

Introduction

The Oklahoma State Department of Education (OSDE) is focused on high outcomes for all students in the state. The vision at the OSDE is to have all students' college, career and citizenship ready. In order to accomplish this task the OSDE has taken several steps to ensure all children in Oklahoma receive the education they need to be successful in life. To accomplish this task the OSDE has worked closely with the Oklahoma Legislature to implement several educational reform laws that focus on high outcomes for all students. The Special Education Section (SES) is a critical member of the team working to implement these new reforms. The OSDE is currently working on implementing:

- The Reading Sufficiency Act (RSA)
- Elimination of the Modified Assessment Option
- Teacher Leader Effectiveness (TLE)
- The Elementary and Secondary Education (ESEA) Waiver
- A-F grading system for school districts
- Special Education Interim Study

The Special Education Section (SES) works directly with all sections within the OSDE to ensure that children with disabilities are represented. For example, the SES section is aligned with the overall structure of the agency and works directly with general education partners to focus on student improvement. The SES section, Assessment and Instruction works with our general education partners in the Assessment and Accountability Office, and the Office of School Improvement. The Compliance, Data and Finance section of SES works directly with the Office of the Comptroller and the Executive Director of the state's longitudinal data system (SLDS). The Early Childhood Section including 619 and early intervention work with our general education partners with the Oklahoma Parents as Teachers Programs, Maternal and Child Health Home Visitation Programs, and the school readiness program Smart Start Oklahoma.

In addition to working with our general education partners the SES has focused on student improvement by working on the following overall **improvement** activities that includes all indicators:

- Results Driven Accountability (RDA) Outcomes from our 2011 Continuous Improvement Visit (CIV)
- General Manual (in process)
- Completing Prong 2 of monitoring activities from 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12.
- Revisions to Policy
- Development of a IEP Process Guide
- Development of a Handbook that includes best practices in special education
- Data Manual (in process)
- Finance Manual
- Development of Professional Development Activities that focus on areas of need
- Align SES budget to accommodate districts and improvement activities
- Use Part B administrative funding to flow to districts to help ease the sequestration cuts

The SES received the designation of “Needs Assistance” last year and has worked closely with the Southeastern Regional Resource Center (SERRC) to not only go back and perform prong 2 activities but to continue to develop external and internal procedures for monitoring every district every year, data collection procedures, reorganization of the state advisory panel, development of resources for districts, and ensuring all financial matters have been resolved at the federal level.

The SES is also working to develop relationships and build on already established relationships with partner state agencies on behalf of students with disabilities. The SES works closely with the following agencies in order to improve outcomes for students with disabilities and their families:

- The Oklahoma Parents Center (OPC)
- The Oklahoma Family Network (OFN)
- Oklahoma State University (OSU)
- State Advisory Panel (SAP)
- Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC)
- The University of Oklahoma Health Science Center (OUHSC)
- Early Foundations
- SoonerSuccess
- The Oklahoma Family Interagency Autism Council
- The Oklahoma State Plan for Autism
- The Oklahoma Department of Human Services (OKDHS)
- The Oklahoma Department of Rehabilitative Services (OKDRS)
- The Oklahoma Health Care Authority (OHCA)
- Special Education Resolution Center (SERC)
- Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA)
- National Post School Outcomes Center (NPSO)
- Special Education Handbook Committee

Organization of the Document

Oklahoma’s FFY 2012 is organized this year to demonstrate the work the section has accomplished toward improving outcomes for children. The general improvement activities are presented first and also at the end so the reader can understand the relationship to the indicators. Compliance indicators will include FFY 2012 data along with information related to FFY 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-2012 and 2012-13 monitoring activities

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012-2013

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See Introduction

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.

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

Measurement: States must report using the adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA.

Beginning with students entering the ninth grade in the 2006-2007 School Year, in order to graduate from a public high school accredited by the State Board of Education with a standard diploma, students shall either complete the requirements for the college preparatory or the work ready curriculum.

The Achieving Classroom Excellence (ACE) law states that: *Beginning with students entering the ninth grade in the 2008-2009 school year, every student shall demonstrate mastery of the state academic content standards in the following subject areas in order to graduate from a public high school with a standard diploma: Algebra I; English II; and Two of the following five: Algebra II, Biology I, English III, Geometry, and United States History.* All Oklahoma graduates must show proficiency in four of seven subject areas by scoring satisfactory or advanced to graduate High School. There are also alternate tests for each subject area as well as approved projects that can be done independently and graded to show proficiency. In addition to these options, there are accommodations and certain exceptions for English Language Learners (ELL) and students who have an Individualized Education Program (IEP).

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------|--|
| FFY 2012-2013 | 82.40% of youth on an Individualized Education Program (IEP) will graduate with a regular diploma. |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

In FFY 2012, 66.62% (4,144 of 6,220) of youth on an Individualized Education Program (IEP) graduated with a regular diploma.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012:

OSDE-SES slipped in the area of graduation. The SES believes this is due to the Achieving Classroom Excellence (ACE) Law that went into effect in the 2012-2013 school year seniors in Oklahoma. The ACE law requires students to pass 4 of 7 end of instruction test in order to graduate from high school. Oklahoma has a few exceptions to this rule but many students were not able to pass these exams and therefore were not allowed to graduate. The intent of this legislation is to raise expectations from students in Oklahoma and districts had several years to prepare students to pass these exams. The entire OSDE is working to improve graduation results for all of Oklahoma's students.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012: *Please see improvement activities at the end of the APR.*

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012-2013

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See Introduction

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

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

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

Oklahoma’s definition of a dropout is a student who enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; has not graduated from high school or completed a State or district-approved educational program; and does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or State or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------|--|
| FFY 2012-2013 | <p><4.05% of youth with IEPs will be reported as dropouts</p> <p>0.00% of youth with IEPs will be reported as dropouts (ESEA)</p> |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

In FFY 2012, 19.52% (1,105 of 5,667) of youth on IEPs in (ages 14-21) dropped out of school based on the above definition.

| Exit Type | Total |
|---|-------|
| a) Graduation with Diploma | 4,535 |
| b) Received a certificate | NA |
| c) Reached Maximum Age | 5 |
| d) Dropped out (includes “moved, not known to be continuing”) | 1,105 |
| e) Died | 22 |
| f) Total | 5,667 |

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012:

The data from FFY 2012 of 19.52% is progress from Oklahoma's corrected data from FFY 2011 of 20.70%. This shows a lower percentage of drop-outs from last year. However, the ESEA target of 0.00% was not met. The SES will continue to work with other sections of the agency to improve drop-out rates.

The SDE provided regional professional development in an effort to provide guidance to LEAs on best practices for gathering and reporting data. Trainings were also provided to assist LEAs in delivering appropriate secondary transition programs, co-teaching practices, as well as, inclusion guidance for general educators and special educators.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012: *Please see improvement activities at the end of the APR.*

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012-2013

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See Introduction

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Measurement:

A. (choose either A.1 or A.2)

A.1 AYP percent = [(# of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP targets for the disability subgroup) divided by the (total # of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size)] times 100.

A.2 AMO percent = [(# of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AMO targets for the disability subgroup) divided by the (total # of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size)] times 100.

B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in the assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window, calculated separately for reading and math)]. 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.

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level, modified and 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, and calculated separately for reading and math)]. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

FFY 2012 Measureable and Rigorous Target

| Indicator | Reading | Math |
|-----------------------|----------------|-------------|
| A. AYP | 59.00% | 63.00% |
| B. Participation Rate | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| C. Proficiency Rate | 80.40% | 81.07% |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

| Indicator | Reading | Math |
|-----------------------|----------------|-------------|
| A. AYP | 91.03% | 91.03% |
| B. Participation Rate | 87.46% | 88.29% |
| C. Proficiency Rate | 49.31% | 51.52% |

A. In FFY 2012, 91.03% of districts (457 of 502) met AYP for reading, and 91.03% of districts (457 of 502) met AYP for math.

B. In FFY 2012, 87.46% of children with IEPs (67,366 of 77,022) participated in assessment of reading, and 88.29% of children with IEPs (68,000 of 77,022) participated in assessment of math.

C. In FFY 2012, 49.31% of children with IEPs (33,221 of 67,366) were proficient in reading, and 51.52% of children with IEPs (35,035 of 68,000) were proficient in math.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012-2013:

During FFY 2012, the OSDE-SES increased the number of districts meeting AYP for both reading and math. A waiver was requested and granted to assist the OSDE in this area.

OSDE decreased from 99.14% reading participation in FFY 2011 to 87.46% in FFY 2012. There was also a decrease in math participation from 99.12% in FFY 2011 to 88.29% in FFY 2012.

In addition to fewer students participating in math and reading assessments, there were fewer students who met proficiency targets in both subjects. The FFY 2012 result of 49.31% proficient in reading is less than the FFY 2011 result of 56.91%. For math, the FFY 2012 result of 51.39% is a decrease from FFY 2011 result of 57.35%.

OSDE-SES slipped in the area of assessment. The SES believes this is due to the Achieving Classroom Excellence (ACE) Law that went into effect in the 2012-2013 school year seniors in Oklahoma. The ACE law requires students to pass 4 of 7 end of instruction test in order to graduate from high school. Oklahoma has a few exceptions to this rule but many students were not able to pass these exams and therefore were not allowed to graduate. The intent of this legislation is to raise expectations from students in Oklahoma and districts had several years to prepare students to pass these exams. The entire OSDE is working to improve graduation results for all of Oklahoma's students. It also is important to note that during this time alternate standards and testing were available in Oklahoma for students with disabilities.

The OSDE continues to provide regional professional development in an effort to offer guidance to LEAs in selecting appropriate assessments and accommodations as well as providing technical assistance on the portfolio development. These trainings were provided throughout the state as requested. The SDE also provided training through the Payne Education Center to assist educators on reading instruction. Oklahoma publishes its assessment results in the Special Education section of the department's web site: <http://ok.gov/sde/assessment>.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012-2013: *Please see improvement activities at the end of the APR.*

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012-2013

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See Introduction

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 4A: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, 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 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))

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates 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 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 districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The OSDE-SES, with stakeholder input from our IDEA Part B advisory group, has defined "significant discrepancy" as a risk ratio of suspension or expulsion of 2.5 or greater for students with disabilities compared to students in the general education classroom within a district/LEA. OSDE has chosen the following comparison method (one of the methods recommended by the OSEP):

The rates of expulsions and suspensions 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 (34 CFR §300.170(a)).

To be included in the analysis, a race/ethnic group must have at least 10 students with disabilities in the LEA. Any findings of significant discrepancies will generate an analysis of policies, procedures, and practices. LEAs will be required to conduct this review (consistent with CFR § 300.170(b)). If appropriate, the LEAs will revise policies, practices, and procedures relating to each of the following topics: development and implementation of IEPs; the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports; and procedural safeguards to comply with the requirements of the IDEA. In reporting any findings of noncompliance, of noncompliance, the corrections must be consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02 dated October 17, 2008.

Definition of Significant Discrepancy and Identification of Comparison Methodology:

“Significant discrepancy” is defined as a risk ratio of suspension or expulsion of 2.5 or greater for students with disabilities compared to students in the general education classroom within a district/LEA. OSDE has chosen P: the following comparison method (which is one of the methods recommended by the OSEP):

The rates of expulsions and suspensions 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 (34 CFR §300.170(a)).

The analysis examines the rate ratio of who are suspended or expelled and compares it to the state level for children with disabilities. If the rate ratio is 2.5 or greater, then the district is identified as having a significant discrepancy and is required to review its procedures and supporting documents.

Oklahoma has identified a minimum n size of 10 children for each LEA. Eight districts did not meet the minimum n size. These districts were included in the denominator. Also, the data source is *Table 5 of Information Collection 1820-0621 (Report of Children with Disabilities Unilaterally Removed or Suspended/Expelled for More than 10 Days)* for the school year 2010-2011 which was due, November 1, 2011.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012 (using 2011-2012 data)

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------------------------|--|
| FFY 2012 (using 2011-2012 data) | 7.19% of LEAs will have significant discrepancies in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year. |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012 (using 2011-2012 data):

| |
|--|
| FFY 2012: 8.42% of LEAs have significant discrepancies in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year |
|--|

This result of 8.42% (46 out of 546 districts) is an **increase** from the data in FFY 2011 (6.80% or 34 out of 544). It should be noted that the denominator is larger this year since charter schools are now considered separately from their districts in the state of Oklahoma. Their data is collected and reported separately.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (*completed in FFY 2011 using 2010-2011 data*):
If any Districts are identified with significant discrepancies:

Districts are notified of any discrepancies when they receive their annual *District Data Profile*. Those with findings of significant discrepancies are required to review policies and procedures with attention to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. A review of policies, procedures and practices occurs during all general supervision and monitoring activities. As a result of reviewing the 46 districts, no findings of noncompliance were found.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012 using 2011-2012 data:

Since last APR submission, the child count for Oklahoma students with an IEP increased over 2,000 students. Most of these students are new to being on an IEP and the stresses of having a disability category and a new classroom environment. Also, with the including the new charter schools, the increase in discipline activities could be due to an increased awareness of defining discipline in special education populations.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012: *Please see the improvement activities at the end of the APR.*

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012-2013

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See Introduction

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 4B: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, 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 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))

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates 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 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 districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The OSDE-SES, with stakeholder input from our IDEA Part B advisory group, has determined that LEAs in which there is a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions/expulsions of children with disabilities (by race/ethnicity) that is the result of inappropriate policies, procedures, and/or practices will be required to review (consistent with CFR § 300.170(b)) and if appropriate, require the affected LEAs to revise policies, practices, and procedures relating to each of the following topics: development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports and procedural safeguards to comply with the requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). In reporting any findings of noncompliance, the

corrections must be consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02 dated October 17, 2008. The State has chosen a comparison methodology to determine whether significant discrepancies, by race or ethnicity, are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a)): Compare the rates of expulsions and suspensions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State.

Definition of Significant Discrepancy and Methodology

For Indicator 4B, OSDE has defined “significant discrepancy” as a suspension or expulsion rate ratio of 4.0 or greater for students with disabilities from one or more racial/ethnic group within a district compared to the state-level rate for all children with disabilities. This definition is based on B4B Example #1a in Exhibit 10. Summary of Methods for Identifying Significant Discrepancy for B4B, page 45, in the March 16, 2012 release of *Measuring Significant Discrepancy: An Indicator B4 Technical Assistance Guide*. (34 CFR §300.170(a)):

Compare the rates of expulsions and suspensions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State. The first step in identifying significant discrepancies was to conduct the analysis and to examine the rate ratio of each race/ethnicity group in the district who are suspended or expelled and then to compare this to the state-level rate for children with disabilities. If the rate ratio is 4.0 or greater, then the district is identified as having a significant discrepancy and is required to review its policies, procedures and practices and supporting documents.

To be included in the analysis, a race/ethnic group has to have at least 15 students with disabilities in the group/cell. All 544 districts had at least one race/ethnic group of students with disabilities and a minimum cell size of less than 15. Yet, all 544 districts had more than two racial/ethnic groups to complete the analysis(that is, no districts were totally excluded from this calculation. Also, the data source is *Table 5 of Information Collection 1820-0621 (Report of Children with Disabilities Unilaterally Removed or Suspended/Expelled for More than 10 Days)* for the school year 2010-2011 which was due, November 1, 2011. Finally, all seven race and ethnicity categories are used for all analyses.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012 (using 2011-2012 data)

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------------------------|--|
| FFY 2012 (using 2011-2012 data) | 0% of districts had (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) 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. |

The second step in identifying a finding of noncompliance is to review the districts with any results of a significant discrepancy. In FFY 2011, 11.58% (63 of 544) LEAs in

Oklahoma during 2010-2011 had a significant discrepancy for at least one race or ethnicity group in the district in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year. However, in FFY 2011 after reviewing district documents, there were no findings of LEA noncompliance related to 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.

4B (a) Districts with Significant Discrepancy, by Race or Ethnicity*, in Rates of Suspension and Expulsion:

(Actual Target Data for FFY 2012) 0% of districts had (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) 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.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012 (using 2011-2012 data):

| Year | Total Number of Districts** | Number of Districts that have Significant Discrepancies by Race or Ethnicity | Percent** |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|------------------|
| FFY 2012(using 2011-2012 data) | 546 | 7 | 1.28% |

This result of 1.28% (7 out of 546) this is a decrease from the data in FFY 2011 (11.28% and 63 of 544districts).

It should be noted that the denominator is larger this year since charter schools are now considered separate from their districts for reported and collected data. Another consideration is that districts are coding race/ethnicity with the seven categories with more frequency than previous years when the multiracial category was rarely used.

4B (b) Districts with Significant Discrepancy, by Race or Ethnicity, in Rates of Suspensions and Expulsions; and 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.

| Year | Total Number of Districts* | Number of Districts that have Significant Discrepancies, 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. | Percent** |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------|--|-----------|
| FFY 2012 (using 2011-2012 data) | 546 | 0 | 0% |

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2011 using 2010-2011 data):
 If any districts are identified with significant discrepancies:

Districts are notified of any discrepancies when they receive their annual *District Data Profile*. Those with findings of significant discrepancies are required to review policies and procedure with attention to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. A review of policies, procedures and practices occurs during all general supervision and monitoring activities.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for (Insert FFY):

There was a decrease of districts with a finding of significant discrepancy (1.28% from 11.58%), no districts (0%) were found to have inappropriate procedures that would impact this finding.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012-2013: Please see improvement activities at the end of the APR.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012-2013

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See Introduction

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 5: Percent of children with IEPs 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))

Measurement:

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

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|----------------------|--|
| <i>FFY 2012-2013</i> | <p>A. In FFY 2012, 51.04% of students with disabilities will be inside the Regular Class at least 80% of the day.</p> <p>B. In FFY 2012, 9.84% of students with disabilities (8,914 of 92,296) will be inside the Regular Class less than 40% of the day.</p> <p>C. In FFY 2012, 1.85% will be in Separate Schools/Facilities.</p> |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012: The data collection for these data was October 1, 2012. Oklahoma used the 618 data for reporting the data for this indicator.

A. In FFY 2012, 62.88% of students with disabilities (58,041 of 92,296) will be inside the Regular Class at least 80% of the day.

B. In FFY 2012, 9.66% of students with disabilities (8,914 of 92,296) will be inside the Regular Class less than 40% of the day.

C. In FFY 2012, 1.37% of students with disabilities (1,265 of 92,296) will be in Separate Schools/Facilities.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for (Insert FFY):

Oklahoma has met and exceeded the target for Indicator 5 in the three areas being analyzed. The target for special education students to be included in the regular education classroom for at least 80% of the school day was 51.04% and our actual result was 62.88%. For special education students being included in the regular education classroom for less than 40% of the day has dropped from 9.84% last year to 9.66% this year. Finally, our target for children placed in residential facilities, separate schools or hospital/homebound also dropped from 1.85% to 1.37%. Improvement activities continue to provide support to districts with the goal that the numbers will continue to show growth as well as give us vital information about the 40%-79% group. Oklahoma will look further into the data to determine how these children are being served and what support can be provided to assist districts in moving children to the 80% category. The Assessment and Instruction team focused professional development activities around co-teaching and inclusion. Professional Development materials are available on the OSDE-SES web site for districts to access as needed. Efforts to assist districts in moving children to a least restrictive environment will continue in order to maximize access to the general education curriculum.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for (FFY 2012): *Please see Improvement Activities at the end of the APR.*

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012-2013

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See Introduction

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs 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.

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

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 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 aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------|--|
| FFY 2012-2013 | <p>A. 39.49% of preschool students with IEPs will receive the majority of their special education and related services in the regular early childhood program</p> <p>B. 18.40% of preschool students with IEPs will receive their special education and related services in a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.</p> |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

- A. In FFY 2012, 73.80% of preschoolers with disabilities (6,283 of 8,514) the majority of their special education and related services in a regular early received childhood program.
- B. In FFY 2012, 16.67% of preschoolers with disabilities (1,419 of 8,514) received the majority of their special education and related services in a separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012: Oklahoma has made significant progress in this indicator. After reviewing the data and obtaining clarification from SERRC and ECTA Oklahoma did not calculate this indicator correctly last year. The new calculation raised our percentage significantly. Oklahoma leads the nation in public four year old preschool programs for typically developing children and this is likely why this indicator is so high. LEA's have the resources needed to place young children with their typically developing peers.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012: *Please see improvement activities at the end of the APR.*

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012-2013

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See Introduction

| |
|---|
| Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE |
|---|

Indicator 7: 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))

| |
|---------------------|
| 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 (use for FFY 2008-2009 reporting):

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered or exited 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.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets and Actual Data for FFY 2012

| Summary Statements | | |
|--|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) | Targets for FFY 2012 | Actual FFY 2012 |
| 1) 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 exited the program | 91.0% | 89.3% |
| 2) The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they exited the program | 59.0% | 58.0% |
| Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy) | Targets for FFY 2012 | Actual FFY 2012 |
| 1) 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 exited the program | 92.0% | 88.8% |
| 2) The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they exited the program | 58.0% | 57.3% |
| Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs | Targets for FFY 2012 | Actual FFY 2012 |
| 1) Of those children who entered or exited the program below | 92.0% | 90.8% |

| | | |
|---|-------|-------|
| age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program | | |
| 2) The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they exited the program | 72.0% | 72.7% |

Actual Data for 2012 Progress Categories

| | FFY 2011 | | FFY 2012 | |
|--|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| | Number of children | Percent of children | Number of children | Percent of children |
| A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships): | | | | |
| a) Percent of children who did not improve functioning | 55 | 1.0% | 74 | 1.2% |
| b) Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 338 | 6.2% | 459 | 7.5% |
| c) Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach | 1,776 | 32.7% | 2,024 | 33.3% |
| d) Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 2,282 | 42.1% | 2,442 | 40.1% |
| e) Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 975 | 18.0% | 1,088 | 17.9% |
| Total | 5,426 | 100% | 6,087 | 100% |
| B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy): | | | | |
| a) Percent of children who did not improve functioning | 61 | 1.1% | 76 | 1.2% |
| b) Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 388 | 7.2% | 489 | 8.0% |
| c) Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach | 1,769 | 32.6% | 2,035 | 33.4% |
| d) Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 2,262 | 41.7% | 2,432 | 40.0% |
| e) Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 946 | 17.4% | 1,055 | 17.3% |

| | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| Total | 5,426 | 100% | 6087 | 100% |
| C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs: | Number of children | Percent of children | Number of children | Percent of children |
| a) Percent of children who did not improve functioning | 51 | 0.9% | 71 | 1.2% |
| b) Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 232 | 4.3% | 329 | 5.4% |
| c) Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach | 1,080 | 19.9% | 1,261 | 20.7% |
| d) Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 2,464 | 45.4% | 2,695 | 44.3% |
| e) Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1,599 | 29.5% | 1,731 | 28.4% |
| Total | 5,426 | 100% | 6,087 | 100% |

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012:

The data displayed above demonstrate progress in all three outcomes in categories A-C, and shows slippage for categories D and E. This consistency shows that children are not making progress to compare or reach functioning of same age peers. This data demonstrates that we are not yet meeting our targets but are moving forward in most areas. The OSDE will continue to provide professional development opportunities for teachers and service providers regarding typical child development and resources for consistently scoring the ECO categories. The Preschool Project coordinator will continue to work with the ECTA to develop materials for professionals and parents to better understand ECO's and their purpose.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012: Please see improvement activities at the end of the APR.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012-2013

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See introduction

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 8: 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))

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.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------|--|
| FFY 2012-2013 | 87.00% of parents with a child receiving special education services will report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. |

Actual Target Data for (Insert FFY):

In FFY 2012, 91.77% (6,567 of 7,156) of parents with a child receiving special education services report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

| Disability Category | Population | | Response Group | |
|---------------------------------------|------------|---------|----------------|---------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Autism | 4,121 | 4.08% | 565 | 7.90% |
| Deaf-Blindness | 12 | 0.01% | 23 | 0.32% |
| Developmental Delay | 16,415 | 16.27% | 889 | 12.42% |
| Serious Emotional Disturbance | 4,306 | 4.27% | 220 | 3.07% |
| Hearing Impairment Including Deafness | 1,172 | 1.16% | 81 | 1.13% |
| Intellectually Disabled | 5,662 | 5.61% | 258 | 3.60% |
| Multiple Disabilities | 1,620 | 1.61% | 558 | 7.80% |
| Orthopedic Impairments | 400 | 0.40% | 36 | 0.50% |
| Other Health Impairments | 13,452 | 13.33% | 574 | 8.00% |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| Specific Learning Disability | 40,567 | 40.21% | 1,747 | 24.41% |
| Speech or Language Impairment | 12,339 | 12.23% | 1,371 | 19.16% |
| Traumatic Brain Injury | 240 | 0.24% | 43 | 0.60% |
| Visual Impairment | 587 | 0.58% | 62 | 0.87% |
| Did Not Report Disability Category | - | 0.00% | 729 | 10.19% |
| Grand Total | 100,893 | 100.00% | 7,156 | 100.00% |

| Racial/Ethnic Group | Population | | Response Group | |
|-------------------------------------|------------|---------|----------------|---------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 16,932 | 16.78% | 1,524 | 20.43% |
| Asian | 817 | 0.81% | - | 0.00% |
| Black or African American | 11,342 | 11.24% | 623 | 8.35% |
| Hispanic | 10,780 | 10.68% | 469 | 6.29% |
| Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander | 153 | 0.15% | 95 | 1.27% |
| Two or more races | 3,736 | 3.70% | - | 0.00% |
| White | 57,133 | 56.63% | 4,586 | 61.49% |
| Did not Report | - | 0.00% | 161 | 2.16% |
| Grand Total | 100,893 | 100.00% | 7,458* | 100.00% |

* (total is more than 7,156 since respondent could choose more than one race)

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2012-2013):

In FFY 2012, 91.77% of parents with a child receiving special education services (6,567 of 7,156) reported that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. The OSDE met its FFY 2012 target of 87.00%. The OSDE-SES’ response rate for FFY 2012 decreased from 9,288 to 7,156 responses due to the new survey distribution and collection of surveys. After increased collaboration between the OSDE-SES and Oklahoma Parent Center, the OSDE-SES provided additional Technical Assistance to LEAs and ensured that additional surveys were mailed to requesting LEAs. These efforts increased the 2012 survey response rate.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FY 2012-2013: *Please see improvement activities at the end of the APR.*

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See introduction

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 9: 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))

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts 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)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2012, describe how the State made its annual determination that the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by §§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' 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 2012 reporting period, i.e., after June 30, 2013. If inappropriate identification is identified, report on corrective actions taken.

Definition of "Disproportionate Representation" and Methodology

The OSDE-SES has defined "disproportionate representation" as a risk ratio of 2.5 or greater (overrepresentation). When disproportionate representation is determined for a district, the OSDE-SES will determine if the disproportionate identification is the result of inappropriate identification. Data for each district and charter school was analyzed for all racial and ethnic groups. Six districts did not meet the minimum Child Count "n" size of 10 in the district.

Step One: Calculating Disproportionate Representation

As recommended by the Data Accountability Center (DAC), OSDE-SES used a risk ratio (RR) to identify districts with 2.5 or greater risk of disproportionate representation for each of the seven racial/ethnic categories. The data source for Oklahoma's analysis was

Table 1 (Child Count) of Information Collection 1820-0043 (Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education under Part B of the IDEA) for all children with disabilities aged 6 through 21 served under the IDEA. All seven race and ethnicity categories were used.

Step Two: Determining if Disproportionate Representation is the Result of Inappropriate Identification

Districts are notified of any discrepancies when they receive their annual *District Data Profile*. Those with findings of significant discrepancies are required to review policies, procedures, and practices with attention to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. And, a review of policies, procedures, and practices occurs during all general supervision and monitoring activities.

Step One: States must provide the *number of districts identified with disproportionate representation* of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services (see Table below).

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------|--------------------------------|
| FFY 2012-2013 | 0% |

FFY 2012 Results: 0% of LEAs had disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification

Districts with Disproportionate Representation of Racial and Ethnic Groups that was the Result of Inappropriate Identification

| Year | Total Number of Districts | Number of Districts with Disproportionate Representation | Number of Districts with Disproportionate Representation of Racial and Ethnic Groups that was the Result of Inappropriate Identification | Percent of Districts |
|----------------------|---------------------------|--|--|----------------------|
| FFY 2012 (2012-2013) | 545 | 66 | 0 | 0.00% |

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012:

In FFY 2011, risk ratios indicated that 66 of 545 (12.11%) districts had disproportionate

representation for race/ethnicity. This is a decrease from the FFY 2011 finding of 18.11% with risk ratios of 2.5 or greater. Oklahoma continues to work with LEAs to address disproportionate representation and to maintain meeting this target.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012 (if applicable): *Please see the improvement activities at the end of the APR.*

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See introduction

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 10: 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))

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts 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)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.”

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2012, describe how the State made its annual determination that the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by §§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' 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 2012, i.e., after June 30, 2013. If inappropriate identification is identified, report on corrective actions taken.

Definition of “Disproportionate Representation” and Methodology

The OSDE-SES has defined “disproportionate representation” as a risk ratio of 2.5 or greater (Over-representation). When disproportionate representation is determined for a district, the OSDE-SES will determine if the disproportionate identification is the result of inappropriate identification. Data for each district and charter school was analyzed for all racial and ethnic groups. In addition, the following six disability categories were used: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. Four districts did not meet the minimum Child Count “n” size of 10 in the district.

Step One: Calculating Disproportionate Representation

As recommended by the Data Accountability Center (DAC), OSDE-SES used a risk ratio (RR) to identify districts with 2.5 or greater risk of disproportionate representation for each of the

seven racial/ethnic categories and six disability categories. The data source for Oklahoma’s analysis was *Table 1 (Child Count) of Information Collection 1820-0043 (Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education under Part B of the IDEA)* for all children with disabilities aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. All seven race and ethnicity categories were used.

Step Two: Determining if Disproportionate Representation is the Result of Inappropriate Identification

Districts are notified of any discrepancies when they receive their annual *District Data Profile*. Those districts with findings of significant discrepancies are required to review policies, procedures and practices with attention to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. . , A review of policies and procedures occurs during all general supervision and monitoring activities.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

| | |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------|
| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
| <i>FFY 2012</i> | <i>0%</i> |

FFY 2012 Results: 0% of LEAs had disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification for race/ethnicity in specific disability categories.

Districts with Disproportionate Representation of Racial and Ethnic Groups in Specific Disability categories that was the Result of Inappropriate Identification

| Year | Total Number of Districts | Number of Districts with Disproportionate Representation | Number of Districts with Disproportionate Representation of Racial and Ethnic Groups in specific disability categories that was the Result of Inappropriate Identification | Percent of Districts |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|
| FFY 2012 (2012-2013) | 545 | 85 | 0 | 0.00% |

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012:

In FFY 2012, risk ratios indicated that 85 of 545 districts (15.59%) had disproportionate representation for race/ethnicity in specific disability categories. This is a significant decrease from the FFY 2011 finding of 66.54% with risk ratios of 2.5 or greater. The SES attributes this significant change as a result of the multi-racial option category. Oklahoma continues work with LEAs to address issues that lead to disproportionate representation as well as to maintain meeting this target.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012 (if applicable): *Please see improvement activities at the end of the APR.*

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012-2013

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Please see introduction.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Indicator 11: 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))

Measurement:

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 45 school 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.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------|---|
| FFY 2012-2013 | 100% of children who were evaluated within the 45 school days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation. |

Actual Target Data for (FFY 2012-2013):

In FFY 2012, 96.67% (18,164 of 18788) were evaluated within the Oklahoma established timeline of 45 school days. Oklahoma made progress from 94.80% to 96.67% in the area of child find and did not reach the target of 100%. Reasons listed for evaluations not completed within 45 school days are:

- a) Child changes districts prior to eligibility determination 168
- b) Parent refusal to sign consent for evaluation or initial services 51
- c) All other late evaluations 624
- d) Evaluation team determined more data was necessary 72
- e) Lack of appropriate resources 27
- f) Breaks in school calendar 33

Of those not completed within 45 school days, an additional 176 days was the greatest number of days needed beyond the required timeline to complete the evaluation and determine eligibility.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for (FFY 2012-2013):

Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance:

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2011 for this indicator: _____%

| | |
|---|----------|
| 1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2011 (the period from July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012) | |
| 2. Number of FFY 2011 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding) | |
| 3. Number of FFY 2011 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)] | 0 |

Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

| | |
|---|----------|
| 4. Number of FFY 2011 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above) | |
| 5. Number of FFY 2011 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”) | |
| 6. Number of FFY 2011 findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)] | 0 |

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected:

The SES has taken several steps in FFY 2012-2013 to verify correction of noncompliance from previous years 2009-2010, 2010-2011 and 2011-2012. SES reviewed all monitoring data available from the previous three years and developed a plan to verify correction of noncompliance at a system level for each districts as outlined in OSEP Memo 09-02. Each district identified as noncompliant received a letter requiring them to verify data related to the identified area of noncompliance. Districts were required to submit data demonstrating compliance. The data was reviewed by the CDF team using a checklist specific to the area of noncompliance. The root cause for continuing noncompliance was determined to not be at the district level but at the state level in regards to OSEP Memo 09-02. Enforcement actions were not necessary. Districts while frustrated have complied with the requested documentation from all three previous years. Results are found in each of the charts below.

Verification of Correction (either timely or subsequent):

The OSDE-SES reviewed a second set of data for all districts demonstrating the lack of systemic noncompliance. Districts received letters advising them that they were in compliance or issued another finding. The OSDE-SES decided to start a new relationship with districts still found in noncompliance. In an effort to move forward with the new leadership at the OSDE-SES and to foster more positive relationships with districts issuing a new finding seemed to be the best way to continuing working with the district and focus on improvement with compliance and student achievement. This will also assist the SES in implementing the revised monitoring procedures reported in Indicator 15.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable):

The SES has taken several steps in FFY 2012-2013 to verify correction of noncompliance from previous years 2009-2010, 2010-2011 and 2011-2012. SES reviewed all monitoring data available from the previous three years and developed a plan to verify correction of noncompliance at a system level for each districts as outlined in OSEP Memo 09-02. Each district identified as noncompliant received a letter requiring them to verify data related to the identified area of noncompliance. Districts were required to submit data demonstrating compliance. The data was reviewed by the CDF team using a checklist specific to the area of noncompliance. The root cause for continuing noncompliance was determined to not be at the district level but at the state level in regards to OSEP Memo 09-02. Enforcement actions were not necessary. Districts while frustrated have complied with the requested documentation from all three previous years

| | |
|--|----|
| 1. Number of remaining FFY 2010 findings noted in OSEP’s July 1, 2013 FFY 2011 APR response table for this indicator | 70 |
| 2. Number of remaining FFY 2010 findings the State has verified as corrected | 67 |
| 3. Number of remaining FFY 2010 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)] | 3 |

Verification of Correction of Remaining FFY 2010 findings:

The OSDE-SES reviewed a second set of data for all districts demonstrating the lack of systemic noncompliance. Districts received letters advising them that they were in compliance or issued another finding. The OSDE-SES decided to start a new relationship with districts still found in noncompliance. In an effort to move forward with the new leadership at the OSDE-SES and to foster more positive relationships with districts issuing a new finding seemed to be the best way to continuing working with the district and focus on improvement with compliance and student achievement. This will also assist the SES in implementing the revised monitoring procedures reported in Indicator 15.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010:

The state is working with each district to resolve noncompliance and to ensure systemic noncompliance is not an issue. Specific punitive actions are not appropriate. Districts were notified that they were in compliance without a second set of data being evaluated in 2010 and 2011.

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2009 or Earlier (if applicable):

| | |
|--|----|
| 1. Number of remaining FFY 2009 findings noted in OSEP’s July 1, 2011 FFY 2010 APR response table for this indicator | 98 |
| 2. Number of remaining FFY 2009 findings the State has verified as corrected | 95 |
| 3. Number of remaining FFY 2009 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)] | 3 |

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for (FFY 2012-2013): Please see improvement activities document at the end of the APR.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012-2013

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See introduction

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 12: 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))

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.

Account for children included in a but not included in b, c, d or e. 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)] times 100.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------|--|
| FFY 2012-2013 | 100.00% of children referred by Part C and who are found eligible for Part B will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday. |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

A. In FFY 2012, 1,313 children that were served by Part C were referred to Part B for eligibility determination.

B. In FFY 2012, 141 of those children were found to be not eligible.

C. In FFY 2012, 965 of those children were found eligible and had their IEP completed on or before their third birthday.

D. In FFY 2012, 96 of those children were delayed due to parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.

E. In FFY 2012, 9 children were late referrals from Part C.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012:

For FFY 2012, 90.00% (962 of 1067) of children referred by Part C prior to the age of three, who were found eligible for Part B, had an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday. This represents slippage from FFY 2011 97.75%. Of those not completed by the third birthday, the range of days beyond the third birthday to determine eligibility and implement an IEP was one to 150 days. Other delays were due to: personnel shortages; LEA’s failure to follow appropriate procedures; evaluation team decided additional data was necessary; lack of appropriate resources; breaks in school calendars; and lack of communication between Part C and Part B. The data used for this indicator is pulled from our state wide child count system within the school district reporting site.

Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance:

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2011 for this indicator: 90%

| | |
|---|----------|
| 7. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2011 (the period from July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012) | 0 |
| 8. Number of FFY 2011 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding) | 0 |
| 9. Number of FFY 2011 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)] | 0 |

Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

| | |
|--|----------|
| 10. Number of FFY 2011 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above) | 0 |
| 11. Number of FFY 2011 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”) | 0 |
| 12. Number of FFY 2011 findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)] | 0 |

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected:

The SES has taken several steps in FFY 2012-2013 to verify correction of noncompliance from previous years 2009-2010, 2010-2011 and 2011-2012. SES reviewed all monitoring data available from the previous three years and developed a plan to verify correction of noncompliance at a system level for each districts as outlined in OSEP Memo 09-02. Each district identified as noncompliant received a letter requiring them to verify data related to the identified area of noncompliance. Districts were required to submit data demonstrating compliance. The data was reviewed by the CDF team using a checklist specific to the area of noncompliance. The root cause for continuing noncompliance was determined to not be at the district level but at the state level in regards to OSEP Memo 09-02. Enforcement actions were not necessary. Districts while frustrated have complied with the requested documentation from all three previous years. Results are found in each of the charts below.

Verification of Correction (either timely or subsequent):

The OSDE-SES reviewed a second set of data for all districts demonstrating the lack of systemic noncompliance. Districts received letters advising them that they were in compliance or issued another finding. The OSDE-SES decided to start a new relationship with districts still found in noncompliance. In an effort to move forward with the new leadership at the OSDE-SES and to foster more positive relationships with districts issuing a new finding seemed to be the best way to continuing working with the district and focus on improvement with compliance and student achievement. This will also assist the SES in implementing the revised monitoring procedures reported in Indicator 15.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable):

The SES has taken several steps in FFY 2012-2013 to verify correction of noncompliance from previous years 2009-2010, 2010-2011 and 2011-2012. SES reviewed all monitoring data available from the previous three years and developed a plan to verify correction of noncompliance at a system level for each districts as outlined in OSEP Memo 09-02. Each district identified as noncompliant received a letter requiring them to verify data related to the identified area of noncompliance. Districts were required to submit data demonstrating compliance. The data was reviewed by the CDF team using a checklist specific to the area of noncompliance. The root cause for continuing noncompliance was determined to not be at the district level but at the state level in regards to OSEP Memo 09-02. Enforcement actions were not necessary. Districts while frustrated have complied with the requested documentation from all three previous years

| | |
|--|---|
| 4. Number of remaining FFY 2010 findings noted in OSEP’s July 1, 2013 FFY 2011 APR response table for this indicator | 1 |
| 5. Number of remaining FFY 2010 findings the State has verified as corrected | 1 |
| 6. Number of remaining FFY 2010 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)] | 0 |

Verification of Correction of Remaining FFY 2010 findings:

The OSDE-SES reviewed a second set of data for all districts demonstrating the lack of systemic noncompliance. Districts received letters advising them that they were in compliance or issued another finding. The OSDE-SES decided to start a new relationship with districts still found in noncompliance. In an effort to move forward with the new leadership at the OSDE-SES and to foster more positive relationships with districts issuing a new finding seemed to be the best way to continuing working with the district and focus on improvement with compliance and student achievement. This will also assist the SES in implementing the revised monitoring procedures reported in Indicator 15.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010:

The state is working with each district to resolve noncompliance and to ensure systemic noncompliance is not an issue. Specific punitive actions are not appropriate. Districts were notified that they were in compliance without a second set of data being evaluated in 2010 and 2011.

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2009 or Earlier (if applicable):

| | |
|--|---|
| 4. Number of remaining FFY 2009 findings noted in OSEP’s July 1, 2011 FFY 2010 APR response table for this indicator | 2 |
| 5. Number of remaining FFY 2009 findings the State has verified as corrected | 2 |
| 6. Number of remaining FFY 2009 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)] | 0 |

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012 (if applicable): Please see improvement activities at the end of the APR.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development: See Introduction

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 13: 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 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))

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 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.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------|--------------------------------|
| FFY 2012-2013 | 100% |

Districts with

| Year | Total number of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP | Total number of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that meets the requirements | Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that meets the requirements |
|----------------------|---|---|--|
| FFY 2012 (2012-2013) | 21,246 | 19,683 | 92.64% |

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2012¹:

The OSDE-SES’ FFY2012 data of 92.64% represents progress from the FFY 2011 data of 87.14%. Even with a 5.5% increase, the OSDE-SES did not meet its target of 100%.

THE OSDE-SES has completed two improvement activities in FFY 2012. On November 4-5, 2013 the OSDE-SES and the Oklahoma Transition Council hosted the 9th annual Oklahoma Transition Institute. During this institute, participants from Oklahoma Public Schools drafted a new plan to improve secondary transition services for students. The OSDE-SES has also provided technical assistance/professional development on developing appropriate transition plans utilizing the transition assessment results.

Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance:

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2011 for this indicator: 92.64%

| | |
|--|----|
| 13. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2011 (the period from July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012) | 39 |
| 14. Number of FFY 2011 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding) | 3 |
| 15. Number of FFY 2011 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)] | 36 |

Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected

¹ In an effort to reduce reporting burden, in the FFY 2012 APR, States: 1) Are not required to provide an explanation of: a) progress; b) no change in actual target data from the data for FFY 2011; or c) slippage if the State meets its target. 2) Are not required to discuss improvement activities for: a) compliance indicators where the State reports 100% compliance for FFY 2012; and b) results indicators where the State has met its FFY 2012 target. 3) May provide one set of improvement activities for the entire APR as long as the Improvement Activities are indexed back to reference the relevant indicators.

more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 16. Number of FFY 2011 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above) | 36 |
| 17. Number of FFY 2011 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”) | 36 |
| 18. Number of FFY 2011 findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)] | 0 |

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected:

The SES has taken several steps in FFY 2012-2013 to verify correction of noncompliance from previous years 2009-2010, 2010-2011 and 2011-2012. SES reviewed all monitoring data available from the previous three years and developed a plan to verify correction of noncompliance at a system level for each districts as outlined in OSEP Memo 09-02. Each district identified as noncompliant received a letter requiring them to verify data related to the identified area of noncompliance. Districts were required to submit data demonstrating compliance. The data was reviewed by the CDF team using a checklist specific to the area of noncompliance. The root cause for continuing noncompliance was determined to not be at the district level but at the state level in regards to OSEP Memo 09-02. Enforcement actions were not necessary. Districts while frustrated have complied with the requested documentation from all three previous years. Results are found in each of the charts below.

For FFY 2011 findings for which the State has not yet verified correction, explain what the State has done to identify the root cause(s) of continuing noncompliance, and what the State is doing about the continued lack of compliance, including, as appropriate, enforcement actions taken against an LEA that continues to show noncompliance.

Verification of Correction (either timely or subsequent):

The OSDE-SES reviewed a second set of data for all districts demonstrating the lack of systemic noncompliance. Districts received letters advising them that they were in compliance or issued another finding. The OSDE-SES decided to start a new relationship with districts still found in noncompliance. In an effort to move forward with the new leadership at the OSDE-SES and to foster more positive relationships with districts issuing a new finding seemed to be the best way to continuing working with the district and focus on improvement with compliance and student achievement. This will also assist the SES in implementing the revised monitoring procedures reported in Indicator 15.

For those findings for which the State has reported correction, describe the process the State used to verify that the LEA: 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 Memorandum 09-02.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable):

The SES has taken several steps in FFY 2012-2013 to verify correction of noncompliance from previous years 2009-2010, 2010-2011 and 2011-2012. SES reviewed all monitoring data available from the previous three years and developed a plan to verify correction of noncompliance at a system level for each districts as outlined in OSEP Memo 09-02. Each district identified as noncompliant received a letter requiring them to verify data related to the identified area of noncompliance. Districts were required to submit data demonstrating compliance. The data was reviewed by the CDF team using a checklist specific to the area of noncompliance. The root cause for continuing noncompliance was determined to not be at the district level but at the state level in regards to OSEP Memo 09-02. Enforcement actions were not necessary. Districts while frustrated have complied with the requested documentation from all three previous years

| | |
|--|----|
| 7. Number of remaining FFY 2010 findings noted in OSEP’s July 1, 2013 FFY 2011 APR response table for this indicator | 51 |
| 8. Number of remaining FFY 2010 findings the State has verified as corrected | 48 |
| 9. Number of remaining FFY 2010 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)] | 3 |

Verification of Correction of Remaining FFY 2010 findings:

The OSDE-SES reviewed a second set of data for all districts demonstrating the lack of systemic noncompliance. Districts received letters advising them that they were in compliance or issued another finding. The OSDE-SES decided to start a new relationship with districts still found in noncompliance. In an effort to move forward with the new leadership at the OSDE-SES and to foster more positive relationships with districts issuing a new finding seemed to be the best way to continuing working with the district and focus on improvement with compliance and student achievement. This will also assist the SES in implementing the revised monitoring procedures reported in Indicator 15.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010:

The state is working with each district to resolve noncompliance and to ensure systemic noncompliance is not an issue. Specific punitive actions are not appropriate. Districts were notified that they were in compliance without a second set of data being evaluated in 2010 and 2011.

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2009 or Earlier (if applicable):

| | |
|--|----|
| 7. Number of remaining FFY 2009 findings noted in OSEP’s July 1, 2011 FFY 2010 APR response table for this indicator | 65 |
| 8. Number of remaining FFY 2009 findings the State has verified as corrected | 65 |
| 9. Number of remaining FFY 2009 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)] | 0 |

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012 (if applicable): *Please see improvement activities at the end of the APR.*

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012-2013

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See introduction

| |
|---|
| Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition |
|---|

Indicator 14: 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))

| |
|---------------------|
| Measurement: |
|---------------------|

| |
|---|
| <p>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.</p> |
|---|

| |
|--|
| <p>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.</p> |
|--|

| |
|--|
| <p>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.</p> |
|--|

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------|--|
| FFY 2012-2013 | <p>A. 31.9% enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>B. 46.9% Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>C. 75.4% 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.</p> |

FFY Measurable and Rigorous Target and Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

There was a response rate of 13% (575 of 5,975 identified leavers). Each leaver is counted only once in the highest category. There was an overall improvement in the response rate improved from FFY 2010 of 7.25% (399 of 5,501 identified leavers). The chart below displays growth in two of the three areas. There was slight slippage in the percent enrolled in higher education from the target.

| | FFY 2011 Data | FFY 2012 Data | FFY 2012 Target | Progress or slippage from |
|---|---------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------------------|
| A. % Enrolled in higher education | 31.2% | 17% | 31.9% | -14.9% |
| B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed | 62.4% | 57% | 46.9% | +10.1% |
| C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed | 80.6% | 71% | 73.5% | -2.5% |

The chart below indicates where each respondent falls after one year of leaving high school. The highest percent (31%) of students indicated they are/have attended at least one semester of higher education. An area of concern is the not engaged group at 20%. This will be an area that will need further research to determine how we can best assist this population.

| Post School Outcomes | Number | Percent |
|--|--------|---------|
| 1. Enrolled in higher education | 98 | 17% |
| 2. Competitive employment | 229 | 40% |
| 3. Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training | 71 | 12% |

| | | |
|--------------------------|------------|-------------|
| 4. Some other employment | 11 | 2% |
| 5. Not Engaged | 166 | 29% |
| Total | 575 | 100% |

A. 98 of 575 (17%) were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.

B. 327 of 575 (57%) were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

C. 409 of 575 (71%) were 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.

| | Enrolled in higher education | Competitive employment | Enrolled in other post-secondary education or training | Some other employment | Not Engaged |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|------------------------------|--------------------|
| State (575) | 98 | 229 | 71 | 11 | 166 |
| Gender | | | | | |
| Female (210) | 39 | 68 | 19 | 8 | 76 |
| Male (365) | 59 | 161 | 52 | 3 | 90 |
| Disability Category (575 out of 4328) | | | | | |
| Specific Learning Disability (320) | 61 | 153 | 30 | 2 | 74 |
| Emotional Disturbance (34) | 3 | 16 | 5 | 0 | 10 |
| Intellectual Disabilities (60) | 0 | 17 | 9 | 0 | 34 |
| All Other Disabilities (161) | 34 | 43 | 27 | 9 | 48 |
| Race/Ethnic Group | | | | | |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 9 | 32 | 11 | 1 | 40 |
| Black (non-Hispanic) | 8 | 21 | 9 | 0 | 22 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 8 | 29 | 4 | 1 | 11 |

| | | | | | |
|--|----|-----|----|---|----|
| White (non-Hispanic) | 73 | 146 | 46 | 9 | 91 |
| Two or more races | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Asian, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

Discussion of improvement activities completed and explanation of progress or slippage that occurred for FFY 2012:

The OSDE-SESs FFY 2012 data identifies that OSDE did not meet its FFY 2012 target for students enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school (A) and students enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school and students 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 (C). However, for student enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school exceeded the target for the second year.

After reviewing the data above, we have determined that an area that requires further data will be the not engaged group as they are setting at a response rate of 29%. Of the not engaged group, 50% dropped out of high school. The American Indian or Alaska Native is our highest not engaged group at 43%. This is a concern as they only represent 57% of the respondents.

The OSDE has determined that due to slippage in two areas, the improvement activities will focus on utilizing the technical assistance provided by National Post-School Outcomes Center (NPSO). Our goal is to develop a system that will enable the OSDE to gain a better understanding of what is needed in the state.

Revisions, with justification, to proposed targets/improvement activities/timelines/resources for FFY 2012: Please see improvement activities at the end of the APR.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012-2013

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See introduction

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 15: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

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

Measurement:

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

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

States are required to use the “Indicator 15 Worksheet” to report data for this indicator (see Attachment 1).

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|----------------------|---|
| FFY 2012-2013 | 100% of noncompliance identified will be corrected within one year of identification. |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012-2013:

| Indicator/Indicator Clusters | General Supervision System Components | # of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2011 (7/1/11 to 6/30/12) | (a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 (7/1/11 to 6/30/12) | (b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| 1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. | Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. | Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school or training program, or both, within one year of leaving high school. | Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments. | Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other | 7 | 17 | 15 |
| 7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrated improved outcomes. | Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4A. Percent of districts identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with | Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Indicator/Indicator Clusters | General Supervision System Components | # of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2011 (7/1/11 to 6/30/12) | (a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 (7/1/11 to 6/30/12) | (b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year. 4B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, 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 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. | Visits, or Other | | | |
| | Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 - educational placements. | Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other | 8 | 15 | 12 |
| 6. Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 – early childhood placement. | Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 8. 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 | Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other | 8 | 34 | 32 |
| | Dispute Resolution: | 2 | 2 | 2 |

| Indicator/Indicator Clusters | General Supervision System Components | # of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2011 (7/1/11 to 6/30/12) | (a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 (7/1/11 to 6/30/12) | (b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| disabilities. | Complaints, Hearings | | | |
| 9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education that is the result of inappropriate identification. | Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. | Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11. 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. | Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other | 8 | 25 | 24 |
| | Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 12. 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. | Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with IEP that | Monitoring Activities: Self- | 8 | 39 | 37 |

| Indicator/Indicator Clusters | General Supervision System Components | # of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2011 (7/1/11 to 6/30/12) | (a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 (7/1/11 to 6/30/12) | (b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| 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 service needs. | Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other | | | |
| | Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Other areas of noncompliance: <u>Extended School Year Services</u> | Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other | 7 | 10 | 8 |
| | Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b | | | 148 | 136 |
| Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification = | | | (b) / (a) X 100 = | 91.89% |
| (column (b) sum divided by column (a) sum) times 100. | 136 | 148 | x100 | 91.89% |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012-2013):

In FFY 2012, 91.89% of all findings were corrected within the one year time frame.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012-2013:

The OSDE-SES has made significant progress from FFY 2011 in correcting findings of noncompliance. In FFY 2012, 91.89% (136 of 148) findings of noncompliance were corrected within the one year timeline as compared to 35.07% in FFY 2011. The SES has taken several steps to ensure that the SEA is monitoring every district each year and has revised its monitoring procedures. In FFY 2011, every district was monitored but the process did not dig deep into the data. During FFY 2012, SES developed a team of specialists to focus on using data and financial information as part of the compliance/monitoring process.

Technical Assistance Received and Verification of previous noncompliance

The SES has received the designation of “Needs Assistance” for the last two years and has worked closely with the Southeastern Regional Resource Center (SERRC) to not only go back and perform Prong II activities but to continue developing external and internal procedures for:

- monitoring all districts every year,
- developing data collection procedures,
- reorganizing the state advisory panel,
- developing and identifying resources for districts, and
- ensuring all financial matters have been resolved at the federal level.

Background

The OSDE-SES has made significant process in developing procedures and processes to carry out the general supervision duties under the IDEA. A new State Superintendent of Public Instruction took office; the Assistant State Superintendent of Special Education position was vacant from June of 2011 to March of 2012. As a result of this OSDE-SES lost many staff, some staff was reassigned different duties, and new staff has been hired. During this time the OSDE-SES also received a Continuous Improvement Visit (CIV) from the USDE-OSEP. The results of the visit required the OSDE-SES to make several critical changes. The required changes were to no longer allow formal written complaints at the local level, and to revise monitoring procedures to include Prong II. Additionally, the OSDE-SES was required to go back to previous years since OSEP Memo 09-02, and perform Prong II activities. In the summer of 2012, some Prong II activities were conducted by previous staff, however since new staff could not verify this documentation, a new Prong II phase was conducted of 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012 data and activities.

Step One

The OSDE-SES was able to identify districts that were monitored and the findings received for the 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012 school years. The files for individual child corrections on these findings were also identified. These files were reviewed to ensure corrections at the child level were accomplished.

Step Two

Each district monitored from the 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012 school years received a letter regarding the required Prong II systemic improvement data verification. All districts were

required to submit student files regarding their area(s) of noncompliance. Districts were given 30 days to return the information to the OSDE-SES.

Step Three

The OSDE-SES reviewed all documentation provided by districts in order to verify compliance. A monitoring check sheet was used to go over each set of documentation to ensure that the district was in compliance and continued to be in compliance regarding their area of findings.

Step Four

Districts that were found in compliance received a letter advising them that the OSDE-SES considered the district in compliance and no further action by the district is required. The districts that could not demonstrate compliance are still receiving technical assistance and training and are required to participate in a corrective action plan. All districts that are not able to demonstrate compliance by June 30, 2014 will receive an onsite monitoring visit. The chart below demonstrates the results of our 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012 data verification.

| Year | Findings | Corrected |
|-------------|-----------------|------------------|
| 2009-2010 | 165 | 162 |
| 2010-2011 | 122 | 116 |
| 2011-2012 | 148 | 136 |

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012-2013: Please see the improvement activities at the end of the APR.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See introduction

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 18: 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))

Measurement: Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|----------------------|--|
| <i>FFY 2012-2013</i> | 85.00% of hearing requests that go to resolution sessions will be resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

In FFY 2012, 31.25% (5 of 16) hearing requests that went to resolution sessions were resolved through resolution settlement agreements. Oklahoma did not meet the state target of 85.00% but made progress from 2011 data of 30.76%.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2012:

The partnership the SES has developed with the SERC is successful and is one of the key players in getting problems with districts and parents resolved. We work in partnership with district special education directors and the Oklahoma Parents Center and SERC to support all children and families involved in the special education process in Oklahoma.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012: *Please see improvement activities at the end of the APR.*

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2012-2013

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See introduction

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 19: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Measurement:

Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|----------------------|--|
| FFY 2012-2013 | 85.00% of mediations held will result in mediation agreements. |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

For FFY 2012, 87.50% (7 of 8) mediations held resulted in mediation agreements. This is slippage from the FFY 2011 data of 91.66%.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012:

While the data demonstrate slippage when evaluating the actual numbers both FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 both show the state only missing one mediation not settling in an agreement. The partnership the SES has developed with the SERC is successful and is one of the key players in getting problems with districts and parents resolved. We work in partnership with district special education directors and the Oklahoma Parents Center and SERC to support all children and families involved in the special education process in Oklahoma.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2013: *Please see the improvement activities at the end of the APR.*

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012-2013

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See Introduction

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 20: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

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

Measurement:

State reported data, including 618 data, State Performance Plan, and Annual Performance Reports, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (first Wednesday in February for child count, including race and ethnicity; and educational environments; first Wednesday in November for exiting, discipline, personnel and dispute resolution; December 15 for assessment; May 1 for Maintenance of Effort & Coordinated Early Intervening Services; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports).
- b. Accurate, including covering the correct year and following the correct measurement.

As stated in the Indicator Measurement Table, States may, but are not required, to report data for this indicator. OSEP will use the Indicator 20 Rubric to calculate the State’s data for this indicator. States will have an opportunity to review and respond to OSEP’s calculation of the State’s data.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------|---|
| FFY 2012-2013 | 100% of Oklahoma state reported data will be timely and accurate. |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

In FFY 2012 100% of State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for (Insert FFY): Please see improvement activities at the end of the APR.

Improvement Activities

| Indicator | Improvement Activity(ies) |
|--|--|
| <p>Indicator 1 – Graduation (% youth w/IEPs graduation w/reg. diploma)</p> | <p>A. The OSDE will utilize data to identify twenty-five LEAs with the lowest graduation rates for individuals with disabilities on IEPs. The SDE will provide targeted, small group trainings with those identified LEAs. The LEAs will analyze their individual data, identify key reasons for low graduation rates, and develop a written plan for improving graduation rates. The OSDE will track the LEAs data over a period of three years as well as provide ongoing technical assistance. Each preceding year for the next three years, the SDE will add twenty additional sites providing trainings and technical support on improving graduation rates.</p> <p>B. The OSDE will analyze data to determine LEAs with the highest graduation rates and encourage sharing of their plan to improve the graduation rate in other districts. This will be accomplished at professional development opportunities.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Indicator 2 – Dropout (% youth w/IEPs dropping out)</p> | <p>A. The OSDE will analyze data to identify twenty-five LEAs with the highest dropout rates for individuals with disabilities on IEPs. The OSDE will provide targeted, small group trainings with those LEAs identified. The LEAs will analyze their individual data, identify key reasons for the high dropout rates, and develop a written plan for encouraging high school graduation. The SDE will track the LEAs data over a period of three years as well as provide ongoing technical assistance. Each preceding year for the next three years, the SDE will add twenty additional sites providing trainings and technical support on improving dropout rates.</p> <p>B. The OSDE will analyze data to determine LEAs with the highest graduation rates and encourage sharing of their plan to improve the graduation rate in other districts. This will be accomplished at professional development opportunities.</p> |
|---|---|

| Indicator | Improvement Activity(ies) |
|---|---|
| <p>Indicator 3 – Statewide Assessment (Participation and Performance)</p> | <p>A. Collaborate with other sections within the OSDE, including Reading Sufficiency, and the Office of Standards and Curriculum to provide professional development activities.</p> <p>B. Provide technical assistance regarding appropriate accommodations and the use of accommodations on state assessment.</p> <p>C. Provide training to general education teachers on assessment and accommodations.</p> <p>D. Collaborate with the Oklahoma Parents Center to train parents about assessment, ACE legislation, and different assessment options.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Indicator 4 – Suspension/Expulsion (Suspension/Expulsion Rates)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Provide breakout session at Vision 2020 Conference regarding behavioral interventions. B. Publicize suspension and expulsion data on OSDE website. C. Require LEAs with significant discrepancies in rates of suspensions/expulsions to set aside 15% of their IDEA Part B funds for Early Intervening Services. D. Provide data collection and reporting workshops in each of the five regions in Oklahoma to assist LEAs in the requirements of the reports and to offer tips for the timelines and accuracy of data submissions. E. Training on identifying threats or bullying; documentation on students. F. Collaboration with other entities; state agencies involved in child welfare, police departments and community groups |
|--|--|

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Indicator 5 – LRE Placement (% of 6-21 children removed from reg. class; served in public/private separate schools; residential; homebound; hospital)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Gather and analyze data for students in LRE 40- 79% of the school day. Gather and analyze data considering students disability category and their placement in LRE. B. Provide training to special education professionals to identify the LRE (continuum of placement) for each student. C. Gather and analyze data for students in LRE 40- 79% of the school day. Gather and analyze data considering students disability category and their placement in LRE. D. Provide training and technical assistance on collaboration, consultation and co-teaching as it applies to LRE on an individual basis. |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> E. Gather and analyze data for students in LRE 40- 79% of the school day. Gather and analyze data considering students disability category and their placement in LRE. F. Develop a webinar training to align with the Oklahoma Co-Teaching Framework. This framework is recommended to LEAs as a model to promote successful LRE for all students. G. Identify which disability categories are having the greatest success using the continuum of placement options. H. Identify which disability categories are having the greatest success using the continuum of placement options. I. Professional development for inclusion strategies and collaboration between special education and general education teachers. |
| <p>Indicator 6 – Preschool Settings</p> <p>(% of preschool children w/IEPs in settings w/typically developing peers)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Collaborate with the OSDE Office of Early Childhood/Family Education regarding services for preschool students with disabilities, including strategies for teaching preschool students with developmental delays.. B. Provide training through online Professional Development on early childhood outcomes for all stakeholders.. C. Provide technical assistance to LEAs regarding the identification, placement, and services available to preschool students with disabilities.. D. Request information and technical assistance from resource and specialty centers on strategies for improving early childhood outcomes or policies from other states. . E. Request additional assistance from ECTA and other agencies, stakeholder groups, taskforces, and technical assistance providers listed in the SPP |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>overview.</p> <p>F. Publicize preschool outcome data on the OSDE-SES website by LEA as part of the district data profiles, where sample sizes allow.</p> <p>G. Provide data collection and reporting workshops in each of the five regions in Oklahoma to assist LEAs in the requirements of the reports and to offer tips for the timeliness and accuracy of data submissions.</p> <p>H. Develop a plan (e.g., public service announcements) to expand the knowledge base and range of audiences (pediatricians) regarding Child Find.</p> |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Indicator 7 – Preschool Skills (% of preschool children with improved positive social emotional skills; acquisition and use of knowledge and skills; use of appropriate behaviors)</p> | <p>A. Collaborate with the OSDE Office of Early Childhood/Family Education regarding services for preschool students with disabilities, including strategies for teaching preschool students with developmental delays..</p> <p>B. Provide training through online Professional Development on early childhood outcomes for all stakeholders..</p> <p>C. Provide technical assistance to LEAs regarding the identification, placement, and services available to preschool students with disabilities..</p> <p>D. Request information and technical assistance from resource and specialty centers on strategies for improving early childhood outcomes or policies from other states. .</p> <p>E. Request additional assistance from ECTA and other agencies, stakeholder groups, taskforces, and technical assistance providers listed in the SPP overview.</p> |
|--|---|

| | |
|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> F. Publicize preschool outcome data on the OSDE-SES website by LEA as part of the district data profiles, where sample sizes allow. G. Provide data collection and reporting workshops in each of the five regions in Oklahoma to assist LEAs in the requirements of the reports and to offer tips for the timeliness and accuracy of data submissions. H. Develop a plan (e.g., public service announcements) to expand the knowledge base and range of audiences (pediatricians) regarding Child Find. |
| <p>Indicator 8 – Parent Involvement</p> <p>(% of parents w/child receiving SPED services who report schools facilitated parent involvement)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Participate in community outreach for parents (Joining Forces Regional State Conferences, etc.) and promote the importance of parental involvement, as well as ways to gain access to the survey. B. Provide technical assistance and resources (through email, telephone technical assistance, and continual postings on the OSDE-SES Website) to LEAs on methods of increasing response rates. C. Email LEAs twice a year, emphasizing the importance of the survey and the ways parents are able to access it (Parent Center, OSDE-SES website, telephone, by mail. D. Provide technical assistance and resources (through email, telephone technical assistance, and continual postings on the OSDE-SES Website) to LEAs on methods of increasing response rates. E. Have ongoing collaboration with the Oklahoma Parent Center regarding the response rate of completed surveys. Once a quarter, identify districts with the lowest response rates and offer them Technical Assistance to increase their response rates. F. OSDE-SES will provide Technical Assistance to parents and teachers regarding the importance of filling out the Demographic areas (race, disability) in order to decrease missing or omitted information on |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>survey responses.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 9 – Disproportionate representation in special education (% of districts w/disproportionality due to inappropriate ID)</p> <p>Indicator 10 - Disproportionate representation in Specific disability categories.</p> <p>(% of districts w/racial and ethnic disproportionality in specific disability categories as a result of inappropriate ID)</p> | <p>A. The OSDE-SES will provide technical assistance to LEAs with disproportionate representation in order to determine if the findings are the result of inappropriate identification. If there are findings of inappropriate identification, the LEA will revise their policies. They will be monitored and provided additional technical assistance and be required to correct within one year.</p> <p>B. Provide technical assistance to LEAs regarding RtI and its use in the identification of students.</p> <p>C. Request information from resources and specialty centers, such as national centers and the National Center for Culturally Responsible Educational Systems (NCCREST) regarding the identification of children as children with disabilities</p> <p>D. Provide LEAs with feedback of their enrollment, child count, and weighted risk ratios by race/ethnicity as part of the annual disproportionality summaries.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Indicator 11 – Child Find (% of children determined eligible within 60 days)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Require LEAs to maintain documentation and data regarding referrals for special education, the number of children that have been identified, located, evaluated, and found eligible for special education and related services. B. Require LEAs exceeding the 60 calendar day timeline to correct the noncompliance within one year. LEAs may also be required to establish appropriate referral, evaluation, and eligibility procedures. C. Provide technical assistance to LEAs needing to revise their policies, practices, and/or procedures of identifying children with disabilities. D. Provide technical assistance to LEAs regarding effective pre-referral strategies and the evaluation process. E. Publicize evaluation/eligibility timeline data on the OSDE-SES website by LEA as part of the district data profiles. |
| <p>Indicator 12 – Part C to B Transition (% children with IEP by 3rd birthday)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Collaborate with the OSDE Office of Early Childhood/Family Education regarding services for preschool students with disabilities, including strategies for teaching preschool students with developmental delays.. B. Provide training through online Professional Development on early childhood outcomes for all stakeholders.. C. Provide technical assistance to LEAs regarding the identification, placement, and services available to preschool students with disabilities.. D. Request information and technical assistance from resource and specialty centers on strategies for improving early childhood outcomes or policies from other states. . E. Request additional assistance from ECTA and other agencies, stakeholder groups, taskforces, and technical assistance providers listed in the SPP overview. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>F. Publicize preschool outcome data on the OSDE-SES website by LEA as part of the district data profiles, where sample sizes allow.</p> <p>G. Provide data collection and reporting workshops in each of the five regions in Oklahoma to assist LEAs in the requirements of the reports and to offer tips for the timeliness and accuracy of data submissions.</p> <p>H. Develop a plan (e.g., public service announcements) to expand the knowledge base and range of audiences (pediatricians) regarding Child Find.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 13 – Secondary Transition w/IEP Goals</p> <p>(% of youth are 16+ w/IEP w/measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services)</p> | <p>A. Require LEAs (with youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that should have coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goals) to correct the noncompliance within one calendar year. Provide technical assistance to LEAs throughout this process.</p> <p>B. The OSDE will analyze data reported by the district to compare with the monitoring to target the data reporting discrepancies. The OSDE will provide targeted, small group trainings with those LEAs identified. The LEAs will analyze their individual data, identify key reasons for the discrepancies, and develop a written plan to improve their data collection methods. The OSDE will track the LEAs data over a period of three years as well as provide ongoing technical assistance.</p> <p>C. Provide technical assistance/professional development to LEAs regarding utilizing the results of the assessments to develop an appropriate secondary transition plan.</p> <p>D. The State in partnership with the Oklahoma Transition Council and the Department of Rehabilitation will host a two day collaborative seminar for parents, community leaders and educators to develop a transition plan for the community in an effort to improve transition services in their individual regions. The state and the Oklahoma</p> |

| | <p>Transition Council will monitor the progress of each plan as well as provide technical assistance throughout the year.</p> |
|---|---|
| Indicator | Improvement Activity(ies) |
| <p>Indicator 14 – Secondary Transition/Post-School Outcome- Competitive Employment,Enrolled in School</p> <p>(% of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been employed, enrolled in postsecondary school, or both, within 1 year of leaving high school)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. The OSDE will determine what additional information needs to be collected in an effort to provide targeted support to the districts. (e.g. LEAs underrepresented). B. The OSDE will evaluate the method used to collect the data in an effort to determine the most appropriate method for collecting data. C. To better understand why 20% of respondent leavers are identified as Not Engaged, the State will conduct a root cause analyses. The root cause analysis will attempt to identify the reason for leavers falling in this category. |
| <p>Indicator 15 – Monitoring, Complaints and Hearings</p> <p>(General supervision system identifies and corrects noncompliance within 1 year)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Request additional assistance from the Educational Oversight Committee, ODSS, OFCEC, and other national entities B. Analyze the LEA data profiles based on data related to priority areas to identify the LEAs which will receive monitoring visits. C. Disseminate the General Supervision Manual by posting on the OSDE website. |

| | |
|--|------------|
| <p>Indicator 16 – Written Complaints</p> <p>(% of signed written complaintsw/reports issued revolved within 60 days)</p> | <p>N/A</p> |
| <p>Indicator 17 – Due Process Hearings</p> <p>(% of due process hearings within 45 days)</p> | <p>N/A</p> |

| <p>Indicator</p> | <p>Improvement Activity(ies)</p> |
|---|---|
| <p>Indicator 18 – Hearing Requests that Went to Resolution (% of hearing requests resolved through resolution agreements)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Provide trainings to hearing and appeal officers that emphasize the timeline requirements, acceptable reasons for granting extensions for due process complaints, and utilization of the resolution session system, to include the enforceability of agreements. B. Provide technical assistance on due process guidelines and resolution sessions at the State Superintendent’s Vision 20/20 Conference. C. Request information and technical assistance from resource and specialty centers, such as the national centers, and NASDSE on due process timelines and resolution sessions or policies from other states. D. Participate in National Center for Dispute Resolution (CADRE) listserve, webinars, and other collaborative activities to increase capacity for dispute resolution. |

| <p>Indicator 19 – Mediations</p> <p>(% of mediations resulting in mediation agreements)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Require the Alternative Dispute Resolution System of the Administrative Office of the Court to maintain a list of current mediators and provide updates to the OSDE-SES. B. Developed, printed, and distributed mediation guidelines in parent-friendly language to mediators, parents, school district personnel, advocates, and any other interested party. C. Distribute the mediation technical assistance brochure to parents and LEA personnel in the mediation process. The brochure is provided to any parent who has requested information on filing a formal written complaint, and provides direction on how to request mediation as a means to encourage use of the mediation system. D. Provide technical assistance (on due process guidelines, resolution sessions, mediations, IDEA requirements regarding the provision of procedural safeguards to parents, as well as the obligations of LEAs after a due process hearing request has been filed) through breakout sessions at the State Superintendent’s Vision 20/20 Conference. |
|--|---|
| <p>Indicator</p> | <p>Improvement Activity(ies)</p> |
| <p>Indicator 20 – Timeline of StateData and Reports</p> <p>(State reported data are timely and accurate)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Provide trainings to LEAs regarding the requirements of data collection, including timelines and accuracy. B. Provide webinars and online trainings to enable LEAs to attend at their convenience. C. Create training materials regarding Child Count and the End of Year Report. D. OSDE-SES staff will attend national trainings and conferences on the data reporting. E. OSDE-SES staff will provide ongoing technical assistance through telephone calls and emails regarding data reporting. |