

## FFY 2019 IDEA Part B APR Target Setting Meeting

Jan. 9, 2020



- Background on Current Targets
- Annual Performance Report (APR) Overview
- APR Target Setting Purpose
- Timeline for Target Setting
- Proposed Federal Fiscal Year (FFY)2019 APR Targets
- Question & Answer



#### Background: DC's Current APR Targets

- The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requires all states to have a special education performance plan.
- The State Performance Plan (SPP) is a six-year plan that each state is required to submit at least every six years. The plan describes special education services in DC and our plan for continued improvement. The SPP covers 17 content areas, referred to as indicators.
- DC's current performance plan covers FFY 2013 through 2018 and contains targets for each indicator for each year of the plan.
- US Office of Special Education Program (OSEP) sets the targets for compliance indicators (either 0 or 100 percent); and OSSE sets the target levels for all results indicators with the help of stakeholders, such as the State Advisory Panel on Special Education (SAPSE).
- On an annual basis, states are required to submit an Annual Performance Report (APR) on the progress of their SPP.



#### **Annual Reporting Requirements**

- The APR is typically due to OSEP on Feb. 1 of each year. The report spans the FFY, which is July 1-June 30.
- OSEP will review APRs from February to April and make requests to states for clarification. States typically have seven-10 days to provide requested clarification.
- OSEP will then review final APR submissions and use the reported results to make an official determination on states' performance regarding implementation of the IDFA.
- States are required to publicly report each local education agency's (LEA's)
  performance against targets established in the SPP no later than 120 days after the
  state's submission of its APR.
- These public postings can be found on OSSE's website:
   https://osse.dc.gov/service/specialized-education-data-and-reports
- In June, states are notified of their determination level and any resulting requirements (e.g., specific conditions reporting). DC currently has a determination level of "needs assistance."



#### Purpose of FFY 2019 Target Setting

- OSEP has approved a one-year extension to the FFY 2013-2018 IDEA Part B APR package.
- The APR consists of compliance and results indicators. States are required to report on their performance against the targets set for each indicator.
- Due to the one-year APR package extension, OSEP is requiring all states to set FFY 2019 (SY 2019-20) targets for each APR results indicator.
- States are required to conduct stakeholder engagement when setting new targets for results indicators.
- The FFY 2019 APR targets must be submitted to OSEP by Feb. 3, 2020

Targets for compliance indicators are set by OSEP. The following are the compliance indicators:

- Indicator 4B- Significant Discrepancy
- Indicator 9 and 10- Disproportionate Representation
- Indicator 11- Timely Initial Evaluation
- Indicator 12- C to B Transition
- Indicator 13- Secondary Transition

## Results Indicators

OSEP requires states to work with a variety of stakeholders to set targets for all results indicators. The following are results indicators:

- Indicator 1- Graduation
- Indicator 2- Dropout
- Indicator 3- Statewide Assessments
- Indicator 4A- Significant Discrepancy
- Indicator 5- Least Restrictive Environment
- Indicator 6- Preschool Settings
- Indicator 7- Child Outcome Summary
- Indicator 8- Parent Involvement
- Indicator 14- Postsecondary Outcomes
- Indicator 15- Resolution Sessions
- Indicator 16- Mediation



# APR Targets and Proposed FFY 2019 Targets

## Graduation

• Indicator 1 (results): The percent of students with disabilities graduating high school with a regular diploma (not a certificate or GED).

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target (%)	44%	45.8%	49.8%	54.8%	60%	60%	52.7%
Data (%)	40.95%	40.88%	46.28%	49.51%	53.12%		

- Recommendation: Consider aligning the FFY 2019 APR target with the 2019-20 school year target set in DC's ESSA State Plan.
  - Pro: Alignment in reporting on academic achievement for students with disabilities
  - Con: Lowering the target may increase scrutiny; however, this can be justified by communicating the change aligns with DC's ESSA State Plan.

### Dropout Rates

• Indicator 2 (results): The percent of students with disabilities dropping out of high school.

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target (%)	5.8%	5.6%	5.3%	5.1%	4.8%	4.6%	4.6%
Data (%)	16.74%	8.08%	23.79%	19.84%	19.96%		



#### Statewide Assessments - Participation

 Indicator 3B (results): The percent of students with disabilities taking the statewide assessment for math and reading.

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Reading Target (%)	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%
Reading Data (%)	97.89%	87.59%	90.95%	91.46%	94.49%		
Math Target (%)	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%
Math Data (%)	98.48%	86.12%	91.51%	90.98%	94.41%		

 Recommendation: Growth has been steady; maintain 95percent target for FFY 2019.



#### Statewide Assessment - Proficiency

 Indicator 3C (results): The percent of students with disabilities scoring "proficient" or higher on the statewide assessment.

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Reading Target (%)	27%	27%	34%	42%	52%	21%
Reading Data (%)	4.20%	4.52%	7.05%	7.94%		
Math Target (%)	30%	30%	37%	48%	60%	20%
Math Data (%)	3.90%	5.63%	8.07%	8.94%		

- Recommendation: Consider aligning the FFY 2019 APR target with the 2019-20 school year
  target set in DC's ESSA State Plan. The state's ESSA plan has two separate targets for students in
  grades 3-8 and high school students. The proposed targets are an average of the two separate
  targets for each subgroup.
  - Pro: Alignment in reporting on academic achievement for students with disabilities.
  - Con: Lowering the targets may increase scrutiny; however, this can be justified by communicating the change aligns with DC's ESSA State Plan.



### Significant Discrepancy - Discipline

• Indicator 4A (results): The percent of school districts (LEAs) with a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspension/expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year between children with disabilities and their non-disabled peers.

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target (%)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data (%)	38.10%	2.17%	12.24%	16.13%	11.76%		

• **Indicator 4B (compliance):** The percent of school districts with a significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy.

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target (%)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data (%)	7.14%	2.17%	4.08%	2.94%	11.76%		



#### Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)

• **Indicator 5 (results):** The percent of students with disabilities served in the following settings:

FFY		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A. Regular classroom 80% or	Target (%)	50%	53%	56%	59%	61%	64%	64%
more of the school day	Data (%)	53.51%	54.59%	55.61%	56.47%	56.63%		
B. Regular	Target (%)	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	14%	14%
classroom less than 40% of the day	Data (%)	15.64%	15.24%	17.38%	15.23%	15.31%		
C. Separate schools, residential	Target (%)	15%	14%	13%	12%	11%	10%	10%
programs, hospital/home	Data (%)	12.40%	11.53%	10.04%	9.41%	9.03%		

Recommendation: Growth has been steady; maintain the FFY 2018 targets.

• **Indicator 6 (results):** The percent of children ages 3 to 5 with disabilities attending:

FFY		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A. Regular early childhood program	Target (%)	55%	56%	57%	58%	59%	60%	60%
& receiving majority of services there	Data (%)	49.34%	48.99%	43.17%	45.37%	51.70%		
B. Separate special education class,	Target (%)	16%	16%	14%	12%	11%	10%	10%
school, or residential program	Data (%)	19.92%	4.34%	7.75%	16.66%	16.21%		



### Child Outcome Summary (COS)

- Indicator 7 (results): Percent of preschool children ages 3 through 5 with individualized education programs (IEPs) who:
  - Summary 1: Substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6
    years of age or exited the program.

F	FY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A1. Improved positive	Target (%)	75%	76%	76%	77%	78%	80%	80%
social- emotional skills	Data (%)	82.05%	75.33%	85.71%	90.62%	84.62%		
B1. Acquire and use of	Target (%)	82%	83%	83%	84%	85%	87%	87%
knowledge and skills	Data (%)	80.12%	77.57%	87.42%	90.38%	85.56%		
C1. Use appropriate	Target (%)	79%	80%	80%	81%	82%	84%	84%
behavior to meet needs	Data (%)	79.37%	77.37%	86.15%	90.32%	92.03%		



- Indicator 7 (results): Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who were:
  - Summary 2: Functioning within age expectation by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

FF	′	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A2. Improved positive social-	Target (%)	63%	64%	64%	65%	66%	68%	68%
emotional skills	Data (%)	69.16%	65.70%	73.62%	73.38%	65.45%		
B2. Acquire and use of	Target (%)	63%	64%	64%	65%	66%	68%	68%
knowledge and skills	Data (%)	67.40%	61.88%	74.77%	76.10%	69.70%		
C2. Use appropriate	Target (%)	75%	76%	76%	77%	78%	80%	80%
behavior to meet needs	Data (%)	75.33%	73.99%	82.11%	84.70%	86.26%		

• Indicator 8 (results): The percent of parents reporting their child's school facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for students with disabilities.

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target (%)	80%	80%	80%	85%	85%	85%	85%
Data (%)	81.76%	84.47%	83.60%	86.44%	88.87%		



#### Disproportionate Representation

• Indicator 9 (compliance): The percent of school districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target (%)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data (%)	0%	0%	0%	0%	3.23%		

 Indicator 10 (compliance): The percent of school districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target (%)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data (%)	3.85%	0%	3.33%	5.88%	0%		



#### Child Find and C to B Transition

 Indicator 11 (compliance): The percent of children evaluated within 60 days from parental consent for the evaluation, or within the state established timeline (120 days).

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target (%)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data (%)	89.42%	90.72%	92.51%	91.07%	92.37%		

• Indicator 12 (compliance): The percent of children referred from Part C prior to age 3, who are eligible for Part B who have an IEP developed and implemented by the child's 3<sup>rd</sup> birthday.

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target (%)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data (%)	98.71%	96.77%	98.44%	94%	95.33%		

• Indicator 13 (compliance): The percent of youth with IEPs ages 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 course of study, that will reasonable enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services.

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target (%)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data (%)	50%	69.67%	63%	71%	76%		



#### **Postsecondary Outcomes**

• Indicator 14 (results): The percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

FFY		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A. Enrolled in higher education	Target (%)	27%	28%	29%	30%	31%	32%	32%
	Data (%)	17.20%	17.29%	12.13%	20.59%	24.37%		
A+B. Competitively employed	Target (%)	34%	39%	44%	49%	54%	59%	59%
	Data (%)	24.10%	25.94%	18.62%	29.99%	34.22%		
A+B+C. Attending some other postsecondary education or training program	Target (%)	40%	45%	50%	56%	63%	74%	74%
	Data (%)	31.6%	36.93%	32.96%	36.11%	54.86%		



#### Critical Concept for Indicators 15 and 16

#### **Resolution Agreements:**

- When parents and schools cannot reach agreement about a student's special education program, the IDEA offers several "dispute resolution" options, or methods of getting the disagreement resolved.
- Resolution sessions occur after a parent has filed a request for a due process hearing. Resolution sessions give parents and districts an opportunity to meet and try to resolve the problems identified in the parent's due process hearing request.

#### **Mediation:**

- In mediation, the parents and the school meet with a trained, impartial person, called a mediator.
- The mediator helps the parents and school communicate. The mediator does not make decisions for the parties, but helps the parents and school think about options and come to agreement.



#### Resolution Sessions and Mediation

 Indicator 15 Resolution Sessions: The percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target (%)	20-35%	22-37%	25-40%	27-42%	29-44%	31-46%	31-46%
Data (%)	2.74%	14.32%	13.90%	17.57%	14.29%		

• **Indicator 16 Mediation:** The percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target (%)	60-75%	62-77%	64-79%	66-81%	68-83%	70-85%	70-85%
Data (%)	66.67%	64.71%	66.67%	68.42%	75%		



# Thank you!