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In accordance with the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA), each state has in place a State Performance Plan (SPP) to evaluate the state’s efforts to meet the requirements and purposes of Part B. The SPP describes Alabama’s performance on the indicators established by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). Measurable and rigorous targets have been established for each indicator and the state reports annually on its performance in the Annual Performance Report (APR). To access the following SPP/APR link, hold the control button then click on the link (http://www.alsde.edu/html/home.asp).

The Alabama State Department of Education (ALSDE) is required to review the performance of each local education agency (LEA) in the state, publicly report data by LEA on Indicators 1-14, and determine whether each LEA:

- Meets the requirements and purposes of Part B.
- Needs assistance in implementing the requirements of Part B.
- Needs intervention in implementing the requirements of Part B.
- Needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of Part B.

There are two types of indicators: **compliance** indicators and **performance** indicators. The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) set the targets for all compliance indicators at either 100% or 0%. The ALSDE, Special Education Services (SES), with input from the Special Education Advisory Panel, set the targets for all performance indicators which were approved by OSEP.

The ALSDE will look closely at whether each LEA demonstrates compliance and/or progress on all indicators, whether each LEA demonstrates timely correction of identified noncompliance (as appropriate), and whether each LEA provides valid, reliable, and timely data.

Each LEA should begin by reviewing its data along with the SPP to assess compliance with the IDEA and the *Alabama Administrative Code* (AAC) and to evaluate the LEA’s performance when compared to the state targets. Based on findings, the LEA is encouraged to analyze its data and develop a plan for meeting the requirements and purposes of Part B of the IDEA and improving educational results for students with disabilities.

The SPP is a “blueprint” for the State and LEAs – a working document to measure progress toward meeting identified targets. The ALSDE encourages LEAs to establish targets for the performance indicators as they plan for educational improvement and, if needed, implement systemic change(s) that will ensure targets are met for all indicators. The ALSDE is committed to supporting LEAs in the implementation of the IDEA with a focus on improving educational results and functional outcomes for all students with disabilities.

This document is designed to identify activities that will assist LEAs in addressing their performance on each indicator. The best way to begin improving performance is to ensure that all required information has been entered into the STISETS program. By doing this, the LEA can ensure that all data are available when the LEA run reports to analyze data for program improvement.

It should be noted that throughout this Help Document, reference is made to reporting periods. For the purpose of federal reporting during a specified school year, a reporting
period begins July 1st of a given year and ends June 30th of the following year. For example, the reporting period for School Year 2013-2014 would be July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014. This coincides with federal fiscal year 2013 or FFY 2013.

This SPP/APR Help Document is being revised in 2014 to reflect changes made by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) beginning with the SPP/APR submitted in February 2015 for FFY 2013. These changes and Alabama’s proposed actions are explained in the following section. Please note that this document is a working document that will be updated as needed to respond to additional changes from OSEP.

State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP): Changes to the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) Beginning in FFY 2013

As part of the OSEP’s new Results-Driven Accountability (RDA) process designed to focus upon a balance between compliance and improving results for children and youth with IEPs, OSEP has implemented revisions to the SPP/APR process that include a new indicator (Indicator 17), which is the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). In addition, OSEP has reduced the number of indicators based on data reported from other sources, (i.e., 618 data). The new SPP/APR will focus upon requiring only what is necessary by statute and regulations and will include the following indicators:

1. Graduation
2. Dropout
3. Participation and Performance in Assessments
4. Suspension/Expulsion
5. Least Restrictive Environment
6. Preschool Least Restrictive Environment
7. Preschool Outcomes
8. Parent Involvement
9. Disproportionate Representation
10. Disproportionate Representation by Disability Category
11. Initial Evaluation
12. Preschool Transition
13. Secondary Transition
14. Post-School Outcomes
15. Resolution Sessions
16. Mediation
17. State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)
STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN Indicator Fact Sheet

**INDICATOR 1: GRADUATION RATES** (Performance)
Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma

**Measurable and Rigorous Target.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>≥57.60%</td>
<td>61.40%</td>
<td>65.30%</td>
<td>69.20%</td>
<td>73.00%</td>
<td>76.90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measurement of Indicator.**
States must report using the adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA.

**Data Source.**
The same data as used for reporting to the Department under the ESEA.

**Capture dates for the data collection or report.**
Data used for reporting is data for the year before the reporting year. For example, for the reporting period of July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2014 (FFY 2013), the state would report using data from 2012-2013.

**ALSDE Verification Process.**
Data verification takes place in the Prevention and Support Services Section. The Special Education Services (SES) Section ensures that reported data are accurate and complete.

**Activities for LEAs to address the Indicator.**
- Provide training to IEP Teams on selecting the highest and most appropriate course of study.
- Ensure that parents are informed of the diploma requirements.
- Consider the rigor of the courses of study when determining the level of support a student with disabilities needs in the regular education setting.
- Monitor student progress regularly to maximize opportunities for success.
- Make appropriate changes to the IEP in a timely manner to ensure success.
- Ensure that students receive appropriate preparation/remediation for assessments.
- Review/ implement programs that are designed to improve student outcomes. Refer to the ALSDE Web site at [www.alsde.edu](http://www.alsde.edu) for information regarding specific programs (i.e., ACCESS, Credit Recovery, 21st Century Community Learning Centers, Curriculum Guides, Positive Behavior Support, Graduation Tracking System).
- Analyze data using *When Your Data Speaks…Are You Listening? Guiding Questions for Using Data to Improve Program Results* (See Appendix).
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**INDICATOR 2: DROP OUT RATES** (Performance)
Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

**Measurable and Rigorous Target.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≤</td>
<td>12.71%</td>
<td>12.46%</td>
<td>12.21%</td>
<td>11.96%</td>
<td>11.71%</td>
<td>11.46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measurement of Indicator.**
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 left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

**Data Source.**
Same data as used for reporting under Section 618 data submission for Exiting.

**Capture dates for the data collection or report.**
Data used for reporting is data for the year before the reporting year. For example, for the reporting period of July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2014 (FFY 2013), the state would report using data from 2012-2013.

**ALSDE Verification Process.**
Data verification takes place in the Prevention and Support Services Section. The SES Section ensures that reported data are accurate and complete.

**Activities for LEAs to address the Indicator.**
- Provide training to IEP Teams on selecting the highest and most appropriate course of study.
- Ensure that parents are informed of the diploma pathways.
- Consider the rigor of the courses of study when determining the level of support a student with disabilities needs in the regular education setting.
- Monitor student progress regularly to maximize opportunities for success.
- Make appropriate changes to the IEP in a timely manner to ensure success.
- Ensure that students receive appropriate preparation/remediation for assessments.
- Review/implement programs that are designed to improve student outcomes. Refer to the ALSDE Web site at [www.alsde.edu](http://www.alsde.edu) for information regarding specific programs (i.e., ACCESS, Credit Recovery, 21st Century Community Learning Centers, Curriculum Guides, Positive Behavior Support, Graduation Tracking System).
- Analyze data using *When Your Data Speaks Are You Listening? Guiding Questions for Using Data to Improve Program Results* (See Appendix).
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**INDICATOR 3: ASSESSMENT DATA** (Performance)
Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:
A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) targets for disability subgroup.
B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate academic achievement standards.

**Measurable and Rigorous Target.**
A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>A ≥</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>95.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>96.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>97.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>98.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>99.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>A ≥</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>16.30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>23.30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>30.30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>37.20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>44.20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>51.20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measurement of Indicator.**
A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window, calculated separately for reading and math)]. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.
C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and,
calculated separately for reading and math). The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Data Source.
Assessment data reported in the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) reporting on ESEA (EDFacts file specifications C004, C185, C188, C175, and C178).

Capture dates for the data collection or report.
The state assessment testing window for each reporting period.

ALSDE Verification Process.
The SES Section verifies all students reported as not participating in state assessments.

Implications for Monitoring.
- Monitoring teams will continue to review IEPs to ensure that all students with disabilities are included in state assessments.
- Monitoring teams will continue to review IEPs to ensure that all students with disabilities assessed using the AAA have benchmarks.
- All LEAs monitored during the reporting period are required to complete a Coordinator’s Questionnaire which includes a question regarding the implementation of research-based reading and math programs.

Activities for LEAs to address the Indicator.
- Ensure that schools use researched-based programs and practices and those programs and practices are implemented with fidelity.
- Implement programs designed to increase student achievement (e.g., ARI, AMSTI).
- Provide in-service programs/technical assistance on progress monitoring.
- Ensure that students are provided instruction in the assigned curriculum and receive the supports documented in the IEP.
- Ensure that students receive necessary preparation, practice, and needed supports for participation in state assessments.
- Ensure that all children with IEPs participate in state assessments.
- Contact and collaborate with your LEA Testing/Accountability Coordinator to review student demographic data during each opportunity to ensure data are reported accurately.
- Contact your LEA Testing/Accountability Coordinator as soon as possible following the administration of all state assessments to obtain (1) a list of names of all students with IEPs that did not participate in state assessments, and (2) the reasons for nonparticipation to be provided to the SDE upon request.
- Analyze data using When Your Data Speaks Are You Listening? Guiding Questions for Using Data to Improve Program Results (See Appendix).
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**INDICATOR 4: SUSPENSION/EXPULSION** (Performance and Compliance)

Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs.

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

**Measurable and Rigorous Target.**

A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≤</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
<td>6.75%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>5.75%</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measurement of Indicator.**

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

B. Percent = [(# of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

**Data Source.**

Student Incident Report (SIR).

**Capture dates for the data collection or report.**

June 16 of a given reporting period.

**ALSDE Verification Process.**

- The ALSDE/LEA may review data to identify patterns/trends.
- The LEA may be required to develop a corrective action plan that addresses efforts to reduce the significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions; and/or
- The ALSDE may require intensive professional development that addresses cultural awareness, classroom management, and/or positive behavioral supports.
- The LEA will be required to use 15% of IDEA funds for Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS) if found to be significantly discrepant.
- Data for Indicator 4B are used in LEA determinations.
Activities for LEAs to address the Indicator.

- Ensure that the SIR data are reported accurately and in a timely manner.
- Ensure that required teachers, administrators, and evaluators, participate in the following training modules: *Addressing Disproportionality in Alabama, Positive Behavior Supports, and Makes Sense Strategies*.
- Analyze data using *When Your Data Speaks...Are You Listening? Guiding Questions for Using Data to Improve Program Results* (Appendix A).
- Allocate 15% of IDEA funds for CEIS.
  - LEAs may choose to use up to 15% as a voluntary use of funds.
  - LEAs will be required to use 15% if identified with a significant discrepancy under Indicator 4B (See CEIS Fact Sheet in Appendix).
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INDICATOR 5: SCHOOL AGE LRE (Performance)
Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:
A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
B. Inside the regular class less than 40% the day; and
C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

**Measurable and Rigorous Target.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target A ≥</td>
<td>65.00%</td>
<td>67.50%</td>
<td>69.75%</td>
<td>72.25%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>77.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target B ≤</td>
<td>6.80%</td>
<td>6.80%</td>
<td>6.50%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target C ≤</td>
<td>2.75%</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td>2.65%</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
<td>2.55%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

*Please note that reporting of LRE for Indicator 5 purposes is limited to the above LRE categories and will not total 100%.

**Data Source.**
Child Count
A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day - LRE Code 01.
B. Inside the regular class less than 40% the day - LRE Code 04.
C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements - LRE Codes 06-11.

**Capture dates for the data collection or report.**
October 1 of a given reporting period.

**ALSDE Verification Process.**
In addition to the Child Count verification process, the SES Section will randomly verify the LRE documented on the IEP and the LRE documented in the Student Folder in STISETS and onsite monitoring through the Student Services Review process.

**Implications for Monitoring.**
- LRE data are collected/verified through the System Profile Information.
- Student Services Reviews include school-aged students as a part of the monitoring process. LRE is one of the 12 items rated for student status.
- LRE placement procedures are monitored through IEP record reviews to ensure the provision of a free appropriate public education (FAPE).
Activities for LEAs to address the Indicator.

- Ensure that children with disabilities are educated with children who are not disabled to the maximum extent appropriate.
- Ensure that the LRE is recorded correctly in the STISETS Student Folder. The LRE code entered on the student’s IEP does not automatically populate into the STISETS Student Folder. It must be entered manually.
- Calculate the percentage of time inside the regular education environment by dividing the number of hours the student spends inside the regular education environment by the total number of hours in the school day (including lunch, hall passing time, recess, and study periods) multiplied by 100, with no rounding.
- Consider the time a student spends outside the regular education environment receiving services unrelated to the student’s disability (e.g., receiving LEP/ELL services) as time inside the regular education environment.
- Count the educational time spent in age-appropriate, community-based settings that include individuals with and without disabilities, such as college campuses or vocational sites, as time spent inside the regular education environment.
- Refer to *Mastering the Maze* and the *Child Count Help Document* for guidance and additional information on determining LRE.
INDICATOR 6: PRESCHOOL LRE (Performance)
Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:
A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

Measurable and Rigorous Target.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target A ≥</td>
<td>46.71%</td>
<td>47.00%</td>
<td>47.50%</td>
<td>47.75%</td>
<td>49.00%</td>
<td>53.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target B ≤</td>
<td>6.50%</td>
<td>6.30%</td>
<td>6.10%</td>
<td>5.90%</td>
<td>5.70%</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measurement of Indicator.
A. Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
B. Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Data Source.
Child Count.
A. Receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program – LRE Code 20
B. Receiving the majority of special education and related services in other location – LRE Code 21.

Capture dates for the data collection or report.
October 1 of a given reporting period.

ALSDE Verification Process.
In addition to the Child Count verification process, the SES Section will randomly verify the LRE documented on the IEP and the LRE documented in the Student Folder in STISETS and onsite monitoring through the Student Services Review process.

Implications for Monitoring.
- LEAs that meet or exceed the state average for participation in regular early childhood programs may be identified through the monitoring process and asked to serve as model sites. The names of the special education coordinators are provided to other LEAs that are considering the development of inclusive settings.
- Student Services Reviews include preschool students as a part of the monitoring process. LRE is one of the 12 items rated for student status.

Activities for LEAs to address the Indicator.
- Ensure that preschool children are provided the opportunity to receive special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers to the maximum extent appropriate.
- Develop programs/activities that are designed to increase participation in settings with typically
developing peers.

- Ensure that accurate LRE codes are used for preschool children based on the directions contained in the *Child Count Help Document*. 
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INDICATOR 7: PRESCHOOL OUTCOMES (Performance)
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.

Measurable and Rigorous Target.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target A1 ≥</td>
<td>90.30%</td>
<td>90.55%</td>
<td>90.80%</td>
<td>91.05%</td>
<td>91.30%</td>
<td>91.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target A2 ≥</td>
<td>82.25%</td>
<td>82.55%</td>
<td>82.80%</td>
<td>83.05%</td>
<td>83.30%</td>
<td>83.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target B1 ≥</td>
<td>90.15%</td>
<td>90.45%</td>
<td>90.70%</td>
<td>90.95%</td>
<td>91.20%</td>
<td>91.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target B2 ≥</td>
<td>64.55%</td>
<td>64.85%</td>
<td>65.10%</td>
<td>65.35%</td>
<td>65.60%</td>
<td>65.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target C1 ≥</td>
<td>88.60%</td>
<td>88.85%</td>
<td>89.10%</td>
<td>89.35%</td>
<td>89.60%</td>
<td>89.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target C2 ≥</td>
<td>87.70%</td>
<td>87.95%</td>
<td>88.20%</td>
<td>88.45%</td>
<td>88.70%</td>
<td>88.95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measurement of Indicator.
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 the (# 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 the (# 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 the (# 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 the (# 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 the (# 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 reposted 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.

**Data Source.**
The Early Learning Progress Profile (ELPP) is used to assess mastery of the Developmental Standards for Preschool Children With Disabilities as well as to determine ongoing progress relative to the areas addressed in the SPP, including positive social-emotional skills, acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, and use of appropriate behaviors to meet the needs of the preschool child.

**Dates for the data collection or report.**
ELPP data must be entered between May 1 and May 15 each year.

**ALSDE Verification Process.**
- LEA and state-wide data will be reviewed for accuracy.
- The SES Section will analyze data comparing the entry and exit levels of each child by LEA to determine progress in the three outcome areas.
Implications for Monitoring.
- Monitoring procedures have been expanded to include preschool children as part of compliance verification and the on-site review process.
- During Student Services Reviews, student records are examined for compliance and the ELPP is checked for completion.
- Timely submission of this data may be used in LEA determinations.

Activities for LEAs to address the Indicator.
- Ensure that the entry ELPP is completed within 60 days of the initiation of special education services.
- Ensure that the exit ELPP data are gathered during a specified window of time between April 15 and May 1 for all children exiting preschool programs who received at least six months of special education services.
- Each LEA must submit the LEA summary form for children remaining on the ELPP to the ALSDE by May 15 of a given reporting period.
- Use the ELPP information to examine the effectiveness of curricula and specially designed instruction for preschool children with IEPs.
INDICATOR 8: PARENT INVOLVEMENT (Performance)
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.

Measurable and Rigorous Target.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>75.13%</td>
<td>75.38%</td>
<td>75.63%</td>
<td>75.88%</td>
<td>76.13%</td>
<td>76.38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measurement of Indicator.
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.

Data Source.
Sampling by districts of parents responding to the Parent Survey.

Capture dates for the data collection or report.
February-June of a given reporting period.

Implications for Monitoring.
- Parental notifications are reviewed through the monitoring process to ensure that parents have an opportunity to participate in all decisions regarding identification, evaluation, educational placement, and the provision of FAPE.
- Parental involvement activities are also reviewed as part of the System Profile Information for monitoring.

Activities for LEAs to address the Indicator.
- Utilize resources provided by the SES Section to facilitate parental involvement.
- Provide parents timely written notice of IEP Team meetings to facilitate attendance/participation.
- Develop a process to receive parental input regarding special education and related services when parents cannot attend IEP Team meetings.
- Promote the active involvement of parents’ participation in IEP Team meetings and in all phases of their child’s education.
INDICATOR 9: DISPROPORTIONALITY-CHILD WITH A DISABILITY (Compliance)
Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement of 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) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Data Source.
Child Count and individual student eligibility reports.

Capture dates for the data collection or report.
October 1 of a given reporting period.

ALSDE Verification Process.
If the LEA is numerically identified as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services, the SES Section staff review records of students to determine if the disproportionate representation is due to inappropriate identification.

Implications for Monitoring.
- Student records will be reviewed to determine if disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification.
- When a system is determined to have disproportionate representation, this may lead to a system being identified as having significant disproportionality, which requires an LEA to allocate 15% of IDEA funds for CEIS. (See CEIS Fact Sheet in Appendix).
- Based on findings from the student record review, LEAs will be required to correct eligibility reports or conduct reevaluations to ensure appropriate identification of students with disabilities.
- Data for this indicator are used in LEA determinations.

Activities for LEAs to address the Indicator.
- Use research-based instructional and behavioral practices/interventions.
- Refer students with academic and behavioral concerns to the Problem Solving Team (PST).
- Ensure that students evaluated and determined eligible for services are appropriately identified based on criteria for disability areas outlined in the AAC.
- Use nontraditional assessments when appropriate.
- Use the Compliance Verification Form to ensure that all required assessments have been administered, documented on the eligibility report, and considered at the eligibility determination meeting.
- Provide professional development that has the potential to reduce disproportionate representation of
racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that may be the result of inappropriate identification.

- Review the records of all students in the racial and ethnic groups that have disproportionate representation to ensure that all students have been appropriately identified.
- Use a central office monitoring process to detect/correct problems with identification.
- Ensure that eligibility data are correctly entered into STISETS.
- Review and analyze Child Count data by race/ethnicity on an on-going basis. As appropriate, use the OSEP disproportionality template when reviewing and analyzing disproportionality data.
- Analyze data using *When Your Data Speaks…Are You Listening? Guiding Questions for Using Data to Improve Program Results* (Appendix A).
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**INDICATOR 10: DISPROPORTIONALITY-ELIGIBILITY CATEGORY** (Compliance)
Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

**Measurable and Rigorous Target.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measurement of Indicator.**
Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

**Data Source.**
Child Count and individual student eligibility reports.

**Capture dates for the data collection or report.**
October 1 of a given reporting period.

**ALSDE Verification Process.**
If the LEA is numerically identified as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories, the SES Section staff will review student records to determine if the disproportionate representation is due to inappropriate identification by specific disability category.

*Please note, provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability (ID), specific learning disabilities (SLD), emotional disability (ED), speech or language impairments (SLI), other health impairments (OHI), and autism (AU).*

**Implications for Monitoring.**
- Student records will be reviewed to determine if disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification.
- When a system is determined to have disproportionate representation, this may lead to a system being identified as having significant disproportionality, which requires an LEA to allocate 15% of IDEA funds for CEIS. (See CEIS Fact Sheet in Appendix).
- Based on findings from the student record review, LEAs may be required to correct eligibility reports or conduct reevaluations to ensure appropriate identification of students with disabilities.
- Data for this indicator are used in LEA determinations.

**Activities for LEAs to address the Indicator.**
- Use research-based instructional and behavioral practices/interventions.
- Refer students with academic and behavioral concerns to the Problem Solving Team (PST).
- Ensure that students evaluated and determined eligible for services are appropriately identified based on criteria for disability areas outlined in the AAC.
- Use nontraditional assessments when appropriate.
• Use the *Compliance Verification Form* to ensure that all required assessments have been administered, documented on the eligibility report, and considered at the eligibility determination meeting.

• Provide professional development that has the potential to reduce disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that may be the result of inappropriate identification.

• Review the records of all students in the racial and ethnic groups in the specific disability categories that have disproportionate representation to ensure that all students have been appropriately identified.

• Use a central office monitoring process to detect/correct problems with identification.

• Ensure that eligibility data are correctly entered into STISETS.

• Review and analyze Child Count data by race/ethnicity on an ongoing basis. As appropriate, use the OSEP disproportionality template when reviewing and analyzing disproportionality data.

• Analyze data using *When Your Data Speaks…Are You Listening? Guiding Questions for Using Data to Improve Program Results* (See Appendix).
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INDICATOR 11: CHILD FIND (Compliance)
Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation.

Measurable and Rigorous Target.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measurement of Indicator.

a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
b. # of children who evaluations were completed within 60 days.

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 these delays.

Percent = \( \frac{(b)}{(a)} \) times 100.

Data Source.
Data collected from the Number of Students Evaluated Within Timeline report in STISETS and the state report generated from the District Approved process. The information in the report is populated from the Eligibility Information under the Basic tab in STISETS.

Capture dates for the data collection or report.
First week in September, annually

ALSDE Verification Process.
• Online review of LEA reports.
• Verification process to ensure valid and reliable data are reported.

Implications for Monitoring.
• Queries are run prior to the monitoring visit to determine the number of overdue initial evaluations.
• Compliance data will be used in LEA determinations.
• Timely submission of this data may be used in LEA determinations.

Activities for LEAs to address the Indicator.
• Develop and implement procedures to ensure that all initial evaluations are completed within 60 days from the date the Notice and Consent for Initial Evaluation was received.
• Monitor the Number of Students Evaluated within Timeline report on an on-going basis.
• Recognize what constitutes an acceptable/unacceptable reason for delay.
• Complete all fields in the Number of Students Evaluated within Timeline report.
• Consider conducting the vision and hearing screenings during the Problem Solving Team (PST) process prior to referring the child for an evaluation.
• Analyze data using When Your Data Speaks…Are You Listening? Guiding Questions for Using Data to Improve Program Results (See Appendix).
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**INDICATOR 12: EARLY CHILDHOOD TRANSITION** (Compliance)
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age three, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

### Measurable and Rigorous Target.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measurement of Indicator.

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.
e. # of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.

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

Percent = \[(c) \div (a – b – d – e)\] times 100.

### Data Source.
Data collected from the *EI to Preschool Tracking Log* in STISETS, the state report generated from the District Approved process, and data provided by Part C GIFTS tracking program.

### Capture dates for the data collection or report.
First week in September, annually

### ALSDE Verification Process.
- Individual LEA and state-wide data will be reviewed for accuracy.
- Individual LEA *EI to Preschool Tracking Log* data will be compared to Part C data for verification and cross-referencing of dates submitted by each agency.
- Periodic random sampling of LEAs will be conducted to ensure that transition from C to B is occurring in a timely manner.

### Implications for Monitoring.
For LEAs that are currently being monitored, preschool transition data will be provided to the respective team leader/regional specialist for on-site technical assistance.

### Activities for LEAs to address the Indicator.
- Monitor the *EI to Preschool Tracking Log* report on an on-going basis.
- Ensure that accurate reasons for delay and range of days are entered correctly.
- Review/revise the process and amend the LEA plan if necessary when eligibility determinations and IEPs are not completed by the child’s third birthday.
- Foster positive relationships with Part C service providers.
- Analyze data using *When Your Data Speaks…Are You Listening? Guiding Questions for Using*
Data to Improve Program Results (See Appendix).
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**INDICATOR 13: SECONDARY TRANSITION** (Compliance)
Percent of youth 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 post-secondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

**Measurable and Rigorous Target.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measurement of Indicator.**
Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes all documented transition requirements that will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her post-secondary goals) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

**Data Source.**
*Transition Verification Report (TVR)* in STISETS and the state report.

**Capture dates for the data collection or report.**
First week in September, annually.

**ALSDE Verification Process.**
- The SES Section will conduct periodic reviews of the TVR by LEA.
- LEAs will be notified when information reviewed does not reflect the implementation of transition services for all students age 16 and older. LEAs will be required to revise IEPs to appropriately address transition services.

**Implications for Monitoring.**
- IEPs are monitored to ensure appropriate transition services are implemented.
- Data for this indicator are used in LEA determinations.

**Activities for LEAs to address the Indicator.**
- Implement appropriate transition services for all students with disabilities beginning with the first IEP to be in effect when students turn 16 years of age or younger if appropriate.
- Ensure that the LEA documents that students are invited to their IEP Team meetings and, as appropriate, representatives of any participating agencies are invited to the IEP Team meetings with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.
- Ensure that the transition page of the IEP is correctly completed (including: Course of Study, transition assessments, transition goals, transition services) for all students age 16 and older.
- Monitor the TVR on an ongoing basis.
- Analyze data using *When Your Data Speaks…Are You Listening? Guiding Questions for Using Data to Improve Program Results* (See Appendix).
INDICATOR 14: POST-SCHOOL OUTCOMES (Performance)

Percent of youth who had IEPs, 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.

Measurable and Rigorous Target.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target A ≥</td>
<td>22.24%</td>
<td>22.49%</td>
<td>22.74%</td>
<td>22.99%</td>
<td>23.24%</td>
<td>23.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target B ≥</td>
<td>62.35%</td>
<td>62.60%</td>
<td>62.85%</td>
<td>63.10%</td>
<td>63.35%</td>
<td>63.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target C ≥</td>
<td>76.36%</td>
<td>76.61%</td>
<td>76.86%</td>
<td>77.11%</td>
<td>77.36%</td>
<td>77.61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measurement of Indicator.

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.

Data Source.

- Student list from ALSDE/Information Systems (IS) for selected LEAs.
- *Alabama Post School Outcomes Survey report* in STISETS.

Capture dates for the data collection or report.

First week in September, annually.

ALSDE Verification Process.

- The SES Section will review the *Alabama Post School Outcomes Survey report* entered into STISETS by the LEA and submitted through the District Approved process.
- LEAs will be contacted based on information reviewed.
- The SES Section will contact selected systems to notify them regarding participation in the *Alabama Post-School Outcomes Survey* each year.
Surveys are to be conducted during the period of May 1 – September 1.

Activities for LEAs to address the Indicator.
- Plan ahead by developing procedures for ensuring accurate contact information before students exit school. Inform students that someone may be contacting them to find out how they are doing.
- Collect student contact information from multiple sources (e.g., relatives, Vocational Rehabilitation Services, counselors, job coaches, STI information).
- Decide who will conduct the survey. Ensure that the designated person(s) is informed of the responsibility, and schedule the timeframe in which students will be contacted. Plan to conduct the surveys as early as possible to ensure ample time to locate the students.
- Ensure that a list of students to be surveyed is received from the SDE in the spring.
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INDICATOR 15: RESOLUTION SESSIONS (Results)
Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

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

Data Source.
Data collected under IDEA section 618
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**INDICATOR 16: MEDIATION** (Results)
Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

**Measurement of Indicator.**
Percent = \((2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) \text{ divided by } 2.1\) times 100.

**Data Source.**
Data collected under IDEA section 618
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**INDICATOR 17: STATE SYSTEMIC IMPROVEMENT PLAN** (Results)
The SSIP is a multi-year plan that is implemented in three phases designed to improve results for students with disabilities across multiple measures. The measurement for Indicator 17 requires that the State’s SPP/APR must include a comprehensive, multi-year State Systemic Improvement Plan focused on improving results for students with disabilities. The components include the following:

- **Phase I (submitted in 2015 with data from FFY 2013):**
  - 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 Activities; and
  - Theory of Action.

- **Phase II (to be submitted in 2016 with data from FFY 2014):**
  - Infrastructure Development;
  - Support for LEA Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
  - Evaluation.

- **Phase III (to be submitted in 2017 with data from FFY 2015)**
  - Results of ongoing evaluation of strategies in the SSIP.

***To access Phase I of the Alabama State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), go to www.alsde.edu > Office of Learning Support > Special Education > Data/Reporting > SPP/APR.
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**INDICATOR 20: STATE REPORTED DATA** (Compliance)
State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

**Measurable and Rigorous Target.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measurement of Indicator.**
State reported data, including 618 data, State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Reports are:

a. Submitted on or before due dates; and
b. Accurate, including covering the correct year and following the correct measurement.

**Data Source.**
- Child Count – includes number of children, assessment data, and LRE data.
- Annual Data Report – includes exiting data, suspension/expulsion data (Student Incident Report), personnel data, and complaint data.
- State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report Data

**Capture dates for the data collection or report.**
- Child Count (snapshot) – October 1st, annually
- Child Count – First week in October, annually
- Annual Data Report – Last week in May and first week in June, annually
- State Reports – First week in September, annually

**ALSDE Verification Process.**
IS/SES Section work together to verify data.

**Implications for Monitoring.**
Documentation of timely and accurate data submissions are used in LEA determinations.

**Activities for LEAs to address the Indicator.**
- Make verification of data an on-going process.
- Use the reports and data tools in STISETS to assist with detection/correction of data problems/trends.
- Address problems through appropriate processes.
- Make one submission to the SDE. Do not use place-holder data in order to appear timely.
Appendix
Appendix A

When Your Data Speaks…Are You Listening?
Guiding Questions for Using Data to Improve Program Results

“If we rely on just impressions and anecdotes, we don’t really know if things are getting better or worse. By using common sense measures, we can be honest with ourselves about whether or not we are making progress. If we work hard and the numbers don’t change, then something more or different is needed.” (Friedman, 2005)

All too often, data collection activities may become ends within themselves rather than the means to determine whether our programs are creating positive results for students. While there is little perceived shortage in the amount of data we collect, we may not always be using data in ways that help create positive changes in our programs and our students.

How might we use the data we collect to determine results and set a course for program improvement? Some common sense suggestions follow to assist you to use your data to develop a pathway toward improved results.

Data Sources and Guiding Questions

Available data sources include, but are not limited to:

- Student Assessment Data
- SPP/APR Indicator Data (including graduation, drop-out, assessment performance data, suspension/expulsion, LRE data, parent survey, evaluation timeline, transition data, and post-school outcome data)
- Student Incident Report Data
- Attendance Reports (faculty and student)
- Monitoring Report Data
- In-School Suspension Data
- Other Relevant Data

Given these data sources, what are some different ways to analyze your data?

Analyze By Trend. Select an area you would like to improve (e.g., graduation rates). Graph the data on a chart to show how you are doing across time. Ideally, you will have access to data for at least three consecutive years to determine a trend.

Guiding Questions:

- What kind of trend do you see?
- What are some of the factors that contribute to your current state—the story behind your baseline? List and discuss them.
- Mark an X on the chart to show your desired performance level.
- How great is the gap between your trend and your desired performance level?
- Based on your past performance and without doing anything differently to affect the outcome, what will the data likely look like in the near future? Draw a dotted line to show what this data looks like. Decide whether or not this is an acceptable performance level.
If the performance level is not acceptable, given the factors noted above, what actions might it take to close the gap between your performance trend and your desired performance level?

**Analyze By Pattern.** Examine data by each school in your district, or select specific grade levels. Then drill deeper and look at the data from individual classrooms.

**Guiding Questions:**

- What patterns do you see developing?
- Where are the strengths and weaknesses?
- Are there certain cluster patterns that become apparent as you disaggregate the data? Or data variations? For example, if you are analyzing reading achievement at the district level, you may see a drop in performance at the sixth grade level across all schools. However, if you examine performance by classrooms, you may notice that there is a peak—one sixth-grade teacher has consistently higher scores than the others. Further investigation may offer some suggestions for improvement that can be implemented on a larger scale.

Examining cluster patterns for variations in performance or “peaks and valleys” can be useful as you simultaneously investigate causes of poor performance and explain what contributes to pockets of good performance. Use your findings about what is working to develop an action plan for improvement.

**Action Plan Development**

Once you have your data graphs detailing your trend and your desired performance level, use your “story behind the baseline” to understand what has contributed to your current state, to set measurable performance goals and to develop actions that may help you change course.

- Develop measurable goals (performance measures) to describe desired program results.
- Given your “story behind the baseline”, list suggested actions that might work to improve your results.
- Determine whether these actions, if implemented, would have a high or low probability of producing results and whether those actions are feasible. Narrow your choices to those one or two that are both feasible and have a high probability of producing results. Include at least one low cost or no-cost action. Develop an implementation timeline and list the persons responsible for implementation. Include any necessary implementation steps.
- Decide how you will evaluate to determine whether the action has produced the results you need.
- Implement your plan. Evaluate and make needed changes based on the results.

Appendix B

Guidance for Improving Results for Preschool Outcomes (Indicator 7)

This information serves to provide guidance relative to improving results for Indicator 7. The 2009-2010 data provided in the Local Education Agency (LEA) Special Education Performance Profiles (Profiles) received by LEAs May 2011 is the first year that data for Indicator 7 has been included in the Profile and publicly reported. As explained in prior training and in the introduction to the Developmental Standards for Preschool Children with Disabilities, Indicator 7 was created by the United States Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) to collect accountability data to determine the effectiveness of Part B preschool programs at the LEA level. The outcomes that must be reported as part of State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) address three areas of child functioning in order to assess child specific progress, as well as over-all LEA progress.

The three child outcomes are functional outcomes in the sense that they refer to behaviors, knowledge, and skills that are meaningful to children in their everyday lives. The outcomes refer to actions that children need to be able to accomplish or knowledge that they need to have in order to function successfully across a variety of settings and ultimately to be successful in kindergarten and later in school. In-depth descriptions of the outcomes are in the introduction to the Developmental Standards.

To meet the OSEP requirement, Alabama created the Developmental Standards for Preschool Children with Disabilities (Developmental Standards) that are collectively reflective of the standards and curricula used in the various preschool settings throughout the state. The Developmental Standards also serve as a natural progression to the kindergarten standards contained in the Alabama Courses of Study. The Early Learning Progress Profile (ELPP) evolved as a direct, on-to-one correlation with the Developmental Standards to provide a mechanism to compile data to measure the outcomes. The Childhood Outcomes Summary Form (COSF), developed by the Early Child Outcomes Center (ECO Center) was chosen as a measurement tool for categorizing the information obtained through completion of the ELPP. The ELPP and COSF are NOT assessment instruments. The ELPP and COSF provide a systematic procedure that allows the use of aggregate data from multiple sources and different assessment tools to be consolidated to provide information about a child’s functioning level.

As you know, the entry ELPP must be completed within 30 days of an individual child beginning Special Education services and the exit ELPP must be completed when the child exits preschool, as long as he/she has received six months of services. Each year since the inception of the ELPP, the data submitted by each LEA has been compiled and used to examine state performance. Beginning in 2008-2009, the state was required to set targets for future data compilation. The targets were based on an average of all data submitted by LEAs during the 2008-2009 school year. The targets were not arbitrary, unreachable figures since many LEAs had already surpassed the selected goals. The expectation is that future targets will increase minimally each year.

At this point in time, the Developmental Standards are being merged with the Office of School Readiness four year old standards. The ELPP is also being revised to continue to provide a one-to-one correspondence with the revised standards. The new version of the standards and the
ELPP will be presented at the MEGA Conference and training will be provided in best practices for collecting data to support ELPP results. Training will also be provided through a WebEx session in August. A DVD is also being developed so that teachers will have a readily available tool to assist in data collection and in evaluating data to make ongoing improvements in instruction for children. A new web-based version of the ELPP is being developed that will allow each case manager access to a Website to complete the ELPP on individual children for entry and exit data. The timeline for ELPP completion each year will remain the same (April 15-May 1), but LEAs will no longer be required to submit the current spreadsheet. The data will be extracted from the Website and compiled for reporting on the Performance Profile. There are exceptions to the new version of the ELPP and the web-based program. If a child’s entry ELPP was completed using the current spreadsheet, then exit data will need to be entered on the spreadsheet instead of the web-based program.

Whether using the current version of the ELPP or the new version that will be presented during the summer, the following information is applicable. The information is offered as suggested steps for improvement of individual LEA data for Indicator 7:

- Training has been provided on how to interpret and use ELPP data for program improvement. Additional training will be provided in the above mentioned activities to assist in data interpretation and service provision.
- Examine the type of services (curriculum, setting, inclusion ratios, frequency and duration of services, etc.) provided to preschool children with disabilities in your LEA for best practices based on national research that has been shared with coordinators on numerous occasions.
- All personnel who provide services to preschool children should become very familiar with the Developmental Standards, objectives and examples. The standards are the Course of Study for Preschool children.
- As you know, IEP goals must be standards based. Goals should be carefully designed to address deficit areas that impede work toward mastery of the standards.
- A curriculum that provides goals and activities that align to the standards should be part of every preschool program.
- Essentially every activity that a preschool child completes should be geared toward mastery of the standards.
- Progress monitoring should be an ongoing, routine process using structured procedures to document data. Results should be examined to make adjustments to the child’s program.
- Activities should be data driven, and modified according to the progress of the child.

Points to remember when completing the ELPP:
- All information gathered should be based on documented data. A training video for data collection is being prepared.
- The “0”, “1”, or “2” scoring procedure used for the ELPP is based on the Child Outcome Summary Form (COSF) ratings. The COSF chart is in the Developmental Standards booklet and on the fold-out that was provided during trainings. The “0” (Not Observed) on the ELPP is equivalent to the lowest rating
on the COSF 1 – Not Yet. The “1” (Emerging) on the ELPP is equivalent to the COSF 2-5 – Emerging and Somewhat. The “2” (Mastered) on the ELPP is equivalent to the COSF 6 or 7 – Completely. Total points yielded from the 0, 1, or 2 on the ELPP are calculated and mathematically converted to a five-point progress category scale that OSEP requires. These progress categories are then converted mathematically to the two summary statements that are on your LEA Performance Profile. As can be seen, it is imperative that data be carefully compiled and reported on the ELPP to be an accurate and true reflection of the child’s performance.

- It is important to remember that a child may make progress within a category (ex.: emerging), but not move to the next level. This progress is reflected in the point total that is used in calculating mathematical improvement trajectories for individual children. Progress within a category is reflected in the calculations. It is very important for teachers to carefully evaluate children within the point system to reflect accurate data.

- The mathematical formulas used to calculate the progress categories and the summary statements are built into the current excel spreadsheet and will be built into the web-based version of the ELPP that will be used in the future.
Appendix C

Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS)

The provision found in Section 613(f) of the IDEA (the statute 20 U.S.C. §1413(f) and the regulations in 34 CFR §300.226) permit LEAs to use Part B funds (up to 15%) to develop and provide CEIS for students who are currently not identified as needing special education services.

Provision of CEIS is required when a state identifies significant disproportionality based on race or ethnicity in an LEA with respect to (1) the identification of children as children with disabilities, (2) the identification of children in specific disability categories, (3) the placement of children with disabilities in particular educational settings, or (4) the taking of disciplinary actions (e.g., suspensions or expulsions).

LEAs identified as having significant disproportionality must use the maximum amount (15%) of funds allowable (VI-B and Preschool) for CEIS for children in the LEA, particularly, but not exclusively, for children in those racial or ethnic groups that were “significantly over-identified.”

Currently, the state’s definition* for CEIS includes:

1. **Identification of Children with Disabilities:** Risk Ratio and Weighted Risk Ratio of over 4.0 and greater than 15 students in racial and ethnic groups.
2. **Identification of Children with Disabilities in Specific Disability Categories:** Risk Ratio and Weighted Risk Ratio of over 5.0 and greater than 20 students in racial and ethnic groups.
3. **Placement of Children with Disabilities in Particular Educational Settings (Least Restrictive Environment, LRE):**
   - Code 01+02 (100-80% of the day inside GE) – (Under-identified): Risk Ratio and Weighted Risk Ratio of under 0.50 and greater than 15 students in the racial and ethnic groups.
   - Code 03 (79-40% of the day inside GE): Risk Ratio and Weighted Risk Ratio of over 4.0 and greater than 15 students
   - Code 04 (Less than 40% of the day inside GE): Risk Ratio and Weighted Risk Ratio of over 4.0 and greater than 15 students
   - Code 06-11 (Separate schools and residential facilities): Risk Ratio and Weighted Risk Ratio of over 4.0 and greater than 15 students
4. **Disciplinary Actions (Suspensions/Expulsions):**
   - Out of School Suspensions or Expulsions > 10 Days: >5.0% of overall SE enrollment with >15 students in the racial and ethnic groups.
   - Out of School Suspensions or Expulsions < 10 Days: >40% of overall SE enrollment with >15 students in the racial and ethnic groups.

*State definition may be determined annually.