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# Introduction

**Instructions**

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State’s systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State’s General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

## Intro - Indicator Data

**Executive Summary**

Seventeen accountability indicators are reported to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on an annual basis, including the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Indicator data are drawn from the district end-of-year reports, October child counts, and various other sources (including annual assessment reports and parent and student surveys). Districts are responsible to the Oklahoma State Department of Education (OSDE) for meeting a target for each indicator, just as the State is responsible to OSEP. The Office of Special Education Services in the OSDE uses a District Data Profile tool to share results with the districts annually. The data are aggregated to report to OSEP.  
  
Oklahoma improved or maintained high quality results on the following indicators: 1, 2, 3A, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13 and 16.

**Additional information related to data collection and reporting**

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

543

**General Supervision System:**

**The systems that are in place to ensure that the IDEA Part B requirements are met (e.g., integrated monitoring activities; data on processes and results; the SPP/APR; fiscal management; policies, procedures, and practices resulting in effective implementation; and improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions).**

Oklahoma’s general supervision system is designed to ensure the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA) of 2004. The main purpose of the State system is to support and build capacity for effective implementation of the IDEA by the State and local education agencies (LEAs), in order to improve outcomes for students with disabilities in Oklahoma. This system is designed to: a) ensure compliance with federal and state regulations and b) improve services and results for students with disabilities.   
  
Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation  
Oklahoma’s special education policies and procedures (revised July, 2022) support state and local implementation of the IDEA. Agencies responsible for special education and related services must abide by Oklahoma State law, policies, procedures, and the federal regulations for the IDEA Part B and C. Agencies having these responsibilities are: local educational agencies (LEA), public charter schools not otherwise included as LEAs, other public agencies (e.g., State schools for students with deafness and blindness and State and local juvenile and adult correctional facilities), and accredited private schools and facilities as described in the applicable federal regulations and established by Oklahoma State laws. The OSDE-SES has outlined specific strategies for implementation of the IDEA in the Oklahoma Special Education Services Policies and Procedures. Additional information about Oklahoma’s policies and procedures is included in the Evaluation and Eligibility Handbook and Oklahoma’s Secondary Transition Handbook. LEAs are responsible for developing policies and procedures that align with state guidance and IDEA and ensuring effective implementation. LEAs are required annually to complete the Local Education Agency Agreement for Special Education in Oklahoma which ensures all eligible students in the LEA will have access to a free and appropriate public education (FAPE) (34 CFR § 300.17). In addition, LEAs are required to submit Local Education Agency Assurances which demonstrate that the LEA understands its responsibilities under the IDEA. All handbooks and guides are available on the OSDE-SES website at https://sde.ok.gov/special-education and https://sde.ok.gov/documents-forms.  
  
IDEA B State Advisory Panel  
The OSDE-SES develops policies and procedures with the support of the IDEA B State Advisory Panel. The IDEA B State Advisory Panel for Special Education serves as an advisory group to the OSDE-SES on issues related to special education and related services for students with disabilities (34 CFR §300.167). The Panel includes the following stakeholders: parents of students with disabilities; individuals with disabilities; state and local education officials; state and local agency representatives; general and special education school administrators and teachers; advocacy groups; representatives of institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel; representatives of private schools and charter schools; representatives of vocational, community, and business organizations concerned with the provision of transition services to youth with disabilities; and representatives of state juvenile and corrections agencies (34 CFR §300.168). The Panel participates in the annual review and revision of the SPP/APR, including the development of state targets, the review of data of improvement activities, and making suggestions for updates to the activities and targets. More information, including the IDEA B State Advisory Panel Operating Guidelines (revised December 2023), can be found here: http://ok.gov/sde/idea-b-advisory-panel.  
  
Integrated Monitoring  
Refer to https://sde.ok.gov/differentiated-monitoring-results for the general supervision system manual that governs differentiated monitoring and compliance monitoring.  
  
Federal Fiscal Management  
Oklahoma’s system of general supervision includes a process to provide oversight in the distribution and use of IDEA funds at the State and local level. Information on these processes can be found in the Special Education Funding Manual for IDEA Part B found at http://sde.ok.gov/finance. Each LEA must complete Assurances and Agreements annually at the beginning of each fiscal year. This activity must take place before the IDEA Consolidated Application is available for LEAs to budget IDEA Part B funds.   
  
Data on Processes and Results   
As part of Oklahoma’s general supervision responsibilities, data are used for decision making about program management and improvement. This process includes: (1) data collection and verification, (2) data examination and analysis, (3) public reporting of data, (4) status determination, and (5) improvement activities. The OSDE-SES posts information on its website to support LEAs as they work to improve their data collection and reporting capacity. Such information includes data collection and reporting guidance, definitions, timelines, and templates. (http://sde.ok.gov/sde/documents/2012-10-01/special-education-data-and-reporting-part-b-children-ages-3-through-21 )  
  
Effective Dispute Resolution   
Several mechanisms are available through the OSDE to assist in resolving disputes (see http://sde.ok.gov/sde/special-education-dispute-resolution). These processes include IEP facilitation, mediation, formal complaints, due process hearings, facilitated resolution sessions and expedited due process hearings. The Special Education Resolution Center (SERC) manages the special education due process hearing system for the State of Oklahoma. SERC’s duties have been expanded to implement innovative programs to assist parents and LEAs to settle disputes at the earliest stage possible. At no cost to either party, SERC provides highly trained mediators to assist with disputes which may develop at any time during the relationship of the parties over special education issues and highly trained facilitators during required resolution sessions of due process. SERC also provides stakeholder training that supports mutual collaboration. More information on SERC can be located at https://okserc.org/.

**Technical Assistance System:**

**The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidence-based technical assistance and support to LEAs.**

Technical Assistance (TA) is designed to link directly to indicators in the SPP/APR and to improve the level of compliance in LEAs. The comprehensive approach to technical assistance enables the OSDE-SES to differentiate the scope of services provided for LEAs based on local needs. For example, the OSDE-SES makes TA available for all LEAs, such as meetings with local LEAs, webinars to support compliant implementation of the IDEA, updates via email, webinars, and in-person training on a variety of topics:   
• the Oklahoma Special Education Services Policies and Procedures,   
• best practices for the use and implementation of accommodations,  
• the special education online IEP system,  
• high quality IDEA documents,  
• high quality data collection and reporting,  
• the differentiated monitoring process, and   
• high quality financial accountability and budgeting  
• Dispute resolution options, among others

**Professional Development System:**

**The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for children with disabilities.**

Professional Development ranges from a basic level of providing general information to targeted and intensive PD, which is focused on data driven school improvement in LEAs, schools and classrooms. The OSDE-SES offers PD or suggests PD resources based on various concerns in collaboration with other divisions in the agency. PD is provided in three ways: 1) as requested by LEAs, school sites, teachers, or other interested stakeholders; 2) providing professional development resources for use by LEAs, school sites, teachers, or other interested stakeholders; and 3) as part of regional or statewide conferences hosted by the OSDE, other state agencies, or technical assistance centers. The OSDE-SES has also implemented an online professional development platform (PEPPER) accessible through the online IEP system and webpage and provides courses to teachers and the general public through OSDE's online training site. Special Education teachers and staff have access to additional modules and may be directed by district leadership or the OSDE-SES, through compliance monitoring, to complete selected modules.  
  
The OSDE-SES also offers PD resources through the agency’s online learning management system OSDE Connect and its online IEP site’s training system (PCG Pepper). The OSDE-SES has created Professional Development modules for use by LEAs, schools, and other interested stakeholders that are shared through OSDE Connect (more information is provided at http://sde.ok.gov/sde/professional-development-directory). These modules are intended for individual use, in a workshop or other professional development settings. When LEAs or schools identify a particular PD need for special education, they can easily access PD modules and provide individualized or local PD in a timely fashion. Importantly, these modules are intended to build coherence around best practices for the provision of special education services. Each module includes relevant background information, activities/materials, content quizzes, and a scripted PowerPoint presentation for a particular topic area. Requests for technical assistance and professional development from the OSDE-SES can be made through an online help desk. Requests are tracked to determine areas of LEA need.  
  
Additionally, the OSDE-SES contracts with other agencies and providers to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for children with disabilities. A few examples are agreements with Oklahoma ABLE Tech, the Oklahoma Autism Center, and the Oklahoma Department of Rehabilitation Services. Oklahoma ABLE Tech (https://www.ok.gov/abletech/) provides training on developing AT teams and acquiring AT devices, and collaborates with the OSDE-SES on updates to technical assistance documents for AT and AEM. The Oklahoma Autism Center, through the University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center, provides comprehensive professional development services to build the state’s capacity for educating children and youth with autism spectrum disorder and related disabilities. This includes providing services statewide to local education agencies, SoonerStart (Part C services), and pre-service educators in teacher and related service preparatory programs. Professional development is provided by maintaining an inclusive model demonstration and training site for observation and hands-on experience and by providing training and technical assistance, including demonstration, coaching and mentoring in the classroom, at LEA sites. Training and support to families is also incorporated into professional development activities through contracts with Oklahoma Parents Center and Sooner Success. Finally, the OSDE-SES collaborates with the Oklahoma Department of Rehabilitation Services to provide training and professional development regarding secondary transition services, to collaborate on updates to the technical assistance documents on secondary transition, and to provide an annual conference on secondary transition.

**Stakeholder Engagement:**

**The mechanisms for broad stakeholder engagement, including activities carried out to obtain input from, and build the capacity of, a diverse group of parents to support the implementation activities designed to improve outcomes, including target setting and any subsequent revisions to targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

All indicator targets were set in the final FFY 2020 report. Targets, cell size, and N size for indicator 4A were revised in FFY 2022. Details about that specific engagement are provided below and in the indicator report.  
  
Stakeholders were engaged through public meetings and presentations of the SPP/APR and district data profiles at various times during the fiscal year. The majority of stakeholders present at these meetings represented LEAs, but the state parent training and information center (the Oklahoma Parents Center) also participated in meetings and presentations about the APR. Second, stakeholders were engaged via the Part B state advisory panel (SAP). The SAP consists of 31 members who represent a wide range of perspectives on special education, including 17 parents and individuals with disabilities, teachers, LEAs, advocacy groups, service providers, and related public agencies. Indicator information was shared with the SAP members at every meeting in a variety of formats. Reports were also published on a public website for general access (link is provided below).  
  
In FFY 2022, OSDE-SES revised the methodology used for Indicators 4A and 4B based on robust data analyses conducted to look at Oklahoma’s longitudinal data, data from similarly situated states, and implications of revisions to the methodology. Specifically, OSDE-SES focused on revising minimum cell and n-sizes to ensure they were reasonably designed to appropriately examine LEAs for significant discrepancy. Findings from the state’s data analyses were shared with stakeholders in a virtual event to ensure their input and perspectives were reflected in the final decisions made by the state. Based on these efforts, OSDE-SES revised its minimum cell and n-sizes, which in turn increased the number of LEAs reviewed for significant discrepancy. The baseline was reset to reflect the FFY 2022 data, as this change in methodology means data from prior years are no longer comparable.   
  
In addition to soliciting stakeholder input on revisions to the significant discrepancy methodology, OSDE-SES also sought stakeholder input on revisions to the targets established for 4A. The state provided stakeholders with context about what the targets reflect, their implications, and importance of striking the balance between targets being rigorous yet achievable. Based on the stakeholder input, the state updated the targets to more adequately account for the changed methodology.  
  
The State Leadership Team for the SSIP has described its efforts to solicit stakeholder input in its indicator 17 report.

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

NO

**Number of Parent Members:**

81

**Parent Members Engagement:**

**Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

In FFY 2022, the primary mechanisms used were a public website, public meetings and the IDEA-B SAP. The SAP provides the state the opportunity to engage with more parents than through other venues. It includes 9 parents plus individuals with disabilities as members, some of whom also represent a variety of advocacy and agency entities in Oklahoma. Improvement strategies and agency initiatives and programs, progress reviews and data analyses are regularly discussed with the SAP members with the goal of improving outcomes for students with disabilities.   
  
In April 2023 and again in June of 2023, OSDE-SES partnered with the Oklahoma Parents Center (OPC) to share with parents the state’s improvement strategies and progress. The April conference hosted 47 participants with 10 parents, and the June conference hosted 185 participants with 60 parents. OPC advertises their parent events through their listserv and social media accounts. It is also advertised through the OSDE weekly listserv. In the spring and summer of 2024, OSDE-SES will again partner with OPC to share the FFY 2022 SPP/APR results.

**Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:**

**The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.**

OSDE-SES has conducted activities to increase the ability of parents to be engaged in the development of implementation activities. First, the state used several outreach mechanisms to ensure that parents from all backgrounds would have access to the updated website resources for the SPP/APR and the SSIP, notifications and invitations sent through social media and email, and information shared through parent and advocacy organizations across the state. The state partnered with the Oklahoma Parent Center in particular to increase outreach to parents. Fewer activities were conducted in FFY 2021 because no new target-setting was completed.

**Soliciting Public Input:**

**The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

Oklahoma used several mechanisms to solicit and collect stakeholder input to inform program development related to the SPP/APR (including the SSIP): online and in-person discussions. Meetings and discussions were held with a broad variety of stakeholders, including members of the state’s IDEA B Advisory Panel, parents, district personnel (teachers and administrators), and parent and community advocates. Stakeholders were invited to participate through the Oklahoma Parent Center spring and summer conferences, social media, and email notices. Information about the SPP/APR has been posted on a public website for all to review (see link below).

**Making Results Available to the Public:**

**The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.**

Oklahoma has created a website for SPP/APR target setting and associated activities: https://sde.ok.gov/apr-target-setting . This website houses a wide variety of documents to support stakeholder engagement and increase capacity to participate. The final target results are also posted on this site, as are annual updates .  
  
A similar page has been created to post information about the SSIP: https://sde.ok.gov/state-systemic-improvement-plan.

**Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2021 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State’s submission of its FFY 2021 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State’s SPP/APR, including any revisions if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2021 APR in 2023, is available.**

The State's performance plan is available on the OSDE-SES Part B data webpage located at http://sde.ok.gov/sde/documents/2012-10-01/special-education-data-and-reporting-part-b-children-ages-3-through-21, and is also distributed through public agencies. Each year, special education reporting dates are posted to build capacity for LEAs to report timely and accurate data. Additional information about the special education reports and due dates are included in the Oklahoma Special Education Data Manual, in the General Supervision System guidance on Differentiated Monitoring and Results-based Accountability, and in all training materials.   
  
Oklahoma reports annually on the targets in the SPP/APR in writing to each LEA located in the State. Additionally, the State reports annually to the public on the performance of each LEA located in the State by posting current redacted DDPs and District Determinations on the OSDE webpage (see above). The FFY 2020 district performance reports ("FY 2021 Public Reporting") are located on the Part B data webpage listed above (and directly at the link provided).

## Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## Intro - OSEP Response

## Intro - Required Actions

# Indicator 1: Graduation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in ED*Facts* file specification FS009.

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

## 1 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 84.63% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Target >= | 87.00% | 87.00% | 87.00% | 84.00% | 85.00% |
| Data | 76.97% | 58.34% | 79.14% | 84.63% | 72.15% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 86.00% | 87.00% | 88.00% | 89.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Stakeholders were engaged through public meetings and presentations of the SPP/APR and district data profiles at various times during the fiscal year. The majority of stakeholders present at these meetings represented LEAs, but the state parent training and information center (the Oklahoma Parents Center) also participated in meetings and presentations about the APR. Second, stakeholders were engaged via the Part B state advisory panel (SAP). The SAP consists of 31 members who represent a wide range of perspectives on special education, including 17 parents and individuals with disabilities, teachers, LEAs, advocacy groups, service providers, and related public agencies. Indicator information was shared with the SAP members at every meeting in a variety of formats. Reports were also published on a public website for general access (link is provided below).

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 5,816 |
| SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) |  |
| SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) |  |
| SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 4 |
| SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 1,384 |

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma** | **Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5,816 | 7,204 | 72.15% | 86.00% | 80.73% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**Graduation Conditions**

**Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.**

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/work ready curriculum or the core curriculum. Please see the following link for the graduation requirements checklists for both curriculum paths (https://sde.ok.gov/achieving-classroom-excellence-resources). Students with disabilities do not have different graduation requirements. No alternative diploma yet exists.

**Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)**

NO

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

## 1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 1 - OSEP Response

## 1 - Required Actions

# Indicator 2: Drop Out

**Instructions and Measurement**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator**: Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in ED*Facts* file specification FS009.

Measurement

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

Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the section 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a

state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

## 2 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2011 | 20.70% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Target <= | 16.00% | 15.00% | 15.00% | 15.90% | 14.90% |
| Data | 14.25% | 14.45% | 13.92% | 15.26% | 27.84% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target <= | 13.90% | 12.90% | 11.90% | 10.90% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Stakeholders were engaged through public meetings and presentations of the SPP/APR and district data profiles at various times during the fiscal year. The majority of stakeholders present at these meetings represented LEAs, but the state parent training and information center (the Oklahoma Parents Center) also participated in meetings and presentations about the APR. Second, stakeholders were engaged via the Part B state advisory panel (SAP). The SAP consists of 31 members who represent a wide range of perspectives on special education, including 17 parents and individuals with disabilities, teachers, LEAs, advocacy groups, service providers, and related public agencies. Indicator information was shared with the SAP members at every meeting in a variety of formats. Reports were also published on a public website for general access (link is provided below).

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 5,816 |
| SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) |  |
| SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) |  |
| SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 4 |
| SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 1,384 |

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out** | **Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1,384 | 7,204 | 27.84% | 13.90% | 19.21% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth**

A student who leaves an accredited public local education agency prior to graduation, without re-enrolling in another public LEA, is considered a drop-out for that academic year. Students who move to private institutions and homeschool are generally considered "return to regular education," and may or may not continue to be eligible for special education (depending on the nature of the exit). Students whose next educational agency is not known are also considered drop-outs, the equivalent of “Moved, not known to be continuing in a diploma-issuing agency.”

**Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)**

NO

**If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.**

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

## 2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 2 - OSEP Response

## 2 - Required Actions

# Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator**: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

3A. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using ED*Facts* file specifications FS185 and 188.

**Measurement**

A. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 92.18% |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 88.50% |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 82.04% |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 92.39% |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 87.79% |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 87.24% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Stakeholders were engaged through public meetings and presentations of the SPP/APR and district data profiles at various times during the fiscal year. The majority of stakeholders present at these meetings represented LEAs, but the state parent training and information center (the Oklahoma Parents Center) also participated in meetings and presentations about the APR. Second, stakeholders were engaged via the Part B state advisory panel (SAP). The SAP consists of 31 members who represent a wide range of perspectives on special education, including 17 parents and individuals with disabilities, teachers, LEAs, advocacy groups, service providers, and related public agencies. Indicator information was shared with the SAP members at every meeting in a variety of formats. Reports were also published on a public website for general access (link is provided below).

**FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED*Facts***

**Data Source:**

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

**Date:**

01/10/2024

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade (1)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs (2) | 10,861 | 9,453 | 7,591 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3) | 3,178 | 1,964 | 2,853 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3) | 6,840 | 6,453 | 3,809 |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 750 | 775 | 583 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

01/10/2024

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs (2) | 10,859 | 9,446 | 7,591 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3) | 3,061 | 1,801 | 2,860 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3) | 6,950 | 6,589 | 3,811 |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 750 | 775 | 583 |

(1) The children with IEPs who are English learners and took the ELP in lieu of the regular reading/language arts assessment are not included in the prefilled data in this indicator.

(2) The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

(3) The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments, as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 10,768 | 10,861 | 98.86% | 95.00% | 99.14% | Met target | No Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 9,192 | 9,453 | 96.77% | 95.00% | 97.24% | Met target | No Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | 7,245 | 7,591 | 93.77% | 95.00% | 95.44% | Met target | No Slippage |

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 10,761 | 10,859 | 98.80% | 95.00% | 99.10% | Met target | No Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 9,165 | 9,446 | 96.43% | 95.00% | 97.03% | Met target | No Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | 7,254 | 7,591 | 93.90% | 95.00% | 95.56% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Regulatory Information**

**The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]**

**Public Reporting Information**

**Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.**

https://sde.ok.gov/documents/2012-10-01/special-education-data-and-reporting-part-b-children-ages-3-through-21

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

## 3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3A - OSEP Response

## 3A - Required Actions

# Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator**: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using ED*Facts* file specifications FS175 and 178.

**Measurement**

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3B - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 7.00% |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 4.46% |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 5.93% |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 11.45% |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 2.39% |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 2.96% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 8.01% | 8.58% | 9.18% | 9.82% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 5.11% | 5.45% | 5.85% | 6.26% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 6.79% | 7.26% | 7.77% | 8.32% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 13.11% | 14.03% | 15.03% | 16.06% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 2.74% | 2.93% | 3.13% | 3.35% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 3.39% | 3.63% | 3.88% | 4.15% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Stakeholders were engaged through public meetings and presentations of the SPP/APR and district data profiles at various times during the fiscal year. The majority of stakeholders present at these meetings represented LEAs, but the state parent training and information center (the Oklahoma Parents Center) also participated in meetings and presentations about the APR. Second, stakeholders were engaged via the Part B state advisory panel (SAP). The SAP consists of 31 members who represent a wide range of perspectives on special education, including 17 parents and individuals with disabilities, teachers, LEAs, advocacy groups, service providers, and related public agencies. Indicator information was shared with the SAP members at every meeting in a variety of formats. Reports were also published on a public website for general access (link is provided below).

**FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED*Facts***

**Data Source:**

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

01/10/2024

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment | 10,018 | 8,417 | 6,662 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 530 | 130 | 206 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 200 | 148 | 363 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

01/10/2024

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment | 10,011 | 8,390 | 6,671 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 874 | 75 | 56 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 584 | 129 | 108 |

(1)The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 730 | 10,018 | 7.93% | 8.01% | 7.29% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 278 | 8,417 | 4.92% | 5.11% | 3.30% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | 569 | 6,662 | 9.20% | 6.79% | 8.54% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

The state attributes the slippage of fourth grade reading proficiency rates for FFY 2022 largely to staffing challenges and shortages as well as the lingering impacts of the pandemic (e.g., learning loss, behavioral challenges resulting in disciplinary removals). Regarding staffing, the state has seen a significant turnover in teachers and administrators, which has steadily increased post-pandemic. Based on the full-time equivalency (FTE) data for the 2022-23 school year, nearly 24% of teachers were reported as “inexperienced” based on the state-established criteria. Over 8% of general education teachers had emergency or provisional credentials. Additionally, the state observed an increase in the number of long-term substitutes filling in for special education teaching positions. The lack of experience based on both time in the classroom and absence of traditional training or credentialing may have impacted the ability of teachers to support students, particularly students with disabilities who may require more intensive support, differentiation of instruction, and implementation of principles like Universal Design for Learning (UDL). This in turn may have affected performance on statewide assessments, which are predicated on the core curriculum and grade level academic achievement standards. In addition to teacher turnover, special education administrative staff turnover has also been substantial. In FFY 2022, almost 17% of special education coordinators were new to their roles. Further, due to teaching shortages there have been notable increases in caseload sizes, with nearly 200 teachers requesting exceptions due to the significant size of their caseloads in the 2022-23 school year.   
  
Regarding the pandemic impact, inherent learning loss from nearly 18 months of inconsistent learning environments (e.g., virtual settings, classroom settings, hybrid teaching models) during the pandemic has almost certainly affected proficiency rates. Teachers have also reported behavioral challenges post-pandemic that have resulted in a larger number of students being removed from classrooms, which may limit their access to the grade level standards and core curriculum on which they are assessed. Students in fourth grade in the 2022-23 school year were likely in first or second grade during the height of the pandemic. These are foundational grades that were disrupted by changes in learning environments when students are beginning their educational careers. Thus, this too may be one of the reasons for slippage from last year’s fourth grade reading performance (which captured students who were in second and third grade during the pandemic).

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

The state attributes the slippage of eighth grade reading proficiency rates for FFY 2022 largely to staffing challenges and shortages as well as the lingering impacts of the pandemic (e.g., learning loss, behavioral challenges resulting in disciplinary removals). Regarding staffing, the state has seen a significant turnover in teachers and administrators, which has steadily increased post-pandemic. Based on the full-time equivalency (FTE) data for the 2022-23 school year, nearly 24% of teachers were reported as “inexperienced” based on the state-established criteria. Over 8% of general education teachers had emergency or provisional credentials. Additionally, the state observed an increase in the number of long-term substitutes filling in for special education teaching positions. The lack of experience based on both time in the classroom and absence of traditional training or credentialing may have impacted the ability of teachers to support students, particularly students with disabilities who may require more intensive support, differentiation of instruction, and implementation of principles like Universal Design for Learning (UDL). This in turn may have affected performance on statewide assessments, which are predicated on the core curriculum and grade level academic achievement standards. In addition to teacher turnover, special education administrative staff turnover has also been substantial. In FFY 2022, almost 17% of special education coordinators were new to their roles. Further, due to teaching shortages there have been notable increases in caseload sizes, with nearly 200 teachers requesting exceptions due to the significant size of their caseloads in the 2022-23 school year.  
  
Regarding the pandemic impact, inherent learning loss from nearly 18 months of inconsistent learning environments (e.g., virtual settings, classroom settings, hybrid teaching models) during the pandemic has almost certainly affected proficiency rates. Teachers have also reported behavioral challenges post-pandemic that have resulted in a larger number of students being removed from classrooms, which may limit their access to the grade level standards and core curriculum on which they are assessed. Students in eighth grade in the 2022-23 school year were likely in fifth or sixth grade during the height of the pandemic. This transition period from elementary school to middle school, which is a vital point in a child’s academic career, was disrupted by changes in learning environments. Thus, this too may be one of the reasons for slippage from last year’s eighth grade reading performance (which captured students who had already transitioned to middle school prior to the pandemic and were in sixth or seventh grade).

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 1,458 | 10,011 | 14.94% | 13.11% | 14.56% | Met target | No Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 204 | 8,390 | 2.85% | 2.74% | 2.43% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | 164 | 6,671 | 3.07% | 3.39% | 2.46% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

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

The state attributes the slippage of eighth grade math proficiency rates for FFY 2022 largely to staffing challenges and shortages as well as the lingering impacts of the pandemic (e.g., learning loss, behavioral challenges resulting in disciplinary removals). Regarding staffing, the state has seen a significant turnover in teachers and administrators, which has steadily increased post-pandemic. Based on the full-time equivalency (FTE) data for the 2022-23 school year, nearly 24% of teachers were reported as “inexperienced” based on the state-established criteria. Over 8% of general education teachers had emergency or provisional credentials. Additionally, the state observed an increase in the number of long-term substitutes filling in for special education teaching positions. The lack of experience based on both time in the classroom and absence of traditional training or credentialing may have impacted the ability of teachers to support students, particularly students with disabilities who may require more intensive support, differentiation of instruction, and implementation of principles like Universal Design for Learning (UDL). This in turn may have affected performance on statewide assessments, which are predicated on the core curriculum and grade level academic achievement standards. In addition to teacher turnover, special education administrative staff turnover has also been substantial. In FFY 2022, almost 17% of special education coordinators were new to their roles. Further, due to teaching shortages there have been notable increases in caseload sizes, with nearly 200 teachers requesting exceptions due to the significant size of their caseloads in the 2022-23 school year.  
  
Regarding the pandemic impact, inherent learning loss from nearly 18 months of inconsistent learning environments (e.g., virtual settings, classroom settings, hybrid teaching models) during the pandemic has almost certainly affected proficiency rates. Teachers have also reported behavioral challenges post-pandemic that have resulted in a larger number of students being removed from classrooms, which may limit their access to the grade level standards and core curriculum on which they are assessed. Students in eighth grade in the 2022-23 school year were likely in fifth or sixth grade during the height of the pandemic. This transition period from elementary school to middle school, which is a vital point in a child’s academic career, was disrupted by changes in learning environments. Thus, this too may be one of the reasons for slippage from last year’s eighth grade math performance (which captured students who had already transitioned to middle school prior to the pandemic and were in sixth or seventh grade).

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

The state attributes the slippage of high school math proficiency rates for FFY 2022 largely to staffing challenges and shortages as well as the lingering impacts of the pandemic (e.g., learning loss, behavioral challenges resulting in disciplinary removals). Regarding staffing, the state has seen a significant turnover in teachers and administrators, which has steadily increased post-pandemic. Based on the full-time equivalency (FTE) data for the 2022-23 school year, nearly 24% of teachers were reported as “inexperienced” based on the state-established criteria. Over 8% of general education teachers had emergency or provisional credentials. Additionally, the state observed an increase in the number of long-term substitutes filling in for special education teaching positions. The lack of experience based on both time in the classroom and absence of traditional training or credentialing may have impacted the ability of teachers to support students, particularly students with disabilities who may require more intensive support, differentiation of instruction, and implementation of principles like Universal Design for Learning (UDL). This in turn may have affected performance on statewide assessments, which are predicated on the core curriculum and grade level academic achievement standards. In addition to teacher turnover, special education administrative staff turnover has also been substantial. In FFY 2022, almost 17% of special education coordinators were new to their roles. Further, due to teaching shortages there have been notable increases in caseload sizes, with nearly 200 teachers requesting exceptions due to the significant size of their caseloads in the 2022-23 school year.  
  
Regarding the pandemic impact, inherent learning loss from nearly 18 months of inconsistent learning environments (e.g., virtual settings, classroom settings, hybrid teaching models) during the pandemic has almost certainly affected proficiency rates. Teachers have also reported behavioral challenges post-pandemic that have resulted in a larger number of students being removed from classrooms, which may limit their access to the grade level standards and core curriculum on which they are assessed. Students taking the high school assessments in the 2022-23 school year experienced a decrease in proficiency for both math and reading. While the state met the target for high school reading proficiency, and thus did not report slippage, the decrease in proficiency rates is similar for both high school subject areas. As with the transition from elementary school to middle school, the transition from middle school to high school is an extremely important point in a child’s academic career. Students taking the high school assessments in the 2022-23 school year were likely in eighth or ninth grade during the height of the pandemic. Accordingly, this transition period from high school to middle school was disrupted by changes in learning environments. Thus, this may be the reason from slippage from last year’s high school math performance (which captured students who had already transitioned to high school prior to the pandemic and were in ninth or tenth grade).

**Regulatory Information**

**The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]**

**Public Reporting Information**

**Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.**

https://sde.ok.gov/documents/2012-10-01/special-education-data-and-reporting-part-b-children-ages-3-through-21

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

## 3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3B - OSEP Response

## 3B - Required Actions

# Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using ED*Facts* file specifications FS175 and 178.

**Measurement**

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time

of testing.

## 3C - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 27.04% |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 30.40% |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 38.70% |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 53.62% |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 14.51% |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 45.70% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 30.96% | 33.13% | 35.44% | 37.92% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 34.80% | 37.24% | 39.85% | 42.64% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 44.31% | 47.41% | 50.73% | 54.28% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 61.39% | 65.69% | 70.28% | 75.20% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 16.61% | 17.78% | 19.02% | 20.35% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 52.32% | 55.98% | 59.90% | 64.10% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Stakeholders were engaged through public meetings and presentations of the SPP/APR and district data profiles at various times during the fiscal year. The majority of stakeholders present at these meetings represented LEAs, but the state parent training and information center (the Oklahoma Parents Center) also participated in meetings and presentations about the APR. Second, stakeholders were engaged via the Part B state advisory panel (SAP). The SAP consists of 31 members who represent a wide range of perspectives on special education, including 17 parents and individuals with disabilities, teachers, LEAs, advocacy groups, service providers, and related public agencies. Indicator information was shared with the SAP members at every meeting in a variety of formats. Reports were also published on a public website for general access (link is provided below).

**FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED*Facts***

**Data Source:**

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

01/10/2024

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment | 750 | 775 | 583 |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient | 143 | 236 | 191 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

01/10/2024

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment | 750 | 775 | 583 |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient | 344 | 129 | 183 |

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 143 | 750 | 22.40% | 30.96% | 19.07% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 236 | 775 | 32.66% | 34.80% | 30.45% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | 191 | 583 | 38.69% | 44.31% | 32.76% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

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

The state attributes the slippage of fourth grade reading proficiency rates for FFY 2022 largely to staffing challenges and shortages as well as the lingering impacts of the pandemic (e.g., learning loss, behavioral challenges resulting in disciplinary removals). Regarding staffing, the state has seen a significant turnover in teachers and administrators, which has steadily increased post-pandemic. Based on the full-time equivalency (FTE) data for the 2022-23 school year, nearly 24% of teachers were reported as “inexperienced” based on the state-established criteria. Over 8% of general education teachers had emergency or provisional credentials. Additionally, the state observed an increase in the number of long-term substitutes filling in for special education teaching positions. The lack of experience based on both time in the classroom and absence of traditional training or credentialing may have impacted the ability of teachers to support students with disabilities, particularly those students taking the alternate assessments who may have more comprehensive needs. In addition to teacher turnover, special education administrative staff turnover has also been substantial. In FFY 2022, almost 17% of special education coordinators were new to their roles. Further, due to teaching shortages there have been notable increases in caseload sizes, with nearly 200 teachers requesting exceptions due to the significant size of their caseloads in the 2022-23 school year.   
  
Regarding the pandemic impact, inherent learning loss from nearly 18 months of inconsistent learning environments (e.g., virtual settings, classroom settings, hybrid teaching models) during the pandemic has almost certainly affected proficiency rates. Students taking alternate assessments in many cases have more significant needs and thus the limited access to additional supports (e.g., particularly assistive technology, in-person learning, paraprofessionals, nursing staff) in virtual environments could have had more considerable impacts on learning and accordingly performance on assessments. Teachers have also reported behavioral challenges post-pandemic that have resulted in a larger number of students being removed from classrooms, which may limit their access to the content on which they are assessed. Students in fourth grade in the 2022-23 school year were likely in first or second grade during the height of the pandemic. These are foundational grades that were disrupted by changes in learning environments when students are beginning their educational careers. Thus, this too may be one of the reasons for slippage from last year’s fourth grade reading performance (which captured students who were in second and third grade during the pandemic).

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

The state attributes the slippage of eighth grade reading proficiency rates for FFY 2022 largely to staffing challenges and shortages as well as the lingering impacts of the pandemic (e.g., learning loss, behavioral challenges resulting in disciplinary removals). Regarding staffing, the state has seen a significant turnover in teachers and administrators, which has steadily increased post-pandemic. Based on the full-time equivalency (FTE) data for the 2022-23 school year, nearly 24% of teachers were reported as “inexperienced” based on the state-established criteria. Over 8% of general education teachers had emergency or provisional credentials. Additionally, the state observed an increase in the number of long-term substitutes filling in for special education teaching positions. The lack of experience based on both time in the classroom and absence of traditional training or credentialing may have impacted the ability of teachers to support students with disabilities, particularly those students taking the alternate assessments who may have more comprehensive needs. In addition to teacher turnover, special education administrative staff turnover has also been substantial. In FFY 2022, almost 17% of special education coordinators were new to their roles. Further, due to teaching shortages there have been notable increases in caseload sizes, with nearly 200 teachers requesting exceptions due to the significant size of their caseloads in the 2022-23 school year.   
  
Regarding the pandemic impact, inherent learning loss from nearly 18 months of inconsistent learning environments (e.g., virtual settings, classroom settings, hybrid teaching models) during the pandemic has almost certainly affected proficiency rates. Students taking alternate assessments in many cases have more significant needs and thus the limited access to additional supports (e.g., particularly assistive technology, in-person learning, paraprofessionals, nursing staff) in virtual environments could have had more considerable impacts on learning and accordingly performance on assessments. Teachers have also reported behavioral challenges post-pandemic that have resulted in a larger number of students being removed from classrooms, which may limit their access to the content on which they are assessed. Students taking the eighth grade assessments in the 2022-23 school year experienced a decrease in proficiency for both math and reading. While the state met the target for eighth grade math proficiency, and thus did not report slippage, the decrease in proficiency rates is similar for both high school subject areas. Students in eighth grade in the 2022-23 school year were likely in fifth or sixth grade during the height of the pandemic. This transition period from elementary school to middle school, which is a vital point in a child’s academic career, was disrupted by changes in learning environments. Thus, this too may be one of the reasons for slippage from last year’s eighth grade reading performance (which captured students who had already transitioned to middle school prior to the pandemic and were in sixth or seventh grade).

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

The state attributes the slippage of high school reading proficiency rates for FFY 2022 largely to staffing challenges and shortages as well as the lingering impacts of the pandemic (e.g., learning loss, behavioral challenges resulting in disciplinary removals). Regarding staffing, the state has seen a significant turnover in teachers and administrators, which has steadily increased post-pandemic. Based on the full-time equivalency (FTE) data for the 2022-23 school year, nearly 24% of teachers were reported as “inexperienced” based on the state-established criteria. Over 8% of general education teachers had emergency or provisional credentials. Additionally, the state observed an increase in the number of long-term substitutes filling in for special education teaching positions. The lack of experience based on both time in the classroom and absence of traditional training or credentialing may have impacted the ability of teachers to support students with disabilities, particularly those students taking the alternate assessments who may have more comprehensive needs. In addition to teacher turnover, special education administrative staff turnover has also been substantial. In FFY 2022, almost 17% of special education coordinators were new to their roles. Further, due to teaching shortages there have been notable increases in caseload sizes, with nearly 200 teachers requesting exceptions due to the significant size of their caseloads in the 2022-23 school year.   
  
Regarding the pandemic impact, inherent learning loss from nearly 18 months of inconsistent learning environments (e.g., virtual settings, classroom settings, hybrid teaching models) during the pandemic has almost certainly affected proficiency rates. Students taking alternate assessments in many cases have more significant needs and thus the limited access to additional supports (e.g., particularly assistive technology, in-person learning, paraprofessionals, nursing staff) in virtual environments could have had more considerable impacts on learning and accordingly performance on assessments. Teachers have also reported behavioral challenges post-pandemic that have resulted in a larger number of students being removed from classrooms, which may limit their access to the content on which they are assessed. Students taking the high school assessments in the 2022-23 school year were likely in eighth or ninth grade during the height of the pandemic. Accordingly, this transition period from high school to middle school was disrupted by changes in learning environments. Thus, this may be the reason from slippage from last year’s high school reading performance (which captured students who had already transitioned to high school prior to the pandemic and were in ninth or tenth grade).

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 344 | 750 | 47.50% | 61.39% | 45.87% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 129 | 775 | 19.81% | 16.61% | 16.65% | Met target | No Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | 183 | 583 | 36.53% | 52.32% | 31.39% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

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

The state attributes the slippage of fourth grade math proficiency rates for FFY 2022 largely to staffing challenges and shortages as well as the lingering impacts of the pandemic (e.g., learning loss, behavioral challenges resulting in disciplinary removals). Regarding staffing, the state has seen a significant turnover in teachers and administrators, which has steadily increased post-pandemic. Based on the full-time equivalency (FTE) data for the 2022-23 school year, nearly 24% of teachers were reported as “inexperienced” based on the state-established criteria. Over 8% of general education teachers had emergency or provisional credentials. Additionally, the state observed an increase in the number of long-term substitutes filling in for special education teaching positions. The lack of experience based on both time in the classroom and absence of traditional training or credentialing may have impacted the ability of teachers to support students with disabilities, particularly those students taking the alternate assessments who may have more comprehensive needs. In addition to teacher turnover, special education administrative staff turnover has also been substantial. In FFY 2022, almost 17% of special education coordinators were new to their roles. Further, due to teaching shortages there have been notable increases in caseload sizes, with nearly 200 teachers requesting exceptions due to the significant size of their caseloads in the 2022-23 school year.   
  
Regarding the pandemic impact, inherent learning loss from nearly 18 months of inconsistent learning environments (e.g., virtual settings, classroom settings, hybrid teaching models) during the pandemic has almost certainly affected proficiency rates. Students taking alternate assessments in many cases have more significant needs and thus the limited access to additional supports (e.g., particularly assistive technology, in-person learning, paraprofessionals, nursing staff) in virtual environments could have had more considerable impacts on learning and accordingly performance on assessments. Teachers have also reported behavioral challenges post-pandemic that have resulted in a larger number of students being removed from classrooms, which may limit their access to the content on which they are assessed. Students in fourth grade in the 2022-23 school year were likely in first or second grade during the height of the pandemic. These are foundational grades that were disrupted by changes in learning environments when students are beginning their educational careers. Thus, this too may be one of the reasons for slippage from last year’s fourth grade math performance (which captured students who were in second and third grade during the pandemic).

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

The state attributes the slippage of high school math proficiency rates for FFY 2022 largely to staffing challenges and shortages as well as the lingering impacts of the pandemic (e.g., learning loss, behavioral challenges resulting in disciplinary removals). Regarding staffing, the state has seen a significant turnover in teachers and administrators, which has steadily increased post-pandemic. Based on the full-time equivalency (FTE) data for the 2022-23 school year, nearly 24% of teachers were reported as “inexperienced” based on the state-established criteria. Over 8% of general education teachers had emergency or provisional credentials. Additionally, the state observed an increase in the number of long-term substitutes filling in for special education teaching positions. The lack of experience based on both time in the classroom and absence of traditional training or credentialing may have impacted the ability of teachers to support students with disabilities, particularly those students taking the alternate assessments who may have more comprehensive needs. In addition to teacher turnover, special education administrative staff turnover has also been substantial. In FFY 2022, almost 17% of special education coordinators were new to their roles. Further, due to teaching shortages there have been notable increases in caseload sizes, with nearly 200 teachers requesting exceptions due to the significant size of their caseloads in the 2022-23 school year.   
  
Regarding the pandemic impact, inherent learning loss from nearly 18 months of inconsistent learning environments (e.g., virtual settings, classroom settings, hybrid teaching models) during the pandemic has almost certainly affected proficiency rates. Students taking alternate assessments in many cases have more significant needs and thus the limited access to additional supports (e.g., particularly assistive technology, in-person learning, paraprofessionals, nursing staff) in virtual environments could have had more considerable impacts on learning and accordingly performance on assessments. Teachers have also reported behavioral challenges post-pandemic that have resulted in a larger number of students being removed from classrooms, which may limit their access to the content on which they are assessed. Students taking the high school assessments in the 2022-23 school year were likely in eighth or ninth grade during the height of the pandemic. Accordingly, this transition period from high school to middle school was disrupted by changes in learning environments. Thus, this may be the reason from slippage from last year’s high school math performance (which captured students who had already transitioned to high school prior to the pandemic and were in ninth or tenth grade).

**Regulatory Information**

**The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]**

**Public Reporting Information**

**Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.**

https://sde.ok.gov/documents/2012-10-01/special-education-data-and-reporting-part-b-children-ages-3-through-21

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

## 3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3C - OSEP Response

## 3C - Required Actions

# Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator**: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

3D. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using ED*Facts* file specifications FS175 and 178.

**Measurement**

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3D - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 15.27 |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 19.45 |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 24.48 |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 16.55 |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 11.10 |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 16.66 |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A <= | Grade 4 | 13.27 | 12.27 | 11.27 | 10.27 |
| Reading | B <= | Grade 8 | 17.45 | 16.45 | 15.45 | 14.45 |
| Reading | C <= | Grade HS | 22.48 | 21.48 | 20.48 | 19.48 |
| Math | A <= | Grade 4 | 14.55 | 13.55 | 12.55 | 11.55 |
| Math | B <= | Grade 8 | 9.10 | 8.10 | 7.10 | 6.10 |
| Math | C <= | Grade HS | 14.66 | 13.66 | 12.66 | 11.66 |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Stakeholders were engaged through public meetings and presentations of the SPP/APR and district data profiles at various times during the fiscal year. The majority of stakeholders present at these meetings represented LEAs, but the state parent training and information center (the Oklahoma Parents Center) also participated in meetings and presentations about the APR. Second, stakeholders were engaged via the Part B state advisory panel (SAP). The SAP consists of 31 members who represent a wide range of perspectives on special education, including 17 parents and individuals with disabilities, teachers, LEAs, advocacy groups, service providers, and related public agencies. Indicator information was shared with the SAP members at every meeting in a variety of formats. Reports were also published on a public website for general access (link is provided below).

**FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED*Facts***

**Data Source:**

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

01/10/2024

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 49,329 | 51,377 | 46,584 |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 10,018 | 8,417 | 6,662 |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 11,627 | 9,676 | 16,580 |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 202 | 149 | 908 |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 530 | 130 | 206 |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 200 | 148 | 363 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

01/10/2024

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 49,299 | 51,286 | 46,630 |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 10,011 | 8,390 | 6,671 |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 16,553 | 7,291 | 7,933 |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 587 | 131 | 375 |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 874 | 75 | 56 |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 584 | 129 | 108 |

(1)The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards** | **Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 7.29% | 23.98% | 15.59 | 13.27 | 16.69 | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 3.30% | 19.12% | 20.00 | 17.45 | 15.82 | Met target | No Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | 8.54% | 37.54% | 29.18 | 22.48 | 29.00 | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

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

In FFY 2022, the state saw an increase of 1.10 percentage points in the reading assessment proficiency gap between fourth grade students with and without disabilities. Through analysis of the data, the state determined this slippage was due to a modest increase in the proficiency rate for students without disabilities on the reading assessment when comparing the data to FFY 2021 and a modest decrease in the proficiency rate for students with disabilities.   
  
The state attributes the slippage in reading assessment proficiency gaps from FFY 2022 largely to staffing challenges and shortages as well as the lingering impacts of the pandemic (e.g., learning loss, behavioral challenges resulting in disciplinary removals). Regarding staffing, the state has seen a significant turnover in teachers and administrators, which has steadily increased post-pandemic. Based on the full-time equivalency (FTE) data for the 2022-23 school year, nearly 24% of teachers were reported as “inexperienced” based on the state-established criteria. Over 8% of general education teachers had emergency or provisional credentials. Additionally, the state observed an increase in the number of long-term substitutes filling in for special education teaching positions. The lack of experience based on both time in the classroom and absence of traditional training or credentialing may have impacted the ability of teachers to support students, particularly students with disabilities who may require more intensive support, differentiation of instruction, and implementation of principles like Universal Design for Learning (UDL). This in turn may have affected the performance of students with disabilities on statewide assessments, which are predicated on the core curriculum and grade level academic achievement standards. This same impact may not have been as substantial for students without disabilities, thus the reason for the marginal improvement in proficiency rates for these students. In addition to teacher turnover, special education administrative staff turnover has also been substantial. In FFY 2022, almost 17% of special education coordinators were new to their roles. Further, due to teaching shortages there have been notable increases in caseload sizes, with nearly 200 teachers requesting exceptions due to the significant size of their caseloads in the 2022-23 school year.   
  
Regarding the pandemic impact, inherent learning loss from nearly 18 months of inconsistent learning environments (e.g., virtual settings, classroom settings, hybrid teaching models) during the pandemic has almost certainly affected proficiency rates. Teachers have also reported behavioral challenges post-pandemic that have resulted in a larger number of students, including students with disabilities, being removed from classrooms, which may limit their access to the grade level standards and core curriculum on which they are assessed. Students in fourth grade in the 2022-23 school year were likely in first or second grade during the height of the pandemic. These are foundational grades that were disrupted by changes in learning environments when students are beginning their educational careers. Thus, this too may be one of the reasons for slippage from last year’s fourth grade reading performance (which captured students who were in second and third grade during the pandemic). The proficiency data suggest that the pandemic impact may be more substantial for students with disabilities when compared to their nondisabled peers.

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards** | **Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 14.56% | 34.77% | 18.03 | 14.55 | 20.20 | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 2.43% | 14.47% | 12.89 | 9.10 | 12.04 | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | 2.46% | 17.82% | 16.16 | 14.66 | 15.36 | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

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

In FFY 2022, the state saw an increase of 2.17 percentage points in the math assessment proficiency gap between fourth grade students with and without disabilities. Through analysis of the data, the state determined this slippage was due to a more notable increase in the proficiency rate for students without disabilities on the reading assessment when comparing the data to FFY 2021 and a modest decrease in the proficiency rate for students with disabilities.   
  
The state attributes the slippage in math assessment proficiency gaps from FFY 2022 largely to staffing challenges and shortages as well as the lingering impacts of the pandemic (e.g., learning loss, behavioral challenges resulting in disciplinary removals). Regarding staffing, the state has seen a significant turnover in teachers and administrators, which has steadily increased post-pandemic. Based on the full-time equivalency (FTE) data for the 2022-23 school year, nearly 24% of teachers were reported as “inexperienced” based on the state-established criteria. Over 8% of general education teachers had emergency or provisional credentials. Additionally, the state observed an increase in the number of long-term substitutes filling in for special education teaching positions. The lack of experience based on both time in the classroom and absence of traditional training or credentialing may have impacted the ability of teachers to support students, particularly students with disabilities who may require more intensive support, differentiation of instruction, and implementation of principles like Universal Design for Learning (UDL). This in turn may have affected the performance of students with disabilities on statewide assessments, which are predicated on the core curriculum and grade level academic achievement standards. This same impact may not have been as substantial for students without disabilities, thus the reason for the improvement in proficiency rates for these students. In addition to teacher turnover, special education administrative staff turnover has also been substantial. In FFY 2022, almost 17% of special education coordinators were new to their roles. Further, due to teaching shortages there have been notable increases in caseload sizes, with nearly 200 teachers requesting exceptions due to the significant size of their caseloads in the 2022-23 school year.   
  
Regarding the pandemic impact, inherent learning loss from nearly 18 months of inconsistent learning environments (e.g., virtual settings, classroom settings, hybrid teaching models) during the pandemic has almost certainly affected proficiency rates. Teachers have also reported behavioral challenges post-pandemic that have resulted in a larger number of students, including students with disabilities, being removed from classrooms, which may limit their access to the grade level standards and core curriculum on which they are assessed. Students in fourth grade in the 2022-23 school year were likely in first or second grade during the height of the pandemic. These are foundational grades that were disrupted by changes in learning environments when students are beginning their educational careers. Thus, this too may be one of the reasons for slippage from last year’s fourth grade reading performance (which captured students who were in second and third grade during the pandemic). The proficiency data suggest that the pandemic impact may be more substantial for students with disabilities when compared to their nondisabled peers.

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

## 3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3D - OSEP Response

## 3D - Required Actions

# Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

**Data Source**

State discipline data, including State’s analysis of State’s Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State’s examination must include one of the following comparisons:

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates of suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEAs.

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon LEAs that met the minimum n and/or cell size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 4A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2022 | 22.22% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Target <= | 6.30% | 6.00% | 6.00% | 40.00% | 45.00% |
| Data | 14.71% | 3.98% | 36.36% | 39.13% | 44.44% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target <= | 22.22% | 18.00% | 17.50% | 17.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

In FFY 2022, OSDE-SES revised the methodology used for Indicators 4A and 4B based on robust data analyses conducted to look at Oklahoma’s longitudinal data, data from similarly situated states, and implications of revisions to the methodology. Specifically, OSDE-SES focused on revising minimum cell and n-sizes to ensure they were reasonably designed to appropriately examine LEAs for significant discrepancy. Findings from the state’s data analyses were shared with stakeholders in a virtual event to ensure their input and perspectives were reflected in the final decisions made by the state. Based on these efforts, OSDE-SES revised its minimum cell and n-sizes, which in turn increased the number of LEAs reviewed for significant discrepancy. The baseline was reset to reflect the FFY 2022 data, as this change in methodology means data from prior years are no longer comparable.   
  
In addition to soliciting stakeholder input on revisions to the significant discrepancy methodology, OSDE-SES also sought stakeholder input on revisions to the targets established for 4A. The state provided stakeholders with context about what the targets reflect, their implications, and importance of striking the balance between targets being rigorous yet achievable. Based on the stakeholder input, the state updated the targets to more adequately account for the changed methodology, as has been reflected in the “Targets” table above.

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy** | **Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 12 | 54 | 44.44% | 22.22% | 22.22% | N/A | N/A |

**Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))**

Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State

**State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology**

The OSDE-SES, with stakeholder input, has defined “significant discrepancy” as a rate ratio of 2.5 or greater. This rate ratio compares the rate of students with disabilities suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days in an LEA compared to the rate of students with disabilities suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days among all LEAs in the State for one year of data (reporting period). In response to OSEP comments and required actions from the FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, the state conducted robust data analysis (see the state’s response to “Required Actions” below) and solicited in-depth stakeholder input on the reasonableness of the state’s methodology for determining significant discrepancy, specifically related to minimum cell and n-size requirements. The state has revised the methodology in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission. The details of the state’s methodology can be found below.  
  
- Target group = students with disabilities ages 3-21 with long-term suspensions/expulsions exceeding 10 days  
- Comparison group = students with disabilities ages 3-21  
- Minimum cell size = 5 students with disabilities ages 3-21 suspended/expelled greater than 10 days  
- Minimum n-size = 10 students with disabilities ages 3-21  
- State long-term suspension/expulsion rate for FFY 2022 = 1.29% (denominator of rate ratio calculations for each LEA in the state)  
  
Threshold:  
- Significant discrepancy (rate ratio) threshold = 2.5 or greater  
  
Calculation:   
To calculate significant discrepancy, the state divides the number of students with disabilities ages 3-21 suspended/expelled for more than 10 days by the number of students with disabilities ages 3-21 for each LEA meeting the state-established minimum cell (5 students) and n-sizes (10 students). This percentage is then divided by the state’s long-term suspension/expulsion rate (state’s total number of students with disabilities ages 3-21 suspended/expelled for more than 10 days divided by the state’s total number of students with disabilities ages 3-21) to yield a rate ratio. Those LEAs both meeting minimum cell and n-sizes and with rate ratios of 2.5 or greater in the reporting period are determined to have significant discrepancy.  
  
Any findings of significant discrepancy generate an analysis of policies, procedures, and practices by SEA personnel. LEAs are also required to conduct this review (consistent with CFR § 300.170(b)). If appropriate, the LEAs will revise policies, practices, and procedures relating to any 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. Corrections will be reviewed by the state for consistency with OSEP QA 23-01.

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

The FFY 2022 discipline data has returned to totals similar to those prior to the COVID-19 pandemic. Accordingly, the state has observed increases in the numbers of students suspended/expelled greater than 10 days statewide when compared to FFY 2021 data (from the 2020-21 school year). The FFY 2022 data are more in keeping with information from FFY 2020 SPP/APR submissions and prior.  
  
The state has revised the baseline for this indicator to reflect changes to methodology made in FFY 2022 that will result in the data from prior years no longer being comparable to FFY 2022 data and the data for future years in which the revised methodology will be applied. For more details about the methodology for FFY 2022, please see the “State’s definition of ‘significant discrepancy’ and methodology” field above as well as the state’s response to the OSEP’s “Required Action” for FFY 2022 below.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 data)**

**Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.**

Annually, districts are required to upload their policies, practices and procedures related to special education identification in their LEA Assurances and Agreement. Districts are notified of any discrepancies when they receive their annual District Data Profile. Those identified as being discrepant in discipline in one or more racial and ethnic groups are subject to an in-depth review of their policies, procedures, and practices with attention to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of PBIS practices, and procedural safeguards. These reviews are conducted by experienced and knowledgeable SEA personnel. A review of policies, procedures, and practices also occurs during all general supervision and monitoring activities.  
  
In FFY 2022, 12 LEAs were found to have significant discrepancy in discipline rates for students with disabilities ages 3-21. The LEAs were notified of their discrepancy in December 2023. At that time, SEA personnel conducted detailed reviews of the policies, practices and procedures of these LEAs and determined that none of the LEAs demonstrated noncompliance.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must explain how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, including how the State’s LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy under the State’s chosen methodology.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR**

In 2023, OSDE-SES conducted a robust analysis of the state’s current methodology used for determining significant discrepancy for Indicator 4A. This analysis included a review of longitudinal state data, including data prior to the pandemic, to control for abnormalities in the data resulting from different learning environments (e.g., virtual learning) that occurred from the end of the 2019-20 school year through the 2020-21 school year. Through this data analysis, the state reviewed the minimum cell and n-size requirements currently established, in response to OSEP’s FFY 2021 comment “the State included a very low percentage of the State’s LEAs in its analysis of rates of suspension and expulsion of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs.”  
  
Longitudinal data analysis of the number of LEAs excluded from significant discrepancy calculations due to failure to meet minimum cell and n-size requirements revealed a significant increase in the percentage of LEAs excluded from analysis over time. This increase in the percentage of LEAs not meeting minimum cell and n-size requirements may be due in part to state efforts, trainings, and supports related to discipline that led to overall statewide decreases in the number of discipline incidents for students with disabilities. Regardless of the reason, when analyzing historical data from the FFY 2019 SPP/APR through the FFY 2022 SPP/APR (were the state to apply its historically established minimum cell and n-sizes), the state identified that on average 95.64% of LEAs in the state were excluded from analysis based on the minimum cell and n-sizes. The OSDE-SES conducted analyses applying smaller minimum cell and n-sizes and removing minimum cell and n-size requirements to the most current discipline data available (2022-23 school year data to be reported in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR) to ascertain how many more LEAs would be included in significant discrepancy calculations. As a result of this analysis, the state determined that when lowering minimum cell and n-sizes to 5 and 10, respectively, 86.74% of LEAs were excluded from further analysis. When lowering the minimum cell and n-sizes to 2 and 5, respectively, 72.74% of LEAs were excluded from further analysis. When removing minimum cell and n-size requirements entirely, the state determined that 59.67% of the LEAs reported 0 students with long-term suspensions and expulsions and 13.08% of the LEAs reported 1 student with long-term suspensions and expulsions.   
  
The state also analyzed methodologies, including minimum cell and n-size requirements for Indicator 4A, from similarly situated states. Comparisons in methodologies were done by region of the country (South Central region, as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau), state population size, and state racial/ethnic demographics. In comparing minimum cell and n-size requirements by region, Oklahoma had the highest minimum cell and n-sizes and had the highest percentage of LEAs excluded from analysis. A similar trend was identified when conducting comparisons of minimum cell and n-sizes across states with similar population sizes. When comparing minimum cell and n-sizes to states with similar racial/ethnic compositions, Oklahoma did not utilize the largest minimum cell and n-size requirements, nor did Oklahoma exclude the largest percentage of LEAs from analysis.   
  
The state brought these findings to a broad stakeholder group, which included practitioners from the field, to solicit input on the state’s current methodology, specifically related to minimum cell and n-sizes. As a result, stakeholders reported that to ensure more equitable inclusion of LEAs in analysis, while also being mindful of the current capacity of the field and volatility of small populations that could result in false positives related to the determination of significant discrepancy, a minimum cell size of 5 and a minimum n-size of 10 would be most appropriate. Utilizing both the analysis conducted and the input from the stakeholders, OSDE-SES elected to move forward with revising the methodology to include LEAs meeting minimum cell sizes of 5 and minimum n-sizes of 10. The state believes its due diligence in reviewing longitudinal data, conducting comparisons between similarly situated states, and soliciting thorough stakeholder feedback ensures the revised methodology for Indicator 4A is reasonably designed.

## 4A - OSEP Response

## 4A - Required Actions

# Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Compliance Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

**Data Source**

State discipline data, including State’s analysis of State’s Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State’s examination must include one of the following comparisons:

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to the rates of suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

## 4B - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2022 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | Not Valid and Reliable |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity** | **Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements** | **Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 17 | 0 | 32 | Not Valid and Reliable | 0% | 0.00% | N/A | N/A |

**Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))**

Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology**

The OSDE-SES, with stakeholder input, has defined “significant discrepancy” as a rate ratio of 2.5 or greater. This rate ratio compares the rate of students with disabilities in one of the seven analyzed racial/ethnic groups who are suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days in an LEA compared to the rate of students with disabilities suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days among all LEAs in the State for one year of data (reporting period). In response to OSEP comments and required actions from the FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, the state conducted robust data analysis (see the state’s response to “Required Actions” below) and solicited in-depth stakeholder input on the reasonableness of the state’s methodology for determining significant discrepancy, specifically related to minimum cell and n-size requirements. The state has revised the methodology in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission. The details of the state’s methodology can be found below.  
LEA rate:  
- Target group = students with disabilities ages 3-21 in a particular racial/ethnic group with long-term suspensions/expulsions exceeding 10 days   
- Comparison group = students with disabilities ages 3-21 in a particular racial/ethnic group   
- Minimum cell size = 5 students with disabilities ages 3-21 in a particular racial/ethnic group suspended/expelled greater than 10 days  
- Minimum n-size = 10 students with disabilities ages 3-21 in a particular racial/ethnic group  
  
State rate:  
- Target group = students with disabilities ages 3-21 with long-term suspensions/expulsions exceeding 10 days   
- Comparison group = students with disabilities ages 3-21   
- State long-term suspension/expulsion rate for FFY 2022 = 1.29%  
  
Threshold:  
- Significant discrepancy (rate ratio) threshold = 2.5 or greater  
  
Calculation:   
To calculate significant discrepancy, the state divides the number of students with disabilities ages 3-21 in a particular racial/ethnic group suspended/expelled for more than 10 days by the number of students with disabilities ages 3-21 in the same racial/ethnic group for each LEA meeting the state-established minimum cell (5 students) and n-sizes (10 students). This percentage is then divided by the state’s long-term suspension/expulsion rate (state’s total number of students with disabilities ages 3-21 suspended/expelled for more than 10 days divided by the state’s total number of students with disabilities ages 3-21) to yield a rate ratio. Those LEAs both meeting minimum cell and n-sizes and with rate ratios of 2.5 or greater are determined to have significant discrepancy. This same calculation and state-established criteria are applied to each racial/ethnic group.  
  
Any findings of significant discrepancy generate an analysis of policies, procedures, and practices by SEA personnel. LEAs are also required to conduct this review (consistent with CFR § 300.170(b)). If appropriate, the LEAs will revise policies, practices, and procedures relating to any 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. Corrections will be reviewed by the state for consistency with OSEP QA 23-01.

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

The FFY 2022 discipline data has returned to totals similar to those prior to the COVID-19 pandemic. Accordingly, the state has observed increases in the numbers of students suspended/expelled greater than 10 days statewide when compared to FFY 2021 data (from the 2020-21 school year). The FFY 2022 data are more in keeping with information from FFY 2020 SPP/APR submissions and prior.  
  
The state has revised the baseline for this indicator to reflect changes to methodology made in FFY 2022 that will result in the data from prior year’s no longer being comparable to FFY 2022 data and the data for future years in which the revised methodology will be applied. For more details about the methodology for FFY 2022, please see the “State’s definition of ‘significant discrepancy’ and methodology” field above as well as the state’s response to the OSEP’s “Required Action” for FFY 2022 reported for Indicator 4A.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 data)**

**Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.**

Annually, districts are required to upload their policies, practices and procedures related to special education identification in their LEA Assurances and Agreement. Districts are notified of any discrepancies when they receive their annual District Data Profile. Those identified as being discrepant in discipline in one or more racial and ethnic groups are subject to an in-depth review of their policies, procedures, and practices with attention to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of PBIS practices, and procedural safeguards. These reviews are conducted by experienced and knowledgeable SEA personnel. A review of policies, procedures, and practices also occurs during all general supervision and monitoring activities.  
  
In FFY 2022, 17 LEAs were found to have significant discrepancy in discipline rates for students with disabilities ages 3-21 in a particular racial/ethnic group. The LEAs were notified of their discrepancy in December 2023 on their District Data Profiles. At that time, SEA personnel conducted detailed reviews of the policies, practices and procedures of these LEAs and determined that none demonstrated noncompliance.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2021. The State must provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2022 in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR using a methodology that does not result in different thresholds for different racial and ethnic groups.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR**

That state has revised the language provided in the field “State’s definition of ‘significant discrepancy’ and methodology” to reflect the state’s methodologies more accurately. The state has historically and will continue to utilize one threshold for all racial/ethnic groups, specifically the state rate that is calculated by dividing the total number of students with disabilities ages 3-21 suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days in the state by the total number of students with disabilities ages 3-21 in the state. For more information about the methodology the state uses and the comparison group for the rate ratio, please see the “State’s definition of ‘significant discrepancy’ and methodology” field above.  
  
The state has also revised its minimum cell and n-sizes for Indicator 4B, which has been reflected in the “State’s definition of ‘significant discrepancy’ and methodology” field above. This methodology for Indicator 4B has been aligned to that used for Indicator 4A, and revisions were made based on analysis and stakeholder input efforts to address OSEP’s “Required Action” in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR. For details about how the state ensured that the revised methodology is reasonably designed, please see the state’s response to the “Required Action” for FFY 2022 for Indicator 4A.

## 4B - OSEP Response

## 4B- Required Actions

# Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served:

A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;

B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and

C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

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

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in ED*Facts* file specification FS002.

**Measurement**

A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)]times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.*

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

## 5 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| A | 2020 | Target >= | 66.00% | 66.00% | 66.00% | 71.00% | 71.50% |
| A | 75.73% | Data | 67.98% | 68.96% | 71.18% | 75.73% | 75.65% |
| B | 2020 | Target <= | 9.25% | 9.25% | 9.25% | 8.00% | 8.00% |
| B | 6.68% | Data | 9.19% | 8.32% | 7.94% | 6.68% | 6.71% |
| C | 2020 | Target <= | 1.85% | 1.83% | 1.83% | 0.75% | 0.75% |
| C | 0.61% | Data | 0.64% | 0.70% | 0.76% | 0.61% | 0.54% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 72.00% | 72.50% | 73.00% | 75.75% |
| Target B <= | 8.00% | 7.50% | 7.50% | 6.65% |
| Target C <= | 0.73% | 0.73% | 0.71% | 0.60% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Stakeholders were engaged through public meetings and presentations of the SPP/APR and district data profiles at various times during the fiscal year. The majority of stakeholders present at these meetings represented LEAs, but the state parent training and information center (the Oklahoma Parents Center) also participated in meetings and presentations about the APR. Second, stakeholders were engaged via the Part B state advisory panel (SAP). The SAP consists of 31 members who represent a wide range of perspectives on special education, including 17 parents and individuals with disabilities, teachers, LEAs, advocacy groups, service providers, and related public agencies. Indicator information was shared with the SAP members at every meeting in a variety of formats. Reports were also published on a public website for general access (link is provided below).

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 08/30/2023 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 | 115,890 |
| SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 08/30/2023 | A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 87,254 |
| SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 08/30/2023 | B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 7,569 |
| SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 08/30/2023 | c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools | 47 |
| SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 08/30/2023 | c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities | 145 |
| SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 08/30/2023 | c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements | 331 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

| **Education Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 87,254 | 115,890 | 75.65% | 72.00% | 75.29% | Met target | No Slippage |
| B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 7,569 | 115,890 | 6.71% | 8.00% | 6.53% | Met target | No Slippage |
| C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3] | 523 | 115,890 | 0.54% | 0.73% | 0.45% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 5 - OSEP Response

## 5 - Required Actions

# Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a:

A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and

B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

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

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in ED*Facts* file specification FS089.

**Measurement**

A. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.*

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (*e.g.*, 75-85%).

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under IDEA section 618, explain.

## 6 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data (Inclusive) – 6A, 6B, 6C**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| **A** | Target >= | 43.00% | 43.75% | 43.75% | 35.50% | 35.00% |
| **A** | Data | 32.54% | 32.76% | 34.76% | 35.65% | 36.31% |
| **B** | Target <= | 16.50% | 16.00% | 16.00% | 19.50% | 19.50% |
| **B** | Data | 16.75% | 16.79% | 16.15% | 19.22% | 19.61% |
| **C** | Target <= |  |  |  | 1.02% | 1.01% |
| **C** | Data |  |  |  | 1.02% | 0.56% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Stakeholders were engaged through public meetings and presentations of the SPP/APR and district data profiles at various times during the fiscal year. The majority of stakeholders present at these meetings represented LEAs, but the state parent training and information center (the Oklahoma Parents Center) also participated in meetings and presentations about the APR. Second, stakeholders were engaged via the Part B state advisory panel (SAP). The SAP consists of 31 members who represent a wide range of perspectives on special education, including 17 parents and individuals with disabilities, teachers, LEAs, advocacy groups, service providers, and related public agencies. Indicator information was shared with the SAP members at every meeting in a variety of formats. Reports were also published on a public website for general access (link is provided below).

**Targets**

**Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.**

Inclusive Targets

**Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.**

Target Range not used

Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

| **Part** | **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | 2020 | 35.65% |
| **B** | 2020 | 19.22% |
| **C** | 2020 | 1.02% |

**Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 36.00% | 37.00% | 38.00% | 39.00% |
| Target B <= | 19.00% | 18.50% | 18.00% | 17.50% |

**Inclusive Targets – 6C**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target C <= | 1.00% | 0.99% | 0.98% | 0.97% |

**Prepopulated Data**

**Data Source:**

SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

**Date:**

08/30/2023

| **Description** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **3 through 5 - Total** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total number of children with IEPs | 1,490 | 2,831 | 709 | 5,030 |
| a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program | 451 | 977 | 271 | 1,699 |
| b1. Number of children attending separate special education class | 439 | 457 | 105 | 1,001 |
| b2. Number of children attending separate school | 7 | 3 | 1 | 11 |
| b3. Number of children attending residential facility | 3 | 7 | 1 | 11 |
| c1**.** Numberof children receiving special education and related services in the home | 14 | 11 | 4 | 29 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5**

| **Preschool Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program | 1,699 | 5,030 | 36.31% | 36.00% | 33.78% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility | 1,023 | 5,030 | 19.61% | 19.00% | 20.34% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| C. Home | 29 | 5,030 | 0.56% | 1.00% | 0.58% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group A aged 3 through 5, if applicable**

In FFY 2022, the state identified a decrease of 2.53 percentage points when comparing Indicator 6A FFY 2021 and FFY 2022 data. The state attributes this slippage to various factors. School district staff and state programming staff have reported that there have been overall increases in the number of preschool children identified with disabilities and more comprehensive needs, which may be a result of the pandemic. these more comprehensive needs may have resulted in placement in more restrictive settings. Further, there are limited numbers of seats available in regular early childhood programs across the state, which means an increase in the population of preschool children with disabilities may have resulted in children being served in 619 programs that are considered separate schools and separate classrooms. This would account for the decrease in Indicator 6A and the increase in the percentage for 6B.

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

## 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 6 - OSEP Response

## 6 - Required Actions

# Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

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

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

Outcomes:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

**Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:**

**Summary Statement 1**: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 1:** Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

**Summary Statement 2:** The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 2**: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three Outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.” If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

## 7 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| A1 | 2008 | Target >= | 90.50% | 93.40% | 93.40% | 93.50% | 93.50% |
| A1 | 93.30% | Data | 93.43% | 93.53% | 94.50% | 94.80% | 96.24% |
| A2 | 2008 | Target >= | 58.75% | 59.00% | 59.00% | 60.00% | 60.50% |
| A2 | 54.50% | Data | 63.73% | 60.66% | 61.81% | 60.96% | 61.91% |
| B1 | 2008 | Target >= | 89.75% | 92.90% | 92.90% | 93.50% | 93.50% |
| B1 | 92.80% | Data | 91.65% | 92.66% | 93.96% | 94.30% | 95.74% |
| B2 | 2008 | Target >= | 57.30% | 58.30% | 58.30% | 59.00% | 59.50% |
| B2 | 55.00% | Data | 60.11% | 58.97% | 60.04% | 59.60% | 60.43% |
| C1 | 2008 | Target >= | 91.75% | 93.00% | 93.00% | 93.50% | 93.50% |
| C1 | 92.90% | Data | 93.86% | 93.78% | 94.81% | 94.87% | 95.25% |
| C2 | 2008 | Target >= | 72.00% | 73.00% | 73.00% | 70.50% | 71.00% |
| C2 | 67.70% | Data | 76.27% | 73.62% | 73.77% | 70.80% | 70.55% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A1 >= | 94.00% | 94.00% | 94.50% | 94.50% |
| Target A2 >= | 61.00% | 61.50% | 62.00% | 62.50% |
| Target B1 >= | 94.00% | 94.00% | 94.50% | 94.50% |
| Target B2 >= | 60.00% | 60.50% | 61.00% | 61.50% |
| Target C1 >= | 94.00% | 94.00% | 94.50% | 94.50% |
| Target C2 >= | 71.50% | 72.00% | 72.50% | 73.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Stakeholders were engaged through public meetings and presentations of the SPP/APR and district data profiles at various times during the fiscal year. The majority of stakeholders present at these meetings represented LEAs, but the state parent training and information center (the Oklahoma Parents Center) also participated in meetings and presentations about the APR. Second, stakeholders were engaged via the Part B state advisory panel (SAP). The SAP consists of 31 members who represent a wide range of perspectives on special education, including 17 parents and individuals with disabilities, teachers, LEAs, advocacy groups, service providers, and related public agencies. Indicator information was shared with the SAP members at every meeting in a variety of formats. Reports were also published on a public website for general access (link is provided below).

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

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

2,483

**Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)**

| **Outcome A Progress Category** | **Number of children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 6 | 0.24% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 69 | 2.78% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 948 | 38.18% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1,290 | 51.95% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 170 | 6.85% |

| **Outcome A** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 2,238 | 2,313 | 96.24% | 94.00% | 96.76% | Met target | No Slippage |
| A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 1,460 | 2,483 | 61.91% | 61.00% | 58.80% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)**

| **Outcome B Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 4 | 0.16% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 95 | 3.83% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 935 | 37.66% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1,290 | 51.95% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 159 | 6.40% |

| **Outcome B** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 2,225 | 2,324 | 95.74% | 94.00% | 95.74% | Met target | No Slippage |
| B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 1,449 | 2,483 | 60.43% | 60.00% | 58.36% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

| **Outcome C Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 5 | 0.20% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 79 | 3.18% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 737 | 29.68% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1,396 | 56.22% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 266 | 10.71% |

| **Outcome C** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.  *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 2,133 | 2,217 | 95.25% | 94.00% | 96.21% | Met target | No Slippage |
| C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.  *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 1,662 | 2,483 | 70.55% | 71.50% | 66.94% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **A2** | OSDE-SES has identified several possible contributors to the slippage identified for Outcome A, Summary Statement 2. Through data analysis, state staff determined significant decreases in this outcome summary statement within 5 of the largest LEAs in the state. These 5 LEAs collectively demonstrated an average decrease of approximately 14 percentage points when comparing their FFY 2022 data to their FFY 2021 data reported in last year’s FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission for Outcome A, Summary Statement 2. These 5 LEAs comprise approximately 18 percent of the total student population in the state and thus have significant impacts on statewide data. In one of the largest LEAs, 22 percent of children with disabilities attending a preschool program had missing entrance and/or exit ratings for all outcomes, including Outcome A, which led to their exclusion from the data set. Accordingly, the exclusion of this substantial group of students could be an additional contributor to the slippage.   Additionally, school staff have reported in FFY 2022 that children with disabilities attending preschool programs have had more significant behavioral challenges, possibly due to the pandemic. Many of the children in the FFY 2022 Indicator 7 data set were served through alternate learning environments (e.g., virtual learning) when beginning school and services in FFY 2019 and FFY 2020. Accordingly, behavioral challenges have impacted the “positive social-emotional skills” outcomes of children and appear to be a viable reason for slippage in the percent of preschool children functioning within age-level expectations upon exiting their preschool program (or turning 6 years of age). |
| **B2** | As with Outcome A, OSDE-SES has identified several possible contributors to the slippage identified for Outcome B, Summary Statement 2. Through data analysis, state staff determined significant decreases in this outcome summary statement within 5 of the largest LEAs in the state. These 5 LEAs collectively demonstrated an average decrease of 11.6 percentage points when comparing their FFY 2022 data to their FFY 2021 data reported in last year’s FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission for Outcome B, Summary Statement 2. These 5 LEAs comprise approximately 18 percent of the total student population in the state and thus have significant impacts on statewide data. In one of the largest LEAs, 22 percent of children with disabilities attending a preschool program had missing entrance and/or exit ratings for all outcomes, including Outcome B, which led to their exclusion from the data set. Accordingly, the exclusion of this substantial group of students could be an additional contributor to the slippage.   Additionally, school staff have reported in FFY 2022 that children with disabilities attending preschool programs have had more significant behavioral and communication challenges, possibly due to the pandemic. Many of the children in the FFY 2022 Indicator 7 data set were served through alternate learning environments (e.g., virtual learning) when beginning school and services in FFY 2019 and FFY 2020. Accordingly, behavioral and communication challenges have impacted the “acquisition of knowledge and skills, including early communication,” outcomes of children and appear to be a viable reason for slippage in the percent of preschool children functioning within age-level expectations upon exiting their preschool program (or turning 6 years of age). |
| **C2** | As with Outcomes A and B, OSDE-SES has identified several possible contributors to the slippage identified for Outcome C, Summary Statement 2. Through data analysis, state staff determined significant decreases in this outcome summary statement within 5 of the largest LEAs in the state. These 5 LEAs collectively demonstrated an average decrease of 15.8 percentage points when comparing their FFY 2022 data to their FFY 2021 data reported in last year’s FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission for Outcome C, Summary Statement 2. These 5 LEAs comprise approximately 18 percent of the total student population in the state and thus have significant impacts on statewide data. In one of the largest LEAs, 22 percent of children with disabilities attending a preschool program had missing entrance and/or exit ratings for all outcomes, including Outcome C, which led to their exclusion from the data set. Accordingly, the exclusion of this substantial group of students could be an additional contributor to the slippage.   Additionally, school staff have reported in FFY 2022 that children with disabilities attending preschool programs have had more significant behavioral challenges, possibly due to the pandemic. Many of the children in the FFY 2022 Indicator 7 data set were served through alternate learning environments (e.g., virtual learning) when beginning school and services in FFY 2019 and FFY 2020. Accordingly, behavioral challenges have impacted the “use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs outcomes” of children and appear to be a viable reason for slippage in the percent of preschool children functioning within age-level expectations upon exiting their preschool program (or turning 6 years of age). |

**Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)**

YES

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | NO |

**Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process? (yes/no)**

YES

**List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.**

Program data for this indicator are collected through Oklahoma's online IEP record system, called EDPlan. LEAs use the system to create electronic records for all students with IEPs, including those in early childhood programs. The Child Outcome Summary Form is completed electronically within this system for each child between the ages of three and five years of age if he or she has had at least six months of service. It is SEA practice that personnel first enter the COSF ratings and evaluation information when the student enters their district and again when the child completes his or her preschool program (end of year prior to kindergarten, completion of IEP, or age six, whichever comes first). If a student moves districts between the ages of 3 and 5 (after receiving entry ratings), the district in which the child is enrolled will report the exit ratings. The online IEP system reminds personnel (via warning notices) to enter the data if they neglect to do so in a timely manner.  
  
The data for this indicator are then pulled through reporting functions in the online system and cleaned to ensure that all relevant records are included.

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

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 7 - OSEP Response

## 7 - Required Actions

# Indicator 8: Parent involvement

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

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

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling****of parents from whom response is requested****is allowed.* *When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross-section of parents of children with disabilities.

Include in the State’s analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must consider race/ethnicity. In addition, the State’s analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

## 8 - Indicator Data

| **Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? | NO |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Stakeholders were engaged through public meetings and presentations of the SPP/APR and district data profiles at various times during the fiscal year. The majority of stakeholders present at these meetings represented LEAs, but the state parent training and information center (the Oklahoma Parents Center) also participated in meetings and presentations about the APR. Second, stakeholders were engaged via the Part B state advisory panel (SAP). The SAP consists of 31 members who represent a wide range of perspectives on special education, including 17 parents and individuals with disabilities, teachers, LEAs, advocacy groups, service providers, and related public agencies. Indicator information was shared with the SAP members at every meeting in a variety of formats. Reports were also published on a public website for general access (link is provided below).

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 93.71% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Target >= | 91.75% | 93.00% | 93.00% | 93.70% | 94.00% |
| Data | 98.38% | 98.66% | 98.02% | 93.71% | 93.81% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 94.00% | 94.00% | 94.00% | 94.00% |

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities** | **Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 17,436 | 18,555 | 93.81% | 94.00% | 93.97% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.**

The Parent Survey used to calculate this indicator does not differentiate between preschool children and school age children. All families answer the same survey. Because preschool children are served in public schools, we believe that it is appropriate for parents of preschool children to answer the same survey as school-age children.

**The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.**

120,930

**Percentage of respondent parents**

15.34%

**Response Rate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** |
| Response Rate | 9.02% | 15.34% |

**Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).**

The State uses a statistical formula (Z-test for two population proportions) to determine if two proportions (i.e., % of surveys received versus % of families in the target population) should be considered statistically different. A p-value less than 0.05 indicates a statistically significant difference between the proportions (non-representativeness).

**Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.**

The age distribution does not align with child count (Table 1) but does match the historical voluntary response patterns for the state's survey: parents of young children are much more likely to respond than parents of older children, especially parents of high school students. Using a z-score test for differences in proportions, the proportion of respondents' children’s ages differs significantly from the proportion of those ages in the annual child count (October 1, 2022) for every age group.   
  
Table 1:   
Age Group Survey Resp Resp Rate Child Count CC Rate Diff in Rates P-Value  
All Ages 18555 n/a 120926 n/a n/a n/a  
3 to 5 2506 13.51% 9657 7.99% +5.52 <0.00001   
6 to 10 7612 41.02% 44516 36.81% +4.21 <0.00001   
11 to 13 3634 19.59% 27593 22.82% -3.23 <0.00001   
14 to 18 3866 20.84% 38322 31.69% -10.85 <0.00001   
19+ 93 0.50% 837 0.69% -0.19 0.00288  
  
Regarding race and ethnicity (Table 2): The differences in proportions between respondents and child count totals are significantly different for all race groups except Pacific Islanders. Based on the difference in rates, underrepresentation was identified for the racial/ethnic groups of Hispanic or Latino, Black/African American, two or more races, and Asian while overrepresentation was identified for the racial/ethnic groups of Native American, Pacific Islander, and White/Caucasian. A substantial 3.21% of respondents chose not to reveal racial or ethnic identities.   
  
Table 2:   
Race/Ethnicity Survey Resp Resp Rate Child Count CC Rate Diff in Rates P-Value  
All 18555 n/a 120925 n/a n/a n/a  
Native American 3004 16.19% 16585 13.71% +2.48 <0.00001  
Asian 94 0.51% 1258 1.04% -0.53 <0.00001  
Black/African Am. 933 5.03% 10234 8.46% -3.43 <0.00001  
Hispanic or Latino 2357 12.70% 19744 16.33% -3.63 <0.00001  
Pacific Islander 46 0.25% 254 0.21% +0.04 0.29834  
Two+ Races 2146 11.57% 16130 13.34% -1.77 <0.00001  
White/Caucasian 9379 50.55% 56720 46.90% +3.65 <0.00001  
Prefer No Answer 596 3.21% n/a n/a n/a n/a  
  
The regional response patterns continue along historical trends (Table 3). The Central region (which includes several of the largest LEAs in the state) is substantially underrepresented in the survey response pool, while every other region (areas of very small LEAs that emphasize survey participation) is overrepresented. This is true except for the Northeast region, which also contains a large urban area and numerous larger LEAs. This region is fairly evenly represented in the response pool compared to child count (and this is the only region that does not have a significant difference between the survey response rate and the population rate).  
  
Table 3:  
Region Survey Resp Resp Rate Child Count CC Rate Diff in Rates P-Value   
All 18555 n/a 120926 n/a n/a n/a  
Northeast 5970 32.17% 38781 32.07% +0.10 0.77948  
Northwest 1404 7.57% 4781 3.95% +3.62 <0.00001  
Panhandle 207 1.11% 686 0.57% +0.54 <0.00001  
Southeast 2328 12.55% 10710 8.86% +3.69 <0.00001  
Southwest 2283 12.30% 12168 10.06% +2.24 <0.00001  
S. Central 1403 7.56% 7137 5.90% +1.66 <0.00001  
Central 4885 26.33% 46663 38.59% -12.26 <0.00001  
Unknown 75 0.40% n/a n/a n/a n/a

The demographics of the children for whom parents are responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)

NO

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics**

All parents are supposed to have an opportunity to voluntarily respond to the survey; a weighted sample is not used. As a result, a perfect representation of child count is unlikely to occur. The State continues to work with LEAs to increase response rates, particularly those that are larger and have had low rates in the past. The state has encouraged LEAs to plan more deliberately when surveys are provided to parents and to ensure that all have the opportunity to respond, which could address some underrepresentation identified in parents of older students. Because larger LEAs are more likely to have lower response rates while also serving a more diverse student population, by increasing response rates in these LEAs, representation should improve in regions like Central Oklahoma, which is underrepresented in the survey data. The state expects that working with larger LEAs to increase local response rates will result in a response pool that more adequately represents families of students in high school and/or who identify as Hispanic or Latino, Black/African American, two or more races, and Asian. These racial/ethnic groups are underrepresented in this FFY 2022 submission and have been historically underrepresented in prior submissions.

**Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.**

The State continues to work with LEAs to increase response rates, which in turn can improve representativeness, by encouraging them to plan more deliberately when surveys are provided to families and to ensure that all families have the opportunity to respond. State staff have provided suggestions to LEA staff on ways to increase survey responses, such as having parents receive and complete, when possible, the Indicator 8 parent survey at a child’s annual IEP meeting. The state has made efforts to increase public awareness of the survey through the state website, which includes information about the survey’s value, direct links to the survey, and a brochure and hard copy of the survey in English and Spanish (https://sde.ok.gov/part-b-parent-survey). The state also distributes a monthly newsletter to districts which at different points throughout the year may include information on how districts can monitor and improve response rates, as well as adding additional information on parent surveys on the state’s website. Additionally, the state has partnered with the Oklahoma Parent Center, a parent training and information center, and Sooner success, a regional parent training group, to promote the importance of completing parent surveys. To incentivize strong response rates and improvements in response rate over time, the state also awards a bonus point on the district’s annual Determination for those districts with a 5% increase in response rate.

**Describe the analysis** **of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.**

Non-response bias may occur when a sub-section of parents is unwilling or unable to respond to a survey. The error comes from the absence of participants and not from collecting erroneous data. Each parent is supposed to be offered an opportunity to complete the parent survey annually, typically at the IEP meeting. To reflect this expectation, our total count of surveys distributed is the annual child count. The method chosen by Oklahoma is to distribute the survey to parents via the LEAs.   
  
To analyze nonresponse bias, the state reviewed parent response data for different groups to ascertain if their survey responses and rates of satisfaction were meaningfully different from the statewide data. When looking at the category of child age, the representativeness analysis indicated that the perspectives of parents with younger children outweigh those of parents with older children in the survey results, with parents of younger children being overrepresented and parents of older children being underrepresented. When reviewing disaggregated responses to survey questions by age, the state determined that parents of older children tended to have less favorable opinions of their school's support (parents of children ages 14 and above reported an overall satisfaction rate of approximately 92%) when compared with parents of younger children (parents of children ages 3-13 reported an overall satisfaction rate of approximately 95%). These differences indicate potential nonresponse bias based on child age, and it is possible that with a more representative response pool predicated on student age, the overall state approval rate may be lower.  
  
When looking at data and determining potential nonresponse bias for the category of race/ethnicity, the representativeness analysis indicated responses for parents of Hispanic or Latino, Black/African American, two or more races, and Asian children were underrepresented by an average of 2.3 percentage points. Conversely, the responses for parents of Native American, Pacific Islander, and White/Caucasian children were overrepresented by an average of 2.1 percentage points. When reviewing disaggregated responses to survey questions by racial/ethnic group, the state determined that parents of children in the four underrepresented racial/ethnic groups tended to have less favorable opinions of their school's support (parents of children in these racial/ethnic groups reported an overall satisfaction rate of approximately 92.5%) when compared with parents of children in the overrepresented racial/ethnic groups (parents of children in these racial/ethnic groups reported an overall satisfaction rate of approximately 94%). These differences indicate potential nonresponse bias based on child race/ethnicity, and it is possible that with a more representative response pool predicated on student age, the overall state approval rate may be lower. It should also be noted that those parents who preferred not to provide their child’s race/ethnicity (3.21% of respondents) had substantially lower average approval ratings, with their overall satisfaction rate being approximately 87%. This suggests that respondents who had more negative experiences with their LEAs were less likely to share personal demographic information.  
  
When looking at data and determining potential nonresponse bias for the category of state region, the representativeness analysis indicated responses for parents from all regions of the state except Central Oklahoma were either slightly or significantly overrepresented (average of 2.0 percentage points) while respondents from Central Oklahoma were substantially underrepresented (12.3 percentage points). When reviewing disaggregated responses to survey questions by region, the state determined that parents of children in the six overrepresented regions tended to have less favorable opinions of their school's support (parents of children in these regions reported an overall satisfaction rate of approximately 92%) when compared with parents of children in the underrepresented region (parents of children in this region reported an overall satisfaction rate of approximately 93.5%). These differences indicate potential nonresponse bias based on region, and it is possible that with a more representative response pool predicated on student age, the overall state approval rate may be higher. It should also be noted that those parents who preferred not to provide their state region (0.40% of respondents) had higher average approval ratings, with their overall satisfaction rate being approximately 94%. Given the very small percentage of the respondent population, it is difficult for the state to make any meaningful conclusions about those parents who did not provide their child’s region of the state.  
  
Through the state’s analysis of the nonresponse bias, while there were not drastic differences in the overall satisfaction rates from parents who had children in groups over- and underrepresented predicated on age, race/ethnicity, and region, there is some indication of potential nonresponse bias that could impact overall state data. In order to address the possible nonresponse bias identified, the state will continue making concerted efforts to improve the survey response rate, which should in turn address representativeness challenges that significantly contribute to nonresponse bias. As well, the state will look into the possibility of weighting data in future years to control for nonresponse bias and provide satisfaction rates that may more accurately reflect statewide family approval.

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | NO |

| **Survey Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was a survey used? | YES |
| If yes, is it a new or revised survey? | NO |
| If yes, provide a copy of the survey. |  |

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

## 8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.   
  
In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and report on steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR**

See details in the fields related to representativeness, response rates, and nonresponse bias above.

## 8 - OSEP Response

## 8 - Required Actions

# Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

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

**Data Source**

State’s analysis, based on State’s Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 9 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

26

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services** | **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification** | **Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 6 | 0 | 518 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).**

The OSDE-SES, with stakeholder input from its IDEA Part B Advisory Panel, has defined “disproportionate representation” as a risk ratio of 2.6 or greater (overrepresentation) for one year of data (reporting period) for the required seven racial/ethnic groups analyzed. When disproportionate representation is determined for a district, the OSDE-SES will determine if the disproportionality is the result of inappropriate identification by reviewing policies, practices and procedures as submitted by the LEA. Data for each LEA and charter school were analyzed for all racial and ethnic groups. The details of the state’s methodology can be found below.  
  
Numerator of risk ratio (risk of student in a particular racial/ethnic group being identified with a disability):  
- Target group = students with disabilities ages 5 years old in kindergarten through age 21 in particular racial/ethnic group  
- Comparison group = all students ages 5 years old in kindergarten through age 21 in a particular racial/ethnic group  
- Minimum cell size = 10 students with disabilities ages 5 years old in kindergarten through age 21 in a particular racial/ethnic group  
- Minimum n-size = 10 students ages 5 years old in kindergarten through age 21 in a particular racial/ethnic group  
  
Denominator of risk ratio (risk of students in all other racial/ethnic groups not represented in the numerator being identified with a disability):  
- Target group = students with disabilities ages 5 years old in kindergarten through age 21 in all other racial/ethnic groups that are not represented in the numerator  
- Comparison group = all students ages 5 years old in kindergarten through age 21 in all other racial/ethnic groups that are not represented in the numerator  
- Minimum cell size = 10 students with disabilities ages 5 years old in kindergarten through age 21 in all other racial/ethnic groups that are not represented in the numerator  
- Minimum n-size = 10 students ages 5 years old in kindergarten through age 21 in all other racial/ethnic groups that are not represented in the numerator  
  
Threshold:  
- Disproportionate representation (risk ratio) threshold = 2.6 or greater  
  
Calculation:   
- To calculate disproportionate representation, the state first calculates for an LEA the risk of a particular racial/ethnic group being identified with a disability (see “Numerator of risk ratio” information detailed above) by dividing the total number of students with disabilities ages 5 years old in kindergarten through age 21 in a particular racial/ethnic group meeting the minimum cell size by the total number of students ages 5 years old in kindergarten through age 21 in a particular racial/ethnic group meeting the minimum n-size. This percentage serves as the numerator of the risk ratio calculation.  
- The state then calculates for an LEA the risk of all other racial/ethnic groups not represented in the numerator being identified with a disability (see “Denominator of risk ratio” information detailed above) by dividing the total number of students with disabilities ages 5 years old in kindergarten through age 21 in all other racial/ethnic groups not represented in the numerator meeting the minimum cell size by the total number of students ages 5 years old in kindergarten through age 21 in all other racial/ethnic groups not represented in the numerator meeting the minimum n-size. This percentage serves as the denominator of the risk ratio calculation.   
- The state finally calculates the LEA risk ratio by dividing the risk of a particular racial/ethnic group being identified with a disability by the risk of all other racial/ethnic groups being identified with a disability.  
- Those LEAs with a risk ratio of 2.6 or greater are determined to have disproportionate representation.

**Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.**

Annually, districts are required to upload their policies, practices and procedures related to special education identification in the LEA Assurances and Agreement. Districts are notified of any disproportionality when they receive their annual District Data Profile. Those identified as being disproportionate in one or more racial and ethnic groups are subject to an in-depth review of their policies, procedures, and practices with attention to the development and implementation of a comprehensive referral and evaluation process, including procedural safeguards. These reviews are conducted by experienced and knowledgeable SEA personnel who flag problematic policies, practices and procedures for discussion and additional review. If any indicate inappropriate identification is a concern, OSDE-SES will work with the LEA for revision and improvement. A review of policies, procedures, and practices occurs during all general supervision and monitoring activities, also.  
  
The state completed these processes to make a determination of whether disproportionate representation identified in the 6 LEAs was the result of inappropriate identification. Through these processes and reviews, the state determined that none of the 6 LEAs demonstrated that the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 9 - OSEP Response

## 9 - Required Actions

# Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

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

**Data Source**

State’s analysis, based on State’s Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the section 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), (e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures). In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 10 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

127

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories** | **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification** | **Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 85 | 1 | 417 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.24% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

In FFY 2022, 1 of the 85 LEAs with disproportionate representation was determined to have inappropriate identification based on a review of policies, procedures, and practices. Historically, the state has not identified any LEAs as having disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification. Therefore, there was slippage of 0.24 percentage points from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022. The LEA with disproportionate representation resulting from inappropriate identification experienced a significant increase in the number of initial referrals from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022. This, combined with staffing shortages, may have resulted in the state determining, through policy, procedures, and practices reviews, contributing factors to inappropriate identification.

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).**

The OSDE-SES, with stakeholder input from its IDEA Part B Advisory Panel, has defined “disproportionate representation” as a risk ratio of 2.6 or greater (overrepresentation) for one year of data (reporting period) for the required seven racial/ethnic groups analyzed in six specific disability categories. When disproportionate representation is determined for a district, the OSDE-SES will determine if the disproportionality is the result of inappropriate identification by reviewing policies, practices and procedures submitted by the LEA. Data for each LEA and charter school were analyzed for all racial and ethnic groups. The details of the state’s methodology can be found below.  
  
Numerator of risk ratio (risk of student in a particular racial/ethnic group being identified with a specific disability):  
- Target group = students with disabilities ages 5 years old in kindergarten through age 21 in particular racial/ethnic group for a specific disability category  
- Comparison group = all students ages 5 years old in kindergarten through age 21 in a particular racial/ethnic group  
- Minimum cell size = 10 students with disabilities ages 5 years old in kindergarten through age 21 in a particular racial/ethnic group for a specific disability category  
- Minimum n-size = 10 students ages 5 years old in kindergarten through age 21 in a particular racial/ethnic group  
  
Denominator of risk ratio (risk of students in all other racial/ethnic groups not represented in the numerator being identified with a specific disability):  
- Target group = students with disabilities ages 5 years old in kindergarten through age 21 in all other racial/ethnic groups that are not represented in the numerator for a specific disability category  
- Comparison group = all students ages 5 years old in kindergarten through age 21 in all other racial/ethnic groups that are not represented in the numerator  
- Minimum cell size = 10 students with disabilities ages 5 years old in kindergarten through age 21 in all other racial/ethnic groups that are not represented in the numerator in a specific disability category  
- Minimum n-size = 10 students ages 5 years old in kindergarten through age 21 in all other racial/ethnic groups that are not represented in the numerator  
  
Threshold:  
- Disproportionate representation (risk ratio) threshold = 2.6 or greater for a specific disability category  
  
Calculation:   
- To calculate disproportionate representation, the state first calculates an LEA the risk of a particular racial/ethnic group being identified with a specific disability category (see “Numerator of risk ratio” information detailed above) by dividing the total number of students with disabilities ages 5 years old in kindergarten through age 21 in a particular racial/ethnic group for a specific disability category and meeting the minimum cell size by the total number of students ages 5 years old in kindergarten through age 21 in a particular racial/ethnic group meeting the minimum n-size. This percentage serves as the numerator of the risk ratio calculation.  
- The state then calculates an LEA the risk of all other racial/ethnic groups not represented in the numerator being identified with a specific disability category (see “Denominator of risk ratio” information detailed above) by dividing the total number of students with disabilities ages 5 years old in kindergarten through age 21 in all other racial/ethnic groups not represented in the numerator for a specific disability category and meeting the minimum cell size by the total number of students ages 5 years old in kindergarten through age 21 in all other racial/ethnic groups not represented in the numerator meeting the minimum n-size. This percentage serves as the denominator of the risk ratio calculation.   
- The state finally calculates the LEA risk ratio by dividing the risk of a particular racial/ethnic group being identified with a specific disability category by the risk of all other racial/ethnic groups being identified with the same specific disability category.  
- Those LEAs with a risk ratio of 2.6 or greater are determined to have disproportionate representation.

**Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.**

Annually, districts are required to upload their policies, practices and procedures related to special education identification in the LEA Assurances and Agreement. Districts are notified of any disproportionality when they receive their annual District Data Profile. Those identified as being disproportionate in one or more racial and ethnic groups are subject to an in-depth review of their policies, procedures, and practices with attention to the development and implementation of a comprehensive referral and evaluation process, including procedural safeguards. These reviews are conducted by experienced and knowledgeable SEA personnel who flag problematic policies, practices and procedures for discussion and additional review. If any indicate inappropriate identification is a concern, OSDE-SES will work with the LEA for revision and improvement. A review of policies, procedures, and practices occurs during all general supervision and monitoring activities, also.  
  
The state completed these processes to make a determination of whether disproportionate representation identified in the 85 LEAs was the result of inappropriate identification. Through these processes and reviews, the state determined that none of the 85 LEAs demonstrated that the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 10 - OSEP Response

## 10 - Required Actions

# Indicator 11: Child Find

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

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

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State’s timeline for initial evaluations.

**Measurement**

a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.

b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

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

**Instructions**

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child’s previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 11 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 90.89% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 97.65% | 98.77% | 95.66% | 96.52% | 98.67% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

| **(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received** | **(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 21,710 | 21,522 | 98.67% | 100% | 99.13% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

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

188

**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.**

Maximum range of days past 45 school days to complete an evaluation: 197  
  
Reasons for delay reported to the state were: LEA failure to follow appropriate procedure; Multidisciplinary Evaluation and Eligibility Group Summary (MEEGS) team needed additional data; lack of appropriate resources; breaks in school calendar and/or staff not on contract; late referral from SoonerStart; parents did not show for scheduled meeting or delayed meeting; and extreme weather or other atypical events such as pandemics.

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used:**

The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted

**What is the State’s timeline for initial evaluations? If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b).**

45 school days. Exceptions are not allowed, outside of the allowable exceptions outlined in 34 CFR §300.301(d). Children with these exceptions are excluded from the numerator and denominator of Indicator 11, per guidance in the SPP/APR Part B Measurement Table.

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

Each LEA is required to report aggregated counts of "Total Referrals," "Evaluations completed within 45 school days from parent consent," "Evaluations not completed within 45 school days from parent consent" broken down by reason, "The maximum amount of days after 45 school days to complete the tardy evaluation", and "Reasons why evaluations were not completed with the 45 day timeline" through the online IEP system. The LEA must validate the End-of-Year report and certify the data being submitted is accurate and true.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 101 | 79 | 20 | 2 |

**FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

OSDE-SES conducted verification of correct implementation of regulatory requirements for FFY 2021 findings to ensure systemic compliance across each LEA in which findings of noncompliance were issued. This was achieved through a two-part process: (a) reviewing FFY 2022 Indicator 11 data at the individual student record level to determine compliance, and should noncompliance be identified, (b) using a subsequent file monitoring process in which student records are randomly selected for compliance reviews until 100% compliance is determined.   
  
Of the 101 LEAs with findings of noncompliance for Indicator 11 in FFY 2021, the state determined through step (a) of the process above that 79 LEAs demonstrated 100% compliance in meeting the state-established timeframe by which evaluations must be completed for all initial evaluations in the 2022-23 school year (FFY 2022 data). Through this subsequent record review, the state verified that the 79 LEAs that were the source of noncompliance were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP’s QA 23-01. For the 22 LEAs that did not demonstrate 100% compliance in the initial evaluation data for FFY 2022, the state proceeded to step (b) of the process above. The state selected a representative, randomly selected sample of records of students who received parental consent for initial evaluation for eligibility under IDEA in the fall of 2023. These indicator-specific reports were reviewed by OSDE-SES specialists for systemic compliance in January 2024. Of the 22 LEAs reviewed in step (b), 20 demonstrated 100% compliance in the sampled records and the state verified that the 20 LEAs were correctly implementing regulatory requirements subsequent to the conclusion of the one-year timeline. Two (2) LEAs did not demonstrate 100% compliance and are receiving intensive technical assistance that includes corrective action planning and root cause analysis.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

The OSDE-SES annually conducts monitoring activities for 100% of the State’s LEAs to determine if all LEAs are in compliance for Indicator 11. Non-compliance is identified through data submitted by LEAs through the annual June end-of-year data collection as well as specific monitoring activities such as desk audits and onsite visits.   
  
After analyzing data collected for Indicator 11 in June 2022 (FFY 2021 Indicator 11 data), non-compliance was identified in 273 student records across 101 LEAs. The 101 LEAs identified as non-compliant were issued a letter of findings and required to make child-specific corrections within 30 days of receipt of the letter. Subsequently, LEAs were required to submit data showing evidence of completed documentation for identified students. The OSDE-SES reviewed Parent Consent forms and Multidisciplinary Evaluation and Eligibility Group Summary (MEEGS) forms submitted by all LEAs through the statewide online IEP system (OK EdPlan) in order to determine that evaluations were conducted in accordance with the regulatory requirements. OSDE-SES staff reviewed the documentation to determine if the child-specific corrections had been made. In addition, when necessary, the OSDE-SES conducted follow-up phone calls to ensure that education records were available for review through the online IEP system. If records were not available for review, LEAs were required to submit the documentation in the children's electronic records.  
  
Through these activities, the state verified that all 273 child-specific records of noncompliance were corrected, albeit late, consistent with OSEP’s QA 23-01.

**FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

If noncompliance is not corrected--meaning LEAs continue to not demonstrate systemic compliance--LEAs are monitored through the differentiated monitoring process for a second consecutive year and are marked as having "longstanding noncompliance" in Indicator 11 on their annual determinations. LEAs identified with continuing noncompliance must revisit their improvement plans from the prior year and review and revise to ensure compliance can be achieved. A subsequent analysis of IEPs is conducted at the end of the school year as described in the prior section ("Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements"). These activities will take place for the 2 LEAs that have not corrected noncompliance or satisfied verification requirements.  
  
If an LEA has been noncompliant (below 95%) for three consecutive years for Indicator 11, the LEA is required to complete the following additional activities:  
o Review the past two years root cause analyses to assist in developing an improvement plan.  
o Use professional development special education grant funds to address the improvement plan implementation. The amount or percentage of funds directed will be determined in consultation with the state.   
o Invite parents of affected students to the school board meeting to participate in the discussions for the plan for improvement.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| FFY 2020 | 6 | 6 | 0 |
| FFY 2019 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2020**

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

OSDE-SES conducted verification of correct implementation of regulatory requirements for FFY 2020 findings not verified as corrected in the FFY 2021 submission to ensure systemic compliance across each LEA in which findings of noncompliance were issued. This was achieved through a two-part process: (a) reviewing FFY 2022 Indicator 11 data at the individual student record level to determine compliance, and should noncompliance be identified, (b) using a subsequent file monitoring process in which student records are randomly selected for compliance reviews until 100% compliance is determined.   
  
Of the 6 LEAs with findings of noncompliance for Indicator 11 in FFY 2020, the state determined through step (a) of the process above that 5 LEAs demonstrated 100% compliance in meeting the state-established timeframe by which evaluations must be completed for all initial evaluations in the 2022-23 school year (FFY 2022 data). Through this subsequent record review, the state verified that the 5 LEAs that were the source of noncompliance were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP’s QA 23-01 (though exceeding the one-year timeframe). For the 1 LEA that did not demonstrate 100% compliance in the initial evaluation data for FFY 2022, the state proceeded to step (b) of the process above. The state selected a representative, randomly selected sample of records of students who received parental consent for initial evaluation for eligibility under IDEA in the fall of 2023. These indicator-specific reports were reviewed by OSDE-SES specialists for systemic compliance in January 2024. The LEA demonstrated 100% compliance in the sampled records and the state verified that the LEA was correctly implementing regulatory requirements.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

All child-specific noncompliance across the 6 LEAs (the source of noncompliance) were verified as corrected in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR. To verify correction of these individual cases of noncompliance, LEAs were required to submit data showing evidence of completed documentation for identified students. The OSDE-SES reviewed Parent Consent forms and Multidisciplinary Evaluation and Eligibility Group Summary (MEEGS) forms submitted by all LEAs through the statewide online IEP system (OK EdPlan) in order to determine that evaluations were conducted in accordance with the regulatory requirements. OSDE-SES staff reviewed the documentation to determine if the child-specific corrections had been made. In addition, when necessary, the OSDE-SES conducted follow-up phone calls to ensure that education records were available for review through the online IEP system. If records were not available for review, LEAs were required to submit the documentation in the children's electronic records. The state verified through this process that all individual cases of child-specific noncompliance were corrected, albeit late, consistent with OSEP’s QA 23-01.

**FFY 2019**

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

OSDE-SES conducted verification of correct implementation of regulatory requirements for the FFY 2019 finding not verified as corrected in the FFY 2021 submission to ensure systemic compliance across the LEA for which findings of noncompliance were issued. This was achieved through a two-part process: (a) reviewing FFY 2022 Indicator 11 data at the individual student record level to determine compliance, and should noncompliance be identified, (b) using a subsequent file monitoring process in which student records are randomly selected for compliance reviews until 100% compliance is determined.   
  
For the outstanding LEA with a finding of noncompliance for Indicator 11 in FFY 2019, the state determined through step (a) of the process above that the LEA did not demonstrate 100% compliance in meeting the state-established timeframe by which evaluations must be completed for all initial evaluations in the 2022-23 school year (FFY 2022 data). The state proceeded to step (b) of the process above. The state selected a representative, randomly selected sample of records of students who received parental consent for initial evaluation for eligibility under IDEA in the fall of 2023. These indicator-specific reports were reviewed by OSDE-SES specialists for systemic compliance in January 2024. The LEA demonstrated 100% compliance in the sampled records and the state verified that the LEA was correctly implementing regulatory requirements.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

All child-specific noncompliance for the LEA (the source of noncompliance) was verified as corrected in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR. To verify correction of these individual cases of noncompliance, the LEA was required to submit data showing evidence of completed documentation for identified students. The OSDE-SES reviewed Parent Consent forms and Multidisciplinary Evaluation and Eligibility Group Summary (MEEGS) forms submitted through the statewide online IEP system (OK EdPlan) in order to determine that evaluations were conducted in accordance with the regulatory requirements. OSDE-SES staff reviewed the documentation to determine if the child-specific corrections had been made. The state verified through this process that all individual cases of child-specific noncompliance in the LEA were corrected, albeit late, consistent with OSEP’s QA 23-01.

## 11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the remaining six uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 and the one remaining finding from FFY 2019 were corrected.   
  
When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 and FFY 2019: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.   
  
If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR**

Requisite information has been provided in the Correction of Findings of Noncompliance sections above.

## 11 - OSEP Response

## 11 - Required Actions

# Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priorit**y: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

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

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.

b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.

c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.

e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.

f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday through a State’s policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

**Instructions**

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 12 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 86.72% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 95.94% | 95.38% | 90.75% | 94.11% | 97.57% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination. | 1,554 |
| b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday. | 207 |
| c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. | 906 |
| d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied. | 305 |
| e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays. | 107 |
| f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday through a State’s policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option. | 0 |

| **Measure** | **Numerator (c)** | **Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. | 906 | 935 | 97.57% | 100% | 96.90% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**Number of children who served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f**

29

**Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.**

Maximum range of days past third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed: 195  
  
Reasons for delay reported to the state (a single delay may have multiple reasons):  
LEA failure to follow appropriate procedures: 9  
MEEGS team needed additional data: 4  
Breaks in school calendar and/or staff not on contract: 4  
Delayed referral from Part C: 8  
Parents did not show for scheduled meeting or delayed meeting: 8  
Extreme weather or other atypical events such as pandemics: 0

**Attach PDF table (optional)**

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

All LEAs are required to enter specific data (including "Total referred from Part C", "Total determined 'Not Eligible'; Determination complete before 3rd birthday", "Total determined 'Eligible'; IEP completed before 3rd Birthday", "Total parents that declined services", "Total referred less than 90 days prior to 3rd birthday", "IEP not completed prior to 3rd birthday", "Maximum number of days beyond 3rd birthday IEP completed", as well as the reasons for delay) into the End-of-Year District Data Summary Report through the online IEP system.   
  
The district superintendent must login to the End-of-Year Report and certify the data being submitted is accurate and true. LEAs are monitored through District Data Profiles and comprehensive monitoring. Technical assistance is then provided by compliance and program specialists.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 19 | 16 | 1 | 2 |

**FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

OSDE-SES conducted verification of correct implementation of regulatory requirements for FFY 2021 findings to ensure systemic compliance across each LEA in which findings of noncompliance were issued. This was achieved through a two-part process: (a) reviewing FFY 2022 Indicator 12 data at the individual student record level to determine compliance, and should noncompliance be identified, (b) using a subsequent file monitoring process in which student records are randomly selected for compliance reviews until 100% compliance is determined.   
  
Of the 19 LEAs with findings of noncompliance for Indicator 12 in FFY 2021, the state determined through step (a) of the process above that 16 LEAs demonstrated 100% compliance for Indicator 12 records completed within the 2022-23 school year (FFY 2022 data). Through this subsequent record review, the state verified that the 16 LEAs that were the source of noncompliance were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP’s QA 23-01. For the 3 LEAs that did not demonstrate 100% compliance in the initial evaluation data for FFY 2022, the state proceeded to step (b) of the process above. The state selected a representative, randomly selected sample of records of children who transitioned from Part C to Part B in the fall of 2023. These indicator-specific reports were reviewed by OSDE-SES specialists for systemic compliance in January 2024. Of the 3 LEAs reviewed in step (b), 1 demonstrated 100% compliance in the sampled records and the state verified that this LEA was correctly implementing regulatory requirements subsequent to the conclusion of the one-year timeline. Two (2) LEAs did not demonstrate 100% compliance and are receiving intensive technical assistance that includes corrective action planning and root cause analysis.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

The OSDE-SES annually conducts monitoring activities for 100% of the State’s LEAs to determine if all LEAs are in compliance for Indicator 12. Non-compliance is identified through data submitted by LEAs through the annual June end-of-year data collection as well as specific monitoring activities such as desk audits and onsite visits.   
  
After analyzing data collected for Indicator 12 in June 2022 (FFY 2021 Indicator 12 data), non-compliance was identified in 19 student records across 19 LEAs. The 19 LEAs identified as non-compliant were issued a letter of findings and required to make child-specific corrections within 30 days of receipt of the letter. Subsequently, LEAs were required to submit data showing evidence of completed documentation for identified students. The OSDE-SES reviewed eligibility and IEP documentation through the statewide online IEP system (EDPlan) in order to determine that both were completed in accordance with the regulatory requirements. OSDE-SES staff reviewed the documentation to determine if the child-specific corrections had been made. In addition, when necessary, the OSDE-SES conducted follow-up phone calls to ensure that education records were available for review through the online IEP system. If records were not available for review, LEAs were required to submit the documentation in the children's electronic records.  
  
Through these activities, the state verified that all 19 child-specific records of noncompliance were corrected, albeit late, consistent with OSEP’s QA 23-01.

**FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

If noncompliance is not corrected--meaning LEAs continue to not demonstrate systemic compliance--LEAs are monitored through the differentiated monitoring process for a second consecutive year and are marked as having "longstanding noncompliance" in Indicator 12 on their annual determinations. LEAs identified with continuing noncompliance must revisit their improvement plans from the prior year and review and revise to ensure compliance can be achieved. A subsequent analysis of IEPs is conducted at the end of the school year as described in the prior section ("Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements"). These activities will take place for the 2 LEAs that have not corrected noncompliance or satisfied verification requirements.  
  
If an LEA has been noncompliant (below 95%) for three consecutive years for Indicator 12, the LEA is required to complete the following additional activities:  
o Review the past two years root cause analyses to assist in developing an improvement plan.  
o Use professional development special education grant funds to address the improvement plan implementation. The amount or percentage of funds directed will be determined in consultation with the state.   
o Invite parents of affected students to the school board meeting to participate in the discussions for the plan for improvement.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| FFY 2020 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2020**

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

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

If noncompliance is not corrected--meaning LEAs continue to not demonstrate systemic compliance--LEAs are monitored through the differentiated monitoring process for a second consecutive year and are marked as having "longstanding noncompliance" in Indicator 12 on their annual determinations. LEAs identified with continuing noncompliance must revisit their improvement plans from the prior year and review and revise to ensure compliance can be achieved. A subsequent analysis of IEPs is conducted at the end of the school year as described in the prior section ("Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements"). These activities will take place for the LEA that has not corrected noncompliance or satisfied verification requirements based on the FFY 2020 finding of noncompliance.  
  
If an LEA has been noncompliant (below 95%) for three consecutive years for Indicator 12, the LEA is required to complete the following additional activities:  
o Review the past two years root cause analyses to assist in developing an improvement plan.  
o Use professional development special education grant funds to address the improvement plan implementation. The amount or percentage of funds directed will be determined in consultation with the state.   
o Invite parents of affected students to the school board meeting to participate in the discussions for the plan for improvement.

## 12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.  
If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR**

Requisite information has been provided in the Correction of Findings of Noncompliance sections above.

## 12 - OSEP Response

## 12 - Required Actions

# Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

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

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

**Instructions**

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 13 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2022 | 99.73% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 99.86% | 99.96% | 99.32% | 99.72% | 99.02% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition** | **Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 29,784 | 29,865 | 99.02% | 100% | 99.73% | N/A | N/A |

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

Data on secondary transition are collected through the State's online IEP system through the end of year data collection, collected on July 1 for the prior FY. Secondary transition plans are required to be completed as part of the IEP process in the online system for all students aged 15 or prior to entering 9th grade. Since an LEA cannot complete an IEP within the system without a comprehensive secondary transition plan, the SEA monitors all LEAs that had IDEA-eligible students that did not have one or more compliant IEPs as of June 30 (or prior, in some cases). These LEAs are in non-compliance with Indicator 13.  
  
Indicator 13 – Student who are turning age 15 or before the first day of 9th grade must have an IEP addressing secondary transition completed timely and finalized within 30 calendar days - https://sde.ok.gov/sites/default/files/General%20Supervision%20System%20Final.pdf.

| **Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Do the State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16? | YES |
| If yes, did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age? | YES |
| If yes, at what age are youth included in the data for this indicator | 15 |

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

The state has revised the baseline based on clarified guidance established in the state’s General Supervision manual published July 2023. The manual can be found here: https://sde.ok.gov/sites/default/files/General%20Supervision%20System%20Final.pdf. Within the manual, the following information is provided: “Indicator 13 – Student who are turning age 15 or before the first day of 9th grade must have an IEP addressing secondary transition completed timely and finalized within 30 calendar days.” Given that this is a change to the methodology, the data from FFY 2021 and prior are no longer comparable, necessitating a change in the baseline year, FFY 2022, and data, 99.73%.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 62 | 46 | 10 | 6 |

**FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

OSDE-SES conducted verification of correct implementation of regulatory requirements for FFY 2021 findings to ensure systemic compliance across each LEA in which findings of noncompliance were issued. This was achieved through a two-part process: (a) reviewing FFY 2022 Indicator 13 data at the individual student record level to determine compliance, and should noncompliance be identified, (b) using a subsequent file monitoring process in which student records are randomly selected for compliance reviews until 100% compliance is determined.  
  
Of the 62 LEAs with findings of noncompliance for Indicator 13 in FFY 2021, the state determined through step (a) of the process above 46 LEAs demonstrated 100% compliance for Indicator 13 records completed within the 2022-23 school year (FFY 2022 data). Through this subsequent record review, the state verified that the 46 LEAs that were the source of noncompliance were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP’s QA 23-01. For the 16 LEAs that did not demonstrate 100% compliance in the initial evaluation data for FFY 2022, the state proceeded to step (b) of the process above. The state selected a representative, randomly selected sample of records for secondary students with IEPs in the fall of 2023. These indicator-specific reports were reviewed by OSDE-SES specialists for systemic compliance in January 2024. Of the 16 LEAs reviewed in step (b), 10 demonstrated 100% compliance in the sampled records and the state verified that this LEA was correctly implementing regulatory requirements subsequent to the conclusion of the one-year timeline. Six (6) LEAs did not demonstrate 100% compliance and are receiving intensive technical assistance that includes corrective action planning and root cause analysis.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

All child-specific noncompliance across the LEA (the source of noncompliance) were verified as corrected in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR. To verify correction of these individual cases of noncompliance, LEAs were required to submit data showing evidence of completed documentation for identified students. The OSDE-SES reviewed IEP documentation through the statewide online IEP system (OK EdPlan) in order to determine that the transition plans in the IEPs were conducted in accordance with the regulatory requirements. OSDE-SES staff reviewed the documentation to determine if the child-specific corrections had been made. In addition, when necessary, the OSDE-SES conducted follow-up phone calls to ensure that education records were available for review through the online IEP system. If records were not available for review, LEAs were required to submit the documentation in the children's electronic records. The state verified through this process that all individual cases of child-specific noncompliance were corrected, albeit late, consistent with OSEP’s QA 23-01.

**FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

If noncompliance is not corrected--meaning LEAs continue to not demonstrate systemic compliance--LEAs are monitored through the differentiated monitoring process for a second consecutive year and are marked as having "longstanding noncompliance" in Indicator 13 on their annual determinations. LEAs identified with continuing noncompliance must revisit their improvement plans from the prior year and review and revise to ensure compliance can be achieved. A subsequent analysis of IEPs is conducted at the end of the school year as described in the prior section ("Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements"). These activities will take place for the LEA that has not corrected noncompliance or satisfied verification requirements based on the FFY 2021 finding of noncompliance.  
  
If an LEA has been noncompliant (below 95%) for three consecutive years for Indicator 13, the LEA is required to complete the following additional activities:  
o Review the past two years root cause analyses to assist in developing an improvement plan.  
o Use professional development special education grant funds to address the improvement plan implementation. The amount or percentage of funds directed will be determined in consultation with the state.   
o Invite parents of affected students to the school board meeting to participate in the discussions for the plan for improvement.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| FFY 2020 | 5 | 2 | 3 |
| FFY 2019 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2020**

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

OSDE-SES conducted verification of correct implementation of regulatory requirements for FFY 2020 findings to ensure systemic compliance across each LEA in which findings of noncompliance were issued. This was achieved through a two-part process: (a) reviewing FFY 2022 Indicator 13 data at the individual student record level to determine compliance, and should noncompliance be identified, (b) using a subsequent file monitoring process in which student records are randomly selected for compliance reviews until 100% compliance is determined.  
  
Of the 5 LEAs with remaining findings of noncompliance for Indicator 13 in FFY 2020, the state determined through step (a) of the process above that 2 LEAs demonstrated 100% compliance for Indicator 13 records completed within the 2022-23 school year (FFY 2022 data). Through this subsequent record review, the state verified that the 2 LEAs that were the source of noncompliance were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP’s QA 23-01. For the 3 LEAs that did not demonstrate 100% compliance in the initial evaluation data for FFY 2022, the state proceeded to step (b) of the process above. The state selected a representative, randomly selected sample of records for secondary students with IEPs in the fall of 2023. These indicator-specific reports were reviewed by OSDE-SES specialists for systemic compliance in January 2024. Of the 3 LEAs reviewed in step (b), none demonstrated 100% compliance and accordingly are receiving intensive technical assistance that includes corrective action planning and root cause analysis.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

All child-specific noncompliance across the LEA (the source of noncompliance) were verified as corrected in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR. To verify correction of these individual cases of noncompliance, LEAs were required to submit data showing evidence of completed documentation for identified students. The OSDE-SES reviewed IEP documentation through the statewide online IEP system (OK EdPlan) in order to determine that the transition plans in the IEPs were conducted in accordance with the regulatory requirements. OSDE-SES staff reviewed the documentation to determine if the child-specific corrections had been made. In addition, when necessary, the OSDE-SES conducted follow-up phone calls to ensure that education records were available for review through the online IEP system. If records were not available for review, LEAs were required to submit the documentation in the children's electronic records. The state verified through this process that all individual cases of child-specific noncompliance were corrected, albeit late, consistent with OSEP’s QA 23-01.

**FFY 2020**

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

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

If noncompliance is not corrected--meaning LEAs continue to not demonstrate systemic compliance--LEAs are monitored through the differentiated monitoring process for a second consecutive year and are marked as having "longstanding noncompliance" in Indicator 13 on their annual determinations. LEAs identified with continuing noncompliance must revisit their improvement plans from the prior year and review and revise to ensure compliance can be achieved. A subsequent analysis of IEPs is conducted at the end of the school year as described in the prior section ("Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements"). These activities will take place for the LEA that has not corrected noncompliance or satisfied verification requirements based on the FFY 2020 finding of noncompliance.  
  
If an LEA has been noncompliant (below 95%) for three consecutive years for Indicator 13, the LEA is required to complete the following additional activities:  
o Review the past two years root cause analyses to assist in developing an improvement plan.  
o Use professional development special education grant funds to address the improvement plan implementation. The amount or percentage of funds directed will be determined in consultation with the state.   
o Invite parents of affected students to the school board meeting to participate in the discussions for the plan for improvement.

**FFY 2019**

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

OSDE-SES conducted verification of correct implementation of regulatory requirements for FFY 2019 findings to ensure systemic compliance across each LEA in which findings of noncompliance were issued. This was achieved through a two-part process: (a) reviewing FFY 2022 Indicator 13 data at the individual student record level to determine compliance, and should noncompliance be identified, (b) using a subsequent file monitoring process in which student records are randomly selected for compliance reviews until 100% compliance is determined.  
  
Of the 3 LEAs with remaining findings of noncompliance for Indicator 13 in FFY 2019, the state determined through step (a) of the process above that 1 LEA demonstrated 100% compliance for Indicator 13 records completed within the 2022-23 school year (FFY 2022 data). Through this subsequent record review, the state verified that this 1 LEA that was the source of noncompliance was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP’s QA 23-01. For the 2 LEAs that did not demonstrate 100% compliance in the initial evaluation data for FFY 2022, the state proceeded to step (b) of the process above. The state selected a representative, randomly selected sample of records for secondary students with IEPs in the fall of 2023. These indicator-specific reports were reviewed by OSDE-SES specialists for systemic compliance in January 2024. Of the 2 LEAs reviewed in step (b), none demonstrated 100% compliance and accordingly are receiving intensive technical assistance that includes corrective action planning and root cause analysis.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

All child-specific noncompliance across the LEA (the source of noncompliance) were verified as corrected in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR. To verify correction of these individual cases of noncompliance, LEAs were required to submit data showing evidence of completed documentation for identified students. The OSDE-SES reviewed IEP documentation through the statewide online IEP system (OK EdPlan) in order to determine that the transition plans in the IEPs were conducted in accordance with the regulatory requirements. OSDE-SES staff reviewed the documentation to determine if the child-specific corrections had been made. In addition, when necessary, the OSDE-SES conducted follow-up phone calls to ensure that education records were available for review through the online IEP system. If records were not available for review, LEAs were required to submit the documentation in the children's electronic records. The state verified through this process that all individual cases of child-specific noncompliance were corrected, albeit late, consistent with OSEP’s QA 23-01.

**FFY 2019**

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

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

If noncompliance is not corrected--meaning LEAs continue to not demonstrate systemic compliance--LEAs are monitored through the differentiated monitoring process for a second consecutive year and are marked as having "longstanding noncompliance" in Indicator 13 on their annual determinations. LEAs identified with continuing noncompliance must revisit their improvement plans from the prior year and review and revise to ensure compliance can be achieved. A subsequent analysis of IEPs is conducted at the end of the school year as described in the prior section ("Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements"). These activities will take place for the LEA that has not corrected noncompliance or satisfied verification requirements based on the FFY 2019 finding of noncompliance.  
  
If an LEA has been noncompliant (below 95%) for three consecutive years for Indicator 13, the LEA is required to complete the following additional activities:  
o Review the past two years root cause analyses to assist in developing an improvement plan.  
o Use professional development special education grant funds to address the improvement plan implementation. The amount or percentage of funds directed will be determined in consultation with the state.   
o Invite parents of affected students to the school board meeting to participate in the discussions for the plan for improvement.

## 13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the remaining five uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 and the remaining three findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 were corrected.   
  
When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 and FFY 2019: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.   
  
If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR**

Requisite information has been provided in the Correction of Findings of Noncompliance sections above.

## 13 - OSEP Response

## 13 - Required Actions

# Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.

B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

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

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling****of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school****is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See General Instructions on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Collect data by September 2023 on students who left school during 2021-2022, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2021-2022 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

**I. *Definitions***

*Enrolled in higher education* as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

*Competitive employment* as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment”:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

*Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training* as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

*Some other employment* as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services).

**II. *Data Reporting***

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;

2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);

3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);

4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

**III. *Reporting on the Measures/Indicators***

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school *must* be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

## 14 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| A | 2020 | Target >= | 32.00% | 32.75% | 32.75% | 20.00% | 21.00% |
| A | 20.02% | Data | 24.56% | 26.42% | 22.27% | 20.02% | 19.55% |
| B | 2020 | Target >= | 48.00% | 49.00% | 49.00% | 54.00% | 55.00% |
| B | 54.72% | Data | 60.58% | 57.19% | 51.27% | 54.72% | 54.85% |
| C | 2020 | Target >= | 61.00% | 73.60% | 73.60% | 64.00% | 66.00% |
| C | 64.73% | Data | 76.60% | 73.36% | 70.18% | 64.73% | 70.02% |

**FFY 2021 Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 22.00% | 23.00% | 24.00% | 25.00% |
| Target B >= | 56.00% | 57.00% | 58.00% | 59.00% |
| Target C >= | 68.00% | 70.00% | 72.00% | 74.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Stakeholders were engaged through public meetings and presentations of the SPP/APR and district data profiles at various times during the fiscal year. The majority of stakeholders present at these meetings represented LEAs, but the state parent training and information center (the Oklahoma Parents Center) also participated in meetings and presentations about the APR. Second, stakeholders were engaged via the Part B state advisory panel (SAP). The SAP consists of 31 members who represent a wide range of perspectives on special education, including 17 parents and individuals with disabilities, teachers, LEAs, advocacy groups, service providers, and related public agencies. Indicator information was shared with the SAP members at every meeting in a variety of formats. Reports were also published on a public website for general access (link is provided below).

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census | 7,054 |
| Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school | 1,530 |
| Response Rate | 21.69% |
| 1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school | 275 |
| 2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school | 547 |
| 3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed) | 76 |
| 4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed). | 89 |

| **Measure** | **Number of respondent youth** | **Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Enrolled in higher education (1) | 275 | 1,530 | 19.55% | 22.00% | 17.97% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2) | 822 | 1,530 | 54.85% | 56.00% | 53.73% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4) | 987 | 1,530 | 70.02% | 68.00% | 64.51% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **A** | In FFY 2022, the state had modest slippage of 1.58 percentage points when comparing the Measure A data to FFY 2021. One likely reason for the slippage is the overall statewide decline in college and university enrollment, which over the last 10 years has decreased by over 17 percent. Students have cited the costs of higher education and the need for a steady income as some reasons for lower enrollments. There has been further decrease in the college and university enrollment since the pandemic, which could be the result of families and students still recovering from wages lost during the pandemic or educational impacts of the pandemic. These statewide trends are reflected in the data for students with disabilities enrolling in higher education.  Another contributing factor to the slippage is the decrease in Measure A percentages within five of the largest LEAs in the state. These five LEAs comprised nearly 23% of the total statewide exiting student population and over 17% of the total statewide exiting student respondents to the Indicator 14 survey. When comparing Measure A percentages from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022 for these five LEAs, there was a decrease of 8.90 percentage points. Given these five LEAs comprise almost a fifth of the total respondents for FFY 2022, their substantial decrease in Measure A percentages likely impacted the overall state data. |
| **B** | In FFY 2022, the state had modest slippage of 1.12 percentage points when comparing the Measure B data to FFY 2021. The primary contributor to the slippage for Measure B is the overall slippage in Measure A. To determine the impact of Measure A on the Measure B data, the state removed those students enrolled in higher education from the total for Measure B to isolate those students who were competitively employed. For FFY 2022, there were 547 students competitively employed, comprising 35.75% of the respondent population. As comparison, in FFY 2021 there were 670 students competitively employed, comprising 35.30% of the respondent population. This means there was actually a 0.40 percentage point increase in the number of students competitively employed in FFY 2022. The reasons for the decrease in higher education enrollment have been provided in the slippage statement for Measure A (see above).  Another contributing factor to the slippage is the decrease in Measure B percentages within five of the largest LEAs in the state. These five LEAs comprised nearly 23% of the total statewide exiting student population and over 17% of the total statewide exiting student respondents to the Indicator 14 survey. When comparing Measure B percentages from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022 for these five LEAs, there was a decrease of 2.31 percentage points. Given these five LEAs comprise almost a fifth of the total respondents for FFY 2022, their modest decrease in Measure B percentages likely impacted the overall state data. |
| **C** | In FFY 2022, the state had notable slippage of 5.51 percentage points when comparing the Measure C data to FFY 2021. When analyzing the data for Measure C, the state determined that the primary reasons for slippage were due to the decrease in enrollment in higher education (Measure A) and the decrease in students enrolled in other postsecondary education or training or engaged in some other employment (not competitive). The state isolated data for students enrolled in other postsecondary education or training or engaged in some other employment for both FFY 2022 and FFY 2021 to ascertain differences. For FFY 2022, there were 165 students competitively employed, comprising 10.78% of the respondent population. As comparison, in FFY 2021 there were 288 students competitively employed, comprising 15.17% of the respondent population. This indicates a there was 4.39 percentage point decrease in the number of students enrolled in other postsecondary education or training or engaged in some other employment. This decrease may be the result of a decline in enrollment in educational programs after high school, for the reasons cited in the slippage statement for Measure A, and/or the modest increase students competitively employed.  Another contributing factor to the slippage is the decrease in Measure C percentages within five of the largest LEAs in the state. These five LEAs comprised nearly 23% of the total statewide exiting student population and over 17% of the total statewide exiting student respondents to the Indicator 14 survey. When comparing Measure C percentages from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022 for these five LEAs, there was a decrease of 9.67 percentage points. Given these five LEAs comprise almost a fifth of the total respondents for FFY 2022, their substantial decrease in Measure C percentages likely impacted the overall state data. |

**Please select the reporting option your State is using:**

Option 2: Report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

**Response Rate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** |
| Response Rate | 26.16% | 21.69% |

**Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).**

The State uses a statistical formula (Z-test for two population proportions) to determine if two proportions (i.e., % of surveys received versus % of families in the target population) should be considered statistically different. A p-value less than 0.05 indicates a statistically significant difference between the proportions (non-representativeness).

**Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.**

As shown in the demographic comparisons below, the pool of respondents resembles the sampling frame in most categories. Significance tests were conducted to assess whether the differences in proportions between the entire population and the respondents were significant. There were several groups that demonstrated statistically significant differences between the respondents and the population.   
  
When analyzing gender (Table 1), the differences between the response rates for both males and females were not statistically significant. Thus, based on the metric established by the state, both genders reported are considered representative.   
  
Table 1:   
Gender Resp Rate Exiting Data Rate Diff in Rates P-Value  
Female 34.58% 36.04% -1.46 0.27572  
Male 65.42% 63.96% +1.46 0.27572  
   
Regarding race and ethnicity representation (Table 2), the differences in the response rate for both White/Caucasian students and students of two or more races compared to their population rate were statistically significant. However, for the other 5 racial/ethnic groups, the data (based on the state metric) are representative.   
  
Table 2:   
Race/Ethnicity Resp Rate Exiting Data Rate Diff in Rates P-Value  
Native American 13.40% 13.48% -0.08 0.93624  
Asian 0.46% 0.60% -0.14 0.93624  
Black/African Am. 12.29% 12.28% +0.01 1.00   
Hispanic or Latino 14.84% 15.99% -1.15 0.26272  
Pacific Islander 0.07% 0.18% -0.11 0.30772  
Two+ Races 8.76% 11.13% -2.37 0.00634  
White/Caucasian 50.20% 46.34% +3.86 0.00596  
  
For exit reasons (Table 3), the differences in the response rates for all three reported exit categories compared to their population rates were statistically significant. Students who dropped out of school were substantially less likely to respond to the survey than graduates. Thus, the survey results over-represent the current status of graduates compared to dropouts.  
  
Table 3:   
Exit Reason Resp Rate Exiting Data Rate Diff in Rates P-Value  
Dropped out 3.33% 19.21% -15.88 <0.00001   
Graduated 96.41% 80.73% +15.68 <0.00001   
Other 0.26% 0.06% +0.20 0.01552

**The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)**

NO

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

To ensure that data are representative, it is imperative to have strong response rates that strongly reflect the overall population of exiters that the state captures annually. In prompts below, the state outlines the efforts being made to increase response rates. Among these efforts is the state’s work to improve low response rates due to inaccurate contact information and leavers’ unwillingness to respond to the survey request. LEAs have begun to assist the state by updating contact information just prior to graduation and by raising awareness of the importance of the survey among personnel. This still presents challenges for those students not graduating, and the state will continue supporting LEAs in designing improved ways to retain updated contact information for all students. To address over- and underrepresentation related race/ethnicity and exit reasons, OSDE-SES personnel and stakeholders such as the Oklahoma Transition Council also continue to work to collaborate with LEAs and support development additional strategies to encourage participation. One such strategy that has been successful is allowing LEAs to manage their own survey collection, which has historically resulted in much higher local response rates. More LEAs have expressed interest in conducting their own surveys, and the state anticipates that these avenues to increase response rate will also in turn increase representativeness.

**Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.**

The pool of possible respondents included all secondary school leavers in SY 2021-22 aged 16 and older. There were 7204 exiters identified, based on the state’s Section 618 Exiting submission (EDFacts file FS009) for the 2021-22 school year. All contact information for these exiters was shared with the contracted polling organization. Of these, 1530 could be contacted and were willing to respond to the survey. The state saw a decrease of 4.47 percentage points in response rate for the FFY 2022 submission (21.69%) when compared to the response rate from FFY 2021 (26.16%). However, the response rate for FFY 2022 remains considerably larger than prior years, which indicates that efforts the state continues to make to increase response rates has had a positive impact longitudinally.   
  
The state recognizes that lower response rates result in data that may not be representative and contribute to potential nonresponse bias. OSDE-SES has directed its contracted polling organization to conduct surveys equitably, regardless of student demographics. All exiters are contacted in a variety of ways, and weighted sampling is not conducted. The polling organization attempts to contact exiters multiple times if the contact information is not "unreachable." The state has also worked to improve contact information for exiters to ensure they indeed can be reached by encouraging LEAs to update contacts at the end of students' senior year. Oklahoma has also encouraged LEAs to collect their own survey responses. LEAs who make their own calls have found it easier to find missing contact information or to update that information when it has changed, ensuring that more students are included in the response pool. Exiters may also be more willing to respond to communications from their former LEA and participate in the survey by virtue of a historic relationship with the LEA and its staff. We expect that if the response rate increases through the efforts described previously, then the respondent pool will continue to become more representative.

**Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.**

Non-response bias may occur when a sub-section of exiters is unwilling or unable to respond to a survey. The error comes from the absence of participants and not from collecting erroneous data. Each student exiting with the reason of dropping out, graduating with a diploma, and reaching maximum age is supposed to be offered an opportunity to complete the exiter survey within one year of leaving high school. To reflect this expectation, our total count of students who are contacted is the full population of exiters meeting the aforementioned criteria based on the state’s Section 618 Exiting file.   
  
To analyze nonresponse bias, the state reviewed student engagement data for different groups to ascertain if their survey responses and levels of engagement were meaningfully different from the statewide data. When looking at data and determining potential nonresponse bias for the category of race/ethnicity, the representativeness analysis indicated responses for exiters of two or more races were underrepresented by 2.37 percentage points. Conversely, the responses for White/Caucasian exiters were overrepresented by an average of 3.86 percentage points. When reviewing disaggregated responses to survey questions by racial/ethnic group, the state determined that exiters of two or more races had engagement percentages for Measures A, B, and C that were all slightly higher than the state data. This same trend existed for the overrepresented group of White/Caucasian exiters. The underrepresentation of exiters of two or more races, coupled with their engagement percentages that were slightly higher than the state averages, could indicate that were the group representative of the exiter population, the statewide rates for Measures A, B, and C might be marginally higher. On the other hand, the notable overrepresentation of White/Caucasian exiters, who also reported slightly higher engagement percentages when compared to state averages, could indicate that were this group of the exiter population appropriately representative, the state averages could be marginally lower for each of the indicator measures.   
  
When looking at data and determining potential nonresponse bias for the category of exit reason, the representativeness analysis indicated responses from students exiting with the reason of dropping out were substantially underrepresentated (15.88 percentage points). Conversely, the responses for students exiting with the reason of graduated with a high school diploma were substantially overrepresented (15.68 percentage points). When reviewing disaggregated responses to survey questions by exit reason group, the state determined that students exiting with the reason of dropping out had engagement percentages for Measures A, B, and C that were all significantly lower than the state averages reported for each indicator measure. However, this trend was different for those students exiting with a high school diploma. Students with this exit reason demonstrated slightly higher percentages across all three engagement measures when compared to the state averages. Based on the substantial differences in the engagement rates of students exiting with the reason of dropping out, coupled with the notable underrepresentation of this demographics category, it is likely that state averages for Measures A, B, and C would be lower were the responses from students who dropped out actual representative of the exiter population. It should be noted that those exiters exiting with a reason of “other” (for this year, this reflects students who exited with the reason of meeting the maximum age for services) comprised an extremely small percentage of the respondent population (0.26%) and the target population (0.06%), resulting in a very small overrepresentation of 0.20 percentage points. All respondents from this exit category reported 0.00% engagement across all three indicator measures. Given the very small percentage of the respondent population, it is difficult for the state to make any meaningful conclusions about these data and their impact on state averages.  
  
Through the state’s analysis of the nonresponse bias, while there were not drastic differences in the engagement responses for students in groups over- and underrepresented predicated on race/ethnicity, there were substantial differences in responses for groups over- and underrepresentated based on exit reason. Given these findings, there is some indication of potential nonresponse bias that could impact overall state data. In order to address the possible nonresponse bias identified, the state will continue making concerted efforts to improve the survey response rate, which should in turn address representativeness challenges that significantly contribute to nonresponse bias. As well, the state will look into the possibility of weighting data in future years to control for nonresponse bias and provide satisfaction rates that may more accurately reflect statewide post-school outcomes.

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | NO |
| **Survey Question** | **Yes / No** |
| Was a survey used? | YES |
| If yes, is it a new or revised survey? | NO |

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

## 14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR**

See details in the fields related to representativeness, response rates, and nonresponse bias above.

## 14 - OSEP Response

## 14 - Required Actions

# Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Results Indicator:** Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

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

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED*Facts* Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/15/2023 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 9 |
| SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/15/2023 | 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 2 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Stakeholders were engaged through public meetings and presentations of the SPP/APR and district data profiles at various times during the fiscal year. The majority of stakeholders present at these meetings represented LEAs, but the state parent training and information center (the Oklahoma Parents Center) also participated in meetings and presentations about the APR. Second, stakeholders were engaged via the Part B state advisory panel (SAP). The SAP consists of 31 members who represent a wide range of perspectives on special education, including 17 parents and individuals with disabilities, teachers, LEAs, advocacy groups, service providers, and related public agencies. Indicator information was shared with the SAP members at every meeting in a variety of formats. Reports were also published on a public website for general access (link is provided below).

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2012 | 62.50% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Target >= | 65.00% - 70.00% | 65.00% - 70.00% | 65.00%-70.00% | 70.00% | 70.00% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 87.50% | 85.71% | 16.67% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 70.00% | 70.00% | 70.00% | 70.00% |

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

| **3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements** | **3.1 Number of resolutions sessions** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2 | 9 | 16.67% | 70.00% | 22.22% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**Targets**

| **FFY** | 2022 (low) | 2022 (high) | 2023 (low) | 2023 (high) | 2024 (low) | 2024 (high) | 2025 (low) | 2025 (high) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target >= | 70.00% |  | 70.00% |  | 70.00% |  | 70.00% |  |

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

| **3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements** | **3.1 Number of resolutions sessions** | **FFY 2021 Data** | FFY 2022 Target (low) | FFY 2022 Target (high) | FFY 2022 Data | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2 | 9 | 16.67% | 70.00% |  | 22.22% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

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

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2022 and accordingly was not required to set baselines or targets for this indicator.

## 15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 15 - OSEP Response

## 15 - Required Actions

# Indicator 16: Mediation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Results indicator:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED*Facts* Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 16 - Indicator Data

**Select yes to use target ranges**

Target Range not used

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/15/2023 | 2.1 Mediations held | 12 |
| SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/15/2023 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 0 |
| SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/15/2023 | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | 10 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Stakeholders were engaged through public meetings and presentations of the SPP/APR and district data profiles at various times during the fiscal year. The majority of stakeholders present at these meetings represented LEAs, but the state parent training and information center (the Oklahoma Parents Center) also participated in meetings and presentations about the APR. Second, stakeholders were engaged via the Part B state advisory panel (SAP). The SAP consists of 31 members who represent a wide range of perspectives on special education, including 17 parents and individuals with disabilities, teachers, LEAs, advocacy groups, service providers, and related public agencies. Indicator information was shared with the SAP members at every meeting in a variety of formats. Reports were also published on a public website for general access (link is provided below).

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 92.31% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Target >= | 84.25% | 85.00% | 85.00% | 70.00% | 70.00% |
| Data | 60.00% | 84.62% | 88.89% | 100.00% | 80.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 70.00% | 70.00% | 70.00% | 70.00% |

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

| **2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints** | **2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints** | **2.1 Number of mediations held** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 10 | 12 | 80.00% | 70.00% | 83.33% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

## 16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 16 - OSEP Response

## 16 - Required Actions

# Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** General Supervision

The State’s SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

**Measurement**

The State’s SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

**Instructions**

**Baseline Data*:*** The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) (SiMR) for Children with Disabilities.

**Targets*:*** In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State’s FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State’s baseline data.

**Updated Data:** In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2022 through February 2027, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State’s targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

*Phase I: Analysis:*

- Data Analysis;

- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;

- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;

- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and

- Theory of Action.

*Phase II: Plan* (which, is in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates)) outlined above):

- Infrastructure Development;

- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and

- Evaluation.

*Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation* (which, is in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates)) outlined above):

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

**Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP**

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

***Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation***

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, (e.g., a logic model) of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State’s last SSIP submission (i.e., February 1, 2023). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

## 17 - Indicator Data

**Section A: Data Analysis**

**What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?**

BY FFY 2025, Oklahoma will see improved early literacy skills in targeted low-performing schools as identified by the state’s ESSA Plan.

**Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (*e.g.*, a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)**

YES

**Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.**

The state is including students in grade KG through third in schools that have been determined as Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) school sites. For this reporting period, there are 4 schools in the cohort included.

**Is the State’s theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Please provide a link to the current theory of action.**

Theory of Action   
https://sde.ok.gov/sites/default/files/Theory%20of%20Change.pdf

**Progress toward the SiMR**

**Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages)*.***

**Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 50.44% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **Current Relationship** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | Data must be greater than or equal to the target | 52.00% | 53.50% | 55.00% | 56.50% |

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | FFY 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | **Status** | **Slippage** |
|  |  | 47.67% | 52.00% |  | N/A | N/A |

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2022 data.**

The data source for the SiMR is the aggregated dataset of benchmark results on preapproved screeners that assess reading skills in grades kindergarten through third. All elementary sites submit this data annually to the SEA.

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

Oklahoma Statute 70 O.S. § 1210.508C requires that each student in kindergarten through third grade is assessed at three points during the school year for a variety of critical reading skills. Screeners used by LEAs must be pre-approved by the SEA. LEAs collect reading screening results to submit to the SEA semi-annually. The datasets are processed at the end of each school year to produce an aggregated table of site-level results to monitor site improvement over time. The SiMR is calculated from the aggregated table of screener results. As described previously, the SiMR is calculated only using the benchmark data from elementary school sites identified as ATSI at the most recent designation. ATSI designations are made every three years using the prior three years of state ‘school report card’ results. The annual school report card measures several school indicators of quality, including assessment proficiency rates and rates of growth, chronic absenteeism, graduation, English language learner progress, and post-secondary opportunities. The current set of sites were identified using the prior three years of data. The SiMR calculation is made by identifying the number of students in grades KG through 3 at all elementary ATSI sites who a) demonstrated reading sufficiency on an approved screener at the beginning of the year or b) improved to demonstrate sufficiency (scoring “on level”) at the end of the year. That number is divided by the total number of KG to third grade students who were screened during the school year, minus those who exited the sites over the course of the year.

**Optional: Has the State collected additional data *(i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey)* that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)**

NO

**Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

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

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

Evaluation Plan SSIP -Bpdf.pdf (ok.gov)   
https://sde.ok.gov/sites/default/files/Evaluation%20Plan%20SSIP%20-Bpdf.pdf   
State Systemic Improvement Plan | Oklahoma State Department of Education

**Is the State’s evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:**

The focus for this reporting period has been to continue development of infrastructure and begin implementation of the strategies determined. The entire framework has been developed and the second year of implementation has begun for the professional development sequence and the pilot year for instructional coaching. The next phase will consist of adjustments to implementation and continued implementation. There are two overall infrastructure goals:   
Goal 1: The Oklahoma State Department of Education will institute and maintain a state leadership structure to support the adoption of a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) framework to address literacy challenges.   
Goal 2: The Oklahoma State Department of Education will provide access and continued monitoring of resources, professional development, and coaching of evidence-based practices increased support at tiered levels, to provide opportunities to develop high quality school site teams in grades K-3 that consistently implement evidence-based practices that support early literacy strategies.   
   
Goal one was established during the previous two reporting periods and provided the framework to support the overall implementation of the remaining infrastructure and activities. The state leadership team comprises of an SSIP Lead, an SSIP Instructional Coach, the Director of Data Analysis from the Office of Special Education, the Director of the State Personnel Development Grant, the Director of Special Education Programs, and the Director of the SSIP-Part C. This team meets monthly to determine programming changes and adjustments. This team also ensures ongoing collaboration with the events and efforts of the Office of Special Education Services. The state has developed a partnership with the Office of School Support to support low performing school sites. Additionally, the state has used surveys and data to determine programmatic changes needed for future planning.   
Goal two is ongoing. The SSIP has developed an online platform to access the resources, provide professional development, and has begun coaching with virtual and in-person tools. These platforms provide quick access for participants to use the tools and resources. These tools support the implementation of the program through infrastructural support. Schools are able to access these materials and their usage is important for their implementation of evidence-based practice explicitly taught and supported with the SSIP. Additional collaborations with OKMTSS Data System supports the ongoing implementation of these practices at a student level.

**Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.**

The first goal and set of strategies have been continuously maintained since the last report and remain to be critical to support the sustainability of the system. Slight improvements to the practice have been utilized to support sustainability. All other outcomes are indicated in the link provided to the evaluation plan.   
Governance: OKMTSS has developed a partnership with Low Performing School Site (LPSS) designations are coordinated in their efforts for systemic change. The SSIP has been a pivotal part of these conversations and has contributed to long-term programmatic change. Collaboration with agencies has continued to sustain commitment to the project. The revision and improvement process has collaborated with SPDG to support relevant updates and alignment. As the pilot year for instructional coaching is continuing, it is determined that system changes must occur to improve outcomes, these specific changes are referenced below. Considerations for evidence-based practices provided in each level of support is determined through data collection, school advocacy, and written procedures of school risk to ensure that the framework of MTSS is best used as the tiered delivery model. As this is the pilot year, the feedback mechanisms exist but the usage is limited to the current participation pool. With the continued collaboration, improved feedback mechanisms are at the forefront.  
  
Data: Surveys have indicated the project has been successful and offer opportunities for stakeholders to voice needs for change. These surveys supported endorsement to program changes. The self-assessment process began in May 2023 with efforts to address the high needs areas. The platform has migrated to a more user-friendly system but has different limitations to collect usage data. SSIP is working with internal processes to improve data collection of usage.   
  
Finance: The SSIP has maintained collaboration with the Office of Special Education for usage of funds for conference provision, personnel, and activities. Currently the SSIP activities follow a state project funding opportunity allowing schools to reimburse for substitutes and travel. In the future, it would be a long-term goal to ensure that participation in the SSIP would receive a stipend provided by the OSDE.   
  
Accountability/Monitoring: Following an application, data collection regarding site participation has been collected monthly and a cohesive partnership with frequent conversations has been developed. However, through tools used with the new OKMTSS System, improved collection is possible to move towards.  
  
Quality Standards: Through the usage of internal processes the SSIP products have been assessed internally to determine quality and delivery. All evidence-based practices and resources have citations available for reference. The agency has collaborated on the development of tools with external collaborations with NCII, NCSI, AIR, and others.   
  
Professional development/technical assistance: Stakeholders provided input regarding scope and sequence and the desire for additional instructional coaching supports. The professional development sequence has been well attended and feedback has been positive for additional supports. In this way, the SSIP will scale up supports to provide more intensive supports for the tier 2 applying group.   
   
The SSIP website contains an infographic describing relevant goal information and achievements of the program. As the program progresses to full implementation the infographic will include additional information relevant to the full scope of the project.

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

NO

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

The existing framework (Tier 1, universal access to the intervention library and conference; Tier 2, professional development sequence; Tier 3, direct instructional coaching) has been determined that it is not meeting all the reported needs of the applying sites and those who are not selected for programming. During the tier 3 action of coaching, the coach observed leadership challenges that heavily impacted educator implementation. Following this experience, at the data retreat, the participating leaders from sites, indicated that they needed more support for their implementation. They enjoyed the in-person event and wanted more events that were supportive of their small group of leaders. When speaking with the Office of School Support, the schools they are working with to coach and support, also indicate that they are in need of more guidance on how to implement the tools that are presented to them as resources. Looking at SSIP professional development data, the team has analyzed that the schools that are participating with success have engaged leadership and the schools that are not participating with success do not have engaged leadership.   
Therefore, the deliverable activities will shift. The current plan is as follows: Tier 1, universal access to the intervention library and conference; Tier 2, professional development sequence; Tier 3, direct instructional coaching. The newly proposed plan is as follows: Tier 1, universal access to the intervention library, conference, and professional development sequence; Tier 2, newly designed site leadership coaching; Tier 3, no change, to the direct instructional coaching supports. This change has been supported by stakeholders as they have asked for these adjustments during surveys and feedback during provided professional development. The intention is to pilot the new site leadership coaching series for the remainder of the 2023 school year before onboarding a cohort of participating schools in 2024.   
In addition to programmatic changes, slight data collection improvements will be made through a new data management system used by educators in the state. Schools partnering with the project will be required to use this platform. Additionally, improved data collection to determine the implementation of all taught evidence-based practices in the state will be collected with all schools who use the platform. The evidence-based practices taught in the SSIP are embedded into the platform. Through the usage of the newly implemented platform named OKMTSS, sites will be able to track evidence-based implementation of interventions and the SSIP will be able to quantify the implementation of the practices more accurately and effectively. This change will begin piloting in January 2024 and will be immersed in the process for SSIP in August 2024, pending unforeseen circumstances.

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

A full list of all the evidence-based protocols and fidelity measures (as added) will be accessible on the OKMTSS website. OK Multi-Tiered System of Supports | Oklahoma State Department of Education (sde.ok.gov/okmtss) The focus of each of these tools is available and explicitly taught in the professional development sequence listed below:  
• Universal Design for Learning  
• Accommodations and Modifications  
• Multi-tiered Systems of Support  
• Implementing Interventions  
• Oral language  
• Phonology  
• Phonics  
• Word Study  
• Fluency  
• Vocabulary  
• Comprehension  
• Implementation

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

Universal Design for Learning   
The framework of universal design for learning focuses on three components; multiple representation of content, means of engagement, and options for expression. Practices taught regarding implementation of instructional practices focusing on multiple representation of content include strategies to deepen educator planning, provide visual components to phonological skills, and empower the teacher and student to create visual graphics collaboratively.   
Accommodations & Modifications   
Accommodations are divided into four variations: time, size, input, and output. Specific examples and case studies are provided to allow participants to critically think about their understanding as it relates to data driven decisions regarding accommodation and modification provisions. The module encourages data driven decisions for educators to consider when selecting accommodations and modifications. Additionally, references to the location of the provision of accommodations and modification is discussed in the synchronous training.   
MTSS Tiered Framework   
Multi-tiered system of supports is an evidence-based framework model of schooling that emphasizes key components involving universal screening to target early identification of skill deficits, tiers of interventions that can be intensified in response to levels of need, progress monitoring using data driven decision making procedures, and fidelity of the evidence-based interventions being implemented as prescribed.   
Implementing Interventions   
Evidence-based instructional strategies taught in this module are intended to be adjusted as students’ specific needs are addressed through the intervention intensity framework guidelines. Participants learn about the seven components of adjusting intensive interventions, strength, dosage, alignment, attention to transfer, comprehensiveness, behavioral or academic support, and individualization. Participants are guided to provide explicit instruction during repeated practice intervention opportunities. Within the module, participants develop their understanding of progress monitoring and how it relates to the intervention provided.   
Literacy Sequence   
The literacy sequence is comprised of nine modules focusing on oral language, phonology, phonics, word study, recap, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension, and implementation. Each of these modules address the terms and misconceptions commonly associated with these areas of literacy. The modules also expound upon structured literacy and the dyslexia/ dysgraphia training required by state legislation. Each module begins with an introduction to the content, a description of relevant possible student level data to consider, evidence-based practices that could address student deficit with regard to intervention intensity, common progress monitoring considerations, and best practices for involving families in this work.   
Intervention Library  
There are intentional stop points during the module that encourage family engagement in regard to each area. All the interventions that are explicitly taught in these modules are provided on the sde.ok.gov/okmtss academic intervention library (K-3 literacy tagged). These interventions are expanded with a lesson plan/intervention protocol, a fidelity check, and any resources needed to support the implementation. The list below indicates the current literacy practices listed on the website.   
5, 15, 45  
Accordion Foldable  
Accuracy: Decoding Phrases  
Accuracy: Letter-Sound Practice  
Accuracy: Preview Text  
Activating prior knowledge: KWL  
Add a Sentence Part  
Alliteration Thumbs Up Thumbs Down  
Arm Blending   
Arm Segmenting  
Blending Clapped Syllables  
Build A Word (Onset Rime)  
Call and Response  
Choice Board/Choice Menu  
Clapping Sentences  
Clapping Syllables  
Color Coding Paragraph Writing  
Color Coding Words  
COPS Editing Strategy  
Cover, Copy, Compare  
Create a Topic Sentence   
Cued Writing Activities   
Elkonin Sound Boxes  
Elkonin Sound Boxes with Encoding Support  
Explicit Instruction  
Folding In  
Four Corners  
Four Types of Sentences  
Generating alliteration  
Generating rhymes  
Graphic Organizers: Student  
Graphic Organizers: Teacher  
Identify the Sentence That Does Not Belong   
Identify the Topic Sentence   
Identifying Non-Alliteration  
Identifying Non-Rhymes  
Key Words in Parenthesis  
Letter Sound Games  
Open/Closed Syllable Sort  
Phoneme Matching  
Previewing Text: Background Knowledge  
Prosody: Choral Reading  
Prosody: Reader's Theater  
Questioning: Wh- Questions  
Rate & Prosody: I read, You Read  
Rate: Sight Phrases  
Rate: Stairstep Story  
Repeated Practice: General  
Rhyming: Thumbs Up Thumbs Down  
Semantic Feature Analysis  
Semantic Mapping/ Word Webs  
Sentence Combining  
Sentence Elaboration   
Sentence or Fragement  
Sentence Part Cards  
Sentence Scrambles  
Silent "e" Find  
Silent "e" Word Sort  
Slicing Onset/Rime  
Slicing Sentences  
Slicing Syllables  
Student Checklists  
Student Grouping  
Teach Transition Words and Phrases   
Teacher Checklists  
Text to Self  
Text to Text  
Think Aloud  
Think-Pair-Share  
Time Delay  
Token Onset/Rime Blending  
Token Onset/Rime Segmenting  
Token sentence segmentation  
Token Sound Manipulation   
Topic Web- Written Expression  
Two Sentence Parts  
Two-Column Notes  
Use Mentor Text Examples   
Visualizing  
Vowel & Consonant Identification  
Word Sorting  
Word study sets  
Writing Templates

**Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.**

The SSIP supports are intended to impact the SiMR by supporting districts at their level of need to create or adjust site policies, procedures and practices that directly impact their ability to provide instruction to students with evidence-based practices in their classrooms. The overlap of these tiered supports is intended to support various levels of school personnel including site administration, teacher, caregiver, in their ability to directly instruct students with evidence-based practices focused on early literacy outcomes. With specific sequenced focus on early literacy and the evidence-based practices, the SLT anticipates incremental change that can grow to statistically significant change over the course of the project.   
   
Universal supports (Tier 1) are available to all K-3 educators and parents via a state-owned website. The materials are organized to meet the needs of the SiMR focusing on evidence-based instructional protocols that educators and parents can follow to support identified student deficits. These deficits, when intervened by matching an evidence-based intervention to the targeted skill deficit, will have a significant impact on student outcomes related to the SiMR. The available intervention tracking tool to be accessible in January 2024 , will be an additional tool to strengthen use of the evidence-based practices. These available tools provide schools access to tools that will impact their program policies. In addition, they are available for educators to implement promptly into their instruction and include fidelity assessments to ensure that the provision of the tools are appropriately implemented.   
   
Schools utilizing the professional development sequence (Tier 2) are accessing explicit technical assistance regarding how to use the library of evidence-based practices via the universal supports (Tier1) website. This explicit instruction to participants is intended to support educator understanding regarding nuanced application and create a common language to support adjustments in site level procedures. Additionally, the modules provide opportunity for sites to determine program changes for their schools. The conversations derived from the modules and live virtual training are intended to support educator practice by discussing implementation.   
  
Schools using the Tier 3 instructional coaching, participants are provided explicit and direct support to implement literacy changes for their students, as well as documented implementation of fidelity of practices. This level of support is the most intensive and provides specific, individual support that takes into account student outcomes as the implementation is conducted.

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

In addition to supporting data collected as described in sections above, content quizzes, implementation surveys, and feedback surveys, the team has met monthly to monitor fidelity, monitor accurate implementation, and to discuss any modifications necessary. Continuous reference to the evaluation plan ensured that identified activities and tasks were upkept to the determined timelines. The SLT utilized a live working document to track actions monthly and completion of tasks. In addition, in May 2023, the SSIP team conducted an internal assessment using an State Systems Fidelity Inventory (SSFI) tool to determine the actions that were supported well with the SSIP and those that needed more focus. This internal assessment also supported a change for deliverables.  
The state has collected self-reported implementation data at regular intervals regarding the module topics, out of the six intervals, the average implementation scores out of 40 is 25 or 62%. This data point indicates the frequency of self-reported implementation strategies. These implementation scores are taken after the completion of the modules. Implementation surveys provide insight into additional need for support and the methods in which participants are utilizing their increased knowledge. However, the state has partnered with the Public Consulting Group (PCG) to use a tool named OKMTSS that allows for tracking of interventions provided. The SSIP team will use this moving forward for the next implementation year to have more accurate data regarding implementation of evidence-based practices, as the current implementation data relies on self-reporting.  
Upon the completion of IMPACT Cycles (Jim Knight’s coined term for a coaching cycle) with the Tier 3 instructional coaching provided to teachers, fidelity of intervention usage, and IMPACT cycle completion will be scored. At this time, one semester of coaching has completed, and data will be collected and analyzed in the spring of 2024.

**Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.**

The State has collected data regarding the progress towards the completion of the determined evaluation measures. Tier 1, universal supports, defined as a resource library that provides access to evidence-based protocols for all K-3 educators within the state. A quarterly survey regarding usage has been posted twice within the pilot year. As of December 2023, 450 educators were connected via this platform. As requested by the survey feedback, users struggled with ease of access of the materials and therefore the new platform has been developed and published. However, the platform has transitioned to a website that is more user friendly but does not offer the same level of data collection. The SSIP team is determining the best tools to use to access the data.   
Tier 2 (professional development) participation for cohort one began with four school sites participating, as of December 2023, cohort one continued partnership with two school sites, with one site being dismissed and one site removing themselves from the partnership. Cohort two began with 24 sites and have 20 sites continuing the first year of implementation. Within the tier 2 professional development sequence (Implementation Goal 1: Strategy 1) participants will have completed content-based quizzes to assess the quantity of content gained from asynchronous modules, with four modules completed the total average is an increase in 16.2 percent. This data point determines the effectiveness of the module as a whole and how participants are gaining increased knowledge to support their practice, ultimately improving the SiMR. In addition, the state has also collected professional development feedback survey data. After the conclusion of three synchronous PD events, the average responses lean towards “strongly agree” and indicate participants are finding value in the project. This supports the continued participation in the project towards the SiMR.   
The third tier of support begun in August of 2023. There have been 10 educators onboarded in 2 schools. As of December 2023, a total of 14 weeks of instructional coaching was provided. Each educator has had an average of 11 hours of direct coaching support. Scheduling has been a barrier to increasing hours of coaching, cameras have been requested but are still not purchased at this time, preventing educators from being able to observe themselves as a part of the process. As of December 2023, seven IMPACT cycles (Jim Knight’s coined term for a coaching cycle comprised of Identify a goal, Learn an instructional strategy, and Improve the strategy) have been completed with seven goals being reached. Anecdotal evidence of improved outcomes includes an increase in special education services for one school site and scheduling adjustments to best set up infrastructure to support student outcomes.

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

Improvements and strengthening of the SSIP framework at all levels will provide a stronger attainment of the anticipated outcomes. The intervention library will become more robust with fidelity measures for each protocol provided. Data collection tools to support the ongoing usage and feedback of these tools will exist within the OKMTSS intervention platform. Data collection regarding the usage of EBP will be more accurate through this platform. The reading conference will engage participants with a hands-on approach to the intervention library and MTSS. The professional development sequence will continue as designed but will be open to schools to participate without application. A new deliverable will include a fidelity assessment and targeted leadership coaching to support implementation of the professional development sequence as designed. The anticipated scale up for coaching will continue as expected. The SSIP team anticipates to onboard 10 more educators in K-3 for coaching supports, bringing the total number of educators to 20 for the coaching tier. Ideally, these educators will be selected in 2 additional school sites.

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

NO

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

Based on stakeholder feedback, the transition of the Tier 2 supports (professional development) will be more widely accessible through Tier 1 supports and the targeted supports will focus on leadership coaching. Beginning in February 2024 the SSIP team will pilot the leadership coaching with 2 sites currently participating in the SSIP. In August 2024, the SSIP team will fully transition towards providing leadership coaching to support sites implementation of the Tier 1 supports. Leadership coaching will consist of monthly meetings with the designated staff at each site to develop agendas, scheduling, and related discussion regarding the professional development topics.   
This decision was indicated as necessary from stakeholders as they are asking to participate in the professional development opportunities more frequently and as administrative teams are looking for more direct support for their leadership teams. As determined in dismissals and ending partnerships from cohort one for professional development, the need lies in implementing the conversations and discussion for sites to be able to make data-driven decision procedures. Through SSIP coaching and in-person events, the conversations from participating schools have indicated that they need more guidance to implement the evidence-based practices with individual support. As many of our participating schools are rural districts, their ability to engage personnel or community partnerships to enhance their systems pose a challenge. Currently, many of the state provided tools recommend a path towards implementation that many of our schools need support to implement independently. The SSIP seeks to mitigate this gap through individual site coaching to support the implementation and outcomes.

**Section C: Stakeholder Engagement**

Description of Stakeholder Input

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

The SSIP team coordinated with OSDE’s Office of Family and Community Engagement to gather parent stakeholders through their existing procedures. This Office was undergoing a revision and meetings discussed improvements in their ability to reach out to parents in new capacities. The SSIP team published a survey gathering contact information from parents that were interested in supporting the SSIP. As of December 2023, four parents had completed in the survey. Parents who had formally been associated with the SSIP no longer indicated participation when directly contacted to continue their participation. Parent stakeholders are also able to participate through IDEA-B panel. Ongoing effort to gather more parent stakeholders continues. In the pilot of the site level leadership coaching, the site will engage parents as a part of the required leaders on the meeting.

**Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.**

School site stakeholders desired access to the full tiered support when they were not within the designation determination. The leadership coaching will focus on the establishment of processes and practices (systems support) that will enable teachers to better implement the EBPs described above. The state made the universal supports access available for all stakeholders to access throughout the duration of the SSIP. Then, the state determined to move even more of the tiered supports to the universal tier of access to better suit the schools seeking the support and be able to provide more targeted support to those asking for more attentiveness.

**Additional Implementation Activities**

**List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.**

The state anticipates implementing leadership coaching sites participating in professional development and identified by the targeted group. Coaching will focus on implementation of the previously described supports.

**Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.**

An updated evaluation plan will include the leadership coaching outcomes in the spring of 2024. Sites will be able to apply for Tier 2 leadership coaching for the August 2024, school year. Through this support, sites will have more accurate implementation of described evidence-based practices and will use tools and practices that demonstrate improved outcomes for students. Within these activities, the state will use surveys, observations, and the new state tool OKMTSS System. The OKMTSS System is an online intervention management tool that will provide data regarding implementation and usage of evidence-based interventions in real time. All of the evidence-based practices taught in the modules intended for student use, will be populated in the tool. With the usage of this tool, the SSIP team will be able to determine the effectiveness of each used practice, the most commonly used practices, and the practices least selected.

**Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.**

Timing of designated school sites through the Office of School Support has been a consistent barrier to timely selection of schools. Conversations regarding adjusting target schools from ATSI designation to alignment towards Indicator 3b 3rd grade ELA proficiency was determined necessary. Ongoing collaboration with the Office of School Support has continued. This change was endorsed by stakeholder groups as the adjustment opened new opportunities for more school sites to participate in the program. Previously, 77 sites were within the target group, but with the adjustment, 283 sites were able to participate in the project. Largely, this adjustment allowed for a significant increase from 4 participating pilot schools to 22 current schools. Due to this change, the baselines will need to be adjusted for the following reporting period and the target will be reset for the new group.   
  
Continued processes to maintain engagement in the program remains to be a barrier to schools. SSIP’s implementation of site leadership coaching seeks to support sites in developing sustainable processes that support their school site long term through these personnel and familial changes.   
A possible barrier for implementation could be finding the right fit and hiring personnel for coaching. The SSIP team will adjust coaching provisions from direct coaching towards a coach the coach model developed by another internal office.

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

## 17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 17 - OSEP Response

## 17 - Required Actions

# Certification

**Instructions**

**Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.**

**Certify**

**I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.**

**Select the certifier’s role:**

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

**Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.**

**Name:**

Travis Thompson

**Title:**

Part B Data Manager

**Email:**

travis.thompson@sde.ok.gov

**Phone:**

405-522-5203

**Submitted on:**

02/01/24 3:12:10 PM

# Determination Enclosures

## RDA Matrix

2024 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

**Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination** (1)

| **Percentage (%)** | **Determination** |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

**Results and Compliance Overall Scoring**

|  | **Total Points Available** | **Points Earned** | **Score (%)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Results** |  |  |  |
| **Compliance** |  |  |  |

**2024 Part B Results Matrix**

**Reading Assessment Elements**

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

**Math Assessment Elements**

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

**(1) For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* in 2024: Part B."**

**Exiting Data Elements**

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

\*\*When providing exiting data under section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to report on the number of students with disabilities who exited an educational program through receipt of a regular high school diploma. These students meet the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As explained in 34 C.F.R. § 300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect June 30, 2017, “the term regular high school diploma means the standard high school diploma awarded to the preponderance of students in the State that is fully aligned with State standards, or a higher diploma, except that a regular high school diploma shall not be aligned to the alternate academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA. A regular high school diploma does not include a recognized equivalent of a diploma, such as a general equivalency diploma, certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, or similar lesser credential.”

**2024 Part B Compliance Matrix**

| **Part B Compliance Indicator** (2) | **Performance (%)** | **Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021** (3) | **Score** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.** |  |  |  |
| **Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.** |  |  |  |
| **Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.** |  |  |  |
| **Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation** |  |  |  |
| **Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday** |  |  |  |
| **Indicator 13: Secondary transition** |  |  |  |
| **Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data** |  |  |  |
| **Timely State Complaint Decisions** |  |  |  |
| **Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions** |  |  |  |
| **Longstanding Noncompliance** |  |  |  |
| **Specific Conditions** |  |  |  |
| **Uncorrected identified noncompliance** |  |  |  |

**(2) The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at:** [**https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2024\_Part-B\_SPP-APR\_Measurement\_Table.pdf**](https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2024_Part-B_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf)

**(3) This column reflects full correction, which is factored into the scoring only when the compliance data are >=5% and <10% for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, and >=90% and <95% for Indicators 11, 12, and 13.**

## Data Rubric

**FFY 2022 APR** (1)

**Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **APR Indicator** | **Valid and Reliable** | **Total** |
| **1** |  |  |
| **2** |  |  |
| **3A** |  |  |
| **3B** |  |  |
| **3C** |  |  |
| **3D** |  |  |
| **4A** |  |  |
| **4B** |  |  |
| **5** |  |  |
| **6** |  |  |
| **7** |  |  |
| **8** |  |  |
| **9** |  |  |
| **10** |  |  |
| **11** |  |  |
| **12** |  |  |
| **13** |  |  |
| **14** |  |  |
| **15** |  |  |
| **16** |  |  |
| **17** |  |  |

**APR Score Calculation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subtotal** |  |
| **Timely Submission Points** - If the FFY 2022 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right. |  |
| **Grand Total** - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) = |  |

**(1) In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table.**

**618 Data** (2)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table** | **Timely** | **Complete Data** | **Passed Edit Check** | **Total** |
| **Child Count/**  **Ed Envs**  **Due Date: 8/30/23** |  |  |  |  |
| **Personnel Due Date: 2/21/24** |  |  |  |  |
| **Exiting Due Date: 2/21/24** |  |  |  |  |
| **Discipline Due Date: 2/21/24** |  |  |  |  |
| **State Assessment Due Date: 1/10/24** |  |  |  |  |
| **Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/15/23** |  |  |  |  |
| **MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/3/23** |  |  |  |  |

**618 Score Calculation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subtotal** |  |
| **Grand Total** (Subtotal X 1.23809524) = |  |

**(2) In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a ‘0’. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.23809524 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.**

**Indicator Calculation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| A. APR Grand Total |  |
| B. 618 Grand Total |  |
| C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) = |  |
| Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator |  |
| Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator |  |
| **Denominator** |  |
| D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator) (3) = |  |
| E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) = |  |

**(3) Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.23809524.**

**APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data**

**DATE: February 2024 Submission**

**SPP/APR Data**

**1) Valid and Reliable Data** - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

**Part B 618 Data**

**1) Timely** – A State will receive one point if it submits all ED*Facts* files or the entire E*MAPS* survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **618 Data Collection** | **ED*Facts* Files/ E*MAPS* Survey** | **Due Date** |
| Part B Child Count and Educational Environments | C002 & C089 | 8/30/2023 |
| Part B Personnel | C070, C099, C112 | 2/21/2024 |
| Part B Exiting | C009 | 2/21/2024 |
| Part B Discipline | C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144 | 2/21/2024 |
| Part B Assessment | C175, C178, C185, C188 | 1/10/2024 |
| Part B Dispute Resolution | Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in EMAPS | 11/15/2023 |
| Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services | Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in EMAPS | 5/3/2023 |

**2) Complete Data** – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all files, permitted values, category sets, subtotals, and totals associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. The data submitted to ED*Facts* aligns with the metadata survey responses provided by the state in the State Supplemental Survey IDEA (SSS IDEA) and Assessment Metadata survey in EMAPS. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

**3) Passed Edit Check –** A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection

## Dispute Resolution

## How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP’s IDEA Website.  How the Department Made Determinations in 2024 will be posted in June 2024. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

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