline does not go to 2011 pg 83
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How and to what extent should stakeholders be involved in changes/additions to the future activities for the SPP? 	It is noted that in the Improvement Strategies, stakeholders are to be identified, however, there is no definite plan for training or input by stakeholders. Pg 83
DISPROPORTIONALITY	
1. Percent of districts identified by the State as having significant disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups identified for special education and related services in which the review of policies, procedures and practices resulted in the need for revision to policies, procedures or practice.	This indicator is addressed on pages 41 through 45 of the APR.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the data in the current APR provide a measure for the new State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators? 	The new SSP requires a percentage of districts for which a review of policies, procedures and practices resulted in a need for revision of such. The states definition of "significant disproportionate representation" was not noted in the ARP. The SSP measurement formula does not appear to be the same as that used in the ARP.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the proposed targets in the current APR measure the new SPP indicators? If yes, are the targets set at a reasonable expectation level? If no, what changes are needed? 	An electronic spreadsheet for state and district level data Is available as described in the SSP. Targets were not noted in the APR.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the future activities in the current APR appropriate and sufficient to make change to meet the SPP targets for the next six years? If no, what changes are needed? 	No, without identified targets, the appropriateness of the activities cannot be evaluated. Timelines do not go to 2011.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How and to what extent should stakeholders be involved in changes/additions to the future activities for the SPP? 	<p>Current practices seem to provide satisfactory stakeholder involvement. Need to continue to involve SEAP, regional hearings or meetings, etc.</p>
<p>EFFECTIVE TRANSITIONS</p> <p>1. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 and who are found eligible for Part B who receive special education and related services by their third birthday.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the data in the current APR provide a measure for the new State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators? 	<p>Most data required appears in the Early Childhood Transition section. Currently, data provided does not include the number of children not eligible for Part B services. Also a written accounting needs to be provided for children who <u>were</u> eligible for Part B services but are not <u>receiving</u> services.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the proposed targets in the current APR measure the new SPP indicators? If yes, are the targets set at a reasonable expectation level? If no, what changes are needed? 	<p>Yes, targets seem reasonable.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the future activities in the current APR appropriate and sufficient to make change to meet the SPP targets for the next six years? If no, what changes are needed? 	<p>No changes needed – Activities seem sufficient.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How and to what extent should stakeholders be involved in changes/additions to the future activities for the SPP? 	<p>Current practices seem to provide satisfactory stakeholder involvement. Need to continue to involve SEAP, regional hearings or meetings, etc.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth age 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate, measurable post-secondary goals and transition services needed to meet goals.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the data in the current APR provide a measure for the new State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators? 	<p>Does not include data for all identified students. Seems to only reflect a sampling of schools involved in the annual reviews, and the indicator seems to indicate a requirement to measure <u>all</u> student data. This data needs to be collected from school districts annually.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the proposed targets in the current APR measure the new SPP indicators? If yes, are the targets set at a reasonable expectation level? If no, what changes are needed? 	<p>No – baseline data will need to be collected, and target indicator is not yet established. Target indicator will be provided to states in FFY 06.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the future activities in the current APR appropriate and sufficient to make change to meet the SPP targets for the next six years? If no, what changes are needed? 	<p>Unsure due to lack of target provided.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How and to what extent should stakeholders be involved in changes/additions to the future activities for the SPP? 	<p>Current practices seem to provide satisfactory stakeholder involvement. Need to continue to involve SEAP, regional hearings or meetings, etc.</p>
<p>3. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who are competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school or both, within two years of leaving high school as compared to non-disabled youth no longer in secondary school.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the data in the current APR provide a measure for the new State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators? 	<p>Data is provided for a 6-month post-graduation follow-up. Needs to look at 2-year post-graduation follow-up.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the proposed targets in the current APR measure the new SPP indicators? If yes, are the targets set at a reasonable expectation level? If no, what changes are needed? 	<p>No – need targets set for 2-year follow-up.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the future activities in the current APR appropriate and sufficient to make change to meet the SPP targets for the next six years? If no, what changes are needed? 	<p>No – need to begin collecting 2-year follow-up data.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How and to what extent should stakeholders be involved in changes/additions to the future activities for the SPP? 	<p>Current practices seem to provide satisfactory stakeholder involvement. Need to continue to involve SEAP, regional hearings or meetings, etc.</p>
<p>EFFECTIVE GENERAL SUPERVISION PART B</p>	
<p>7. (Part B child find) Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days (or established timeline).</p>	<p>This indicator is not included in the APR.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the data in the current APR provide a measure for the new State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators? 	<p>No</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the proposed targets in the current APR measure the new SPP indicators? If yes, are the targets set at a reasonable expectation level? If no, what changes are needed? 	<p>Targets need to be established</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the future activities in the current APR appropriate and sufficient to make change to meet the SPP targets for the next six years? If no, what changes are needed? 	<p>Activities need to be developed.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How and to what extent should stakeholders be involved in changes/additions to the future activities for the SPP? 	<p>Stakeholder involvement needs to include SEAP, regional hearings or meetings, etc.</p>