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# 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 new 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 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.

**Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year**

42

**General Supervision System:**

**The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.**

Accountability under IDEA. This system of accountability is designed to improve results for children while ensuring compliance of IDEA within our general supervision responsibilities.

Tier I

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

Compliance:
Disproportionate Suspension & Expulsion Ethnicity (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
Equitable Services for Parentally Placed Private School Student
Needs-Based Funding Verification
Consolidated Grant Approval Process – IDEA Program and Fiscal Monitoring
Fiscal Monitoring of MOE and Excess Costs
Analysis of Dispute Resolution and Mediation issues (Indicator 15 & 16)

Results:
State Assessment Participation and Performance (Indicator 3 a,b,c,d)
Significant Discrepancy Suspension and Expulsion (Indicator 4a)
Early Childhood Outcomes (Indicator 7)
Graduation Rate (Indicator 1)
Drop-out Rate (Indicator 2)
LRE (Indicator 5)
LRE Preschool (Indicator 6)
Parent Involvement (Indicator 8)
Post School Outcomes (Indicator 14)

Tier II

For compliance issues, the LEA is required to correct all individual student noncompliance, conduct a Root Cause Analysis in the area of noncompliance, and develop a Corrective Action Plan including 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 randomly selected student files, again utilizing updated data, to ensure there are no systemic issues of non-compliance and that the LEA is implementing the regulatory requirements under IDEA. If continued noncompliance exists, the LEA will move to Tier III. For results issues, the LEA is monitored through Continuous Improvement Plans developed by the LEAs and through monitoring activities of the Exceptional Children Resources Workgroup.

Compliance:
LEA corrects individual noncompliance,
LEA conducts a Self- Assessment including a Root Cause Analysis in the area of noncompliance,
LEA develops a Corrective Action Plan including improvement activities, benchmarks, and timeline for deliverables and status updates,
DDOE provides TA, as requested,
DDOE verifies correction of individual student noncompliance utilizing updated data,
DDOE verifies systemic compliance utilizing updated data,
DDOE monitors status of Corrective Action Plan.

Results:
LEA driven, DDOE monitors through progress/status updates of Continuous Improvement Plan,
LEA reviews data, conducts a Root Cause Analysis and develops a Continuous Improvement Plan,
DDOE monitors through analysis of LEA data and status of Continuous Improvement Plan,
DDOE reviews alignment of data within Consolidated Grant to Continuous Improvement activities to show improvement,
DDOE provides TA, as requested.

Tier III

Compliance:
LEA and DDOE driven, DDOE monitors through deliverables and process of utilizing updated data: verification of individual student corrections of noncompliance, verification of systemic compliance and that the LEA is implementing the regulatory requirements under IDEA, progress/status updates and TA.
LEA corrects individual noncompliance,
LEA and DDOE conducts a Self- Assessment including a Root Cause Analysis in the area of noncompliance,
LEA and DDOE develop an Intervention Plan together to include improvement activities, benchmarks, and timeline for submitting deliverables and status updates,
TA provided by DDOE or other entity,
DDOE verifies correction of individual student noncompliance utilizing updated data,
DDOE verifies systemic compliance utilizing updated data,
DDOE monitors status of Intervention Plan.

Results:
LEA and DDOE driven, DDOE monitors through Intervention Plan progress/status update and status of Intervention Plan,
LEA reviews data, conducts a Root Cause Analysis and works with DDOE to develop an Intervention Plan,
DDOE monitors through analysis of LEA data and status of Intervention Plan,
DDOE reviews alignment of data within Consolidated Grant to Intervention Plan activities to show improvement,
DDOE provides TA in necessary areas.

Tier IV

Compliance:
DDOE driven, DDOE monitors through deliverables and the process of utilizing updated data: individual student corrections of noncompliance, verification of systemic compliance and that the LEA is implementing the regulatory requirements under IDEA, progress/status updates, and TA directed by DDOE and/or other entity,
LEA corrects individual noncompliance,
Root Cause Analysis is completed by LEA and DDOE in the area of noncompliance,
DDOE develops a Compliance Agreement and the LEA and DDOE enter into the Compliance Agreement which includes improvement activities, benchmarks, PD, TA, and timeline for submitting deliverables and status updates,
TA provided by DDOE or other entity,
DDOE verifies correction individual student noncompliance utilizing updated data,
DDOE verifies systemic compliance utilizing updated data,
DDOE monitors status of Compliance Agreement,
Possible direction of IDEA funds.

Results:
DDOE driven, DDOE monitors through progress updates, deliverables, discussions of data and status of a Compliance Agreement,
DDOE reviews data, and supports the LEA in conducting a Root Cause Analysis and develops a Compliance Agreement,
DDOE monitors through analysis of LEA data and status of the Compliance Agreement,
DDOE provides TA to LEA in areas of improvement.
For Tier IV issues, DDOE monitors the Compliance Agreement closely. 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.

**Technical Assistance System:**

**The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced 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. Since the federal Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) has broadened their focus from holding states accountable for compliance indicators only to now holding states accountable for both compliance and results indicators, DDOE issues LEA annual determinations based on a combination of the following compliance and results indicators:

Compliance:
Indicator 4b: Significant Discrepancy, by Race or Ethnicity, in the rate of Suspensions and Expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements
Indicators 9 & 10: Disproportionate Representation related to Identification
Indicator 11: Timely Evaluations
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition from Part C/preschool special education services to Part B/school-age special education services
Indicator 13: Transition Planning in the IEP
Other: Equitable Services, Needs-Based Funding, Fiscal Monitoring
Other: Corrective Action as a result of an Administrative Complaint or Due Process

Results:
Indicator 1: Graduate Rate
Indicator 2: Drop Out Rate
Indicator 3a: Participation in the State Assessment
Indicator 3b: Proficiency on the State Assessment
Indicator 3c: Proficiency on the State Alternate Assessment
Indicator 3d: Gap in Proficiency
Indicator 4a: Significant Discrepancy in the rates of long-term Suspension of Students with Disabilities
Indicator 5: LRE
Indicator 7: Early Childhood Outcomes

After receiving their annual determinations, LEAs must analyze their data, engage stakeholders in a root cause analysis and develop a Continuous Improvement Plan to actively improve results for students with disabilities. DDOE provides technical assistance to support each LEA in this 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 results issues, progress updates are provided on the LEA’s Intervention Plan. TA is provided to LEA by DDOE throughout the year. 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, DDOE monitors the Compliance Agreement closely. 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: Bi-monthly Special Education Leadership, County and Charter meetings held throughout the year, monthly Literacy Coalition and Cadre meetings, monthly Math Cadre meetings, quarterly DE-Positive Behavior Support Cadre meetings, monthly Delaware Transition Cadre meetings, quarterly Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), Access to the General Education Advisory Committee meetings, monthly Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) meetings, quarterly Early Childhood Transition Collaborative meetings, ECSE Itinerant Teacher Community of Practice, quarterly 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, DE-PBS website, and the ACCESS website.

**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.**

Professional Development System
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, utilizing Delaware State Standards as a foundation in Tier I for academic and DE-PBS School-wide for behavior. 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.

Following are examples of the professional development and coaching provided:

Systematic Processes for Enhancing and Assessing Communication Supports (SPEACS): The DDOE has contracted with the University of Delaware, Center for Disabilities Studies’ ACCESS Project to provide training and technical assistance in the area of communication for students with significant disabilities. Built on the premise that all students can communicate, the SPEACS initiative provides training and coaching to school teams who work with targeted students with complex communication needs to increase communication skills with the ultimate goal of symbolic communication. Literacy and writing skills are also addressed in training.

IEP Development for Behavior & Social/Emotional Skills: The DDOE has contracted with The University of Delaware, Center for Disabilities Studies’ DE-PBS Project to provide training and coaching focused on IEP development related to function-based behavioral goals and social/emotional supports. This includes group trainings, individual coaching, online collaboration, and a variety of methods necessary, in order to successfully support state education professionals in development and implementation IEPs addressing behavioral/social/emotional needs.

Tiered Behavior Supports: The DDOE, through the DE-PBS Project, focuses on tiered behavior supports through implementation of systems that provide positive and preventative Tier 1 Schoolwide strategies, Tier 2 evidence-based group interventions, as well as Tier 3 individual Functional Behavior Assessment and the Prevent-Teach-Reinforce (PTR) model of behavior support. Training and coaching are provided to ensure teachers are able to implement behavior plans with fidelity. Additionally, efforts and funding from the ARRA and SAMHSA’s AWARE grant are braided to provide leveled supports such as resources, coaching and professional learning to individual educators, school and district level teams, focusing on social, emotional and behavioral wellness. This includes direct therapeutic behavioral health group and individual interventions to youth and their families.

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. Universal Design for Learning (UDL) is a framework for teaching, learning and developing curricular materials that consider the diverse learning needs of all students and provides access to the general education curriculum for students with disabilities. 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.

Accessibility Guidelines: Open to all LEA staff with a focus on increasing access to all assessments in the Delaware System of Student Assessments.

DDOE’s Delaware Early Literacy Initiative provides a system of professional learning through a Multi-Tiered System of Academic Supports (MTSS) for early literacy. Through this initiative, schools engage in high-quality, job embedded training and coaching in effective literacy practices and a framework to improve literacy outcomes for all students, including students with disabilities and English learners (ELs), preschool through third grade. Delaware Early Literacy Initiative’s multi-pronged approach to professional learning is focused on promoting teacher and leader effectiveness related to reading and literacy instruction to meet the needs of all learners within an MTSS framework, responsive to the needs of district and school staff, who are active partners in shaping their professional learning plans, seamlessly aligned with Delaware’s ESSA Plan, Delaware State Literacy Plan and district initiatives/priorities, as well as with Guskey’s Levels of Professional Development Evaluation and Learning Forward Professional Learning Standards, provided by a team of experts in implementation of research-based literacy practices including former administrators, veteran teachers, English learner (EL) specialists and special educators.

DDOE’s Delaware Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (DE MTSS) initiative provides professional development and coaching designed to build the capacity of the state education agency (SEA), local education agencies (LEAs), and school personnel. The purpose of this partnership is to implement and sustain MTSS practices throughout Delaware to increase outcomes for all students. The DE MTSS initiative provides district and school leadership with high-quality training and coaching in effective practices to align academic and behavior supports under one MTSS framework.

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).

Equity in IDEA at the Delaware Department of Education is addressed through diverse stakeholder engagement and professional development. DDOE provides professional learning across the state by bringing in national experts on topics such as discipline, identification, placement and instruction. For example, in the fall of 2021, DDOE established the statewide Equity Summit which brought educators across the state together to focus on issues surrounding equity in education. DDOE is continuing this work through the DDOE Equity Council and developing professional learning relating to educational benefits for students with disabilities. Ongoing TA with LEAs continues through meetings with Special Education Leadership, Curriculum Directors and other staff members throughout the year.

**Broad Stakeholder Input:**

**The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State’s targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State’s Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).**

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 insure 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 2021 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, DE-Positive Behavior Support Project Cadre (DE-PBS), MTSS Leadership/Advisory, Special Education Leadership, Special Education Director County meetings, Equity Professional Learning Community, and the Equity in IDEA Stakeholder Committee, Transition Cadre, 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 capacity and deepen knowledge and understanding of the indictor/indicator data resulting in rich discussion around progress and evaluation of improvement activities. For example, LEA Special Education Directors were led through a deep dive into their data for Indicators 4, 9 and 10 during which they identified trends, and engaged in discussion around strategies to target areas of need. ECR staff has also met with GACEC to explain the state-wide data system that ensures that LEA data is complete, accurate, reliable and valid, share trends and discuss improvement activities including MTSS, DE-PBS, and other targeted support provided to LEAs. In addition, at state-wide 619 coordinator meetings, data is regularly analyzed at the state and LEA levels around Indicator 12 to determine root causes of noncompliance and strategies to address the root causes. The DDOE also continued to focus on parent engagement, parent representation on stakeholder groups and supporting the 42 LEA Parent Councils of Students with Disabilities. In addition, the DDOE, in collaboration with PIC, have reached out to community centers to identify and remove barriers for underrepresented groups. Community centers include the Boys and Girls Club, United Way, Sussex County Health Coalition and the Latin American Community Center.

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

YES

**Number of Parent Members:**

4,151

**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 insure 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 insure 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 2021 SPP/APR, the DDOE continued to focus on parent engagement, parent representation on stakeholder groups and supporting the 42 LEA Parent Councils of Students with Disabilities. In addition, the DDOE, in collaboration with PIC, have reached out to community centers to identify and remove barriers for underrepresented groups. Community centers include the Boys and Girls Club, United Way, Sussex County Health Coalition and the Latin American Community Center.

**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 insure 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 2021 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, 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 indictor/indicator data resulting in rich discussion around progress and evaluation of improvement activities. For example, LEA Special Education Directors were led through a deep dive into their data for Indicators 4, 9 and 10 during which they identified trends, and engaged in discussion around strategies to target areas of need. At state-wide 619 coordinator meetings, data is regularly analyzed at the state-wide and LEA levels around Indicator 12 to determine root causes of noncompliance and strategies to address the root causes. The DDOE also continued to focus on parent engagement, parent representation on stakeholder groups and supporting the 42 LEA Parent Councils of Students with Disabilities. In addition, the DDOE, in collaboration with PIC, have reached out to community centers to identify and remove barriers for underrepresented groups. Community centers include the Boys and Girls Club, United Way, Sussex County Health Coalition and the Latin American Community Center.

**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.

**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: Delaware’s State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report Stakeholder Input/Feedback to report the results of stakeholder/parent engagement in target setting, data analysis, input/feedback, suggested improvement strategies and mechanisms for evaluating progress for all public to view. In addition, the DDOE has created a report entitled: Delaware’s State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report Improvement Activity Update which will be posted on the DDOE website following the February 1, 2023 submission of the SPP/APR.

Summary of stakeholder input/feedback regarding target setting and improvement activities can be found at: https://www.doe.k12.de.us/Page/4541

**Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2020 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 2020 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 revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2020 APR in 2022, is available.**

DDOE posted their FFY 2020 APR Report and FFY 2020 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 2020 APR Report for all families to view.

As soon as the FFY 2021 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 FFY2021 LEA Annual Determinations are issued and not later than 120 days after submitting the FFY 2021 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 2021 and 2022 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2022 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 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, 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 2020 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 Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC), the National Post School Outcomes Center (NPSO), 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.

We have 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 Data Quality Peer Group to support our data collections and data reporting and the Discipline Partnership with IDC, DE-PBS and the PBIS Cadre. 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. 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. 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.

NSTTAC and NTACT have 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 (NCIS) 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 2021 and 2022 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 24, 2022 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, 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 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.

# 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 EDFacts 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 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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[[1]](#footnote-2)**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 80.62% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target >= | 74.10% | 77.80% | 67.30% | 68.50% | 80.62% |
| Data | 67.15% | 67.94% | 69.07% | 73%[[2]](#footnote-3) | 80.62% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 81.12% | 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/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 insure 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 2021 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, DE-Positive Behavior Support Project Cadre (DE-PBS), MTSS Leadership/Advisory, Special Education Leadership, Special Education Director County meetings, Equity Professional Learning Community, and the Equity in IDEA Stakeholder Committee, Transition Cadre, 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 capacity and deepen knowledge and understanding of the indictor/indicator data resulting in rich discussion around progress and evaluation of improvement activities. For example, LEA Special Education Directors were led through a deep dive into their data for Indicators 4, 9 and 10 during which they identified trends, and engaged in discussion around strategies to target areas of need. ECR staff has also met with GACEC to explain the state-wide data system that ensures that LEA data is complete, accurate, reliable and valid, share trends and discuss improvement activities including MTSS, DE-PBS, and other targeted support provided to LEAs. In addition, at state-wide 619 coordinator meetings, data is regularly analyzed at the state and LEA levels around Indicator 12 to determine root causes of noncompliance and strategies to address the root causes. The DDOE also continued to focus on parent engagement, parent representation on stakeholder groups and supporting the 42 LEA Parent Councils of Students with Disabilities. In addition, the DDOE, in collaboration with PIC, have reached out to community centers to identify and remove barriers for underrepresented groups. Community centers include the Boys and Girls Club, United Way, Sussex County Health Coalition and the Latin American Community Center.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 1,200 |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) |  |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) | 106 |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 28 |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 148 |

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1,200 | 1,482 | 80.62% | 81.12% | 80.97% | 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 is based on OSEP’s previously approved measurement which was documented in previous APR reports. Data for the FFY ’20 APR is based off of the new OSEP approved measurement which is described in the measurement/instructions for this indicator.
As some LEAs were still operating virtually or hybrid for a portion of the year, DDOE ensures that this data is complete, accurate, reliable, and valid for Indicator 1. DDOE mitigated the impact of COVID-19 by providing guidance and technical assistance 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.

## 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 EDFacts file specification FS009.

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

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 data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), 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.

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

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[[3]](#footnote-4)**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 8.57% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target <= | 4.60% | 4.30% | 4.00% | 3.70% | 8.57% |
| Data | 2.91% | 2.38% | 2.60% | 2.07% | 8.57% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target <= | 8.27% | 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 insure 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 2021 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, DE-Positive Behavior Support Project Cadre (DE-PBS), MTSS Leadership/Advisory, Special Education Leadership, Special Education Director County meetings, Equity Professional Learning Community, and the Equity in IDEA Stakeholder Committee, Transition Cadre, 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 capacity and deepen knowledge and understanding of the indictor/indicator data resulting in rich discussion around progress and evaluation of improvement activities. For example, LEA Special Education Directors were led through a deep dive into their data for Indicators 4, 9 and 10 during which they identified trends, and engaged in discussion around strategies to target areas of need. ECR staff has also met with GACEC to explain the state-wide data system that ensures that LEA data is complete, accurate, reliable and valid, share trends and discuss improvement activities including MTSS, DE-PBS, and other targeted support provided to LEAs. In addition, at state-wide 619 coordinator meetings, data is regularly analyzed at the state and LEA levels around Indicator 12 to determine root causes of noncompliance and strategies to address the root causes. The DDOE also continued to focus on parent engagement, parent representation on stakeholder groups and supporting the 42 LEA Parent Councils of Students with Disabilities. In addition, the DDOE, in collaboration with PIC, have reached out to community centers to identify and remove barriers for underrepresented groups. Community centers include the Boys and Girls Club, United Way, Sussex County Health Coalition and the Latin American Community Center.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 1,200 |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) |  |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) | 106 |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 28 |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 148 |

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 148 | 1,482 | 8.57% | 8.27% | 9.99% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

Through an analysis of the data personal, truancy and Groves/Job Corps were cited as primary reasons for dropped outs in school year 2020-2021. Through engagement with stakeholders including LEAs, feedback alluded to 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. Reports 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 is based on OSEP’s previously approved measurement which was documented in previous APR reports. Data for the FFY ’20 APR is based off of the new OSEP approved measurement which is described in the measurement/instructions for this indicator.
As some LEAs were still operating virtually or hybrid for a portion of the year, DDOE ensures that this data is complete, accurate, reliable, and valid for Indicator 1. DDOE mitigated the impact of COVID-19 by providing guidance and technical assistance 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.

## 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** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 95.00% | 95.00%  | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 95.00% | 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 insure 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 2021 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, DE-Positive Behavior Support Project Cadre (DE-PBS), MTSS Leadership/Advisory, Special Education Leadership, Special Education Director County meetings, Equity Professional Learning Community, and the Equity in IDEA Stakeholder Committee, Transition Cadre, 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 capacity and deepen knowledge and understanding of the indictor/indicator data resulting in rich discussion around progress and evaluation of improvement activities. For example, LEA Special Education Directors were led through a deep dive into their data for Indicators 4, 9 and 10 during which they identified trends, and engaged in discussion around strategies to target areas of need. ECR staff has also met with GACEC to explain the state-wide data system that ensures that LEA data is complete, accurate, reliable and valid, share trends and discuss improvement activities including MTSS, DE-PBS, and other targeted support provided to LEAs. In addition, at state-wide 619 coordinator meetings, data is regularly analyzed at the state and LEA levels around Indicator 12 to determine root causes of noncompliance and strategies to address the root causes. The DDOE also continued to focus on parent engagement, parent representation on stakeholder groups and supporting the 42 LEA Parent Councils of Students with Disabilities. In addition, the DDOE, in collaboration with PIC, have reached out to community centers to identify and remove barriers for underrepresented groups. Community centers include the Boys and Girls Club, United Way, Sussex County Health Coalition and the Latin American Community Center.

**FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs\* | 1,997 | 2,000 | 1,374 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | 430 | 305 | 298 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | 1,373 | 1,377 | 685 |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 107 | 120 | 131 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs\* | 1,998 | 2,000 | 1,374 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | 375 | 191 | 298 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | 1,424 | 1,488 | 685 |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 107 | 120 | 133 |

\*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.

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 1,910 | 1,997 | 66.96% | 95.00% | 95.64% | Met target | No Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 1,802 | 2,000 | 51.78% | 95.00% | 90.10% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | 1,114 | 1,374 | 51.72% | 95.00% | 81.08% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 1,906 | 1,998 | 66.17% | 95.00% | 95.40% | Met target | No Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 1,799 | 2,000 | 50.58% | 95.00% | 89.95% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | 1,116 | 1,374 | 51.67% | 95.00% | 81.22% | 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 2021 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

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

DDOE ensures that this data is complete, accurate, reliable, and valid for Indicator 3A. DDOE mitigated the impact of COVID-19 by providing guidance and technical assistance for LEAs. COVID-19 did not have any impact on the data collection since the SEA and LEA utilize a state data system. Although most schools resumed in person learning, some schools continued to offer virtual and/or hybrid options. Ongoing quarantines continue to impact instruction.

The DDOE engaged with stakeholders to review historical data, discuss targets and identify improvement activities for participation of students with disabilities in 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, and parents from across the state, school psychologists, teachers, administrators and DDOE staff. Feedback from stakeholders to improve participation rates for Indicator 3 included enrichment opportunities in evenings and on weekends, additional support materials, clear communication with parents, and addressing needs of ELL students.

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 Multi-Tiered System of Support 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 English Language Learners, math standards, quality instruction and initiatives that focus on Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (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** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 22.42% | 25.48% | 28.54% | 31.60% | 34.66% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 17.29% | 20.93% | 24.57% | 28.21% | 31.85% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 17.45% | 21.07% | 24.69% | 28.31% | 31.93% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 21.78% | 24.91% | 28.04% | 31.17% | 34.30% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 12.63% | 16.69% | 20.85% | 25.01% | 29.17% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 11.92% | 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 insure 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 2021 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, DE-Positive Behavior Support Project Cadre (DE-PBS), MTSS Leadership/Advisory, Special Education Leadership, Special Education Director County meetings, Equity Professional Learning Community, and the Equity in IDEA Stakeholder Committee, Transition Cadre, 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 capacity and deepen knowledge and understanding of the indictor/indicator data resulting in rich discussion around progress and evaluation of improvement activities. For example, LEA Special Education Directors were led through a deep dive into their data for Indicators 4, 9 and 10 during which they identified trends, and engaged in discussion around strategies to target areas of need. ECR staff has also met with GACEC to explain the state-wide data system that ensures that LEA data is complete, accurate, reliable and valid, share trends and discuss improvement activities including MTSS, DE-PBS, and other targeted support provided to LEAs. In addition, at state-wide 619 coordinator meetings, data is regularly analyzed at the state and LEA levels around Indicator 12 to determine root causes of noncompliance and strategies to address the root causes. The DDOE also continued to focus on parent engagement, parent representation on stakeholder groups and supporting the 42 LEA Parent Councils of Students with Disabilities. In addition, the DDOE, in collaboration with PIC, have reached out to community centers to identify and remove barriers for underrepresented groups. Community centers include the Boys and Girls Club, United Way, Sussex County Health Coalition and the Latin American Community Center.

**FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**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 regular assessment | 1,803 | 1,682 | 983 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 150 | 56 | 26 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 92 | 89 | 53 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**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 regular assessment | 1,799 | 1,679 | 983 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 151 | 26 | 7 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 85 | 32 | 17 |

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 242 | 1,803 | 13.11% | 22.42% | 13.42% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 145 | 1,682 | 9.22% | 17.29% | 8.62% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | 79 | 983 | 8.75% | 17.45% | 8.04% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable**

From FFY 2020 to FFY 2021, the percentage of students with disabilities in grade 8 decreased in proficiency on the state reading assessment. Analysis of the statewide reading assessment data showed a decrease in proficiency for all students from FFY 2020 to FFY 2021. FFY 2021 showed an increase of 39.37% more 8th grade students with disabilities that participated in the state reading assessment than the previous year. The significant increase in participation also affected the proficiency rate by having a similar number of students that scored proficient out of a much larger N size. When analyzing the statewide data by subgroups, we noticed English Language Learners and students identified as low income increased in proficiency while Students with Disabilities did not. Feedback from stakeholders included COVID -19 as an ongoing influence on the decrease in proficiency rates. FFY 2020 was virtual and/or hybrid for many districts with quarantines remaining problematic. LEAs are still focusing on pandemic recovery of unfinished learning. The impact of COVID-19 related challenges and the ongoing efforts to reach pre-pandemic levels of student success are likely contributors to slippage.

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable**

From FFY 2020 to FFY 2021, the percentage of students with disabilities in High School decreased in proficiency on the state reading assessment. Analysis of the data showed statewide reading proficiency in ELA for all students decreased from the previous year (FFY 2020). An increase of 29% occurred in the number of high school students with disabilities that participated in the ELA state assessment from FFY 2020 to FFY 2021. The significant increase in participation also affected the proficiency score by having a similar number of students that scored proficient but out of a much larger N size. This was also reflected in the analysis of additional statewide data within other subgroups: English Language Learners, students identified as low income, and Students with Disabilities all saw a decrease in proficiency. Feedback from stakeholders included COVID -19 as an ongoing influence on the decrease in proficiency rates. FFY 2020 was virtual and/or hybrid for many districts with quarantines remaining problematic. LEAs are still focusing on pandemic recovery of unfinished learning. The impact of COVID-19 related challenges and the ongoing efforts to reach pre-pandemic levels of student success are likely contributors to slippage.

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 236 | 1,799 | 10.61% | 21.78% | 13.12% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 58 | 1,679 | 3.15% | 12.63% | 3.45% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | 24 | 983 | 2.09% | 11.92% | 2.44% | 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 2021 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. DDOE mitigated the impact of COVID-19 by providing guidance and technical assistance for LEAs. COVID-19 did not have any impact on the data collection since the SEA and LEA utilize a state data system. Although most schools resumed in person learning, some schools continued to offer virtual and/or hybrid options. Ongoing quarantines continue to impact instruction.
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 English Language Learners (ELL).
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 English Language 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 participate 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 EDFacts 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** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 28.35% | 30.76% | 33.17% | 35.58% | 37.99% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 43.79% | 44.48% | 45.17% | 45.86% | 46.55% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 42.98% | 43.76% | 44.54% | 45.32% | 46.10% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 33.75% | 35.55% | 37.35% | 39.15% | 40.95% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 24.55% | 27.38% | 30.21% | 33.04% | 35.87% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 16.44% | 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 insure 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 2021 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, DE-Positive Behavior Support Project Cadre (DE-PBS), MTSS Leadership/Advisory, Special Education Leadership, Special Education Director County meetings, Equity Professional Learning Community, and the Equity in IDEA Stakeholder Committee, Transition Cadre, 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 capacity and deepen knowledge and understanding of the indictor/indicator data resulting in rich discussion around progress and evaluation of improvement activities. For example, LEA Special Education Directors were led through a deep dive into their data for Indicators 4, 9 and 10 during which they identified trends, and engaged in discussion around strategies to target areas of need. ECR staff has also met with GACEC to explain the state-wide data system that ensures that LEA data is complete, accurate, reliable and valid, share trends and discuss improvement activities including MTSS, DE-PBS, and other targeted support provided to LEAs. In addition, at state-wide 619 coordinator meetings, data is regularly analyzed at the state and LEA levels around Indicator 12 to determine root causes of noncompliance and strategies to address the root causes. The DDOE also continued to focus on parent engagement, parent representation on stakeholder groups and supporting the 42 LEA Parent Councils of Students with Disabilities. In addition, the DDOE, in collaboration with PIC, have reached out to community centers to identify and remove barriers for underrepresented groups. Community centers include the Boys and Girls Club, United Way, Sussex County Health Coalition and the Latin American Community Center.

**FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**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 | 107 | 120 | 131 |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient | 44 | 33 | 29 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**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 | 107 | 120 | 133 |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient | 12 | 19 | 8 |

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 44 | 107 | 13.00% | 28.35% | 41.12% | Met target | No Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 33 | 120 | 20.00% | 43.79% | 27.50% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | 29 | 131 | 40.45% | 42.98% | 22.14% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable**

From FFY 2020 to FFY 2021, the percentage of students proficient on the ELA high school Alternate Achievement Standards Assessment decreased by 18.31%. While the number of students that scored proficient in this group did not significantly change (FFY 2020 was 36 students and FFY 2021 was 29 students), the participation rate of students with IEPs in state assessments increased by 29%. The larger N size affected the proficiency rate overall. When analyzing the subgroup data for this group on this assessment, the N size is too small year to year to make meaningful conclusions. Feedback from stakeholders included COVID -19 as an ongoing influence on the decrease in proficiency rates. FFY 2020 was virtual and/or hybrid for many districts with quarantines remaining problematic. LEAs are still focusing on pandemic recovery from unfinished learning. The impact of COVID-19 related challenges and the ongoing efforts to reach pre-pandemic levels of student success are likely contributors to slippage.

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 12 | 107 | 39.00% | 33.75% | 11.21% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 19 | 120 | 8.89% | 24.55% | 15.83% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | 8 | 133 | 32.18% | 16.44% | 6.02% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable**

From FFY 2020 to FFY 2021, the percentage of students proficient on the High School Math Alternate Achievement Standards Assessment decreased by 26.16%. While the proficiency rate decreased, the participation rate increased for students with IEPs on state assessments by 29%. The larger N size affected the proficiency rate overall. When analyzing the High School Alternate Achievement Standard assessment data, the N size is too small year to year to make meaningful conclusions. Feedback from stakeholders included COVID -19 as an ongoing influence on the decrease in proficiency scores. FFY 2020 was virtual and/or hybrid for many districts with quarantines remaining problematic. LEAs are still focusing on the pandemic recovery from unfinished learning. The impact of COVID-19 related challenges and the ongoing efforts to reach pre-pandemic levels of student success 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 2021 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

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

DDOE ensures that this data is complete, accurate, reliable, and valid for Indicator 3C. DDOE mitigated the impact of COVID-19 by providing guidance and technical assistance for LEAs. COVID-19 did not have any impact on the data collection since the SEA and LEA utilize a state data system. Although most schools resumed in person learning, some schools continued to offer virtual and/or hybrid options. Ongoing quarantines continue to impact instruction.

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, and 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 English Language Learners (ELL).

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 English Language 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 participate 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 2021-2022 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 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 2021-2022 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 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** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A <= | Grade 4 | 30.21 | 28.70  | 27.19 | 25.68 | 24.17 |
| Reading | B <= | Grade 8 | 39.30 | 37.33 | 35.36 | 33.39 | 31.42 |
| Reading | C <= | Grade HS | 36.33 | 34.51 | 32.69 | 30.87 | 29.05 |
| Math | A <= | Grade 4 | 31.78 | 30.19 | 28.60 | 27.01 | 25.42 |
| Math | B <= | Grade 8 | 31.76 | 30.17 | 28.58 | 26.99 | 25.40 |
| Math | C <= | Grade HS | 22.98 | 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 insure 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 2021 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, DE-Positive Behavior Support Project Cadre (DE-PBS), MTSS Leadership/Advisory, Special Education Leadership, Special Education Director County meetings, Equity Professional Learning Community, and the Equity in IDEA Stakeholder Committee, Transition Cadre, 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 capacity and deepen knowledge and understanding of the indictor/indicator data resulting in rich discussion around progress and evaluation of improvement activities. For example, LEA Special Education Directors were led through a deep dive into their data for Indicators 4, 9 and 10 during which they identified trends, and engaged in discussion around strategies to target areas of need. ECR staff has also met with GACEC to explain the state-wide data system that ensures that LEA data is complete, accurate, reliable and valid, share trends and discuss improvement activities including MTSS, DE-PBS, and other targeted support provided to LEAs. In addition, at state-wide 619 coordinator meetings, data is regularly analyzed at the state and LEA levels around Indicator 12 to determine root causes of noncompliance and strategies to address the root causes. The DDOE also continued to focus on parent engagement, parent representation on stakeholder groups and supporting the 42 LEA Parent Councils of Students with Disabilities. In addition, the DDOE, in collaboration with PIC, have reached out to community centers to identify and remove barriers for underrepresented groups. Community centers include the Boys and Girls Club, United Way, Sussex County Health Coalition and the Latin American Community Center.

**FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 10,003 | 10,482 | 8,489 |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 1,803 | 1,682 | 983 |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 3,586 | 3,990 | 3,797 |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 467 | 377 | 204 |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 150 | 56 | 26 |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 92 | 89 | 53 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 10,041 | 10,501 | 8,489 |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 1,799 | 1,679 | 983 |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 3,158 | 2,307 | 1,964 |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 390 | 166 | 97 |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 151 | 26 | 7 |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 85 | 32 | 17 |

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 13.42% | 40.52% | 23.46 | 30.21 | 27.10 | Met target | No Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 8.62% | 41.66% | 34.90 | 39.30 | 33.04 | Met target | No Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | 8.04% | 47.13% | 40.50 | 36.33 | 39.09 | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 13.12% | 35.34% | 17.19 | 31.78 | 22.22 | Met target | No Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 3.45% | 23.55% | 20.65 | 31.76 | 20.10 | Met target | No Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | 2.44% | 24.28% | 25.54 | 22.98 | 21.84 | Met target | No Slippage |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

DDOE ensures that this data is complete, accurate, reliable, and valid for Indicator 3C. DDOE mitigated the impact of COVID-19 by providing guidance and technical assistance for LEAs. COVID-19 did not have any impact on the data collection since the SEA and LEA utilize a state data system. Although most schools resumed in person learning, some schools continued to offer virtual and/or hybrid options. Ongoing quarantines continue to impact instruction.
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 decrease the gap: enrichment opportunities in evenings and on weekends, additional support materials, clear communication with parents, and addressing needs of English Language Learners (ELL).
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 English Language 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 participate 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 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 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), 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 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 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 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 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 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts 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 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) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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, etc.) 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target <= | 0.00% | 50.00% | 50.00% | 40.00% | 40.00% |
| Data | 66.67% | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target <= | 32.00% | 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 insure 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 2021 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, DE-Positive Behavior Support Project Cadre (DE-PBS), MTSS Leadership/Advisory, Special Education Leadership, Special Education Director County meetings, Equity Professional Learning Community, and the Equity in IDEA Stakeholder Committee, Transition Cadre, 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 capacity and deepen knowledge and understanding of the indictor/indicator data resulting in rich discussion around progress and evaluation of improvement activities. For example, LEA Special Education Directors were led through a deep dive into their data for Indicators 4, 9 and 10 during which they identified trends, and engaged in discussion around strategies to target areas of need. ECR staff has also met with GACEC to explain the state-wide data system that ensures that LEA data is complete, accurate, reliable and valid, share trends and discuss improvement activities including MTSS, DE-PBS, and other targeted support provided to LEAs. In addition, at state-wide 619 coordinator meetings, data is regularly analyzed at the state and LEA levels around Indicator 12 to determine root causes of noncompliance and strategies to address the root causes. The DDOE also continued to focus on parent engagement, parent representation on stakeholder groups and supporting the 42 LEA Parent Councils of Students with Disabilities. In addition, the DDOE, in collaboration with PIC, have reached out to community centers to identify and remove barriers for underrepresented groups. Community centers include the Boys and Girls Club, United Way, Sussex County Health Coalition and the Latin American Community Center.

**FFY 2021 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.**

0

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy** | **Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 0 | 42 | 0.00% | 32.00% | 0.00% | 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 to identify significant discrepancy. 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 students without disabilities suspended or expelled greater than 10 days within each LEA.

The DDOE defines “significant discrepancy” as those LEAs with a rate ratio which exceeds the State Determined Ratio of 2.0 for three years and for which the number of students with disabilities suspended or expelled greater than 10 days equals or exceeds 15 students (state established n size). Delaware’s threshold is a static rate ratio of 2.0, with a state-established n size of 15 for Indicator 4A. To identify Significant Discrepancy, the DDOE examines three consecutive years of data. If an LEA meets the n size and State Determined Ratio of 2.0 for each of three consecutive years, the LEA is identified with Significant Discrepancy.

To ensure that the suspension/expulsion rate for every LEA is analyzed, Delaware goes a step further and reviews data using an additional rate ratio of 5.0 and an n size of 5. Any LEA that exceeds the 5.0 rate ratio for one year and also meets the n size of 5 is 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)**

DDOE ensures that this data is complete, accurate, reliable, and valid for Indicator 4A. DDOE mitigated the impact of COVID-19 by providing guidance and technical assistance for LEAs. This included providing professional learning and training in the DE-Positive Behavior Support Project 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-PBS Project. 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 2021 using 2020-2021 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.**

For FFY 21, using 2020-2021 data, the Delaware Department of Education did not identify any LEAs with significant discrepancy. Therefore, the Delaware Department of Education did not need to conduct a review of policies, procedures and practices.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

| **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 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), 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 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 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 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2020-2021 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 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 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 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 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 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) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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, etc.) 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 100.00% | 50.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target  | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**FFY 2021 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.**

0

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 0 | 0 | 42 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

**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. The DDOE defines Significant Discrepancy for Indicator 4B as those LEAs with a rate ratio which exceeds the “State bar” of 2.0 and for which the number of students with disabilities within a racial or ethnic category are suspended or expelled greater than 10 days equals or exceeds 10 students (state established n size). The DDOE calculates the LEAs’ rate ratio by dividing the percentage of students with disabilities in each race or ethnicity, suspended or expelled greater than 10 days by the percentage of general education students suspended or expelled greater than 10 days within each LEA. The DDOE also reviews data for LEAs that exceed the rate ratio in any race or ethnic category by a significant margin but do not meet the n size. In addition, any LEA, with an n size of 5 or more in a race or ethnic group, that exceeds the rate ratio of 5.0 within one year, will be identified with Significant Discrepancy.

The state bar or threshold for Delaware is a static rate ratio of 2.0, with a state-established n size of 10 for Indicator 4B. In addition, 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. If an LEA meets the n size and rate ratio for each of three consecutive years, the LEA is identified with Significant Discrepancy.

 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)**

DDOE ensures that this data is complete, accurate, reliable, and valid for Indicator 4B. DDOE mitigated the impact of COVID-19 by providing guidance and technical assistance for LEAs. This included providing professional learning and training in DE-PBS 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-PBS Project. 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 2021 using 2020-2021 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.**

For FFY 21 using SY 2020-2021 data, the DDOE did not identify any LEAs with significant discrepancy. Therefore, DDOE did not need to conduct a review of any LEAs 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 DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

| **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 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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

# 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 EDFacts 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** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| A | 2020 | Target >= | 70.00% | 71.00% | 72.00% | 72.00% | 64.54% |
| A | 64.54% | Data | 65.72% | 65.74% | 64.98% | 64.25% | 64.54% |
| B | 2020 | Target <= | 15.10% | 14.90% | 14.70% | 14.70% | 15.09% |
| B | 15.09% | Data | 14.96% | 14.94% | 14.61% | 14.80% | 15.09% |
| C | 2020 | Target <= | 4.50% | 4.00% | 3.50% | 3.50% | 4.93% |
| C | 4.93% | Data | 5.46% | 5.22% | 4.91% | 4.83% | 4.93% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 65.54% | 66.54% | 67.54% | 68.54% | 69.54% |
| Target B <= | 14.59% | 14.09% | 13.59% | 13.09% | 12.59% |
| Target C <= | 4.73% | 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 insure 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 2021 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, DE-Positive Behavior Support Project Cadre (DE-PBS), MTSS Leadership/Advisory, Special Education Leadership, Special Education Director County meetings, Equity Professional Learning Community, and the Equity in IDEA Stakeholder Committee, Transition Cadre, 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 capacity and deepen knowledge and understanding of the indictor/indicator data resulting in rich discussion around progress and evaluation of improvement activities. For example, LEA Special Education Directors were led through a deep dive into their data for Indicators 4, 9 and 10 during which they identified trends, and engaged in discussion around strategies to target areas of need. ECR staff has also met with GACEC to explain the state-wide data system that ensures that LEA data is complete, accurate, reliable and valid, share trends and discuss improvement activities including MTSS, DE-PBS, and other targeted support provided to LEAs. In addition, at state-wide 619 coordinator meetings, data is regularly analyzed at the state and LEA levels around Indicator 12 to determine root causes of noncompliance and strategies to address the root causes. The DDOE also continued to focus on parent engagement, parent representation on stakeholder groups and supporting the 42 LEA Parent Councils of Students with Disabilities. In addition, the DDOE, in collaboration with PIC, have reached out to community centers to identify and remove barriers for underrepresented groups. Community centers include the Boys and Girls Club, United Way, Sussex County Health Coalition and the Latin American Community Center.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/06/2022 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 | 24,217 |
| SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/06/2022 | A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 15,728 |
| SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/06/2022 | B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 3,658 |
| SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/06/2022 | c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools | 988 |
| SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/06/2022 | c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities | 28 |
| SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/06/2022 | c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements | 139 |

**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 2021 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 15,728 | 24,217 | 64.54% | 65.54% | 64.95% | 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 | 3,658 | 24,217 | 15.09% | 14.59% | 15.11% | 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] | 1,155 | 24,217 | 4.93% | 4.73% | 4.77% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

DDOE met with stakeholders to discuss baseline, 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 mitigated the impact of COVID-19 by providing guidance and technical assistance to LEAs on LRE. The technical assistance includes guidance documents, professional development and training at Access to the General Education Committee meetings and LEA Special Education Director Leadership meetings. In addition, DDOE meets individually with LEAs to problem solve, review/analyze data and support the implementation of best practices relating to least restrictive environments. 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.

## 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 EDFacts 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 – 6A, 6B**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| **A** | Target >= | 48.50% | 49.00% | 50.50% | 50.50% |  |
| **A** | Data | 47.46% | 49.24% | 47.91% | 49.37% | 28.89% |
| **B** | Target <= | 33.50% | 32.00% | 31.00% | 31.00% |  |
| **B** | Data | 34.78% | 34.59% | 37.38% | 34.45% | 51.15% |

**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 insure 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 2021 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, DE-Positive Behavior Support Project Cadre (DE-PBS), MTSS Leadership/Advisory, Special Education Leadership, Special Education Director County meetings, Equity Professional Learning Community, and the Equity in IDEA Stakeholder Committee, Transition Cadre, 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 capacity and deepen knowledge and understanding of the indictor/indicator data resulting in rich discussion around progress and evaluation of improvement activities. For example, LEA Special Education Directors were led through a deep dive into their data for Indicators 4, 9 and 10 during which they identified trends, and engaged in discussion around strategies to target areas of need. ECR staff has also met with GACEC to explain the state-wide data system that ensures that LEA data is complete, accurate, reliable and valid, share trends and discuss improvement activities including MTSS, DE-PBS, and other targeted support provided to LEAs. In addition, at state-wide 619 coordinator meetings, data is regularly analyzed at the state and LEA levels around Indicator 12 to determine root causes of noncompliance and strategies to address the root causes. The DDOE also continued to focus on parent engagement, parent representation on stakeholder groups and supporting the 42 LEA Parent Councils of Students with Disabilities. In addition, the DDOE, in collaboration with PIC, have reached out to community centers to identify and remove barriers for underrepresented groups. Community centers include the Boys and Girls Club, United Way, Sussex County Health Coalition and the Latin American Community Center.

**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 not 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** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A1, age 3 >= | 36.70% | 36.80% | 36.90% | 37.00% | 37.50% |
| Target B1, age 3 <= | 40.40% | 40.00% | 39.50% | 39.00% | 38.50% |
| Target A2, age 4 >=  | 41.10% | 41.90% | 42.70% | 43.50% | 44.40% |
| Target B2, age 4 <= | 40.40% | 40.00% | 39.50% | 39.00% | 38.50% |
| Target A3, age 5 >=  | 44.30% | 46.00% | 47.90% | 49.80% | 51.80% |
| Target B3, age 5 <=  | 38.90% | 38.00% | 37.10% | 36.20% | 35.40% |

**Individual Targets – 6C**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target C1, age 3 <= | 1.80% | 1.80% | 1.80% | 1.80% | 1.80% |
| Target C2, age 4 <= | 0.80% | 0.80% | 0.80% | 0.80% | 0.80% |
| Target C3, age 5 <= | 0.60% | 0.60% | 0.60% | 0.60% | 0.60% |

**Prepopulated Data**

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

**Date:**

07/06/2022

| **Description** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **3 through 5 - Total** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total number of children with IEPs | 768 | 1,059 | 311 | 2,138 |
| 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 | 249 | 385 | 113 | 747 |
| b1. Number of children attending separate special education class | 358 | 485 | 147 | 990 |
| b2. Number of children attending separate school | 32 | 23 | 4 | 59 |
| b3. Number of children attending residential facility | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| c1**.** Numberof children receiving special education and related services in the home | 7 | 5 | 3 | 15 |

**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 2021 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 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 | 249 | 768 | 26.86% | 36.70% | 32.42% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| B1. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility | 390 | 768 | 55.32% | 40.40% | 50.78% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| C1. Home | 7 | 768 | 1.06% | 1.80% | 0.91% | Met target | No Slippage |

**FFY 2021 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 2020 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 | 385 | 1,059 | 28.52% | 41.10% | 36.36% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| B2. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility | 508 | 1,059 | 50.72% | 40.40% | 47.97% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| C2. Home | 5 | 1,059 | 0.29% | 0.80% | 0.47% | Met target | No Slippage |

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 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 | 113 | 311 | 35.54% | 44.30% | 36.33% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| B3. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility | 151 | 311 | 41.81% | 38.90% | 48.55% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| C3. Home | 3 | 311 | 0.35% | 0.60% | 0.96% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group B3 age 5, if applicable**

The difference between children age 5 with IEPs between FFY 20 and FFY 21 is an increase of 24 more 5-year-olds, with IEPs in FFY 21. Correspondingly, the difference between those served in these preschool environments from FFY 20 to FFY 21 reflects an increase of 31 children. LEAs continue to report recruitment and retention of early childhood personnel, especially related service providers as very difficult. In turn, this reduces the ability of districts to serve these children itinerantly, in their community based settings, especially when these children require multiple service providers. Technical assistance has been provided to the LEAs to consider alternative options such as continuing to seek out and contract with providers to use telepractice supports. Also, given the small number of children, a modest to low change in numbers of settings will be amplified enough to produce this slippage of 6.74%.

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group C3 age 5, if applicable**

For FFY 20 1 child in the 5 year old age group was reported as served at home. This year the number is 3, reflecting an increase of 2 children from last year. In any given school year, this number may have some variability which the SEA believes is not indicative of a systemic issue related to this particular setting.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

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 2 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** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| A1 | 2020 | Target >= | 88.60% | 89.80% | 91.00% | 91.00% | 86.00% |
| A1 | 86.00% | Data | 89.89% | 91.25% | 89.78% | 85.99% | 84.61% |
| A2 | 2020 | Target >= | 58.00% | 59.30% | 60.70% | 60.70% | 47.53% |
| A2 | 47.53% | Data | 51.26% | 51.06% | 50.95% | 46.63% | 47.03% |
| B1 | 2020 | Target >= | 91.10% | 92.20% | 93.40% | 93.40% | 87.04% |
| B1 | 87.04% | Data | 87.36% | 88.14% | 88.49% | 86.84% | 85.24% |
| B2 | 2020 | Target >= | 52.70% | 53.70% | 54.80% | 54.80% | 46.12% |
| B2 | 46.12% | Data | 48.60% | 46.86% | 48.38% | 44.97% | 43.86% |
| C1 | 2020 | Target >= | 90.20% | 91.30% | 92.30% | 92.30% | 88.31% |
| C1 | 88.31% | Data | 88.19% | 89.60% | 89.34% | 87.73% | 85.54% |
| C2 | 2020 | Target >= | 65.30% | 65.40% | 65.50% | 65.50% | 59.35% |
| C2 | 59.35% | Data | 64.31% | 63.58% | 60.92% | 59.14% | 56.57% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A1 >= | 86.50% | 87.20% | 88.31% | 89.00% | 89.51% |
| Target A2 >= | 48.42% | 49.32% | 50.21% | 51.11% | 52.00% |
| Target B1 >= | 87.27% | 87.49% | 87.72% | 87.94% | 88.71% |
| Target B2 >= | 46.62% | 47.12% | 47.62% | 48.12% | 48.62% |
| Target C1 >= | 88.65% | 88.99% | 89.32% | 89.66% | 90.00% |
| Target C2 >= | 59.65% | 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 insure 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 2021 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, DE-Positive Behavior Support Project Cadre (DE-PBS), MTSS Leadership/Advisory, Special Education Leadership, Special Education Director County meetings, Equity Professional Learning Community, and the Equity in IDEA Stakeholder Committee, Transition Cadre, 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 capacity and deepen knowledge and understanding of the indictor/indicator data resulting in rich discussion around progress and evaluation of improvement activities. For example, LEA Special Education Directors were led through a deep dive into their data for Indicators 4, 9 and 10 during which they identified trends, and engaged in discussion around strategies to target areas of need. ECR staff has also met with GACEC to explain the state-wide data system that ensures that LEA data is complete, accurate, reliable and valid, share trends and discuss improvement activities including MTSS, DE-PBS, and other targeted support provided to LEAs. In addition, at state-wide 619 coordinator meetings, data is regularly analyzed at the state and LEA levels around Indicator 12 to determine root causes of noncompliance and strategies to address the root causes. The DDOE also continued to focus on parent engagement, parent representation on stakeholder groups and supporting the 42 LEA Parent Councils of Students with Disabilities. In addition, the DDOE, in collaboration with PIC, have reached out to community centers to identify and remove barriers for underrepresented groups. Community centers include the Boys and Girls Club, United Way, Sussex County Health Coalition and the Latin American Community Center.

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

**Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed**

867

**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 | 14 | 1.61% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 89 | 10.27% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 297 | 34.26% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 315 | 36.33% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 152 | 17.53% |

| **Outcome A** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 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. *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 612 | 715 | 84.61% | 86.50% | 85.59% | Did not meet target | No 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. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 467 | 867 | 47.03% | 48.42% | 53.86% | Met target | No 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 | 1.61% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 100 | 11.53% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 321 | 37.02% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 364 | 41.98% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 68 | 7.84% |

| **Outcome B** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 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. *Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 685 | 799 | 85.24% | 87.27% | 85.73% | Did not meet 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. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 432 | 867 | 43.86% | 46.62% | 49.83% | 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 | 16 | 1.85% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 87 | 10.03% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 227 | 26.18% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 385 | 44.41% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 152 | 17.53% |

| **Outcome C** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 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.*Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*  | 612 | 715 | 85.54% | 88.65% | 85.59% | 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. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 537 | 867 | 56.57% | 59.65% | 61.94% | Met target | No Slippage |

**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 Form (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)**

DDOE ensures that this data is complete, accurate, reliable, and valid for Indicator 7. DDOE continues working closely with the LEA 619 staff and meets individually with LEAs as requested to provide technical assistance for problem solving, reviewing and analyzing of their data and for supporting the LEA’s implementation of evidence-based practices for 619 eligible children. Technical assistance information and training is available through the DDOE supported online learning platform known as Schoology. Enhancements to the statewide data portal, known as EdInsights has greatly improved the Indicator 7 data collection and reporting process both at the SEA level and at the LEA level.

## 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 2 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 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023,** 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 insure 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 2021 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, DE-Positive Behavior Support Project Cadre (DE-PBS), MTSS Leadership/Advisory, Special Education Leadership, Special Education Director County meetings, Equity Professional Learning Community, and the Equity in IDEA Stakeholder Committee, Transition Cadre, 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 capacity and deepen knowledge and understanding of the indictor/indicator data resulting in rich discussion around progress and evaluation of improvement activities. For example, LEA Special Education Directors were led through a deep dive into their data for Indicators 4, 9 and 10 during which they identified trends, and engaged in discussion around strategies to target areas of need. ECR staff has also met with GACEC to explain the state-wide data system that ensures that LEA data is complete, accurate, reliable and valid, share trends and discuss improvement activities including MTSS, DE-PBS, and other targeted support provided to LEAs. In addition, at state-wide 619 coordinator meetings, data is regularly analyzed at the state and LEA levels around Indicator 12 to determine root causes of noncompliance and strategies to address the root causes. The DDOE also continued to focus on parent engagement, parent representation on stakeholder groups and supporting the 42 LEA Parent Councils of Students with Disabilities. In addition, the DDOE, in collaboration with PIC, have reached out to community centers to identify and remove barriers for underrepresented groups. Community centers include the Boys and Girls Club, United Way, Sussex County Health Coalition and the Latin American Community Center.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2017 | 89.54% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target >= | 88.00% | 89.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% |
| Data | 89.18% | 89.54% | 93.50% | 92.33% | 94.07% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 90.50% | 91.00% | 91.50% | 92.00% | 92.50% |

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1,716 | 1,879 | 94.07% | 90.50% | 91.33% | 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 56 Part B 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.**

26,667

**Percentage of respondent parents**

7.05%

**Response Rate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Response Rate  | 6.99% | 7.05% |

**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 DDOE continues to engage stakeholders in analyzing survey data to increase response rate. Stakeholders include the Parent Information Center of Delaware (PIC), Governor’s Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens, Special Education Leadership and Special Education Directors.
Based on stakeholder input, the following strategies were implemented for the 2022-2023 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 was displayed on both the DDOE website, the PIC website, and Facebook/via social media. In addition, the flyers were distributed to 42 LEA parent councils.
• While the survey is mailed to families twice a year based on their student’s annual IEP date, families also have the option to complete the electronic version of the survey after their IEP meeting by the use of a QR scan code.

Moving forward, the DDOE in collaboration with PIC will create a guidance document for PIC staff to use when explaining the survey to parents and encouraging participation. In addition, to extend the reach to underrepresented groups such as our African American and Hispanic families, the DDOE and PIC have reached out to community centers to engage in identifying and eliminating barriers for underrepresented groups. Community centers include the Boys and Girls Club, Latin American Community Center and the United Way. Strategies to reach African American and Hispanic families include the inclusion of the survey information in newsletters in multiple languages, access to multilingual community members to answer questions regarding the survey and increased informational displays and tables at school events that attract diverse families (Open House, graduation, and parent teacher conferences).

**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 = 16.90%, Representation of survey respondents = 9.79%
American Indian/Alaskan Native: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 0.34%, Representation of survey respondents = 0.27%
Black/African American: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 35.81%, Representation of survey respondents = 20.33%
White/Caucasian: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 40.29%, Representation of survey respondents = 52.37%
Asian American: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 1.97%, Representation of survey respondents = 2.87%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 0.12%, Representation of survey respondents = 0.00%
Multi-Racial: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 4.57%, Representation of survey respondents = 12.72%

Age Groups

Age 3: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 2.91%, Representation of survey respondents = 3.99%
Age 4: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 4.02%, Representation of survey respondents = 4.79%
Age 5: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 4.53%, Representation of survey respondents = 6.01%
Age 6: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 5.22%, Representation of survey respondents = 6.49%
Age 7: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 6.03%, Representation of survey respondents = 6.33%
Age 8: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 6.61%, Representation of survey respondents = 6.65%
Age 9: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 7.07%, Representation of survey respondents = 7.08%
Age 10: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 7.74%, Representation of survey respondents = 5.96%
Age 11: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 7.60%, Representation of survey respondents = 6.01%
Age 12: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 7.85%, Representation of survey respondents = 4.84%
Age 13: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 7.70%, Representation of survey respondents = 5.11%
Age 14: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 7.39%, Representation of survey respondents = 3.99%
Age 15: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 6.97%, Representation of survey respondents = 5.38%
Age 16: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 6.91%, Representation of survey respondents = 5.96%
Age 17: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 6.04%, Representation of survey respondents = 5.22%
Age 18: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 3.56%, Representation of survey respondents = 2.50%
Age 19: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 1.04%, Representation of survey respondents = 1.05%
Age 20: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 0.60%, Representation of survey respondents = 0.43%
Age 21: Statewide representation of student with IEPs = 0.19%, Representation of survey respondents = 0.37%

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

Caucasian students were overrepresented by 11.47% while Black/African American students were underrepresented by 15.96% and Hispanic/Latino students were underrepresented by 7.11%. 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 8.15%.

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 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 was displayed on both the DDOE website, the PIC website, and Facebook/via social media. In addition, the flyers were distributed to 42 LEA parent councils and all LEA special education directors for distribution.
• While the survey is mailed to families twice a year based on their student’s annual IEP date, families also have the option to complete the survey after their IEP meeting by the use of a QR scan code.

Moving forward, the DDOE in collaboration with PIC will create a guidance document for PIC staff to use when explaining the survey to parents and encouraging participation. In addition, to extend the reach to underrepresented groups, the DDOE and PIC have reached out to community centers to engage in identifying and eliminating barriers for underrepresented groups. Community centers include the Boys and Girls Club, Latin American Community Center and the United Way

**Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding 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.**

An analysis of the survey response rate for parents of children in each race and ethnicity category was compared to the statewide race and ethnicity categories for all students receiving special education services. According to the statewide race and ethnicity demographics for children receiving special education services, African American and Hispanic/Latino students represent 52.71% of the special education population. The combined survey response rate for the parents of African American and Hispanic/Latino students with disabilities was 30.02%. This response rate was not representative of the statewide demographics.
 Based on stakeholder feedback, the DDOE also analyzed the survey response rate for parents of students receiving special education services compared to the statewide demographics of students receiving special education services by age (3-21). All of the age group categories were representative of the state demographics for students receiving special education services with the exception of 12 and 14 year olds.

The demographics of the parents 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, the following strategies were implemented for the 2022-2023 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 was displayed on both the DDOE website, the PIC website, and Facebook/via social media. In addition, the flyers were distributed to 42 LEA parent councils and all LEA special education directors for distribution.
• While the survey is mailed to families twice a year based on their student’s annual IEP date, families also have the option to complete the survey after their IEP meeting by the use of a QR scan code.

Moving forward, the DDOE in collaboration with PIC will create a guidance document for PIC staff to use when explaining the survey to parents and encouraging participation. In addition, to extend the reach to underrepresented groups, the DDOE and PIC have reached out to community centers to engage in identifying and eliminating barriers for underrepresented groups. Community centers include the Boys and Girls Club, Latin American Community Center and the United Way. The DDOE will also target activities to increase the response rate among middle school (12 year old students) and high school (14 year olds).

**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.

| **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 2021 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2021 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 2020 SPP/APR**

An analysis of the survey response rate for parents of children in each race and ethnicity category was compared to the statewide race and ethnicity categories for all students receiving special education services. According to the statewide race and ethnicity demographics for children receiving special education services, African American and Hispanic/Latino students represent 52.71% of the special education population. The combined survey response rate for the parents of African American and Hispanic/Latino students with disabilities was 30.02%. This response rate was not representative of the statewide demographics.
Based on stakeholder feedback, the DDOE also analyzed the survey response rate for parents of students receiving special education services compared to the statewide demographics of students receiving special education services by age (3-21). All of the age group categories were representative of the state demographics for students receiving special education services with the exception of 12, and 14 year olds.

## 8 - OSEP Response

## 8 - 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.

# 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, etc. 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 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

**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.

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 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, etc.) 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target  | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 17.50% | 0.00% | 5.13% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target  | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 1 | 0 | 41 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | N/A | N/A |

**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 Delaware Department of Education (DDOE) used its data from December 1, 2021 (submitted to OSEP in April 2022) for the FFY 2021 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 school population
\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Denominator: # all other Non-X SWD
---------------------------------------------------------
Total # of Non-X in the school 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" was set at a relative risk ratio of 2.0. The DDOE brought stakeholders together to engage in rich discussion around Disproportionate Representation and to provide input/feedback on how to improve this indicator. After lengthy discussion and data analysis, stakeholders agreed to increase the state bar from 1.46 to 2.0 with a cell size of 15. This changed the baseline year to FFY 2021.

**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 2021, 1 LEA exceeded the relative risk ratio 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 a self-assessment in those areas and submitted to the DDOE, the DDOE assessed for compliance and also reviewed an additional sample of individual student records for compliance with federal and DDOE regulations.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

For FFY 2021, the State 'bar" was set at a relative risk ratio of 2.0. The DDOE brought stakeholders together to engage in rich discussion around Disproportionate Representation and to provide input/feedback on how to improve this indicator. After lengthy discussion and data analysis, stakeholders agreed to increase the state bar from 1.46 to 2.0 with a cell size of 15. This changed the baseline year to FFY 2021.
DDOE ensures that this data is complete, accurate, reliable, and valid for Indicator 9. DDOE mitigated the impact of COVID-19 by providing guidance documents and technical assistance. This includes professional learning, training and coaching in Multi-Tiered Systems of Behavioral and Academic Supports (MTSS), Universal Design for Learning, Delaware Early Literacy Initiative and the DE-PBS Project. 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. 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. 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.

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.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

| **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 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 9 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2021, and OSEP accepts that revision.

## 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 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, etc. 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 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

**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.

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 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, etc.) 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target  | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 18.92% | 2.70% | 5.13% | 2.63% | 2.56% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target  | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**FFY 2021 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 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 18 | 1 | 41 | 2.56% | 0% | 2.44% | N/A | N/A |

**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 Delaware Department of Education (DDOE) used its data from December 1, 2021 (submitted to OSEP in April 2022) for the FFY 2021 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 school
\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
Denominator:
# of Other students in Y disability category
-----------------------------------------------------------------
Total # of Other students in the school 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” was set at a relative risk ratio of 2.0. The DDOE brought stakeholders together to engage in rich discussion around Disproportionate Representation and to provide input/feedback on how to improve this indicator. After lengthy discussion and data analysis, stakeholders agreed to increase the state bar from 1.50 to 2.0 with a cell size of 10 beginning in FFY 2021. This changed the baseline year to FFY 2021.

**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 2021, 18 LEAs exceeded the relative risk ratio 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 a self-assessment in those areas, the DDOE assessed for compliance and reviewed an additional sampling an individual student records for compliance with federal and DDOE regulations.

1 LEA was found non-compliant with an individual student record. They were notified and directed to correct the student file. They did so within a 30-day timeline.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The DDOE brought stakeholders together to engage in rich discussion around Disproportionate Representation and to provide input/feedback on how to improve this indicator. After lengthy discussion and data analysis, stakeholders agreed to increase the state bar from 1.50 to 2.0 with a cell size of 10 beginning in FFY 2021. This changed the baseline year to FFY 2021.

DDOE ensures that this data is complete, accurate, reliable, and valid for Indicator 10. DDOE mitigated the impact of COVID-19 by providing guidance documents and technical assistance. This includes professional learning, training and coaching in Multi-Tiered Systems of Behavioral and Academic Supports (MTSS), Universal Design for Learning, Delaware Early Literacy Initiative and the DE-PBS Project. 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. 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. 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.

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.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

| **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 |

**FFY 2020 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 correction of non-compliance of policies, practices and procedures. The DDOE then utilized updated data to randomly select student records from the 1 LEA and verified that the LEA was 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 2020, the DDOE identified 1 LEA with noncompliance relating to disproportionate representation. The individual files presented to DDOE were compliant, however, the LEA self-identified non-compliance in regulatory requirements related to policies, procedures and practices.
The LEA was directed to develop a Corrective Action Plan including a Root Cause Analysis. The LEA provided professional development to staff addressing the areas of non-compliance. Technical assistance was provided by the DDOE to the LEA to assist in this process. Based on the root causes identified, the LEA corrected their policies, procedures and practices. Utilizing updated data, DDOE verified through a review of the student’s files in the area of noncompliance identified in policies, procedures and practices, that the area of non-compliance was corrected in the LEA within the one-year timeframe.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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 2020 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that the district identified in FFY 2020 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 2021 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 2020, although its FFY 2020 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 2020.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

For FFY 2020, the DDOE identified 1 LEA with noncompliance relating to disproportionate representation. The individual files presented to DDOE were compliant, however, the LEA self-identified non-compliance in regulatory requirements related to policies, procedures and practices.
The LEA was directed to develop a Corrective Action Plan including a Root Cause Analysis. The LEA provided professional development to staff addressing the areas of non-compliance. Technical assistance was provided by the DDOE to the LEA to assist in this process. Based on the root causes identified, the LEA corrected their policies, procedures and practices. Utilizing updated data, DDOE verified through a review of the student’s files in the area of noncompliance identified in policies, procedures and practices, that the area of non-compliance was corrected in the LEA within the one-year timeframe.

Utilizing updated data, the DDOE verified correction of non-compliance of policies, practices and procedures. The DDOE then utilized updated data to randomly select student records from the 1 LEA and verified that the LEA was compliant and correctly implementing the regulatory requirements under IDEA within the one-year time frame.

## 10 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2021, and OSEP accepts that revision.

## 10 - 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.

# 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 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, etc.) 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 98.97% | 99.36% | 99.24% | 98.47% | 98.26% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4,083 | 4,014 | 98.26% | 100% | 98.31% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

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

69

**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 69 students in 11 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 119 plus days over the state timeline as some have yet to be completed (39 students fell within 1-10 days, 20 students fell within 10-50 days, 10 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, and miscounting the timeline. Scheduling difficulties due to students receiving remote instruction at times and not being available for face to face assessment due to COVID-19 and staff quarantines were also identified as reasons for delay.

**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)**

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. 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 2020 and FFY 2021. Data indicated an increase in the number of initial evaluations conducted in FFY 2021 (4083) in comparison to FFY 2020 (2878). 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 2020**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 50 | 50 | 0 | 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***

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 13 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 13 LEAs found noncompliant, and verified that 100% of the 13 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 50 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 2020**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. 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 noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 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 2021 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 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

## 11 - OSEP Response

## 11 - 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.

# Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priorit**y: 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 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, etc.) 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 98.55% | 89.11% | 93.68% | 91.56% | 95.75% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.  | 1,031 |
| b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.  | 86 |
| c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.  | 645 |
| 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.  | 234 |
| e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.  | 49 |
| 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 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. | 645 | 662 | 95.75% | 100% | 97.43% | 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**

17

**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.**

The range of days beyond the third birthday went from 1 day up to 150 days. Reasons provided by the LEAs included a lack of sufficient numbers of school psychologists to conduct initial evaluations, meetings being scheduled 30 days or less from third birthday and then due to circumstances such as a school closure due to weather, staff unavailability or parent cancelling or not coming the meeting ended up being held past third birthday. In addition, one LEA cited lack of bilingual evaluators as reason for delays. 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 that the 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 2020**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 24 | 24 |  | 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 cases of individual child noncompliance and at the conclusion of professional development around noncompliant areas, utilizing updated data, the DDOE subsequently reviewed new randomly selected child records 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 individual 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 2020**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. 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 noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 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 2021 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 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

## 12 - OSEP Response

## 12 - 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.

# 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 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, etc.) 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 99.24% | 100.00% | 96.50% | 99.89% | 98.85% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 8,845 | 9,442 | 98.85% | 100% | 93.68% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

During the course of SY 21-22 with the return to mostly in-person learning, LEAs experienced a large turnover in staff. Due to staffing shortages and reassignment of many school transition leads, LEAs were unable to adequately train staff for new roles. Although DDOE continued to coordinate a statewide transition cadre, attendance decreased over previous years due to shortages of substitutes to allow for transition staff to attend trainings.

**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.**

Describe the method used to collect these data were required to conduct a self-assessment of all student records for students age 14 or in the 8th grade and above.

Through analysis of the historical data after the 2013-2014 SY, with input provided by stakeholder groups, the DDOE determined that the representative sample used in previous years did not provide a true representation of transition planning state-wide. In addition, the DDOE had moved to a cyclical monitoring process, thus our sample size decreased. After discussions internally at DDOE and with stakeholder groups, it was determined the DDOE needed to increase the data pool to provide a true state-wide representation. The decision was made that beginning with the 2014-2015 SY, the DDOE would begin implementing a new monitoring process for Indicator 13. Through this process, all districts and charters having transition age (age 14 or in the 8th grade) students are monitored for Indicator 13 each year. This process has been implemented 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. Self-Assessment was sent to DDOE.

Phase 2 - DDOE validation of LEA submitted data

After the completion of the LEA Self-Assessments, DDOE reviewed a randomly selected sample of the submitted data for verification. The data reviewed represented all schools within the LEA.
All disability categories were proportionately represented.

| **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 mitigated the impact of COVID-19 by providing guidance and technical assistance for LEAs. This included professional learning and training in monthly statewide Transition Cadre meetings and special education director leadership meetings. DDOE also provides technical assistance and support to individual LEAs through Standards-Based IEP Training, the Pipeline Initiative, Developing and Supporting Authentic Customized Work-Based Learning Experiences and Jobs for Students and Adults with Disabilities: A Bootcamp for Educators and Employment Professionals and guidance and resource documents to support transition planning.
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 throughout all areas of our work. For Indicator 13, Stakeholders include Statewide Transition Cadre, Parent Information Center of Delaware, Division for Visual Impairments Vocational Rehab Advisory Council, Developmental Disabilities Council, Governor’s Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens (GACEC), Employment First Commission, Governor’s Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens (IDEA State Advisory Panel) and Special Education Leadership and LEA Special Education Directors. Using Leading by Convening, the DDOE continues to meet with and engage stakeholders in analyzing data related to secondary transition, developing strategies to support improvement activities and evaluating progress toward targets.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6 | 3 | 0 | 3 |

**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 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, of the 6 LEAs identified with noncompliance, 3 of the LEAs were compliant and correctly implementing the regulatory requirements under IDEA within the one-year time frame while 3 of the LEAs were found noncompliant and therefore, not correctly implementing the regulatory requirements under IDEA within the one-year time frame.

Each of the 3 LEAs found noncompliant have moved to Tier III within Delaware’s Multi-Tiered System of Accountability. Corrective action will be LEA and DDOE driven. The LEA will correct all instances of individual student noncompliance and the LEA and the DDOE will conduct a new self-assessment, develop an Intervention Plan including further analysis of root causes, targeted professional development provided by the DDOE, improvement activities, benchmarks and timelines. After the verification of correction of all individual noncompliance and at the conclusion of professional development around noncompliant areas, utilizing updated data, the DDOE will review new randomly selected student records to verify systemic compliance and that all 3 LEAs are 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 2020, the DDOE identified 113 cases of individual student noncompliance in 6 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.

**FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. 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 noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 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 2021 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 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

## 13 - OSEP Response

## 13 - 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.

# 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 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Collect data by September 2022 on students who left school during 2020-2021, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2020-2021 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, etc.).

**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 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 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.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, 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** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| A | 2020 | Target >= | 33.00% | 37.00% | 41.00% | 45.00% | 44.14% |
| A | 44.14% | Data | 49.47% | 41.39% | 45.62% | 53.41% | 44.14% |
| B | 2020 | Target >= | 64.00% | 68.00% | 72.00% | 76.00% | 64.82% |
| B | 64.82% | Data | 82.59% | 62.16% | 73.54% | 73.44% | 64.82% |
| C | 2020 | Target >= | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 87.69% |
| C | 87.69% | Data | 86.20% | 81.56% | 81.01% | 87.69% | 80.37% |

**FFY 2020 Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 46.14% | 48.14% | 50.14% | 52.14% | 54.14% |
| Target B >= | 66.82% | 68.82% | 70.82% | 72.82% | 74.82% |
| Target C >= | 100.00% | 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 insure 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 2021 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, DE-Positive Behavior Support Project Cadre (DE-PBS), MTSS Leadership/Advisory, Special Education Leadership, Special Education Director County meetings, Equity Professional Learning Community, and the Equity in IDEA Stakeholder Committee, Transition Cadre, 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 capacity and deepen knowledge and understanding of the indictor/indicator data resulting in rich discussion around progress and evaluation of improvement activities. For example, LEA Special Education Directors were led through a deep dive into their data for Indicators 4, 9 and 10 during which they identified trends, and engaged in discussion around strategies to target areas of need. ECR staff has also met with GACEC to explain the state-wide data system that ensures that LEA data is complete, accurate, reliable and valid, share trends and discuss improvement activities including MTSS, DE-PBS, and other targeted support provided to LEAs. In addition, at state-wide 619 coordinator meetings, data is regularly analyzed at the state and LEA levels around Indicator 12 to determine root causes of noncompliance and strategies to address the root causes. The DDOE also continued to focus on parent engagement, parent representation on stakeholder groups and supporting the 42 LEA Parent Councils of Students with Disabilities. In addition, the DDOE, in collaboration with PIC, have reached out to community centers to identify and remove barriers for underrepresented groups. Community centers include the Boys and Girls Club, United Way, Sussex County Health Coalition and the Latin American Community Center.

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census | 1,482 |
| Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school | 822 |
| Response Rate | 55.47% |
| 1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school  | 420 |
| 2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school  | 106 |
| 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) | 64 |
| 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). | 0 |

| **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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Enrolled in higher education (1) | 420 | 822 | 44.14% | 46.14% | 51.09% | Met target | No Slippage |
| B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2) | 526 | 822 | 64.82% | 66.82% | 63.99% | Did not meet 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) | 590 | 822 | 80.37% | 100.00% | 71.78% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **C** | Students who typically fall into this reporting category are those with more complex needs. Through engagement with stakeholders, including parents, adult agencies, community service providers and LEAs, feedback indicated that some students/families continue to be uneasy engaging in community employment. Stakeholders also mentioned 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 1/2 years. Reports indicated that some individuals were continuing to have concerns about COVID-19 and the return to community engagement. In addition, stakeholders are reporting many families or students with complex needs not wanting to enter into the workforce due to the potential of losing their current benefits.  |

**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** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Response Rate  | 53.30% | 55.47% |

**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 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.

**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 20-21 Exiters/53%, Representation of SY 20-21 Respondents/39%

Mild Intellectual Disability: Representation of SY 20-21 Exiters/7%, Representation of SY 20-21 Respondents/12%

Moderate Intellectual Disability: Representation of SY 20-21 Exiters/1%, Representation of SY 20-21 Respondents/3%

Severe Intellectual Disability: Representation of SY 20-21 Exiters/<1%, Representation of SY 20-21 Respondents/<1%

Emotional Disability: Representation of SY 20-21 Exiters/9%, Representation of SY 20-21 Respondents/5%

Other Health Impairment: Representation of SY 20-21 Exiters/19%, Representation of SY 20-21 Respondents/14%

Orthopedic Impairment: Representation of SY 20-21 Exiters/<1%, Representation of SY 20-21 Respondents/1%

Hearing Impairment: Representation of SY 20-21 Exiters/1%, Representation of SY 20-21 Respondents/1%

Autism: Representation of SY 20-21 Exiters/7%, Representation of SY 20-21 Respondents/13%

Deaf/Blind: Representation of SY 20-21 Exiters/<1%, Representation of SY 20-21 Respondents/<1%

Blind-Visual Impairment: Representation of SY 20-21 Exiters/1%, Representation of SY 20-21 Respondents/1%

Speech/Language Impairment: Representation of SY 20-21 Exiters/1%, Representation of SY 20-21 Respondents/1%

Traumatic Brain Injury: Representation of SY 20-21 Exiters/<1%, Representation of SY 20-21 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 categories of mild intellectual disability and autism. There was an underrepresentation in the category of emotional disability, other health impaired and learning disability.

Race/Ethnicity

Hispanic/Latino: Representation of SY 20-21 Exiters/29%, Representation of SY 20-21 Respondents/13%

American Indian/Alaskan Native: Representation of SY 20-21 Exiters/<1%, Representation of SY 20-21 Respondents/<1%

Black/African American: Representation of SY 20-21 Exiters/34%, Representation of SY 20-21 Respondents/34%

White/Caucasian: Representation of SY 20-21 Exiters/34%, Representation of SY 20-21 Respondents/40%

Asian American: Representation of SY 20-21 Exiters/1%, Representation of SY 20-21 Respondents/1%

Native Hawaiin Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander: Representation of SY 20-21 Exiters/<1%, Representation of SY 20-21 Respondents/<1%

Multi-Racial: Representation of SY 20-21 Exiters/1%, Representation of SY 20-21 Respondents/1%

For race/ethnicity, the response data were not consistent/within consistent range (+/- 3%) of statewide exiter representation of race/ethnicity. There was an overrepresentation in White/Caucasian. There was an underrepresentation in Hispanic/Latino

Gender

Male: Representation of SY 20-21 Exiters/63%, Representation of SY 20-21 Respondents/62%

Female: Representation of SY 20-21 Exiters/37%, Representation of SY 20-21 Respondents/38%

For gender, the response data were consistent/within consistent range(+/- 3%) of statewide exiter representation of gender. There was an underrepresentation of male and an overrepresentation of female.

Exit Type

Regular High School Diploma: Representation of SY 20-21 Exiters/81%, Representation of SY 20-21 Respondents/80%

Certificate/Alternate Diploma: Representation of SY 20-21 Exiters/7%, Representation of SY 20-21 Respondents/13%

Age Out: Representation of SY 20-21 Exiters/1%%, Representation of SY 20-21 Respondents/4%

Drop Out: Representation of SY 20-21 Exiters/10%, Representation of SY 20-21 Respondents/2%

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 certificate/alternate 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 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 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.

| **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)**

The DDOE ensures that this data is complete, accurate, valid, and reliable for Indicator 14. COVID-19 did not have any impact on the response rate (data collection) since the SEA mitigated the impact by continuing to partner with sister agencies through data sharing agreements.
After engaging in rich discussions with stakeholders, DDOE elected to change the baseline year to 2020 due to the impact COVID-19 has had on post­ school outcomes. While COVID-19 did not impact the response rate, the data collected indicated that families and students reported students not wanting to enter higher education/training or employment due to virtual environments/business closures and/or fear of exposure to the virus.

DDOE presented historical data (previous data and targets) to County Special Education Director Meetings, as well as, Charter Special Education Director meetings. LEA special education directors, coordinators and state program representatives were in attendance,
• DDOE scheduled community conversations in collaboration with Parent Information Center. These meetings were open to the public and held as lunchtime learning and evening opportunities. Historical data (previous data and targets) were presented during each opportunity. Parents, state councils and state advocacy members were invited.
• DDOE presented historical data (previous data and targets) during monthly Transition Cadre meetings. Parents, teachers, transition specialists/coordinators, special education directors/coordinators, state agency representatives, community service providers, and other community members are invited.
• DDOE invited members of the Governor's Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens, State Special Education Advisory Council, Employment First Oversight Commission, State Developmental Disabilities Council, Division for Individuals with Visual Impairments Vocational Rehabilitation Advisory Council to be members of stakeholder groups to be part of the consultation process and provide input into the state plan.

One-pagers were designed to provide information for each indicator including indicator definition, measuremen/calculation, historical data (previous 7 years) and targets for each of those years. Each of the aforementioned groups were provided the one-pagers along with links to surveys to provide information around each indicator. Each survey asked for stakeholders to provide information around current strategies positively effecting the indicator data, potential new strategies to implement, feedback for setting new targets, and other information the stakeholder felt important to include for the indicator.
In addition to group stakeholder meetings, DDOE staff offered individual and small group opportunities to discuss the indicator and gather feedback/input.

## 14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2021 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 2020 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 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.

# 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 EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**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 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/02/2022 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 15 |
| SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/02/2022 | 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 5 |

**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 insure 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 2021 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, DE-Positive Behavior Support Project Cadre (DE-PBS), MTSS Leadership/Advisory, Special Education Leadership, Special Education Director County meetings, Equity Professional Learning Community, and the Equity in IDEA Stakeholder Committee, Transition Cadre, 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 capacity and deepen knowledge and understanding of the indictor/indicator data resulting in rich discussion around progress and evaluation of improvement activities. For example, LEA Special Education Directors were led through a deep dive into their data for Indicators 4, 9 and 10 during which they identified trends, and engaged in discussion around strategies to target areas of need. ECR staff has also met with GACEC to explain the state-wide data system that ensures that LEA data is complete, accurate, reliable and valid, share trends and discuss improvement activities including MTSS, DE-PBS, and other targeted support provided to LEAs. In addition, at state-wide 619 coordinator meetings, data is regularly analyzed at the state and LEA levels around Indicator 12 to determine root causes of noncompliance and strategies to address the root causes. The DDOE also continued to focus on parent engagement, parent representation on stakeholder groups and supporting the 42 LEA Parent Councils of Students with Disabilities. In addition, the DDOE, in collaboration with PIC, have reached out to community centers to identify and remove barriers for underrepresented groups. Community centers include the Boys and Girls Club, United Way, Sussex County Health Coalition and the Latin American Community Center.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2015 | 50.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target >= | 50.00% | 50.00% - 60.00% | 50.00% - 60.00% | 50.00%-60.00% | 55.00% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 75.00% | 66.67% | 16.67% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 55.00% | 55.00% | 55.00% | 55.00% | 55.00% |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

| **3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements** | **3.1 Number of resolutions sessions** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | 15 | 16.67% | 55.00% | 33.33% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**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. However, it is likely that COVID-19 did contribute to the increase in the number of cases filed. Since Delaware participated as a member of the Center for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education’s (CADRE) Written State Complaint Intensive Technical Assistance Work Group, DDOE continues to work on the Delaware’s action plan with goals to improve the system. Although the work group ended in June 2022, Delaware remains engaged with CADRE through the DMS calls webinars that they provide.

## 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 EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**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 resolution 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 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/02/2022 | 2.1 Mediations held | 10 |
| SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/02/2022 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 3 |
| SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/02/2022 | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | 3 |

**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 insure 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 2021 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, DE-Positive Behavior Support Project Cadre (DE-PBS), MTSS Leadership/Advisory, Special Education Leadership, Special Education Director County meetings, Equity Professional Learning Community, and the Equity in IDEA Stakeholder Committee, Transition Cadre, 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 capacity and deepen knowledge and understanding of the indictor/indicator data resulting in rich discussion around progress and evaluation of improvement activities. For example, LEA Special Education Directors were led through a deep dive into their data for Indicators 4, 9 and 10 during which they identified trends, and engaged in discussion around strategies to target areas of need. ECR staff has also met with GACEC to explain the state-wide data system that ensures that LEA data is complete, accurate, reliable and valid, share trends and discuss improvement activities including MTSS, DE-PBS, and other targeted support provided to LEAs. In addition, at state-wide 619 coordinator meetings, data is regularly analyzed at the state and LEA levels around Indicator 12 to determine root causes of noncompliance and strategies to address the root causes. The DDOE also continued to focus on parent engagement, parent representation on stakeholder groups and supporting the 42 LEA Parent Councils of Students with Disabilities. In addition, the DDOE, in collaboration with PIC, have reached out to community centers to identify and remove barriers for underrepresented groups. Community centers include the Boys and Girls Club, United Way, Sussex County Health Coalition and the Latin American Community Center.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2015 | 76.92% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target >= | 89.00% | 70.00% - 80.00% | 70.00% - 80.00% | 70.00%-80.00% | 80.00% |
| Data | 50.00% | 88.89% | 77.78% | 80.00% | 50.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 80.00% | 80.00% | 80.00% | 80.00% | 80.00% |

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | 3 | 10 | 50.00% | 80.00% | 60.00% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**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 begun to offer webinars and technical assistance resources focusing on culturally responsive mediation.

## 16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 16 - OSEP Response

## 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) for Children with Disabilities.

**Targets*:*** In its FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2021 through FFY 2025. The State’s FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State’s baseline data.

**Updated Data:** In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 1, 2023, 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) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2021 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, is 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, is 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 2021 through 2025 SPP/APR, 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., Feb 2022). 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 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023for the FFY 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023).).

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 (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., 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 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023for the FFY 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023)) 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 students with disabilities in K-3rd grade, as measured by a decrease in the percentage of third grade students with disabilities scoring below proficiency on Delaware’s statewide assessments.

**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/Page/2343

**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** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target>= | 83.72% | 81.72% | 79.72% | 77.72% | 75.72% |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of Students Not Proficient on SBAC or DeSSA-ALT** | **Number of Students Tested on SBAC or DeSSA-ALT** | FFY 2020 Data | FFY 2021 Target | FFY 2021 Data | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 1,507 | 1,829 | 84.43% | 83.72% | 82.39% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 data.**

Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) and the Delaware System of Student Assessment Alternative (DeSSA - Alt)

**Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR**.

The DE DOE Office of Assessment is responsible for collecting, analyzing, and reporting on the SBAC and DeSSA - Alt results. The Office of Assessment provides state-level data for each assessment to the SSIP Core Team. While the DE SiMR addresses all the ELA proficiency of all third grade students with disabilities in the state, the assessment data are disaggregated so that a secondary analyses can be conducted for the two SSIP districts and three charter schools that received intensive support and implemented key elements of Multi Tiered System of Support (MTSS), related to reading, during the 2021-22 school year. The assessment results from the SSIP sites are compared to the average state assessment results. 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)**

NO

**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)**

YES

**If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State’s ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.**

COVID-19 has impacted our ability to directly assess participating teachers’ early literacy fidelity of implementation. MTSS fidelity of intervention data were collected, although the method of administration was virtual starting in spring 2020, with varied involvement of SSIP coaches to facilitate the process, impacting the completeness, reliability, and validity of the results.

**Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation**

**Please provide a link to the State’s current evaluation plan.**

https://www.doe.k12.de.us/Page/2343

**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 teams were used to support the implementation of the DE SSIP infrastructure improvement strategies. This included a focus on governance, standards, accountability, and monitoring through collaborative teaming; professional learning; and family engagement.
MTSS Core Team
The DE MTSS Core Team consists of three members of the DE DOE Exceptional Childrens Resources (ECR) Workgroup, led by Jalee Pernol; and three members of the Academic Support Team, led by Pam Alfaro (who left the DOE in March 2022); Zach Weingarten, lead staff for the American Institutes for Research (AIR); Meedra Surratte, the DE Parent Information Center (PIC) Director; and Brent Garrett, the SSIP external evaluator. This group is responsible for direct oversight and support of MTSS and early literacy professional learning. The Core Team met monthly during the 2021-22 school year.
MTSS Leadership Team:
The MTSS Leadership Team (LT) consists of the Core Team members, plus representatives from the DE DOE Offices of Assessment, School Leadership, Equity and Innovation, Early Learning, and English Language Learners. Representatives from the DE PBS Project and ACCESS Project from the University of Delaware who focus on Positive Behavior Supports, Social Emotional Learning, and Universal Design for Learning also participate on the MTSS Leadership Team. The Leadership Team provides the coordination and leadership to build the capacity of state, district, charter, and school personnel to implement an integrated MTSS framework. This includes (1) a focus on multidirectional communication with stakeholders, including families, to increase capacity for MTSS implementation and (2) supporting the alignment of initiatives to improve whole child outcomes and use data to continuously improve supports for districts, charters, schools, and families. The Leadership Team met five times during the 2021-22 school year.
MTSS Advisory Council
The MTSS Advisory Council provides advice on SSIP work related to governance, standards, accountability, and monitoring. The MTSS AC (with approximately 65 stakeholders) met twice this reporting period (November 23, 2021 and June 8, 2022), averaging 19 participants at each meeting. The MTSS Advisory Council includes personnel from the DE DOE, districts and schools, community agencies, SSIP staff, and family representatives. The two Advisory Council meetings held in 2021-22 included (1) a review and feedback on SPP/APR Indicator 3, (2) MTSS evaluation updates, and (3) MTSS updates and professional learning opportunities.
Professional learning Strategies (MTSS and DELI Trainings, Book Studies, Modules, and Job-Embedded Coaching)
DELI is the name given for the SSIP professional learning initiative. DE SSIP staff facilitated professional learning through the use of training and job-embedded coaching. During 2021-22, the types of training, as well as the audience for training continued to evolve, due to challenges brought on by COVID-19. DE SSIP Cohort schools continued to receive to virtual professional learning options, including a virtual course and two book studies. The virtual courses and book studies were open to all interested Delaware educators. Four MTSS trainings were conducted with Cohort sites in 2021-22, addressing needs specific to their schools, impacting approximately 45 Delaware educators.
The Delaware MTSS Virtual Institute provided K-12 educators and school leaders with professional learning to develop the knowledge, skills, and infrastructure to effectively implement a MTSS framework. The Institute was targeted for K-12 educators, school leaders, and MTSS leadership team members. A total of 47 participants from 19 school districts and charters started the Institute, with 20 educators completing the majority of activities.
Participants in the two book studies read and discussed Leading Equity-Based MTSS for All Students (by Amy McCart and Dawn Miller). The book studies were facilitated by AIR staff. Participants received a copy of the book and engaged in two synchronous sessions focused on how to implement equity-based MTSS to improve academic, behavioral, and social outcomes for all students. The book study was targeted for K–12 educators, school leaders, and MTSS leadership team members. A total of 61 participants completed the book studies and attended at least one of the synchronous sessions. A book study on Integrated Multi-Tiered Systems of Support: Blending RTI and PBIS (by Kent McIntosh and Steve Goodman) was offered in spring 2022, but there was insufficient interest to conduct the book study.
AIR staff, with review from DE DOE staff, created five MTSS and five DELI training modules available to all Delaware Educators. The modules are housed on Schoology, a virtual platform available to all Delaware educators. The modules were launched in September 2021. The MTSS modules were (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 were (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 2021-22 school year, 124 educators had completed the evaluation survey for all five MTSS modules and 8 educators had completed the evaluation survey for all five DELI modules.
AIR staff provided sustained, job embedded coaching to support early literacy and/or MTSS implementation in three DE SSIP charter schools, two DE SSIP school districts, and seven associated schools. In 2021-22, there were 62 MTSS coaching contacts and 5 early literacy coaching contacts. Coaching content was specific to each school or district, driven by the results of their MTSS fidelity of implementation data collection and subsequent action plan.
Family 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 developed and disseminated 21 articles in the PIC electronic newsletter during the 2021-22 school year. This included an MTSS fact sheet and MTSS resources articles that are also available in Spanish and Haitian Creole. Two SSIP presentations were presented to the GACEC. More detailed information about family engagement is presented in Section C of this report.

**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
Evaluation data were collected at one of the two DE MTSS Advisory Council meetings held in 2021-22. On average, 96% of Advisory Council members (n=8) were in strong agreement that the MTSS AC meetings were of high quality, their views were listened to and honored, and there were opportunities for collaboration. Across the eight respondents, 91% expressed strong agreement that they were more knowledgeable of the content delivered at the Advisory Council meeting. These results support the impact the DE SSIP teaming structure has had on efforts to support system change. Continuation of this improvement strategy is critical to our sustainability and scale-up efforts.
Professional Learning Strategies (MTSS and DELI Trainings, Book Studies, Modules, and Job-Embedded Coaching)
Training and job-embedded coaching output data were collected via a Google Form, allowing real time analyses. Data were analyzed continually to inform the MTSS Core Team of the type and frequency of professional learning provided. Evaluation data have been useful in determining changes to the training process. As a result, trainings are shorter in duration, with more varied training forums.
Across the seven DE SSIP trainings, two book studies, and the MTSS Virtual Institute held in 2021-22, there were 208 participants (a duplicated count), with an average of 30 people at each training. The number of participants ranged from 15 to 47. Training evaluation data were collected at each of the trainings. When asked, 95% of respondents stated the training objectives were met, 100% reported the trainings were of high-quality, relevant, and useful, and 96% of participants thought the purposes of the trainings were well defined, communications were clear, and the training platforms were easy to use.
At the end of the 2021-22 school year, a total of 425 educators registered and 289 completed the MTSS course. The number of educators who completed at least one of the five MTSS modules training evaluations ranged from 124-212. On average, across all modules, 95% - 96% 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=131) and special education teachers (n=58) were most likely to have completed the MTSS course evaluation survey.
At the end of the 2021-22 school year, a total of 58 educators had registered for the DELI modules and 25 completed the course. The number of completed evaluation forms for at least one of the five DELI modules ranged from 8-20. The degree of participation with the DELI modules was much lower than with the MTSS modules reported on in the Goal 1 section of this report. On average, across all DELI modules, 88% - 91% 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=6), district or school coaches/instructional support (n=4), and special education teachers (n=3) were the most frequent respondents on DELI course evaluation survey.
Further feedback on the impact and effectiveness of SSIP MTSS professional learning (including training and coaching) was gathered from impacted personnel in the two participating districts (and two member schools) and three charter schools in March 2022 on the Participating Personnel Survey. The DELI early literacy Participating Personnel Survey was not administered in spring 2022, due to the limited amount of contact with educators in Cohort schools in 2021-22. Of the 29 DE SSIP MTSS survey respondents, 87% agreed or strongly agreed that the professional learning was high quality, relevant, and useful. When asked to what degree the professional learning impacted their knowledge of MTSS and their confidence to support schools to use data (i.e., progress monitoring and benchmarking data) to inform instruction, 82% of the respondents were in agreement that the DE SSIP training increased their knowledge and confidence. The same percentage of respondents (82%) felt they were more knowledgeable to support and sustain MTSS in their districts and schools.
A retrospective pre/post-test was used to gauge the impact on participants’ knowledge of early literacy practices across the school year. Participants were asked to rate their knowledge of (1) writing, (2) vocabulary, (3) phonemic awareness, (4) fluency, (5) comprehension, and (6) phonics prior to, and at the end of the school year. 81% of respondents felt moderate to very knowledgeable about the literacy topics prior to their involvement with DELI, increasing to 89% at the end of the school year. Qualitative feedback received indicated the greatest benefit of the training was on participants’ understanding of MTSS and working with data.
Family Engagement
The DE Core Team monitored and tracked the DE PIC deliverables related to MTSS and early literacy resources, webinars, and videos. All resources were vetted by the DE DOE to ensure they were of high quality, relevant, and useful before being disseminated across the state. The detailed list of resources developed by the DE PIC during 2021-22 is shared in Section C (Stakeholder Engagement) of this report. The quality of the DE PIC resources supports the continued use of this improvement strategy. These results support the reach and impact of the DE SSIP family engagement activities, which are critical to informing parents and families of MTSS and early literacy practices that can be implemented in the home. Continuation of this improvement strategy is an important part of the DE SSIP sustainability efforts.

**Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**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: While the DDOE’s teaming structure will continue as in previous years, the team participants will be modified. The Core Team will still include staff from Exceptional Children and Curriculum Instruction and Professional Development workgroups that focus on early literacy. The DE Early Literacy Advisory Group will serve as our stakeholder group and includes DDOE, LEA curriculum and literacy personnel, and the SSIP external evaluator. The newly created Early Literacy Advisory Group includes staff from the DDOE, LEAs , PIC, State Board of Education, Rodel, Rivet Eduaction, and Reading Assist and will focus on literacy statewide through topics such as SSIP, the State Literacy Plan, and literacy regulations. This group is facilitating guidance around screeners and interventions related to literacy. It will be addressing capacity building and sustainability through numerous professional learning opportunities, improving current tools, and ongoing support in districts.
Professional Learning Strategies: As we move away from the cohort model used previously, the number of professional learning improvement strategies with a statewide reach will be increased.
DELI (Delaware Early Literacy Initiative) Modules are currently found on Schoology. We are also working to build a competency-based component to these. They are aligned to the Science of Reading, and we are also working to build a Facilitators guide so that they could be used as a professional learning option during PLC’s.
MTSS Modules, described previously are also on Schoology and available to all educators in the state. The importance of implementing evidence-based early literacy strategies through an MTSS framework will continue to be emphasized.
DE Literacy Plan Training Series consists of multiple courses that address early literacy from an educator’s and administrator’s perspective. The courses addressing reading, writing, assessment, and leadership. A brief summary of the courses are listed below.
LETRS (Lexia):The goal is for educators to complete the Volume 1 training, Volume 2, and the facilitator training. Educators who attain facilitator status will be able to provide professional learning within their local system and across the state, serving as a capacity building mechanism. Participants who may be interested in becoming a LETRS Facilitator Trainer to lead future LETRS trainings themselves must achieve a score of 88% or higher on the Volume Post-Test.
AIM Pathways: Again, our goal is to increase the number of AIM Pathway facilitators. 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 a 85% on the knowledge inventory to move to the next level. We are also offering a Pathways to Literacy Leadership course in the summer that is a wonderful resource for building principals’ understanding of the components of early literacy.
Professional Development Center for Educators (PDCE) Courses: The PDCE courses are offered through University of Delaware and are currently posted on Professional Development Management System the DOE’s (PDMS). These courses support educators who are 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: Currently, we have 29 micro-credentials that are released 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.
Reading Interventionists: There are 395Reading Interventionists positions, funded through the DE Literacy Plan who support K-5 educators and/or students in the use of evidence-based literacy interventions. They support educators working with a wide range of students, including those with disabilities and multi-lingual learners. We are improving our data collection efforts to better demonstrate the impact of the Reading Interventionists on students’ literacy outcomes.
Systematic Processes for Enhancing and Assessing Communication Supports (SPEACS), is a low incidence initiative designed to improve communication and educational services to students with the most significant disabilities. It is built on the premise that all students communicate. The main objective of SPEACS is to assist school teams in progressing students from pre-symbolic and emergent communication to symbolic communication. To accomplish this goal, SPEACS focuses on training teams to work with targeted students with complex communication needs who participate in the state’s alternate assessment. Aligning SPEACS with the DE Literacy Plan professional learning activities will support literacy efforts for all Delaware students.
Reimagining Professional Learning (RPL) Grants are used by schools to create sustainable professional learning conditions and processes, aligned to high quality instructional materials (HQIM) that lead to improved teacher practice and student learning. The DE SSIP will work with RPL grantees to ensure the professional learning conditions and processes, and the high-quality instructional materials (HQIM) incorporate strategies for improving literacy outcomes for students with disabilities.
Family Engagement: 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.
We will also partner with the DE Readiness Teams. These teams work in collaborating with a panel of stakeholders to improve early literacy outcomes. They are led by First Lady Carney, Dr. Annie Norman from DE Libraries, DDOE staff from Exceptional Children Workgroup and Curriculum Instruction and Professional Development Workgroup, the DE PIC and other community members. They organize and promote the use of early literacy resources and website links so that early literacy messaging across forums would be consistent, repetitive, and easy to understand and navigate. Books were distributed through events, agencies, and doctors’ offices. The books were selected based on the summer reading theme “Oceans of Possibilities.” They were also offered in multiple languages.

**List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:**

1. MTSS Implementation
2. Evidence-Based Early Literacy Instruction
3. Evidence-Based Professional Learning Practices

**Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.**

MTSS Implementation
The DE-MTSS framework is 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. As in 2020-21, 2021-22 DE SSIP activities focused mainly on the development of professional learning offerings and resources to support MTSS implementation, to support the new MTSS regulations that went into effect in July 2021. Initial professional learning offerings included the development of two MTSS book studies (discussesd in the previous section), a MTSS Virtual Institute, and a series of MTSS modules available through the DE DOE-sponsored Schoology platform. More information on the implementation of the professional learning improvement strategies was addressed in the previous sections of this report.
The resources listed below were finalized in fall 2021 by SSIP partners at AIR. The resources were vetted with national MTSS experts at AIR, before being reviewed by DE DOE staff. Resources were then shared with the DE MTSS Advisory Council to gather their feedback and suggestions for improvement. The resources listed below can be accessed at https://www.doe.k12.de.us/Page/4413 and corresponding web pages.
? The DE-MTSS Professional Learning Plan
? A DE-MTSS Professional Learning one-pager
? DE-MTSS Overview Video
? DE-MTSS Overview Infographic
? DE-MTSS Implementation Guide
? District/Charter Quick Reference Guide
? School Quick Reference Guide
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.
Evidence-Based Professional Learning Practices
The AIR professional learning staff has extensive experience providing targeted, intensive technical support in MTSS and literacy for states and LEAs through several projects, including the Center on MTSS at AIR, the National Center on Intensive Intervention (NCII), the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI); and multiple other federal, state, and LEA projects.
The DELI training and follow-up coaching were informed by evidence-based practices for professional learning and adult learning practices (Dunst & Trivette, 2012 and Guskey, 2000). At the DELI trainings, participants had opportunities to reflect on evidence-based instructional practices and consider ways that these practices could be adapted to fit their classroom context. Survey data from DE SSIP trainings, book studies, and modules indicated that participants were more felt the trainings were of high quality, relevant, useful, and used adult learning practices to facilitate learning.

**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
Personnel from the two participating SSIP districts (and two member schools) and three charter schools implemented key elements of MTSS during the 2021-22 school year. All SSIP sites used MTSS teams to review student data and make decisions about interventions and instruction. Ensuring that schools had a well-developed screening process, strong progress monitoring practices, the capacity to use data to inform decision-making, quality core instruction and the use of Tier 2 and 3 interventions, and the necessary infrastructure (including the use of fidelity tools to evaluate progress) are essential components to ensuring that schools are able to improve students’ early literacy outcomes. Similarly, the participating districts and schools used the results of the MTSS fidelity tool to review and strengthen their MTSS policy, procedures, and practices. MTSS screening and intervention will impact the SiMR by identifying students in need of extra reading support and providing targeted interventions to address their needs.
Evidence-Based Early Literacy Instruction
Due to limited time available for training and coaching since the pandemic, and accentuated by staffing shortages.
minimal training and coaching were provided on early literacy instruction in 2021-22. Pre-pandemic, 2019-20 data indicated that teachers were beginning to implement literacy practices with fidelity. For example, in the Teacher Instruction domain, 66% of second grade teachers observed implemented the practices with fidelity. As discussed previously in the improvement strategy section, participating teachers reported increased knowledge and skills to implement evidence-based literacy practices and feel that student outcomes are improving as a result. Evidence-based literacy instruction will impact child outcomes by improving students' ability to decode and comprehend text.
Evidence-Based Professional Learning Practices
SSIP training and follow-up coaching were informed by evidence-based practices for professional learning and the use of adult learning practices (Dunst & Trivette, 2012 and Guskey, 2000). At the DELI trainings, participants had opportunities to ask questions, interact, and reflect on evidence-based instructional practices and consider ways that these practices could be adapted to fit their classroom context. Similarly, after MTSS trainings, participants were able to interact with peers, ask questions, and reflect on what they learned and plan for further implementation. Survey data from DE SSIP trainings, book studies, and modules suggests that participants were more knowledgeable about MTSS and early literacy practices. This feedback suggests that the improved systems and teachers’ instructional practices should impact the DE SSIP SiMR.

**Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.**

The Delaware MTSS Fidelity of Implementation Rubric and MTSS Essential Components Worksheet were adapted from the National Center on Response to Intervention Response to Intervention (NCRTI RTI) Fidelity of Implementation Rubric and RTI Essential Components Worksheet as the instrument and process to measure fidelity of implementation of the essential components of MTSS at the school-level, beginning with the Cohort 3 schools. A different fidelity tool was used with Cohort 1 and 2 schools that was not compatible with data from the new instrument.
The Delaware MTSS Fidelity of Implementation Rubric and MTSS Essential Components Worksheet were completed by the team responsible for monitoring school-level fidelity of MTSS implementation. The rubric is aligned with the essential components of MTSS and the infrastructure that is necessary for successful implementation. The MTSS Essential Components Worksheet includes guiding questions for use in an interview with a school’s MTSS leadership team. The Rubric is comprised of eight domains. Each domain is made up of three to eight items. The Rubric uses a five-point scale, with a one indicting little or no implementation and a five meaning complete and consistent implementation. The fidelity threshold is 3.5 on the five-point scale. With the exception of the final administration, a DE SPDG coach facilitated the the completion of Rubric with completed with school implementation team, and assigned the final ratings.
The results from the fidelity tool administration were used to develop action plans to guide MTSS implementation and inform the SSIP professional learning provided. Baseline fidelity data were collected as schools began participation in the DE SSIP, then in the spring or summer of each following year. SSIP coaches facilitated the MTSS fidelity data collection with school leadership teams, then used the fidelity results for action plan development.
The four Cohort 3 schools collected their baseline fidelity data in fall 2018, with their third fidelity of implementation administration conducted in spring or fall 2021. The spring 2020 and 2021 fidelity data collection process occurred virtually for each school, while the initial meetings were face-to-face. All four Cohort 3 schools showed growth in their MTSS implementation on the Delaware MTSS Fidelity of Implementation Rubric. over the three-year period. Three of the four schools surpassed the 3.5 fidelity threshold, while one school fell just short of the threshold. As the change from face-to-face review of data and consensus on ratings changed to a virtual platform for the last two years, care must be taking in interpreting these results.
We also disaggregated by Rubric components for the four Cohort 3 schools that completed three administrations of the Rubric. On the final administration, participating schools rated their use of screening assessments the highest (4.4), followed by data-based decision making and Tier 2 (both 4.3). The lowest ratings were provided for the fidelity and evaluation components (3.4). The most growth was found with the Tier 2 component (+1.5).
The three charter schools which began implementation after the Cohort 3 schools completed a baseline and second administration of the Rubric, although the timing of the fidelity data collection varied across the schools. None of the three charter schools reached the 3.5 fidelity threshold.
Fidelity of implementation data collection related to teachers' use of evidence-based early literacy practices has been more of a challenge in a virtual environment. No data has been collected since prior to COVID-19 (spring 2020), although we continue to explore methods to facilitate this process.

**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.**

Evidence-Based Early Literacy Instruction - As just mentioned, with the end of the cohort-model of implementation support, data collection becomes more challenging. At the same time, SSIP activities will be 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 more targeted professional learning initiatives listed below 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 will create a state-approved adoption list for evidence-based, reading instruction curricula for grades K-3. LEAs must adopt from the list by the start of the 2027-2028 school year. The state is also assisting LEAs in providing 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 will be the creation of 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 districts and charters in the development of the lists of aligned screeners and interventions. DE Early Literacy Advisory Group, referenced earlier, plays a critical role in the development of this resource. Educators must also be given time during the contractual day to complete duties associated with the universal reading screener, including DDOE provided professional learning.
DELI Modules – As mentioned previously, a competency-based assessment will be built for each set of DELI modules to assess the impact of the modules on educators’ use of evidence-based practices. DELI modules topics include: explicit instruction, foundational reading skills, vocabulary and comprehension, intensive interventions in reading, and effective writing instruction.
DDOE is partnering with American Institutes of Research (AIR) to update existing DELI Schoology eLearning modules to include a competency component that supports educators in local school systems in demonstrating their acquisition of early literacy knowledge. AIR is also building a facilitator guide and training package for systems to use in collaborative learning environments such and professional learning communities (PLCs) or professional learning days.
Reading Interventionists - The Reading Interventionists collect and report on the types of universal screening and progress monitoring tools used in their schools, as well as the number of students impacted. They also report on the number of students they support at each performance level of the universal screening tool used, at the beginning and end of the school year. We will work with the Reading Interventionists and the DE Early Literacy Advisory Group to create and implement a self-assessment fidelity of implementation tool they can use with their teachers to ensure the early literacy evidence-based practices are used with fidelity. We will also develop a process to survey the participating teachers to gather their perceptions on the impact of the professional learning on their use of evidence-based practices.
Reimagining Professional Learning (RPL) Grants - Through the RPL grants, we will be able to assess the impact of the professional learning in these schools on teachers’ use of evidence-based practices. RPL grantees. A fidelity of implementation tool is used by the RPL grantees. We will use the DE Early Literacy Advisory Group to review the fidelity tool to ensure it is aligned with SSIP practices for students with disabilities. We will also collect data on student performance, disaggregating by students with disabilities.
Systematic Processes for Enhancing and Assessing Communication Supports (SPEACS) - During the DE 2012-2017 SPDG, a fidelity of implementation tool and student outcome measures were developed to determine the impact of SPEACS professional learning on communication and academic outcomes for students with significant cognitive disabilities. These tools will be reviewed by the DE Early Literacy Advisory Group and revised as necessary to ensure alignment with the DE Literacy Plan.
MTSS Implementation - With the ending of the DE SPDG, which supported a cohort model of professional learning, much of our MTSS professional learning will focus on universal strategies, with the opportunity to impact all Delaware educators. These include the MTSS Schoology modules and the MTSS book studies. Districts and schools that complete the MTSS Schoology modules and the MTSS book studies will become more knowledgeable about MTSS implementation and will begin to implement MTSS with fidelity. We will develop sample fidelity of implementation tools which can be used by districts and schools to determine to what degree MTSS is being implemented with fidelity.
Evidence-Based Professional Learning Practices - The current set of professional learning practices used with SSIP training and coaching will continue. The actual practices will vary depend on the type of professional learning, but a focus on the use of evidence-based strategies ensuring that the professional learning is sustained and not stand-alone trainings. Trainings are evaluated to make sure they are skill based, incorporate adult learning practices, and assess teacher competency. With the Reading Interventionists, RPL, and SPEACS initiatives, job-embedded coaching is used to support educators in implementing what they learned through trainings.

**Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)**

NO

**If no, describe any changes to the activities, strategies or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or justification for the changes.**

DDOE is still dealing with the consequences of COVID related to staff shortages and decreased time for professional learning opportunities. These challenges are being addressed through professional learning opportunities being provided in various modalities and offered to a wider audience statewide. This is evidenced in the synchronous learning opportunities provided such as DE MTSS Virtual Institutes and Community of practice and asynchronous opportunities such as MTSS modules, videos, and guidance documents. The DE SSIP continues to align with the State Literacy Plan and also address new state literacy regulations. The creation of the DE Early Literacy Advisory Group may lead to future modifications based on stakeholder feedback while enhancing the integration of literacy initiatives and regulations for the state. These changes enable our efforts to have a larger statewide impact and increase our capacity building and sustainability.

**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 insure 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 2021 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, DE-Positive Behavior Support Project Cadre (DE-PBS), MTSS Leadership/Advisory, Special Education Leadership, Special Education Director County meetings, Equity Professional Learning Community, and the Equity in IDEA Stakeholder Committee, Transition Cadre, 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 capacity and deepen knowledge and understanding of the indictor/indicator data resulting in rich discussion around progress and evaluation of improvement activities. For example, LEA Special Education Directors were led through a deep dive into their data for Indicators 4, 9 and 10 during which they identified trends, and engaged in discussion around strategies to target areas of need. ECR staff has also met with GACEC to explain the state-wide data system that ensures that LEA data is complete, accurate, reliable and valid, share trends and discuss improvement activities including MTSS, DE-PBS, and other targeted support provided to LEAs. In addition, at state-wide 619 coordinator meetings, data is regularly analyzed at the state and LEA levels around Indicator 12 to determine root causes of noncompliance and strategies to address the root causes. The DDOE also continued to focus on parent engagement, parent representation on stakeholder groups and supporting the 42 LEA Parent Councils of Students with Disabilities. In addition, the DDOE, in collaboration with PIC, have reached out to community centers to identify and remove barriers for underrepresented groups. Community centers include the Boys and Girls Club, United Way, Sussex County Health Coalition and the Latin American Community Center.

 **Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.**

MTSS Advisory Council
The DE MTSS Advisory Council is the most engaged group of stakeholders providing insight and feedback on SSIP implementation activities. The specific Advisory Council strategies and outcomes were discussed in detail in the teaming improvement strategy discussed previously in this report.
The Parent Information Center of Delaware Activities
The DE PIC is an essential partner in the SSIP family engagement activities, as they are for other focus areas within the DE DOE. The DE PIC Director is a member of the DE MTSS Leadership Team and MTSS Advisory Council. This allows both groups to consistently hear and learn from the parent/family perspective. The DE PIC’s role is to disseminate information and resources necessary to increase parents’ awareness and understanding of MTSS and early literacy practices.
During the 2021-22 school year, the DE PIC has increased the number of family engagement resources from previous years. Resources are developed on an ongoing basis, including videos and webinars on parent/child shared reading, dialogic reading, social-emotional learning, phonics, and MTSS. During the 2021-22 school year, the PIC developed and disseminated the 21 family resources listed below. These resources can be accessed at https://picofdel.org/resources/.
• Parents as Remote Literacy Partners (8/6/2021)
• Dyslexia video Understood (9/9/21)
• How a Delaware school Transformed Literacy in Three Years (9/30/2021)
• Story Walks Video (9/30/2021)
• What's the Difference Between Structured Literacy and Balanced Literacy? (10/21/2021)
• Six Skills of Early Literacy Video (11/4/2021) (replay)
• Nine Great Books for Reluctant Readers (11/21/2021)
• The Legit Fear Behind "Don't Call on Me to Read" – Understood.org (12/29/2021)
• What is Structured Literacy? (1/26/2022)
• Learn the Signs (2/10/2022)
• Eight Tips for Talking to Your Teachers About Dyslexia (2/17/2022)
• MTSS One-Pager (2/17/2022)
• Video Resource: Delaware Department of Education - Delaware's Social, Emotional and Behavioral Wellbeing (SEBW) Plan and how it can be incorporated into a multi-tiered system of support (MTSS) to aid all students in Delaware. (2/24/2022)
• Developing Emotional Literacy Across all Grade Levels (4/14/2022)
• Why Is Reading So Hard? (2/23/2022)
• 8 Tips for Talking to your Teachers about Dyslexia (2/17/2022)
• MTSS One-Pager -(2/17/2022)
• Learning to Read – Literacy first 3 years (4/29/2022)
• Phonics Blending- An Evidenced Based Literacy Strategy (5/5/2022)
• Advocating for Dyslexia in Schools (6/2022)
• Reading from Birth (6/14/2022)
In January 2022, PIC partnered with the Disability Law Program to provide three webinars breaking down the US Department of Education’s Back to School Roadmap Guidance for families. The series covered topics highlighted in the guidance to ensure despite the pandemic, students with disabilities continued to receive appropriate services under IDEA, and infants and toddlers with disabilities and families, appropriate Part C services. Disabilities Law Program is a part of Community Legal Aid Society, Inc. and serves as the state’s protection and advocacy center (PNA) for individuals with disabilities. The event was advertised via social media, on our website and within our networks. The event was advertised via social media, on our website and within our networks. The webinars were recorded so that families not able to participate in the live webinar could view them at a convenient time for them. There was an average of 21 participants at the three webinars.
Early Literacy Advisory Group
This newly formed group was created to support and provide feedback as we work to support Districts and Charters with the roll out of recent legislation and current SSIP regarding the Science of Reading, reading screening, and literacy interventions.
Governor’s Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens (GACEC)
DE SSIP staff met twice with the GACEC during the 2021-22 school year to share information related to SSIP implementation and outcomes. The new MTSS regulation was discussed along with related supports and resources. Updates on DELI were also given with ongoing professional learning opportunities. Designated members of GACEC participate in additional committees such as MTSS Advisory Council.
Professional Learning Participants
District and school personnel participating in the MTSS professional learning activities were surveyed in March 2022 to receive their feedback on the quality and effectiveness of each improvement activity. They also provided qualitative feedback on what could be done to improve the professional learning offerings. Detailed information related to feedback from professional learning participants was discussed in detail previously in the professional learning improvement strategy section of this report.

**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. The primary barriers related to the impact of the COVID-19 are the same as those reported in the 2021 SSIP Phase III report.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).**

DDOE ensures that this data is complete, accurate, reliable, and valid for Indicator 17. DDOE mitigated the impact of COVID-19 by providing guidance and technical assistance for LEAs. COVID-19 did not have any impact on the data collection since the SEA and LEA utilize a state data system. Although most schools resumed in person learning, some schools continued to offer virtual and/or hybrid options. Ongoing quarantines continue to impact instruction.
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 English Language Learners (ELL).
DDOE meets with Special Education leadership and Directors throughout the state, six times a year, and reviews relevant Indicator 17 improvement activities and outcome data. The DDOE continues to share Indicator 17 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 English Language 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.

## 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 Matusevich

**Title:**

Director, Exceptional Children Resources

**Email:**

dale.matusevich@doe.k12.de.us

**Phone:**

13027354210

**Submitted on:**

04/26/23 6:44:20 PM

# Determination Enclosures

## RDA Matrix

**Delaware**

2023 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

**Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination[[4]](#footnote-5)**

| **Percentage (%)** | **Determination** |
| --- | --- |
| 78.75% | Needs Assistance |

**Results and Compliance Overall Scoring**

|  | **Total Points Available** | **Points Earned** | **Score (%)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Results** | 24 | 15 | 62.50% |
| **Compliance** | 20 | 19 | 95.00% |

**2023 Part B Results Matrix**

**Reading Assessment Elements**

| **Reading Assessment Elements** | **Performance (%)** | **Score** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments** | 90% | 2 |
| **Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments** | 84% | 1 |
| **Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | 20% | 0 |
| **Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | 94% | 1 |
| **Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | 27% | 1 |
| **Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | 94% | 1 |

**Math Assessment Elements**

| **Math Assessment Elements** | **Performance (%)** | **Score** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments** | 90% | 2 |
| **Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments** | 84% | 1 |
| **Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | 32% | 0 |
| **Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | 93% | 1 |
| **Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | 12% | 0 |
| **Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | 92% | 1 |

**Exiting Data Elements**

| **Exiting Data Elements** | **Performance (%)** | **Score** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out** | 10 | 2 |
| **Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma\*\*** | 81 | 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.”

**2023 Part B Compliance Matrix**

| **Part B Compliance Indicator[[5]](#footnote-6)** | **Performance (%)**  | **Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020** | **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.** | 0.00% | N/A | 2 |
| **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.** | 2.44% | YES | 2 |
| **Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation** | 98.31% | YES | 2 |
| **Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday** | 97.43% | YES | 2 |
| **Indicator 13: Secondary transition** | 93.68% | NO | 1 |
| **Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data** | 97.62% |  | 2 |
| **Timely State Complaint Decisions** | 100.00% |  | 2 |
| **Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions** | 100.00% |  | 2 |
| **Longstanding Noncompliance** |  |  | 2 |
| **Specific Conditions** | None |  |  |
| **Uncorrected identified noncompliance** | None |  |  |

## Data Rubric

**Delaware**

FFY 2021 APR[[6]](#footnote-7)

|   | **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 |
|  | **Subtotal** | 21 |
| **APR Score Calculation** | **Timely Submission Points** - If the FFY 2021 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 |

|  |  | **618 Data[[7]](#footnote-8)** |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table** | **Timely** | **Complete Data** | **Passed Edit Check** | **Total** |
| **Child Count/****Ed Envs** **Due Date: 4/6/22** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **Personnel Due Date: 11/2/22** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **Exiting Due Date: 11/2/22** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **Discipline Due Date: 11/2/22** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **State Assessment Due Date: 12/21/2022** | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| **Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/2/22** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/4/22** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
|  |  |  | **Subtotal** | 20 |
| **618 Score Calculation** |  |  | **Grand Total** (Subtotal X 1.23809524) = | 24.76 |

| **Indicator Calculation** |  |
| --- | --- |
| A. APR Grand Total | 26 |
| B. 618 Grand Total | 24.76 |
| C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) = | 50.76 |
| 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\*) = | 0.9762 |
| E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) = | 97.62 |

**\*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 2023 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 | 1st Wednesday in April |
| Part B Personnel  | C070, C099, C112 | 1st Wednesday in November |
| Part B Exiting | C009 | 1st Wednesday in November |
| Part B Discipline  | C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144 | 1st Wednesday in November |
| Part B Assessment | C175, C178, C185, C188 | Wednesday in the 3rd week of December (aligned with CSPR data due date) |
| Part B Dispute Resolution  | Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in EMAPS | 1st Wednesday in November |
| Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services | Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in EMAPS | 1st Wednesday in May |

**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



## 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 2023 will be posted in June 2023. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

[https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/](https://nam10.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fsites.ed.gov%2Fidea%2Fhow-the-department-made-determinations%2F&data=05%7C01%7Cdan.royal%40aemcorp.com%7C56561a053eed4e4dffea08db4cd0ea7f%7C7a41925ef6974f7cbec30470887ac752%7C0%7C0%7C638188232405320922%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=REJfNg%2BRs0Gk73rS2KzO2SIVRCUhHLglGd6vbm9wEwc%3D&reserved=0)

1. Prior to the FFY 2020 submission, the State used a different data source to report data under this indicator. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Percentage blurred due to privacy protection. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Prior to the FFY 2020 submission, the State used a different data source to report data under this indicator. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. 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 2023: Part B." [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at: <https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2023_Part-B_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)