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## Subject

State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report for Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 covering program year 2016–17.

## Type of Action

Action, Information

## Summary of the Issue(s)

As required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 2004, Part B, the California Department of Education (CDE), Special Education Division (SED), developed the State Performance Plan (SPP), a six-year plan covering federal fiscal year (FFY) 2013–14 through 2018–19, using the instructions sent to the CDE, SED, by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). The SED prepares an Annual Performance Report (APR) each year that covers California’s progress on five compliance indicators, eleven performance indicators, and one indicator with both compliance and performance components. The attached report is for program year 2016−17.

This report provides data on the status of California’s students with disabilities in seventeen required federal indicators as required for submission annually under the IDEA. There are a number of these indicators (graduation rate, suspension/expulsion, and assessment) that overlap with California’s Statewide Accountability System, however, the calculation methodology and targets for these indicators differ due to specific parameters set forth by OSEP. Established targets for these indicators predate California’s new accountability system. As the lead state educational agency for California, the State Board of Education must approve this report and these data prior to submission. Failure to submit this report to OSEP may result in withholding of IDEA funds.

The SED has begun to review protocols and approach for compliance monitoring under IDEA to maximize alignment with the statewide system of support to the greatest extent possible; and that work will continue over the course of the coming year.

## Recommendation

The CDE recommends the State Board of Education (SBE) review and approve the Executive Summary of the FFY 2016 APR for Part B of the IDEA covering program year 2016–17 as prepared by the SED.

## Brief History of Key Issues

California is required to have in place an SPP to guide the state's implementation of Part B of the IDEA and to describe how the state will meet implementation targets. California’s initial plan was submitted to OSEP on December 2, 2005, as approved by the SBE and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Each year, the SPP has been updated to reflect changes in federal requirements. The SPP remains current through FFY 2016, program year 2016–17.

The APR is presented to the SBE annually for review and approval as part of the CDE’s annual report to the public on the performance of its local educational agencies (LEAs). The APR documents describe the progress of the LEAs and the state toward meeting the targets and benchmarks identified in the SPP, and summarizes the statewide activities associated with each of the target indicators in the SPP. A stakeholder workgroup assisted the SED in establishing and re-benching performance indicators at meetings held from December 2014 through June 2015. The new targets are included in the Executive Summary.

Similar to last year, this item contains indicators 1 through 16 that document overall progress as measured by state data. Indicator 17 describes improvement activities of the state in the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), which will be prepared for the March 2018 meeting. The SSIP covers multiple years and is focused on improving academic achievement for students with disabilities and contains broad strategies with detailed improvement activities related to data analysis, identification of areas for improvement, and infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity based on the Theory of Action presented last year.

On February 1, 2018, the SPP and APR for indicators 1 through 16 will be submitted to the OSEP. Indicator 17 will be presented to the SBE at its March 2018 meeting and will be submitted to the OSEP on April 2, 2018.

## Summary of Previous State Board of Education Discussion and Action

In November 2016, the SBE approved the FFY 2015 APR Executive Summary which reported on the progress of the 2015–16 compliance and performance indicators as required by the IDEA.

## Fiscal Analysis (as appropriate)

There is no fiscal impact.

## Attachment(s)

Attachment 1: Executive Summary of the FFY 2016 Annual Performance Report for Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act covering program year 2016–17 (39 pages).
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## Special Education in California

The California Department of Education (CDE) provides state leadership and policy guidance for local educational agencies (LEAs) special education programs and services for students with disabilities, birth to twenty-two years of age. Special Education is defined as specially designed instruction and services, at no cost to parents, to meet the unique needs of students with disabilities. Special education services are available in a variety of settings, including day-care, preschool, regular classrooms, classrooms that emphasize specially designed instruction, the community, and the work environment.

The CDE provides families with information on the education of students with disabilities. The CDE works cooperatively with other state agencies to provide a range of services from family-centered services for infants and preschool children with disabilities to planned steps for transitions from high school to employment and quality adult life. The CDE responds to consumer complaints and administers programs related to the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) for students with disabilities in California.

## Accountability and Data Collection

In accordance with the IDEA of 2004, California is required to report annually to the U.S. Department of Education (ED) on California’s performance and progress meeting targets defined in the State Performance Plan (SPP). This report is the State Annual Performance Report (APR). The APR requires the CDE to report on 17 indicators (Table 1) that examine a comprehensive array of compliance and performance requirements relating to the provision of special education and related services. The California Special Education Management Information System (CASEMIS) is the data reporting and retrieval system used by the CDE. CASEMIS provides the LEAs a statewide standard for maintaining a core of special education data at the local level that is used for accountability reporting and to meet statutory and programmatic needs in special education.

The CDE is required to publish the APR for public review. The current APR reflects data collected during Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2016, which is equivalent to California’s school year 2016–17. Please note that Indicators 1, 2, and 4 are reported in lag years using data from school year 2015–16. The 17 federal indicators include 11 performance indicators, 5 compliance indicators, and 1 indicator (Indicator 4) with both performance and compliance components. All compliance indicator targets are set by the ED at either 0 or 100 percent. Performance indicator targets were established based on recommendations of a stakeholder group, and approved by the State Board of Education (SBE) in November 2014 (Table 5).

**Table 1: California State Indicators**

| Indicator Type | No. | Description |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Performance | 1 | Graduation Rates |
| Performance | 2 | Dropout Rates |
| Performance | 3 | Statewide Assessments |
| Performance | 3A  | LEAs Meeting Accountability for Students with Disabilities |
| Performance | 3B | Participation for Students with Disabilities |
| Performance | 3C  | Proficiency for Students with Disabilities |
| Combined | 4 | Suspension and Expulsion |
| Performance | 4A  | Rates of Suspension and Expulsion |
| Compliance | 4B  | Rates of Suspension and Expulsion by Race or Ethnicity |
| Performance | 5 | Education Environments |
| Performance | 5A  | Education Environments (In Regular Class ≥ 80% of day) |
| Performance |  5B | Education Environments (In Regular Class < 40% of day)  |
| Performance | 5C  | Education Environments (Served in separate school or other placement)  |
| Performance | 6 | Preschool Environments |
| Performance | 6A | Preschool Environments: Services in the regular childhood program |
| Performance | 6B | Preschool Environments: Separate special education class, school, or facility |
| Performance | 7 | Preschool Outcomes |
| Performance |  7A | Preschool Outcomes: Positive social-emotional skills |
| Performance |  7B | Preschool Outcomes: Acquisition/use of knowledge and skills |
| Performance |  7C | Preschool Outcomes: Use of Appropriate Behaviors |
| Performance | 8 | Parent Involvement |
| Compliance | 9 | Disproportionate Representation  |
| Compliance | 10 | Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories |
| Compliance | 11 | Child Find |
| Compliance | 12 | Early Childhood Transition |
| Compliance | 13 | Secondary Transition |
| Performance | 14 | Post-school Outcomes |
| Performance | 14A  | Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school |
| Performance | 14B  | Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school |
| Performance | 14C  | 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 |
| Performance | 15 | Resolution Sessions |
| Performance | 16 | Mediation |
| Performance | 17 | State Systemic Improvement Plan |

## Overview of Population and Services

During Fiscal Year (FY) 2016–17, a total of 754,337 students from birth to twenty-two years were enrolled in special education. Compared to the total student enrollment in California of 6,228,235, students with disabilities comprise about 10.9 percent of kindergarten through grade twelve students. As shown in Figure 1, almost half of students with disabilities in California (49 percent) are between six and twelve years of age. As well as over two-thirds of students with disabilities are male (68 percent), over a quarter are also English-language learners (28.5 percent). All tables and figures are based on students with disabilities birth to twenty-two years.

California students identified with at least one disability are eligible for services to meet their need(s). There are 13 disability categories, as displayed in Table 2. The most common primary disability category designation for students is “Specific Learning Disability” (38.87 percent), followed by “Speech or Language Impairment” (21.21 percent).



CASEMIS, Dec 2016

**Table 2: Enrollment of Students with Disabilities by Disability Type**

| **Disability** | **Number of Students** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Specific Learning Disability (SLD)** | 293,231 | 38.87 |
| **Speech or Language Impairment (SLI)** | 160,024 | 21.21 |
| **Autism (AUT)** | 104,573 | 13.86 |
| **Other Health Impairment (OHI)** | 90,195 | 11.96 |
| **Intellectual Disability (ID)** | 43,978 | 5.83 |
| **Emotional Disturbance (ED)** | 24,560 | 3.26 |
| **Orthopedic Impairment (OI)** | 11,153 | 1.48 |
| **Hard of Hearing (HH)** | 10,528 | 1.4 |
| **Multiple Disability (MD)** | 6,887 | 0.91 |
| **Visual Impairment (VI)** | 3,565 | 0.47 |
| **Deafness (DEAF)** | 3,346 | 0.44 |
| **Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI)** | 1,689 | 0.22 |
| **Established Medical Disability (EMD)** | 497 | 0.07 |
| **Deaf Blindness (DB)** | 111 | 0.01 |

CASEMIS, Dec 2016

Of all students with disabilities in California, Hispanic/Latino students represent the greatest numbers of students in need of services (56 percent). Followed by White students (25 percent), Black or African American students (8 percent), Asian students (6 percent), students who identify with two or more races (4 percent), American Indian or Alaska Native students (1 percent) and the smallest group is Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander students (.38 percent). This data is reflected below in figure 2.

CASEMIS, Dec 2016

The CDE also tracks the type of school or program in which students with disabilities receive the majority of their instructional services. These include public schools, private schools, independent study, charter schools, community schools, correctional programs, higher education, and transition programs. Table 3 shows the greatest proportion of students with disabilities are enrolled in a public day school (85.32 percent).

**Table 3: Enrollment of Students with Disabilities by Type of School**

| **School Type** | **Number of Students** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Public Day School** | 643,632 | 85.32 |
| **Charter School (Operated by an LEA)** | 29,008 | 3.85 |
| **Charter School (Operated as an LEA)** | 22,078 | 2.93 |
| **Nonpublic Day School** | 11,489 | 1.52 |
| **Special Education Center or Facility** | 8,793 | 1.17 |
| **Continuation School** | 5,714 | 0.76 |
| **No School** | 5,655 | 0.75 |
| **Other Public School or Facility** | 5,013 | 0.66 |
| **Private Day School** | 2,942 | 0.39 |
| **Child Development or Child Care Facility** | 2,901 | 0.38 |
| **Community School** | 2,163 | 0.29 |
| **Home Instruction** | 2,144 | 0.28 |
| **Parochial School** | 1,858 | 0.25 |
| **Adult Education Program** | 1,696 | 0.22 |
| **Independent Study** | 1,575 | 0.21 |
| **Head Start Program** | 1,522 | 0.2 |
| **State Preschool Program** | 1,469 | 0.19 |
| **Juvenile Court School** | 1,383 | 0.18 |
| **Private Preschool** | 657 | 0.09 |
| **Nonpublic Residential School** | 675 | 0.09 |
| **Alternative Work Education Center/Work Study Program** | 613 | 0.08 |
| **Extended Day Care** | 355 | 0.05 |
| **Hospital Facility** | 272 | 0.04 |
| **Correctional Institution or Incarceration Facility** | 192 | 0.03 |
| **Community College** | 210 | 0.03 |
| **Public Residential School** | 183 | 0.02 |
| **Nonpublic** | 128 | 0.02 |
| **Private Residential School**  | 17 | 0 |

CASEMIS, Dec 2016

Students with disabilities in California receive a variety of services to address their unique needs. During FFY 2016–17, there were 1,800,794 services provided to California’s students with disabilities, many receiving multiple services. Table 4 describes the type of services provided to students. The most common service provided was Specialized Academic Instruction (34.33 percent), followed by Language and Speech Services (20.42 percent).

**Table 4: Services Provided To Students with Disabilities**

| **Services** | **Number of Students** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Specialized academic instruction** | 618,233 | 34.33 |
| **Language and speech** | 367,758 | 20.42 |
| **Vocational/career** | 245,812 | 13.64 |
| **Mental health services** | 141,374 | 7.85 |
| **College preparation** | 110,796 | 6.15 |
| **Occupational therapy** | 76,445 | 4.25 |
| **Other transition service** | 58,790 | 3.26 |
| **Adapted physical education** | 42,225 | 2.34 |
| **Services for deaf students** | 19,907 | 1.1 |
| **Intensive individual services** | 15,362 | 0.85 |
| **Special services for ages 0–2** | 14,494 | 0.8 |
| **Health and nursing**  | 13,717 | 0.76 |
| **Other special education/related service (must be in Local Plan)** | 11,797 | 0.66 |
| **Services for visually impaired** | 10,445 | 0.58 |
| **Physical therapy** | 10,616 | 0.59 |
| **Individual and small group instruction (ages 3–5 only)** | 7,957 | 0.44 |
| **Travel training** | 7,904 | 0.44 |
| **Specialized services for low incidence disabilities** | 6,495 | 0.36 |
| **Assistive technology services** | 6,412 | 0.36 |
| **Agency linkages** | 6,082 | 0.34 |
| **Specialized orthopedic services** | 4,224 | 0.23 |
| **Interpreter services** | 1,844 | 0.1 |
| **Recreation services** | 1,082 | 0.06 |
| **Residential treatment services** | 559 | 0.03 |
| **Day treatment services** | 385 | 0.02 |
| **Reader and note taking** | 136 | 0.007 |

CASEMIS, Dec 2016

## 2016−17 Annual Performance Report Indicators

During FFY 2016, California met 56 percent of the 16 target indicators. Table 5 identifies each indicator, its target, the FFY 2015 state results, and whether or not the target was met. The pages following Table 5 provide an overview of each individual indicator, including a description of the indicator, the target, the data collected, and the results.

**Table 5: Federal Fiscal Year 2016 Indicators, Target, Results, and Change**

| Indicators | Target | Results | Met Target | Change from Previous Year |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1** Graduation Rate | 90%/74.96%/74.84% | 65.5% | No | + 1.0% |
| **2** Dropout Rate | ≤12.72% | 13.75 | No | -0.71% |
| **3** Statewide Assessment | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 3A Statewide Assessment Adequate Yearly Progress  | 3A Not Reported | 3A Not Reported | N/A | N/A |
| 3B Statewide Assessment Participation | 3B 95% ELA/Math | 3B 95.0%/94.7% ELA/Math | Yes/No | Various |
| 3C Statewide Assessment Elementary, High, and Unified Districts | 3C. 13.9 % ELA, 11.6% Math | 3C Multiple Results | Yes/No | Various |
| **4** Suspension/Expulsion | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 4A Suspension and Expulsion Rate Overall | 4A ≤10% | 4A 3.21% | Yes | +0.90% |
| 4B Suspension and Expulsion Rate by Race/Ethnicity | 4B 0% | 4B 2.78% | No | -2.96% |
| **5** Education Environments | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 5A Education Environments Regular class 80 percent or more | 5A ≥50.2% | 5A 54.9% | Yes | + 0.83% |
| 5B Education Environments Regular class less than 40 percent | 5B ≤23.6%  | 5B 20.6% | Yes | -0.93% |
| 5C Education Environments Separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements | 5C ≤4.2% | 5C 3.5% | Yes | -0.9% |
| **6** Preschool Least Restrictive Environment | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 6A Preschool Least Restrictive Environment Regular preschool | 6A >33.9% | 6A 45.19% | Yes | +1.06% |
| 6B Preschool Least Restrictive Environment Separate schools or classes | 6B <33.4% | 6B 29.86% | Yes | -1.68% |
| **7** Preschool Assessment | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 7A Preschool Assessment (1 and 2) | 7A 82.2%/78.5% | 7A 82.2%/78.5% | Yes  | +14.6%/+6.0% |
| 7B Preschool Assessment (1 and 2) | 7B 79.7%/77.57% | 7B 79.7%/77.6%  | Yes | +11.1%/+6.4% |
| 7C Preschool Assessment (1 and 2) | 7C 73.7%/76.45% | 7C 73.7%/76.5%  | Yes | +5.0%/+6.1% |
| **8** Percent of Parents Reporting the Schools Facilitated Parental Involvement | 91% | 99.5% | Yes | +5.7% |
| **9** Disproportionate Representation | 0% | 2.57% | No  | +2.57% |
| **10** Disproportional Representation by Disability Category | 0% | 16.75% | No | +16.0% |
| **11** Child Find | 100% | 98.5% | No | -0.26% |
| **12** Early Childhood Transition | 100% | 94% | No | +8.0% |
| **13** Secondary Transition  | 100% | 99.8% | No | +0.2% |
| **14** Post-School Outcomes |  |  |  |  |
| 14A Post-School Outcomes Enrolled in higher education | 14A 52.3% | 14A 48.9% | No | -3.4% |
| 14B Post-School Outcomes Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within a year  | 14B 72.4% | 14B 72.6% | Yes | -2.9% |
| 14C Post-School Outcomes Enrolled in higher education, postsecondary education or training or competitively employed  | 14C 81.0% | 14C 81.7% | Yes | -1.5% |
| **15** Resolution Sessions | 58% | 31.24% | No | -.05% |
| **16** Mediation | 58% | 53.60% | No | -7.0% |
| **17** State Systemic Improvement Plan | N/A | Not yet available | N/A | N/A |

## Indicator 1: Graduation Rate

### Description

Indicator 1 is a performance indicator that measures the percent of youth with individualized education programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular diploma (20 *United States Code [U.S.C.]* 1416 [a][3][A]). The calculation methods for this indicator were revised in 2008–09 and again in 2009–10, to align with reporting criteria under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). A new reporting methodology was implemented for the FFY 2012 APR. The graduation rate uses the 2015−16 four year cohort. As the new accountability standards for ESSA are implemented, this data will change in future years.

### Target for 2016–17

* Have a 2016 graduation rate of 90 percent or more **or**
* Meet the 2016 fixed growth rate of 74.96 percent or more **or**
* Meet the 2016 variable growth rate of 74.84 percent or more

### Measurement

The data are reported in lag years using California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) data from FFY 2015 (2015–16). The calculation is based on data from California’s ESSA reporting.

### Results for 2016−17

The graduation rate for FFY 2016 demonstrated that 65.50 percent of students with disabilities graduated with a high school diploma.

**Target Met:** No

**Graduation Rate Targets and Results for FFY 2013–18**

| **Indicator 1** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 90% | 90% | 90% | 90% | 90% | 90% |
| Result |  61.8 | 62.2% | 64.5% | 65.5% | N/A |  N/A |
| Target Met | No | No | No | No | N/A | N/A |

## Indicator 2: Dropout Rate

### Description

Indicator 2 is a performance indicator that measures the percent of students with disabilities dropping out of high school (20 *U.S.C.* 1416 [a][3][A]). The calculation methods for this indicator were revised in 2009–10 to create a more rigorous target and approved by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) in April 2010. Dropout rates are calculated from data reported for grades nine through twelve. The CDE uses the annual (one-year) dropout rate. The rate is an estimate of the percent of students who would drop out in a four-year period based on data collected for a single year.

### Target for 2016–17

No more than 12.72 percent of students with disabilities will drop out of high school. These targets represent changes approved by the SBE and the OSEP in FFY 2014 and will be in effect for FFY 2013–18.

### Measurement

The data are reported in lag years using CASEMIS data from FFY 2015 (2015−16). The CDE uses the annual (one-year) dropout rate.

### Results for 2016–17

For FFY 2016, the Dropout Rate was 13.75 percent.

**Target Met:** No

**Drop Out Rate Targets and Results for FFY 2013–18**

| **Indicator 2** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 15.72% | 14.72% | 13.72% | 12.72% | 11.72% | 10.72% |
| Result | 15.7% | 17.5% | 14.46% | 13.75% | N/A | N/A |
| Target Met | Yes | No | No | No | N/A | N/A |

## Indicator 3: Statewide Assessment

### Description

Indicator 3 is a performance indicator that measures the participation and performance of students with disabilities on statewide assessments including: (1) Percent of the LEAs with a students with disabilities that meets the state’s minimum “n” size, that meet the state Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for English-Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics targets for the students with disabilities group; (2) Participation rate for students with disabilities; and (3) Proficiency rate for students with disabilities against grade-level, modified, and alternate academic achievement standards (20 *U.S.C*. 1416 [a][3][A]).

### Targets for 2016–17

These targets represent changes approved by the SBE and the OSEP in FFY 2014 and will be in effect for FFY 2013–18.

3A. The annual benchmarks and six-year target for the percent of LEAs meeting the state AYP objectives for progress for students with disabilities is 60 percent. This indicator is not currently reported per direction from the U.S Department of Education.

3B. The annual benchmark and target for participation on statewide assessments in ELA and math, 95 percent (rounded to nearest whole number), as established under ESEA.

3C. Consistent with the ESEA accountability framework, the 2016–17 annual benchmarks for the percent proficient on statewide assessments are broken down by subject and student group.

ELA = 13.9 percent

Math = 11.6 percent

### Measurement

The AYP percent equals the number of LEAs with students with disabilities that meets the state minimum “n” size and meets the state AYP targets for the students with disabilities divided by the total number of LEAs that have a students with disabilities group that meets the state minimum “n” size.

Participation rate percent equals the number of students with disabilities participating in the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) tests divided by the total number of students with disabilities enrolled on the first day of testing, calculated separately for reading and math.

Proficiency rate percent equals number of students with disabilities enrolled for a full academic year scoring at or above proficient divided by the total number of students with disabilities enrolled for a full academic year, calculated separately for reading and math.

### Results for 2016–17

1. In FFY 2016 for Target A, the results are as follows:

Percent of LEAs Meeting AYP for Disability student group (3A)

| Indicator 3A | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 58% | 59% | 60% | 61% | 62% | 63% |
| Result | 17% | 78.5% | \* | \* | N/A | N/A |
| Target Met | No | Yes | \* | \* | N/A | N/A |

\* Not reported in 2015 or 2016

1. In FFY 2016 for Target B, the results are as follows:

Percent of Participation for Students with IEPs (3B)

| Indicator 3B | 2013\* | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ELA Target | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% |
| Result | 18% | 94.2% | 93.4% | 95.0% | N/A | N/A |
| Target Met | No | No | No | Yes | N/A | N/A |
| Math Target | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% |
| Result | 13% | 93.8% | 94.6% | 94.7% | N/A | N/A |
| Target Met | No | No | No | No | N/A | N/A |

\*Pilot year for California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress, only California Alternate Performance Assessment data was included.

1. In FFY 2016 for Target C (Proficiency), the results are as follows:

Percent Proficient for Students with Disabilities (3C)

| Type of LEA | ELA Target | ELA Result | Target Met | Math Target | Math Result | Target Met |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Elementary School Districts | 13.0% | 17.6% | Yes | 11.6% | 14.7% | Yes |
| High School Districts | 13.9% | 18.5% | Yes | 11.6% | 8.2% | No |
| Unified School Districts and County Offices of Education | 13.9% | 15.7% | Yes | 11.6% | 12.3% | Yes |

**Target Met: 3A** Not Reported **3B** Yes/No **3C** Yes/No

## Indicator 4A: Suspension and Expulsion Overall

### Description

Indicator 4A is a performance indicator that measures the percent of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for students with disabilities (20 *U.S.C.* 1416[a][3][A] and 1412[a][22]). An LEA is considered to have a significant discrepancy if the districtwide rate for suspension and expulsion exceeds the statewide rate for suspension and expulsion. LEAs identified to have a significant discrepancy are required to review policies, procedures, and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. The data reported here are from FFY 2015–16.

### Target for 2016–17

No more than 10 percent of LEAs will have rates of suspensions and expulsions of students with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year. These targets represent changes approved by the SBE and the OSEP in FFY 2014 and will be in effect for FFY 2013–18.

### Measurement

The data are reported in lag years using the CALPADS data from the FFY 2015

(2015–16). The percent is calculated by the number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of students with IEPs for greater than 10 days in a school year divided by the number of LEAs in the state, multiplied by 100.

### Results for 2016–17

In FFY 2016, there were 37 LEAs (3.21 percent) that had a rate of suspension and expulsion for students with disabilities greater than the statewide rate.

**Target Met:** Yes

**Suspension and Expulsion Targets and Results for FFY 2013–18**

| **Indicator 4A** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | ≤10% | ≤10% | ≤10% | ≤10% | ≤10% | ≤10% |
| Result | 1.2% | 2.13% | 2.31 | 3.21 | N/A | N/A |
| Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A |

## Indicator 4B: Suspension and Expulsion Rate by Race or Ethnicity

### Description

Indicator 4B is a compliance indicator that measures the percent of LEAs that have:

(1) significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for students with disabilities; and (2) policies, procedures, or practices that 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 (20 *U.S.C.* 1416[a][3][A] and 1412[a][22]).

### Target for 2016–17

Zero percent of LEAs will have a significant discrepancyin the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year for students with disabilities by race.

### Measurement

The data are reported in lag years using the CALPADS data from FFY 2015

(2015–16). This percent is calculated by the number of LEAs that have: (1) A significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of students with disabilities; and (2) policies, procedures, or practices that 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 divided by the number of LEAs in the state, multiplied by 100.

### Results for 2016–17

In FFY 2016, 2.78 percent of LEAs had a significant discrepancyin the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year for students with disabilities by race.

**Target Met:** No

**Suspension/Expulsion by Race or Ethnicity Targets and Results for FFY 2013–18**

| **Indicator 4B** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Result | 1.89% | 2.31% | 5.74% | 2.78% | N/A | N/A |
| Target Met | No | No | No | No | N/A | N/A |

## Indicator 5: Education Environments

### Description

Indicator 5 is a performance indicator that measures the percent of students with disabilities, ages six to twenty-two, served inside the regular class 80 percent or more of the day; inside the regular class less than 40 percent of the day, and served in public or private separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placement.

### Targets for 2016–17

These targets represent changes approved by the SBE and the OSEP in FFY 2014 and will be in effect for FFY 2013–18.

5A. 50.2 percent or more of students with disabilities will be in regular class 80 percent of the day or more;

5B. No more than 23.6 percent of students with disabilities will be removed from regular class more than 60 percent of the day; **and**

5C. No more than 4.2 percent of students with disabilities are served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound/hospital placements.

### Measurement

5A. The number of students with disabilities served inside the regular class 80 percent or more of the day divided by the total number of students aged six to twenty-two with disabilities.

5B. The number of students with disabilities served inside the regular class less than 40 percent of the day divided by the total number of students aged six to twenty-two with disabilities.

5C. The number of students with disabilities served in public or private separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements divided by the total number of students ages six to twenty-two with disabilities.

### Results for 2016–17

California did meet the targets for 5A (54.9 percent of students were in regular class 80 percent of the day or more); for 5B, (20.6 percent of students were in regular class less than 40 percent of the day); and for 5C, (3.54 percent of students were served in public or private separate schools and facilities).

**Target Met: 5A** Yes **5B** Yes **5C** Yes

**Education Environment Targets and Results for FFY 2013–18**

| **Indicator 5** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5A Target – LRE > 80% | 49.2% | 49.2% | 49.2% | 50.2% | 51.2% | 52.2% |
| Result | 56.3% | 53.3% | 54.07% | 54.9% | N/A | N/A |
| Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A |
| 5B Target – LRE < 40% | 24.6% | 24.6% | 24.6% | 23.6% | 22.6% | 21.6% |
| Result | 23.6% | 22% | 21.53% | 20.6% | N/A | N/A |
| Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A |
| 5C Target – LRE: Separate School  | 4.4% | 4.4% | 4.4% | 4.2% | 4% | 3.8% |
| Result | 3.9% | 3.3% | 3.63% | 3.5% | N/A | N/A |
| Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A |

## Indicator 6: Preschool Least Restrictive Environments

### Description

Indicator 6 is a performance indicator that measures the percent of children with disabilities ages three through five years, attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related service in the regular early childhood program; as well as children with disabilities attending a separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility (20 *U.S.C.* 1416[a][3][A]).

### Target for 2016–17

These targets represent changes approved by the SBE and the OSEP in FFY 2014 and will be in effect for FFY 2013–18.

1. 33.9 percent or more of children with disabilities will be served in settings with typically developing peers.
2. No more than 33.4 percent of children with disabilities will be served in a separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility.

### Measurement

1. Percent = ([number of children ages three through five 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 number of children ages three through five with IEPs]), multiplied by 100.
2. Percent = ([number of children ages three through five with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility] divided by the [total number of children ages three through five with IEPs]), multiplied by 100.

### Results for 2016–17

1. 45.19 percent of children ages three through five attended a regular early childhood program and received the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program.
2. 29.86 percent of children ages three through five attended a separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility.

**Target Met: 6A** Yes **6B** Yes

**Preschool Environments Targets and Results for FFY 2013–18**

| **Indicator 6** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6A Target – Preschool Regular Setting | 32.9% | 32.9% | 32.9% | 33.9% | 34.9% | 35.9% |
| Result | 32.9% | 32.9% | 44.13% | 45.19% | N/A | N/A |
| Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A |
| 6B Target – Preschool Separate Class, School, or Facility  | 34.4% | 34.4% | 34.4% | 33.4% | 32.4% | 31.4% |
| Result | 34.4% | 34.4% | 31.45% | 29.86% | N/A | N/A |
| Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A |

## Indicator 7A: Preschool Assessment–Positive Social-Emotional Skills

### Description

Indicator 7A is a performance indicator that measures the percent of children with disabilities who demonstrate improvement in Positive Social-Emotional Skills, including social relationships.

### Targets for 2016–17

* Of those children with disabilities who entered the program with below age expectations, 82.2 percent will substantially increase their rate of growth by the time they turn six years of age or exited the program.
* Of those children with disabilities who were functioning within age expectations, 78.5 percent will function within age expectations by the time they turn six years of age or exit the program.

### Measurement

Positive social-emotional skills, including social relationships:

* Number of preschool children who did not improve functioning divided by the number of preschool children with IEPs assessed, multiplied by 100.
* Number of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers divided by the number of preschool children with IEPs assessed, multiplied by 100.
* Number of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it divided by the number of preschool children with IEPs assessed, multiplied by 100.
* Number of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by the number of preschool children with IEPs assessed, multiplied by 100.
* Number of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by the number of preschool children with IEPs assessed, multiplied by 100.

### Results for 2016–17

For FFY 2016, 82.2 percent of students substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program, and 78.5 percent of students were functioning within age expectations by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.

**Target Met:** Yes

**Preschool Outcomes–Positive Social-Emotional Skills Targets and Results for FFY 2013–18**

| **Indicator 7A** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016\*** | **2017** | **2018** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 72.7% /82.1% | 72.7% / 82.1% | 67.6%/72.5% | 82.2%/ 78.5% | 83.2%/ 79.5% | 84.2%/ 80.5% |
| Result | 59.4%/60.8% | 60.9%/60.3% | 67.6%/72.5% | 82.2%/ 78.5% | N/A | N/A |
| Target Met | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A |

\*Targets were changed this year

## Indicator 7B: Preschool Assessment–Acquisition/Use of Knowledge and Skills

### Description

Indicator 7B is a performance indicator that measures the percent of children with disabilities who demonstrate improvement in Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills, including early language/communication and early literacy.

### Targets for 2016–17

* Of those children with disabilities who entered the program with below age expectations, 79.7 percent will substantially increase their rate of growth by the time they turn six years of age or exit the program.
* Of children with disabilities who were functioning within age expectations in, 77.57 percent will function within age expectations by the time they turn six years of age or exit the program.

### Measurement

Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, including early language/communication and early literacy is measured by the:

* Number of preschool children who did not improve functioning divided by the number of preschool children with disabilities assessed, multiplied by 100.
* Number of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers divided by the number of preschool children with disabilities assessed, multiplied by 100.
* Number of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it divided by the number of preschool children with disabilities assessed, multiplied by 100.
* Number of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by the number of preschool children with disabilities assessed, multiplied by 100.
* Number of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by the number of preschool children with disabilities assessed, multiplied by 100.

### Results for 2016–17

In FFY 2016, 79.7 percent of students substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program; and 77.6 percent of students were functioning within age expectations by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.

**Target Met:** Yes

**Preschool Outcomes–Acquisition/Use of Knowledge and Skills Targets and Results for FFY 2013–18**

| **Indicator 7B** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016\*** | **2017** | **2018** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 70% / 82.5% | 70% / 82.5% | 68.6% / 71.2% | 79.7%/ 77.57% | 80.7%/ 78.57% | 81.7%/ 79.57% |
| Result | 60.9% /60.3% | 60.2% / 59.6% | 68.6% / 71.2% | 79.7%/ 77.6% | N/A | N/A |
| Target Met | No | No | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A |

\* Targets were changed this year due to new assessment tool

## Indicator 7C: Preschool Assessment–Use of Appropriate Behaviors

### Description

Indicator 7C is a performance indicator that measures the percent of children with disabilities who demonstrate improvement in Use of Appropriate Behaviors to meet their needs (20 *U.S.C.* 1416[a][3][A]).

### Targets for 2016–17

* Of those children who entered the program with below age expectations, 73.7 percent will substantially increase their rate of growth by the time they turn six years of age or exit the program.
* Of those children who were functioning within age expectations, 76.45 percent will function within age expectations by the time they turn six years of age or exit the program

### Measurement

Use of Appropriate Behaviors to meet their needs:

* Number of preschool children who did not improve functioning divided by the number of preschool children with disabilities assessed, multiplied by 100.
* Number of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers divided by the number of preschool children with disabilities assessed, multiplied by 100.
* Number of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it divided by the number of preschool children with disabilities assessed, multiplied by 100.
* Number of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by the number of preschool children with disabilities assessed, multiplied by 100.
* Number of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by the number of preschool children with disabilities assessed, multiplied by 100.

### Results for 2016–17

In FFY 2016, 73.7 percent of students substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program; and 76.5 percent of students were functioning within age expectations by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.

 **Target Met:** Yes

**Preschool Outcomes–Use of Appropriate Behaviors Targets and Results
for FFY 2013–18**

| **Indicator 7C** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016\*** | **2017** | **2018** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 75% / 79% | 75% / 79% | 68.7% / 70.4% | 73.7%/ 76.45% | 74.7%/ 77.45% | 75.7%/ 78.45% |
| Result | 65.9% / 65.7% | 65.8% / 65.8% | 68.7% / 70.4% | 73.7%/ 76.5% | N/A | N/A |
| Target Met | No | No | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A |

\* Targets were changed this year due to new assessment tool

## Indicator 8: Percent of Parents Reporting the Schools Facilitated Parental Involvement

### Description

Indicator 8 is a performance indicator that measures the percent of parents with a student receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for students with disabilities (20 *U.S.C.* 1416[a][3][A]). These data are one question in a survey distributed, collected, and reported by the Special Education Local Plan Areas (SELPAs). The measure is the percentage of parents responding “yes” to the following question: “Did the school district facilitate parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for your child?”

### Target for 2016–17

Ninety-one percent of parents will report LEAs facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for students with disabilities. These targets represent changes approved by the SBE and the OSEP in FFY 2014 and will be in effect for FFY 2013–18.

### Measurement

The number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for students with disabilities divided by the total number of respondent parents of students with disabilities.

### Results for 2016–17

The result for FFY 2016 was 99.5 percent of respondent parents with a student receiving special education services reported that LEAs facilitated parental involvement.

 **Target Met:** Yes

**Parent Involvement/Input–Targets and Results for FFY 2013–18**

| **Indicator 8** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 90% | 90% | 90% | 91% | 92% | 93% |
| Result | 99.1% | 99.2% | 93.8% | 99.5% | N/A | N/A |
| Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A |

## Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

### Description

Indicator 9 is a compliance indicator that measures the percent of LEAs 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]). The calculation for Indicator 9 has been changed to match the new federal regulations in 34 CFR 300.647. Effective FFY 2016, the CDE uses the risk ratio (or the alternate risk ratio when appropriate) to make identification of disproportionate representation. LEAs selected are required to go through a review of policies, practices, and procedures. LEAs identified had noncompliance in those reviews.

### Target for 2016–17

Zero percent of LEAs will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services as a result of inappropriate identification.

### Measurement

The number of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services as a result of inappropriate identification divided by the number of LEAs in the state.

### Results for 2016–17

For FFY 2016, 2.57 percent of LEAs had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services as a result of inappropriate identification. The CDE requires these disproportionate LEAs to implement corrective actions.

**Target Met:** No

**Disproportionate Representation Targets and Results for FFY 2013–18**

| **Indicator 9** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Result | .09% | .09% | 0% | 2.57% | N/A | N/A |
| Target Met | No | No | Yes | No | N/A | N/A |

## Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation by Disability Categories

### Description

Indicator 10 is a compliance indicator that measures the percent of LEAs 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]). The calculation for Indicator 10 (Ethnicity by Disability) has been changed to match the new federal regulations in 34 CFR 300.647. Effective FFY 2016, the CDE uses the risk ratio (or the alternate risk ratio when appropriate) to make identification of disproportionate representation. LEAs selected are required to go through a review of policies, practices, and procedures. LEAs identified below had noncompliance in those reviews.

### Target for 2016–17

Zero percent of LEAs will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories as a result of inappropriate identification.

### Measurement

The number of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories, as identified by both the risk ratio or the alternate risk ratio, which is the result of inappropriate identification divided by the number of LEAs in the state.

### Results for 2016–17

For FFY 2016,16.75 percent of LEAs had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories as a result of inappropriate identification. The CDE requires these significant disproportionate LEAs to implement corrective actions.

 **Target Met:** No

**Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories Targets and Results for FFY 2013–18**

| **Indicator 10** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target  | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Result | .57% | .87% | .75% | 16.75% | N/A | N/A |
| Target Met | No | No | No | No | N/A | N/A |

## Indicator 11: Child Find

### Description

Indicator 11 is a compliance indicator that measures the percent of students with disabilities 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]). These data were calculated using CASEMIS data fields related to parental consent date and initial evaluation date. Determination of eligibility was made using the data field which includes the type of plan a student has (IEP, Individualized Family Support Plan, Individual Service Plan), if the student is eligible, or no plan if the student is determined ineligible. If the parent of a student repeatedly failed or refused to bring the student for the evaluation, or a student enrolled in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations had begun, and prior to a determination by the students previous public agency as to whether the student is a student with a disability, then the student was eliminated from both the numerator and the denominator.

### Target for 2016–17

Eligibility determinations will be completed within 60 days for 100 percent of students with disabilities for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.

### Measurement

The number of students whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or a state-established time line) divided by the number of students for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.

### Results for 2016–17

For FFY 2016, 98.5 percent of eligibility determinations were completed within 60 days for students whom parental consent to evaluate was received.

**Target Met**: No

**Child Find Targets and Results for FFY 2013–18**

| **Indicator 11** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Result | 98.1% | 96% | 98.76% | 98.5% | N/A | N/A |
| Target Met | No | No | No | No | N/A | N/A |

## Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

### Description

Indicator 12 is a compliance indicator that measures the percent of children referred by the infant program (IDEA Part C) prior to age three, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday (20 *U.S.C.* 1416[a][3][B]). These data were collected through CASEMIS and data from the Department of Developmental Services.

### Target for 2016–17

One hundred percent of children referred by the IDEA Part C prior to age three and who are found eligible for the IDEA Part B will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday.

### Measurement

* Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B (LEA notified pursuant to the IDEA section 637[a][9][A] for Part B eligibility determination).
* Number of children referred determined to be **not** eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthday.
* Number of children found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday.
* Number of children for whom parental refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.

### Results for 2016–17

For FFY 2016, 94 percent of children referred by Part C of IDEA prior to age three and who were found eligible for Part B of IDEA had an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday. To increase this rate, the CDE has been partnering with the IDEA Part C agency, the California Department of Developmental Services, to increase timely referrals.

**Target Met:** No

**Early Childhood Transition Targets and Results for FFY 2013–18**

| **Indicator 12** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Result | 98.5% | 93.5% | 86% | 94% | N/A | N/A |
| Target Met | No | No | No | No | N/A | N/A |

## Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

### Description

Indicator 13 is a compliance indicator that measures the percent of students with disabilities ages sixteen and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment and 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 service 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 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]).

### Target for 2016–17

One hundred percent of students ages sixteen and above will have an IEP that includes appropriate and measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment and transition services.

### Measurement

Number of students with IEPs ages sixteen and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment and transition services divided by the number of students with an IEP ages sixteen and above.

### Results for 2016–17

For FFY 2016, 99.8 percent of students with IEPs, ages sixteen and above, have all eight postsecondary goals included in their IEPs which (1) include education, training, employment, and independent living; (2) updated goals according to the student’s changing strengths and preferences; (3) age appropriate transition assessment; (4) services in the IEP that will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her goals; (5) inclusion of courses that will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her goals; (6) annual goals related to the student’s transition services needs; (7) evidence the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting; and (8) evidence a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

**Target Met:** No

**Secondary Transition (Part C to Part B) Targets and Results for FFY 2013–18**

| **Indicator 13** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Result | 93.5% | 99.4% | 99.6% | 99.8% | N/A | N/A |
| Target Met | No | No | No | No | N/A | N/A |

## Indicator 14: Post-school Outcomes

### Description

Indicator 14 is a performance indicator that measures the percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school that had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were either enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school; enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school; or 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]).

### Target for 2016–17

These targets represent changes approved by the SBE and the OSEP in FFY 2014 and will be in effect for FFY 2013–18.

1. 52.3 percent or more of youth who had IEPs who are no longer in secondary school will be reported to have been enrolled in some type of postsecondary school within one year of leaving high school.
2. 72.4 percent or more of youth who had IEPs who are no longer in secondary school will be reported to have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.
3. 81 percent or more of youth who had IEPs who are no longer in secondary school will be reported to have been enrolled in higher education or in some type of postsecondary school, or training program; or competitively employed in some other employment.

### Measurement

1. The number of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect when they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school divided by the number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school.
2. Number of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect when they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school divided by the number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school.
3. Number of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect when 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 number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school.

### Results for 2016–17

1. 48.9 percent of youth who had IEPs who were no longer in secondary school reported to have been enrolled in some type of postsecondary school within one year of leaving high school.
2. 72.6 percent of youth who had IEPs who were no longer in secondary school reported to have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.
3. 81.7 percent of youth who had IEPs who were no longer in secondary school reported to have been enrolled in higher education or in some type of postsecondary school, or training program; or competitively employed in some other employment.

 **Target Met**: A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes

**Post-school Outcomes Targets and Results for FFY 2013–18**

| **Indicator 14** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 14A Target – Postsecondary  | 52.3% | 52.3% | 52.3% | 52.3% | 53.3% | 54.3% |
| Result | 52.3% | 50.4% | 52.3% | 48.9% | N/A | N/A |
| Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | N/A | N/A |
| 14B Target – Employed/Postsecondary | 72.4% | 72.4% | 72.4% | 72.4% | 73.4% | 74.4% |
| Result | 72.4% | 72.4% | 75.5% | 72.6% | N/A | N/A |
| Target Met | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A |
| 14C Target – Any Education/Employment | 81% | 81% | 81% | 81% | 82% | 83% |
| Result | 81% | 82.1% | 83.2% | 81.7% | N/A | N/A |
| Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A |

## Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

### Description

Indicator 15 is a performance indicator that measures the percent of due process hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. (20 *U.S.C.* 1416[a][3][B]).

### Target for 2016–17

Fifty-eight percent of due process hearing requests will be resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

### Measurement

Percent equals (3.1[a] divided by 3.1) multiplied by 100.

| **Due Process Complaints** | **Count** |
| --- | --- |
| (3) Total number of due process complaints filed | 4692 |
|  (3.1) Resolution meetings | 1434 |
|  (a) Written settlement agreements | 448 |
|  (3.2) Hearings fully adjudicated | 133 |
|  (a) Decisions with time line (including expedited) | 31 |
|  (b) Decisions within extended time line | 102 |
|  (3.3) Due process complaints pending | 1259 |
|  (3.4) Due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed (including resolved without hearing) | 3300 |

### Results for 2016–17

For FFY 2016**,** 31.24 percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

 **Target Met:** No

**Resolution Sessions Targets and Results for FFY 2013–18**

| **Indicator 15** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 55% | 56% | 57% | 58% | 59% | 60% |
| Result | 32.7% | 30.2% | 32.17% | 31.24% | N/A | N/A |
| Target Met | No | No | No | No | N/A | N/A |

## Indicator 16: Mediation

### Description

Indicator 16 is a performance indicator that measures the percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. (20 *U.S.C.* 1416[a][3][B]).

### Target for 2016–17

Fifty-eight percent of mediation conferences will result in mediation agreements.

### Measurement

Percent equals (2.1[a][i] + 2.1[b][i]) divided by 2.1, multiplied by 100.

| **Mediation Requests**  | **Count** |
| --- | --- |
| (2) Total number of mediation requests received through all dispute resolution processes  | 4668 |
| (2.1) Mediations held | 2302 |
| (a) Mediations held related to due process complaints | 2129 |
| (i) Mediation agreements related to due process complaints | 1174 |
| (b) Mediations held not related to due process complaints | 125 |
| (i) Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints | 60 |
| (2.2) Mediations withdrawn or not held (including pending mediations)  | 2088 |

### Results for 2016–17

For FFY 2016, 53.60 percent of mediation conferences resulted in mediation agreements.

**Target Met:** Yes

**Mediation Targets and Results for FFY 2013–18**

| **Indicator 16** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 55% | 56% | 57% | 58% | 59% | 60% |
| Result | 65.1% | 62.6% | 60.06% | 53.60% | N/A | N/A |
| Target Met | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | N/A | N/A |

## Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)

### Description

The SSIP indicator describes how the state identified and analyzed key data, including data from the SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) Select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for students with disabilities, and (2) Identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the state should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the state identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the state will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data. This indicator will be reported to the SBE in March 2018 for approval and will be submitted to OSEP in April 2018.