

OR  
Part B

FFY2016  
State Performance Plan /  
Annual Performance Report

The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) Office of Student Services is responsible for Oregon's 197 school districts and 35 Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE) programs that serve students eligible for IDEA services. ODE works collaboratively with districts and programs to support improved academic and functional results for children with disabilities. ODE supports and monitors its districts and programs via the following processes: General Supervision System; Technical Assistance System; Professional Development System; Stakeholder Involvement; and Reporting to the Public. These systems are designed to facilitate high expectations and college and career readiness (CCR) for Oregon's students with disabilities.

Oregon has a Technical Assistance System that utilizes technology and personnel to provide districts and programs timely access to data and activities that ensure compliance, as well as improved academic and functional outcomes for students with disabilities. Education specialists serve as a single point of contact for districts and programs. In addition, a web-based system provides access to data and on-demand technical assistance, to specialists, districts, and programs.

Oregon's Professional Development System leverages both IDEA discretionary funds and funds from the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) to provide every district and program the opportunity to receive direct technical assistance and professional development focusing on the implementation of evidence-based practices for students with disabilities. Activities include: annual state-wide training on data collections and compliance and performance issues as informed by the state-wide, web-based System Performance Review & Improvement (SPR&I) application; workshops to parents of students with disabilities regarding procedural safeguards and navigating the IEP or IFSP; support for districts to implement Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS); and the Statewide Transition Technical Assistance Network that supports districts with secondary and Post-secondary students with disabilities.

Oregon solicits stakeholder input as needed on Annual Performance Report (APR) target setting and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) content. Oregon creates Special Education report cards for each of Oregon's 197 school districts and 35 Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE) county programs. These Report cards display the indicators on the Annual Performance Report that is required for public reporting. Report Cards are given to parents of children with disabilities and made available to the public on ODE's website.

#### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

197

#### General Supervision System:

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

The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) works collaboratively with 197 school districts, as well as nine contractors that implement 35 Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE) county programs on comprehensive data collection and analysis, performance reporting, improvement planning, implementation, and progress reporting.

ODE's general supervision system is coordinated out of the Office of Student Services. Within this Office are data, monitoring, and legal components designed to identify noncompliance. The general supervision system components are organized as follows:

1. System Performance Review & Improvement (SPR&I): All school districts and EI/ECSE programs in Oregon are required to participate in the ODE System Performance Review and Improvement (SPR&I) application of annual accountability and performance reporting. This system focuses on procedural compliance and performance indicators identified through federal and state regulation and previous state monitoring findings. Districts and programs conduct individual child file reviews annually to collect procedural compliance data. These data are collected on a specified number of child files determined by ODE. Individual child procedural compliance data is collected by districts and programs and submitted to ODE electronically through the SPR&I database. The SPR&I system provides ODE the mechanism for review of district/program policies, procedures, and systems, to ensure the requirements set forth in 43 CFR 300.600-609.
2. Complaints and dispute resolution: While ODE oversees complaints, due process hearings, mediations, and other alternative dispute resolution activities as part of its general supervision responsibilities, only complaints and due process hearings result in findings of noncompliance.

ODE uses independent contractors to conduct mediations and complaint investigations for ODE, with support, coordination, and additional assistance by the ODE special education legal specialist. ODE provides training and oversight for these complaint contractors. When a complaint final order identifies noncompliance and orders corrective action, ODE staff work with district and

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

program staff to ensure completion of corrective action within required time lines. ODE uses the same complaint resolution system and complaint contractors for Part B and Part C.

ODE has a one-tier due process hearing system. All special education due process hearings are conducted by Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) administrative law judges. OAH and ODE have trained OAH administrative law judges to conduct special education hearings. When a due process hearing final order identifies noncompliance and orders corrective action, ODE staff work with district and program staff to ensure completion of corrective action within required time lines. ODE uses the same due process hearing system and complaint contractors for Part B and Part C.

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

**Technical Assistance System:**

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

The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) provides Technical Assistance (TA) to Oregon's 197 school districts and 35 Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE) county programs in several ways. ODE makes use of a state-wide, web-based cycle of continuous improvement mechanism called System Performance Review & Improvement (SPR&I). The SPR&I mechanism gives districts and programs access to data and activities so that monitoring compliance/noncompliance can occur with regularity and accuracy and allows for timely corrective action to occur. In addition, each district and program is assigned a county contact, an education specialist who serves as their point of contact and provides assistance with the SPR&I mechanism and additional TA.

ODE provides annual, regionally focused training on data collection and compliance and performance issues as well as trainings for new district and program participants as part of the SPR&I mechanism.

TA to districts and programs includes the following: advice by experts; assistance in identifying and implementing professional development, instructional strategies or methods of instruction that are based on scientifically based instruction and using experienced program coordinators and specialists to provide advice, technical assistance, and support; and collaboration with institutions of higher education, educational service agencies, national centers of technical assistance, and private TA providers.

The ODE website (<http://www.oregon.gov/ode/students-and-family/SpecialEducation/Pages/default.aspx>) provides up-to-date forms, statutes and regulations, policies and procedures, and program operation guidelines.

ODE uses e-mail distribution lists to provide timely information and support to programs ensuring that critical information is received.

Attachments				
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	Remove
	<a href="#">spp apr ta addendum 2018.docx</a>	Alan Garland		

**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 students with disabilities.

The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) has several systems in place to provide professional development to its 197 school districts and 35 Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE) county programs. ODE has leveraged both IDEA discretionary funds and funds from the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) to provide every district and program the opportunity to receive direct technical assistance and professional development focusing on the implementation of evidence based practices for students with disabilities.

The State Advisory Council for Special Education brings together a variety of partners such as but not limited to: parents, representatives from higher education, state and local officials, administrators, private school and charter school representatives to provide a channel for information to be shared among programs and stakeholders.

ODE provides annual, state-wide training, on compliance and performance issues as informed by the state-wide, web-based, cycle of continuous improvement mechanism called Systems Performance Review & Improvement. ODE also works with the Confederation of Oregon School Administrators to develop and present training on a wide variety of topics in their annual fall conference.

ODE contracts with Family and Community Together (FACT) to provide six workshops per year to families in both English and Spanish. Topics include procedural safeguards and navigating the IEP or IFSP.

The OrRTI (Oregon Response to Intervention) project focuses on developing leadership capacity and infrastructure at the district and school levels to establish and sustain deep systems change related to targeted and effective instruction to meet the needs of all

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

students and provide a framework to identify students with specific learning disability.

SWIFT (Schoolwide Integrated Framework for Transformation) is a national K-8 technical assistance center that builds capacity to provide academic and behavioral support to improve outcomes for all students through equity-based inclusion. ODE continues to partner with the SWIFT Center as ODE integrates the four districts that began implementation of the SWIFT (Schoolwide Integrated Framework for Transformation) framework in 2016 into the scale up of Oregon's integrated System of Support that is detailed further in the paragraph below. The SWIFT framework builds capacity to provide academic and behavioral support to improve outcomes for all students through equity-based inclusion. This project initially began with four districts participating, with four more districts added in each of the next two years.

The Statewide Transition Technical Assistance Network includes professional development and technical assistance for teachers, administrators, and other educational service regarding transition-related curricula/instructional approaches, outcome-based transition planning approaches, facilitation interagency teams and resources.

**Attachments**

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

**Stakeholder Involvement:**  apply this to all Part B results indicators

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

On November 7, 2013, 63 stakeholders participated in Annual Performance Report (APR) target setting and dialogue on State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) content. Among those invited were parents, representatives of school districts, EI/ECSE service providers, education service districts, higher education, charter schools, private schools, and state agencies. Members of the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) and the State Advisory Council for Special Education (SACSE) also participated. Following a review of past APR data, input was sought for targets for the 2013-2018 SPP/APR. Stakeholders were also presented with information on the development of the B17 and C11 SSIP and the determination of the State-Initiated Measurable Results. This process was repeated in seven regional trainings for all EI/ECSE programs in the state.

Targets for Indicators B1 and B3 were not established on the November 7, 2013, stakeholder meeting, but were previously established per Oregon's ESEA Flexibility Waiver as of March 13, 2013.

On November 7, 2014, stakeholders participated in a dialogue regarding the APP/APR and Phase I of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) content.

On November 4, 2015, 12 stakeholders participated in Annual Performance Report (APR) target setting and dialogue focused specifically on the Parent Survey.

On November 6, 2015, 52 stakeholders participated in Annual Performance Report (APR) target setting and dialogue on State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) content. Among those invited were parents, representatives of school districts, EI/ECSE service providers, education service districts, higher education, charter schools, private schools, and state agencies. Members of the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) and the State Advisory Council for Special Education (SACSE) also participated. Following a review of past Parent Survey data, input was sought for targets for the 2014-2018 SPP/APR. Stakeholders were also presented with a review of Phase I of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) and an opportunity for stakeholders to provide feedback on Phase II of the SSIP.

On November 29, 2016 over 55 stakeholders participated in Annual Performance Report review and target setting. Discussion focused on current Oregon's current rating for Part B and for Part C. Data was shared across all Indicators and Results. Among those attending were parents, representatives from school districts and programs, education service districts, state agencies and other community partners. In addition to the APR/SPP discussions, participants also provided input on components of Oregon's ESSA plan.

Three quarterly meetings were held during the 2015-16 school year with regional ESD Special Education directors. Agendas included ODE updates and critical issues identified by the directors, and feedback was solicited regarding Oregon's state performance plan and determinations. Secondary transition issues were a focus.

On November 29, 2017, over 50 stakeholders participated in review of and submitted recommendations for Oregon's standards under the new federal regulations concerning Significant Disproportionality. Among those invited were parents and representatives of: school districts, EI/ECSE service providers, education service districts, higher education, charter schools/virtual schools, private schools, and state agencies, including ODE. Members of the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) and the State Advisory Council for Special Education (SACSE) were in attendance. The agenda also included a review of Phase II and Phase III of both the Part B and Part C State Systemic Improvement Plans (SSIP), with a focus on scale-up efforts and evaluation of progress.

**Attachments**

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

**Reporting to the Public:**

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2015 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 2015 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, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2015 APR in 2017, is available.

The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) produces Special Education Report Cards annually. These report cards display the indicators required for public reporting and the corresponding data for each of Oregon's 197 school districts and 35 Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE) county programs. In addition, an additional EI/ECSE report card is produced for the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs and a combined report card for Sherman, Gilliam, and Wheeler counties. These Special Education Report cards are then released to the public 60 days following the APR submission to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). The Special Education Report Cards were released to the public on April 3, 2016. ODE requires that districts distribute the cards to all parents of students with IFSPs/IEPs. ODE then makes all Special Education Report cards available to the public via its website (<http://www.oregon.gov/ode/schools-and-districts/reportcards/SpEdReportCards/Pages/default.aspx>). In addition, a public announcement is sent via the statewide message system of the Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction to major Oregon news media. ODE provides the current SPP/APR at the following address: <http://www.oregon.gov/ode/reports-and-data/SpEdReports/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-and-Annual-Performance-Report-for-Special-Education.aspx>.

**Attachments**

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 1: Graduation**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:

Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma.

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			72.00%	58.00%	68.10%	65.00%	65.00%	67.00%	67.00%	69.00%	72.00%
Data		63.34%	58.49%	62.72%	75.51%	42.43%	41.78%	42.24%	38.19%	37.16%	51.11%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	75.00%
Data	52.74%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	78.00%	81.00%	84.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	10/12/2017	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma</a>	3,701	
SY 2015-16 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	10/12/2017	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate</a>	6,668	null
SY 2015-16 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	10/12/2017	<a href="#">2014-15 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table</a>	55.50%	Calculate <input type="checkbox"/>

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2015 Data	FFY 2016 Target	FFY 2016 Data
3,701	6,668	52.74%	78.00%	55.50%

**Graduation Conditions**

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using: 4-year ACGR

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

In Oregon the requirements to earn a Regular Diploma and Modified Diploma are the same for students with and without IEP's. To earn the Regular Diploma, students must successfully complete the 24-credit requirement, demonstrate proficiency in the Essential Skills, and meet the Personalized Learning requirements. To earn a Modified Diploma in Oregon, students are required to earn 24 credits, complete the Personalized Learning Requirements and demonstrate proficiency in the required Essential Skills. The Modified Diploma is a high school completion document that may be earned by students who have demonstrated an inability to meet the full set of

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

academic content standards required for a regular high school diploma, even with reasonable accommodations. To be eligible for the Modified Diploma, a student must have a “documented history” of an inability to maintain grade level achievement due to significant learning and instructional barriers, or a documented history of a medical condition that creates a barrier to achievement. Students also have the option to earn credit by demonstrating proficiency. These graduation requirements apply to all students, including those students with IEPs.

Oregon uses two cohort methodologies to calculate graduation rates. The definition of the high school diploma includes students leaving with a regular diploma, a modified diploma and those students who have earned their diploma but are continuing for an additional year before having the diploma awarded.

Using the four-year cohort methodology, Oregon’s graduation rate for students with IEPs is 55.50% (3,701/6,668) which did not reach the state target of 78.00%. Oregon experienced an increase of 2.76 percentage points in the graduation rate of students with disabilities using the four-year cohort methodology between FFY 2015 and FFY 2016 (52.74% to 55.50%). Using the five-year cohort methodology, Oregon’s graduation rate of 59.90% (3,832/6,401) did not reach the state target of 83.00%. Oregon experienced an increase of 1.48% in the graduation rate of students with disabilities using the five-year cohort methodology between FFY 2015 and FFY 2016.

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? No

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 2: Drop Out**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:  
Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2008

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			5.40%	6.00%	6.00%	3.70%	3.60%	3.60%	3.50%	3.50%	3.40%
Data			6.24%	5.44%	3.57%	3.72%	4.56%	4.34%	4.80%	6.01%	6.10%

FFY	2015
Target ≤	3.40%
Data	5.79%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	3.30%	3.20%	3.10%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Please indicate whether you are reporting using Option 1 or Option 2.

- Option 1
- Option 2

Has your State made or proposes to make changes to the data source under Option 2 when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012? No

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of high school students with IEPs	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
1,520	26,882	5.79%	3.30%	5.65%

Use a different calculation methodology

- Change numerator description in data table
- Change denominator description in data table

Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

**Dropout Rates in Oregon High Schools**

Dropout data is collected in the Annual Cumulative Average Daily Membership (ADM) Data Collection each year at the end of the school year, which identifies students' enrollment dates and status as of the last day of enrollment for the year.

The 2015-16 report presents dropout rates by school and district for students who dropped out of grades 9 through 12 between July 1 and June 30, along with rates for student subgroups measured against the count of enrolled students at the beginning of the school year (Fall Membership for most schools or ADM enrollment for schools providing only hourly instruction).

A dropout is a student who withdrew from school and did not graduate or transfer to another school that leads to graduation. Dropouts

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

do not include students who:

- are deceased,
- are being home schooled,
- are enrolled in an alternative school or hospital
- are enrolled in a foreign exchange program,
- are temporarily absent because of suspension, a family emergency, or severe health problems that prevent attendance at school,
- received a GED certificate,
- received an adult high school diploma from a community college.

Rules developed by the Oregon Department of Education ensure a complete accounting of students who drop out during the school year, as well as students who drop out between school years.

Oregon's dropout reporting procedures are in full agreement with the procedures developed by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) for uniform and comparable reporting of dropout rates by the states. In FFY 2008, OSEP changed the required data source for this indicator to match the data used under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Since FFY 2011, states are given the option of using the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) data or using 618 data for this indicator. Oregon continues to use the NCES data as its methodology. For FFY 2016, the reported data is from 2015-2016. The one-year statewide dropout rate calculation uses the NCES formula: dividing the number of dropouts (for grades 9-12) by the number of students reported on the October Average Daily Membership (ADM) Collection for grades 9-12, times 100.

The ADM is the number of students enrolled as of the first school day in October. The enrollment count includes fifth-year seniors (shown as 12th graders) and students placed in an alternative program, regardless of where the student attends school.

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

A dropout is a student who withdrew from school and did not graduate or transfer to another school that leads to graduation. Dropouts do not include students who:

- are deceased,
- are being home schooled,
- are enrolled in an alternative school or hospital
- are enrolled in a foreign exchange program,
- are temporarily absent because of suspension, a family emergency, or severe health problems that prevent attendance at school,
- received a GED certificate,
- received an adult high school diploma from a community college.

**Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs?** No

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

**Historical Data**

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		96.10%	97.10%	97.50%	98.50%	98.30%	98.40%	98.40%	98.20%	98.22%	93.59%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		97.30%	96.90%	97.40%	98.50%	98.30%	98.10%	98.10%	98.10%	98.00%	93.16%

	Group Name	FFY	2015
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	95.00%
		Data	92.19%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	95.00%
		Data	91.43%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

	FFY	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Overall	46,926	42,330	92.19%	95.00%	90.21%

**Reasons for Group A Slippage**

Participation rates in Oregon were lower in 2016-17 due to a significant number of parents opting their children out of statewide assessments. Oregon is working with school districts to increase participation in future years.

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Overall	46,961	41,997	91.43%	95.00%	89.43%

**Reasons for Group A Slippage**

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Participation rates in Oregon were lower in 2016-17 due to a significant number of parents opting their children out of statewide assessments. Oregon is working with school districts to increase participation in future years.

### Public Reporting Information

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

Information regarding statewide assessment results can be found at <http://www.oregon.gov/ode/educator-resources/assessment/Pages/Assessment-Results.aspx>

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

**Historical Data**

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Elementary	2016	Target ≥			50.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	70.00%	70.00%	69.00%	72.00%	54.50%
			Data		39.10%					58.92%	45.60%	42.91%	42.23%	29.70%
	B Middle	2016	Target ≥			50.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	70.00%	70.00%	69.00%	72.00%	54.50%
			Data		39.10%					43.39%	33.73%	31.90%	31.24%	22.25%
	C HS	2016	Target ≥							70.00%	70.00%	82.00%	85.00%	54.50%
			Data							46.36%	49.43%	48.50%	49.25%	31.73%
Math	A Elementary	2016	Target ≥			49.00%	59.00%	59.00%	59.00%	70.00%	70.00%	66.00%	69.00%	40.00%
			Data		48.90%					36.39%	36.30%	33.26%	32.96%	26.10%
	B Middle	2016	Target ≥			49.00%	59.00%	59.00%	59.00%	70.00%	70.00%	66.00%	69.00%	40.00%
			Data		48.90%					26.31%	25.05%	23.13%	21.73%	17.01%
	C HS	2016	Target ≥							70.00%	70.00%	67.00%	70.00%	40.00%
			Data							26.47%	21.42%	23.70%	24.83%	11.79%

	Group Name	FFY	2015
Reading	A Elementary	Target ≥	54.50%
		Data	24.79%
	B Middle	Target ≥	54.50%
		Data	19.86%
	C HS	Target ≥	54.50%
		Data	29.17%
Math	A Elementary	Target ≥	40.00%
		Data	21.89%
	B Middle	Target ≥	40.00%
		Data	14.39%
	C HS	Target ≥	40.00%
		Data	10.24%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

	FFY	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Elementary	28.00%	35.00%	41.00%
	B ≥ Middle	28.00%	35.00%	41.00%
	C ≥ HS	28.00%	35.00%	41.00%
Math	A ≥ Elementary	25.00%	32.00%	39.00%
	B ≥ Middle	25.00%	32.00%	39.00%
	C ≥ HS	25.00%	32.00%	39.00%

Key:

**Explanation of Changes**

The revised targets are now the official state targets as approved by our State Board and the U.S. Department of Education under ESSA.

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

The new baseline is FFY 2016.

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#). Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

The revised targets are now the official state targets as approved by our State Board and the U.S. Department of Education under ESSA. The new baseline is FFY 2016.

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Elementary	19,452	4,503	24.79%	28.00%	23.15%
B Middle	18,098	3,331	19.86%	28.00%	18.41%
C HS	4,780	1,402	29.17%	28.00%	29.33%

**Reasons for Group A Slippage**

Performance was lower in 2016-17 in ELA for all elementary school level students across the state, including elementary school level students with IEPs.

**Reasons for Group B Slippage**

Performance was lower in 2016-17 in ELA for all middle school level students across the state, including middle school level students with IEPs.

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Elementary	19,386	4,054	21.89%	25.00%	20.91%
B Middle	17,933	2,434	14.39%	25.00%	13.57%
C HS	4,678	486	10.24%	25.00%	10.39%

**Public Reporting Information**

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

Information regarding statewide assessment results can be found at <http://www.oregon.gov/ode/educator-resources/assessment/Pages/Assessment-Results.aspx>**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	9.70%	8.70%	7.70%	7.70%	7.20%
Data		0%	19.29%	22.80%	22.80%	10.70%	13.20%	8.60%	12.20%	11.17%	13.71%

FFY	2015
Target ≤	6.70%
Data	8.63%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	6.20%	5.70%	5.20%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement?  Yes  No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement. 170

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
17	27	8.63%	6.20%	62.96%

**Reasons for Slippage**

The principal reason for slippage is a change in the instructions for calculating data from FFY 2015 to FFY 2016. Specifically, the denominator for FFY 2016 excludes districts in the State that do not meet the State's minimum n-size. In FFY 2015, the denominator was described as "Number of districts in the State," regardless of whether the district meets the State's minimum n-size. As 170 districts in the State do not meet the State-established minimum n-size, there is a significant shift in the B4A calculation.

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
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

**State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology**

Oregon defines significant discrepancy as a rate of suspension/expulsion for greater than 10 days based on a rate ratio greater than 2.0 and more than three IDEA-eligible students with greater than 10 days suspension/expulsion.\* Only districts that meet both of these criteria are flagged for significant discrepancy. Oregon compares the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to children without IEPs within the district. Data is collected from all school districts through the Discipline Incidents Collection.

The standard operating procedures for this indicator include:

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- Preparing and disseminating to all districts a discipline report for students with and without disabilities using the System Performance Review and Improvement (SPR&I) system.
- Identifying districts that exceed the threshold with a significant discrepancy.
- Requiring districts with a significant discrepancy to complete a Consolidated Plan that includes a section dedicated to behavior intervention and disciplinary removal. The Consolidated Plan includes questions about district policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports (PBIS) and strategies, use of manifestation determination processes, professional development, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with IDEA, as required by 34 CFR § 300.170(b).
- Providing written notification of noncompliance to districts that have policies, procedures, and practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as well as to districts that have identified noncompliance as a result of the Consolidated Plan review.
- Requiring districts that have policies, procedures, or practices contributing to the significant discrepancy, and/or districts that have identified noncompliance as a result of the Consolidated Plan review to submit an action plan within each district's Consolidated Plan that identifies at least one goal, one activity, or one policy revision to address significant discrepancies in the areas of behavior intervention and disciplinary removal, as identified in ODE findings.
- Reviewing district Consolidated Plans, including action plans and accompanying documentation to determine compliance with this indicator. District Consolidated Plans and accompanying documentation that do not address compliance are amended and resubmitted by the district to ODE.

\*170 of Oregon's 197 districts were excluded from the calculation because they did not meet the State's minimum n-size.

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

### FFY 2015 Identification of Noncompliance

#### Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2016 using 2015-2016 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.

During FFY 2016, ODE conducted Consolidated Plan reviews for 17 districts identified with significant discrepancy based on 2015-2016 data. The Consolidated Plan process includes a review of three main areas: (1) district data decision-making; (2) school/district processes; and (3) procedural safeguards. Related sub-components that are reviewed across these three areas include manifestation determination, functional behavior assessment and behavior intervention planning, district professional development, special factors consideration, and other relevant factors as appropriate. Based on this review, the 17 identified districts were required to either develop a behavior intervention and disciplinary removal action plan or review their existing action plan and describe progress or make plan adjustments, as necessary.

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

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

The State DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

In FFY 2016, ODE conducted Consolidated Plan reviews for 17 districts identified with significant discrepancy. The Consolidated Plan process includes a review of three main areas: (1) district data decision-making; (2) school/district processes; and (3) procedural safeguards. Related sub-components that are reviewed across these three areas include manifestation determination, functional behavior assessment and behavior intervention planning, district professional development, special factors consideration, and other relevant factors as appropriate. Districts flagged for noncompliance are required to develop a behavior intervention and disciplinary removal action plan, as well as the process by which they will review subsequent data to ensure there are no other systemic issues of noncompliance, pursuant to OSEP memo 09-02. Districts that already had an action plan were required to review their existing action plan and describe progress or make plan adjustments, as necessary. All plans were submitted to ODE. District Consolidated Plans that did not meet State requirements were amended and resubmitted by the district to ODE until each met the State's established requirements.

The State did NOT ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
17	17	0	0

**FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

In FFY 2015, using 2014-2015 data, ODE identified 8.63% (17/197) of districts as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions/expulsions of greater than 10 days for more than three children with IEPs. ODE conducted Consolidated Plan reviews for the 17 districts identified with significant discrepancy. The Consolidated Plan process includes a review of three main areas: (1) district data decision-making; (2) school/district processes; and (3) procedural safeguards. Related sub-components that are reviewed across these three areas include manifestation determination, functional behavior assessment and behavior intervention planning, district professional development, special factors consideration, and other relevant factors as appropriate.

Based on these extensive reviews, each of the 17 districts were required to develop a behavior intervention and disciplinary removal action plan and correct noncompliance within one year. Each district developed, submitted, and obtained ODE approval for their Consolidated Plans. For noncompliance identified in FFY 2015, pursuant to 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(b), ODE verified that all 17 districts showed 100% compliance within one year after the initial noncompliance was identified based on a review of the required Consolidated Plans. Consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02, dated October 17, 2008, each district addressed each individual case of noncompliance through the Consolidated Plan process.

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

Individual cases of noncompliance were identified through the Consolidated Plan review process. Districts flagged for noncompliance were required to articulate a plan for correcting noncompliance, as well as the process by which they will review subsequent data to ensure there are no other systemic issues of noncompliance.

In FFY 2015, ODE conducted Consolidated Plan reviews with each of the 17 districts identified with significant discrepancy. Each of the 17 identified districts were required to complete Consolidated Plans. Districts evaluated their data and decision-making processes to correct instances of noncompliance and make adjustments, as warranted. All plans were submitted to ODE. District Consolidated Plans that did not address compliance were amended and resubmitted by the district to ODE until each met the State's established requirements.

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data						1.00%	3.00%	3.00%	1.01%	1.52%	1.52%

FFY	2015
Target	0%
Data	5.58%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement?  Yes  No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n-size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement. 188

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
9	9	9	5.58%	0%	100%

**Reasons for Slippage**

The principle reason for slippage is a change in the calculation of data from FFY 2015 to FFY 2016. Specifically, the denominator for FFY 2016 excludes districts in the State that do not meet the State's minimum n-size. In FFY 2015, the denominator was described as "Number of districts in the State," regardless of whether the district meets the State's minimum n-size. Because 188 districts in the State do not meet the State-established minimum n-size, there is a significant shift in the B4B calculation.

From FFY 2015 to FFY 2016, the number of districts in the State identified as having a significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity decreased from eleven to nine.

Beginning with the 2015-2016 school year, ODE initiated its Consolidated Plan review process. The Consolidated Plan is a continuous improvement plan with required annual reviews and updates based on annual data associated with each indicator. The Consolidated Plan's review and update process involves collaborative discussions between districts and ODE staff. The Consolidated Plan is divided into the following four sections: (1) College and Career Ready Indicators; (2) Equity and Disproportionality Indicators; (3) Statewide Assessment Indicator; and (4) Child Find Indicator. Each section requires that each district analyze its indicator data and articulate an action plan (e.g., goal, intervention, policy revision) for identified area(s) of slippage and/or noncompliance.

Within the Equity and Disproportionality Indicators, districts submitted data analyses regarding behavior intervention and disciplinary removal. After ODE review of each district's Consolidated Plan, districts found to have policies, procedures, or practices contributing to the significant discrepancy, and/or districts that have identified noncompliance as a result of the Consolidated Plan review were required to either submit an action plan that identifies at least one goal, one activity, and one policy revision to address significant discrepancies in the areas of behavior intervention and disciplinary removal, or review existing action plans and describe progress or make plan adjustments as necessary. In FFY 2016, nine school districts were required to develop an action plan or review their existing action plan and either describe progress or make adjustments to the plan, as necessary.

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

### State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Oregon defines significant discrepancy as the rates of expulsions and suspensions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for all children without IEPs in the same LEA and flags districts where:

- The rate ratio analysis shows a value greater than 2.0 in the same race/ethnic category.
- At least five IDEA eligible students received long-term suspension/expulsions in a specific race/ethnic category.\*

Only districts that meet both of these criteria are flagged for significant discrepancy.

\*188 of Oregon's 197 districts were excluded from the calculation because they did not meet the State's minimum n-size.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The standard operating procedures for this indicator include:

- Preparing and disseminating to all districts a discipline report for students with and without disabilities, using the System Performance Review and Improvement (SPR&I) system.
- Identifying districts that exceed both the greater than 2.0 Race Ratio (RR) and minimum n-size (five or more students eligible for IDEA in the same race/ethnicity category threshold with significant discrepancy.)
- Requiring districts with a significant discrepancy to complete a Consolidated Plan that includes a section dedicated to behavior intervention and disciplinary removal. The Consolidated Plan includes questions about district policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports (PBIS) and strategies, professional development, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).
- Requiring districts that have policies, procedures, or practices contributing to the significant discrepancy, and/or districts that have identified noncompliance as a result of the Consolidated Plan review to submit an action plan within each district's consolidated plan that identifies at least one goal, one activity, and one policy revision to address significant discrepancies in the areas of behavior intervention and disciplinary removal, as identified in ODE findings.
- Reviewing district Consolidated Plans, including action plans and accompanying documentation to determine compliance with this indicator. District consolidated plans and accompanying documentation that do not address compliance are amended and resubmitted by the district to ODE.

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

### FFY 2015 Identification of Noncompliance

#### Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2016 using 2015-2016 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.

ODE conducted Consolidated Plan reviews for nine districts identified with significant discrepancy based on 2015-2016 data. The Consolidated Plan process includes a review of three main areas: (1) district data decision-making; (2) school/district processes; and (3) procedural safeguards. Related sub-components that are reviewed across these three areas include manifestation determination, functional behavioral assessment and behavior intervention planning, district professional development, special factors consideration, and other relevant factors as appropriate. Based on this review, the nine identified districts were required to either develop a behavior intervention and disciplinary removal action plan or review its existing action plan and describe progress or make plan adjustments, as necessary.

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

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

The State DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

In FFY 2016, ODE conducted Consolidated Plan reviews for nine districts identified with significant discrepancy. The Consolidated Plan process includes a review of three main areas: (1) district data decision-making; (2) school/district processes; and (3) procedural safeguards. Related sub-components that are reviewed across these three areas include manifestation determination, functional behavioral assessment and behavior intervention planning, district professional development, special factors consideration, and other relevant factors as appropriate. Districts flagged for noncompliance are required to develop a behavior intervention and disciplinary removal action plan for individual correction, as well as the process by which they will review subsequent data to ensure there are no other systemic issues of noncompliance, pursuant to OSEP memo 09-02. Based on this review, nine districts were required to develop a behavior intervention and disciplinary removal action plan or review their existing action plan and describe progress or make plan adjustments, as necessary. All plans were submitted to ODE. District Consolidated Plans that did not address compliance were amended and resubmitted by the district to ODE until each met the State's established requirements.

 The State did NOT ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
11	11	0	0

**FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

In FFY 2015, using 2014-2015 data, ODE identified 11 districts that had a significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity and policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to significant discrepancy. Each of the 11 districts developed Consolidated Plans. The Consolidated Plan development process included a review of three main areas: (1) district data decision-making; (2) school/district processes; and (3) procedural safeguards. Related sub-components that were reviewed across these three areas included manifestation determination, interim services, special factors consideration, functional behavioral assessment and behavior intervention planning, and other relevant factors as appropriate.

ODE required each of these 11 districts to complete a Corrective Action Plan regarding the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and the use of procedural safeguards. For noncompliance identified in FFY 2015, pursuant to 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(b), ODE verified that these districts showed 100% compliance one year after the initial noncompliance was identified based on a review of the required Consolidated Plans. Consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02, dated October 17, 2008, each district addressed each individual case of noncompliance through the Consolidated Plan process.

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

Individual cases of noncompliance were identified through the Consolidated Plan process. The Consolidated Plan process included a review of three main areas: (1) district data decision-making; (2) school/district processes; and (3) procedural safeguards. Related sub-components that were reviewed across these three areas included manifestation determinations, staff training, special factors consideration, functional behavioral assessment and behavior intervention planning, and other relevant factors as appropriate. Individual cases of noncompliance were identified through the Consolidated Plan review process. Districts flagged for noncompliance were required to articulate a plan for correcting individual cases of noncompliance, as well as the process by which they will review subsequent data to ensure there are no other systemic issues of noncompliance.

In FFY 2015, ODE conducted Consolidated Plan reviews with each of the 11 districts identified with such significant discrepancy and policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to significant discrepancy. Each of the 11 identified districts were required to complete Consolidated Plans. Districts evaluated their data and decision-making processes to correct instances of noncompliance and make adjustments, as warranted. All plans were submitted to ODE. District Consolidated Plans that did not address compliance were amended and resubmitted by each district to ODE until each met the State's established requirements. Consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02, dated October 17, 2008, each district corrected each individual case of noncompliance.

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

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

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2005	Target ≥			72.50%	69.00%	69.50%	70.00%	70.00%	70.00%	70.00%	70.00%	72.00%
		Data		70.60%	68.90%	69.30%	70.10%	70.10%	70.80%	71.80%	72.60%	72.91%	72.92%
B	2005	Target ≤			10.10%	11.00%	10.90%	10.80%	10.80%	10.80%	10.80%	10.80%	10.80%
		Data		11.30%	11.00%	11.00%	10.80%	10.60%	10.70%	10.70%	10.80%	10.60%	10.57%
C	2005	Target ≤			2.30%	2.20%	2.10%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	1.80%
		Data		2.20%	1.90%	1.70%	1.80%	1.60%	1.50%	1.30%	1.40%	1.18%	1.42%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	72.00%
	Data	73.37%
B	Target ≤	10.70%
	Data	10.15%
C	Target ≤	1.80%
	Data	1.19%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	72.00%	73.00%	73.00%
Target B ≤	10.70%	10.60%	10.60%
Target C ≤	1.80%	1.80%	1.80%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21</a>	75,013	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</a>	55,126	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</a>	7,430	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools</a>	635	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities</a>	62	null

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements</a>	201	null

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	55,126	75,013	73.37%	72.00%	73.49%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	7,430	75,013	10.15%	10.70%	9.90%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	888	75,013	1.19%	1.80%	1.20%

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Indicator 6: Preschool Environments**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

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

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2011	Target ≥									35.00%	35.00%	35.00%
		Data								32.70%	32.50%	40.05%	37.00%
B	2011	Target ≤									24.60%	24.60%	24.60%
		Data								25.60%	25.20%	24.34%	22.93%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	35.50%
	Data	39.91%
B	Target ≤	24.00%
	Data	23.30%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	35.50%	36.00%	36.00%
Target B ≤	24.00%	23.50%	23.50%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5</a>	10,852	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">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</a>	4,911	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">b1. Number of children attending separate special education class</a>	2,098	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">b2. Number of children attending separate school</a>	50	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">b3. Number of children attending residential facility</a>	n	null

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early	4,911	10,852	39.91%	35.50%	45.25%

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
childhood program					
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	2,149	10,852	23.30%	24.00%	19.80%

Use a different calculation methodology

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes**

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))

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2015	Target ≥						75.10%	74.30%	74.30%	74.80%	74.80%	74.80%
		Data					75.06%	74.30%	80.20%	81.20%	78.80%	75.06%	73.96%
A2	2015	Target ≥						29.60%	32.50%	32.50%	32.80%	32.80%	32.80%
		Data					29.58%	32.50%	29.00%	32.90%	33.20%	30.81%	29.79%
B1	2015	Target ≥						65.80%	60.50%	60.50%	61.00%	61.00%	61.00%
		Data					65.82%	60.50%	54.30%	53.60%	56.50%	55.55%	53.40%
B2	2015	Target ≥						22.50%	23.60%	23.60%	23.90%	23.90%	23.90%
		Data					22.50%	23.60%	21.30%	23.80%	24.30%	24.09%	24.34%
C1	2015	Target ≥						57.30%	44.80%	44.80%	45.30%	45.30%	45.30%
		Data					57.33%	44.80%	43.50%	42.00%	46.20%	43.35%	38.80%
C2	2015	Target ≥						36.70%	31.70%	31.70%	32.00%	32.00%	32.00%
		Data					36.66%	31.70%	29.20%	31.10%	32.20%	30.37%	28.83%

	FFY	2015
A1	Target ≥	75.00%
	Data	75.62%
A2	Target ≥	33.00%
	Data	60.20%
B1	Target ≥	61.50%
	Data	73.66%
B2	Target ≥	24.00%
	Data	57.84%
C1	Target ≥	45.50%
	Data	73.63%
C2	Target ≥	32.20%
	Data	61.21%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	76.10%	76.10%	76.10%
Target A2 ≥	60.50%	60.50%	60.50%
Target B1 ≥	74.20%	74.20%	74.20%
Target B2 ≥	58.10%	58.10%	58.10%
Target C1 ≥	74.10%	74.10%	74.10%
Target C2 ≥	61.50%	61.50%	61.50%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Background: On November 7, 2013, 63 stakeholders participated in APR target setting and dialogue on State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) content. Among those invited were parents, representatives of school districts, EI/ECSE service providers, education service

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

districts, higher education, charter schools, private schools, and state agencies. Members of the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) and the State Advisory Council for Special Education (SACSE) also participated. Following a review of past APR data, input was sought for targets for the 2013-2018 SPP/APR Stakeholders were also presented with information on the development of the B17 and C11 SSIP and the determination of the State-Initiated Measurable Results. This process was repeated in seven regional trainings for all EI/ECSE programs in the state.

Stakeholder input for these new baselines and targets was obtained through a variety of methods and settings. These new baselines and targets were reviewed, and input was received, at the annual System Performance Review and Improvement fall trainings, conducted with local program EI/ECSE staff on the following dates and locations:

- September 27, 2016, La Grande, Oregon
- September 29, 2016, Bend, Oregon
- October 13, 2016, Oregon City, Oregon
- October 18, 2016, Ashland, Oregon
- October 20, 2016, Eugene, Oregon
- October 25, 2016, Hillsboro, Oregon
- November 2, 2016, Salem, Oregon

These baselines and targets were reviewed by stakeholders on two additional occasions. The first was during the April 13, 2016 EI/ECSE contractors meeting. The second occasion was at the annual statewide special education stakeholders meeting conducted on Tuesday, November 29, 2016 at the Public Service Building, Salem, Oregon.

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	3644.00
--	---------

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	71.00	1.95%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	452.00	12.40%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	988.00	27.11%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	684.00	18.77%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1449.00	39.76%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	1672.00	2195.00	75.62%	76.10%	76.17%
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. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	2133.00	3644.00	60.20%	60.50%	58.53%

**Reasons for A2 Slippage**

During FFY 2016, three Assessment, Evaluation, Programming System (AEPS) trainings were conducted by authorized Brookes Publishing Company trainers. One of the trainings was conducted in the Portland, Oregon metropolitan area and included staff from the three largest Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE) programs in the state. The other two trainings were conducted in rural areas of Oregon. This was the most comprehensive AEPS training since the initial AEPS trainings in FFY 2008. The staffs receiving the training serve 63.1% of the children in Oregon EI/ECSE programs. Increased staff accuracy in administering the AEPS due to the training may have resulted in the change in data from the previous year for B7 summary statements, including the 1.67 percentage point drop for summary statement A2.

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	46.00	1.26%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	549.00	15.07%

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1019.00	27.96%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	470.00	12.90%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1560.00	42.81%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	1489.00	2084.00	73.66%	74.20%	71.45%
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. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	2030.00	3644.00	57.84%	58.10%	55.71%

**Reasons for B1 Slippage**

During FFY 2016, three Assessment, Evaluation, Programming System (AEPS) trainings were conducted by authorized Brookes Publishing Company trainers. One of the trainings was conducted in the Portland, Oregon metropolitan area and included staff from the three largest Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE) programs in the state. The other two trainings were conducted in rural areas of Oregon. This was the most comprehensive AEPS training since the initial AEPS trainings in FFY 2008. The staffs receiving the training serve 63.1% of the children in Oregon EI/ECSE programs. Increased staff accuracy in administering the AEPS due to the training may have resulted in the change in data from the previous year for B7 summary statements, including the 2.21 percentage point drop for summary statement B1.

**Reasons for B2 Slippage**

During FFY 2016, three Assessment, Evaluation, Programming System (AEPS) trainings were conducted by authorized Brookes Publishing Company trainers. One of the trainings was conducted in the Portland, Oregon metropolitan area and included staff from the three largest Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE) programs in the state. The other two trainings were conducted in rural areas of Oregon. This was the most comprehensive AEPS training since the initial AEPS trainings in FFY 2008. The staffs receiving the training serve 63.1% of the children in Oregon EI/ECSE programs. Increased staff accuracy in administering the AEPS due to the training may have resulted in the change in data from the previous year for B7 summary statements, including the 2.13 percentage point drop for summary statement B2.

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	44.00	1.21%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	504.00	13.83%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	919.00	25.22%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	593.00	16.27%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1584.00	43.47%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	1512.00	2060.00	73.63%	74.10%	73.40%
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. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	2177.00	3644.00	61.21%	61.50%	59.74%

**Reasons for C2 Slippage**

During FFY 2016, three Assessment, Evaluation, Programming System (AEPS) trainings were conducted by authorized Brookes Publishing Company trainers. One of the trainings was conducted in the Portland, Oregon metropolitan area and included staff from the three largest Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE) programs in the state. The other two trainings were conducted in rural areas of Oregon. This was the most comprehensive AEPS training since the initial AEPS trainings in FFY 2008. The staffs receiving the training serve 63.1% of the children in Oregon EI/ECSE programs. Increased staff accuracy in administering the AEPS due to the training may have resulted in the change in data from the previous year for B7 summary statements, including the 1.36 percentage point drop for summary statement C2.

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

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process? No

Provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.”

Beginning in 2008 for all children qualifying for early childhood special education services, all EI/ECSE programs in Oregon are required to enter child the Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming System (AEPS) data into the Early Childhood Web (ecWeb) system, starting with all children qualifying for early childhood special education services in May of 2008.

**Criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers”**

In 2015, using a national AEPS data set from typically developing children, a review team considered 90%, 85% and 80% percentile cut offs against the national data results to decide the cut off level that best reflected Oregon’s children in ECSE programs. The review team, the Oregon Department of Education staff, the EI/ECSE Contractors and the EI/ECSE stakeholder group were all asked to analyze the percentile cut offs and determine the cut off level Oregon should use for reporting to the ECSE child outcomes. The consensus was to use the 80% cut off level. It was believed that this most closely represents the children who are eligible for Early Childhood Special Education programs and receive services in Oregon.

**Child progress is measured using the following rubric:**

- If a child enters with a score below the normal range and stays the same or regresses at the next test administration, the child is categorized as (a) does not improve functioning.
- If the child makes progress and the ratio of how far below the normal level of development increases between test administrations, the child is categorized as (b) improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.
- If the child makes progress but the ratio of how far below the normal level of development decreases between test administrations, the child is categorized as (c) improved functioning to a level nearer to the functioning of same-aged peers, but did not reach it.
- If a child enters with a score below the normal range and increases to reach or exceed the normal range at the next test administration, the child is categorized as (d) improved functioning sufficient to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.
- If a child enters with a score at or above the normal range and maintains their score at or above the normal range at the next test administration, the child is categorized as (e) maintains functioning at or above same age peers.

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

As of 2008, all EI/ECSE programs in Oregon are required to enter individual child assessment results from the Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming System (AEPS) into the Early Childhood Web (ecWeb). The aggregate results are utilized for reporting on indicators C3 and B7.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 8: Parent involvement**

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))

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? Yes

Will you be providing the data for preschool children separately? Yes

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Preschool	2014	Target ≥			44.00%	49.00%	54.00%	61.00%	66.00%	66.00%	66.00%	66.00%
		Data		44.00%	41.00%	47.00%	48.50%	61.00%	39.60%	46.60%	35.80%	44.57%
School Age	2014	Target ≥			25.00%	31.00%	34.00%	37.00%	41.00%	41.00%	41.00%	41.00%
		Data		25.00%	30.00%	29.00%	32.50%	28.00%	33.40%	34.70%	40.10%	35.79%

	FFY	2014	2015
Preschool	Target ≥	82.18%	82.48%
	Data	82.18%	81.16%
School Age	Target ≥	76.23%	76.73%
	Data	76.23%	78.12%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Preschool Target ≥	82.68%	83.68%	85.68%
School-age Target ≥	77.73%	78.73%	81.23%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
Preschool	203.51	236.00	81.16%	82.68%	86.23%
School-age	1610.94	2046.00	78.12%	77.73%	78.74%

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.	10.18%	22417.00
---	--------	----------

The percentage shown is the number of respondent parents divided by the number of parents to whom the survey was distributed.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Note: Due to the weighting of responses the number of parents in the data table are not whole numbers.

**Part B 619**

The representativeness of the Part B 619 results was assessed by examining the demographic characteristics of the children of the

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

parents who responded to the survey to the demographic characteristics of children with disabilities in the Part B 619 in the population. This comparison indicates the results are generally representative by the (1) age of the child and (2) primary disability of the child. For example, 34% of the population have a child with primary disability of developmental delay, and the weighted results indicate that 31% of the respondents have a child with a primary disability of developmental delay. Parents of white students were slightly over-represented (the weighted results indicated that 74% of parent respondents had a student with a race/ethnicity of white whereas 67% of preschool children with disabilities are white). ODE will continue to encourage parents of students of all race/ethnicities to complete the survey Results were weighted by program to ensure that the parent survey results reflected the population of parents.

**School Age**

The representativeness of the K-12 results was assessed by examining the demographic characteristics of the students of the parents who responded to the survey to the demographic characteristics of students with disabilities in K-12 in the population. This comparison indicates the results are generally representative by the (1) size of the district and (2) grade level of the child. For example, 50% of the population are from large districts, and the weighted results indicate that 50% of the respondents are from large districts. Parents of white students were slightly over-represented (the weighted results indicated that 74% of parent respondents had a student with a race/ethnicity of white whereas 64% of special education students are white). In addition, parents of students with a learning disability were slightly under-represented (the weighted results indicated that 24% of parent respondents had a student with a learning disability whereas 34% of students in the population have a learning disability). ODE will continue to encourage parents of students of all race/ethnicities and parents of students of all disabilities to complete the survey. Results were weighted by district to ensure that the parent survey results reflected the population of parents.

Was sampling used? Yes

Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

The sampling methodology was designed to choose a representative set of districts/programs each year that is reflective of the state population as a whole. Within districts/programs, either a census is selected or in cases where a sample of parents is selected, the population is stratified by school, grade, race/ethnicity, primary disability, and gender in order to ensure the representativeness of the sample. See the attached Sampling Plan for details.

Was a survey used? Yes

Submitted survey: No Collection Tool Submitted

The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. Yes

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Per the Instructions for this indicator:

*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.*

Oregon is not submitting a survey because the survey it is using is neither a new nor revised one.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation**

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY	2015
Target	0%
Data	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement?  Yes  No

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 totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. 28

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and 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-size	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
10	0	169	0%	0%	0%

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?  Yes  No

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).

Oregon defines Disproportionate Representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services as:

- The percentage of IDEA eligible students disaggregated by race/ethnicity differs by +/- 20% from the percentage of all students within the district disaggregated by race/ethnicity in at least one race/ethnicity category
- A weighted risk ratio analysis shows a value of >2.0 in the same race/ethnicity category; and
- At least ten IDEA eligible students in the same race/ethnicity category in special education

Based on FFY 2016 data, 14.21% (28/197) of districts were excluded from the calculation due to the minimum “n” size requirement of at least ten IDEA eligible students in the same race/ethnicity category in special education. Of the remaining 169 districts, 159 or 94.08% (159/169) of districts fell within the threshold on their Disproportionate Representation in Special Education Report. The remaining 5.92% of districts (10/169) were required to complete a Consolidated Plan, a focused review of data analysis and action planning, to determine whether Disproportionate Representation was the result of inappropriate identification or was justified due to unique characteristics of the district. For these ten districts, ODE conducted an internal verification and validation of submitted analyses and determined that none of the districts identified with Disproportionate Representation in Special Education was the result of inappropriate identification.

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

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

All Oregon districts/programs review and analyze performance and compliance indicator data as part of the required activities of the System Performance Review & Improvement (SPR&I) monitoring and accountability system. Districts/programs engage in data collection, review, and analysis to inform meaningful improvement. The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) works collaboratively with districts/programs on verification and validation of data submissions, analyses, improvement planning, and implementation.

To assist in addressing flagged indicators, districts/programs develop a Consolidated Plan, a three-year plan with required annual reviews and updates based on annual data associated with each indicator. The Consolidated Plan's review and update process involves collaborative discussions between districts and ODE staff. The Consolidated Plan is divided into the following four sections: (1) College and Career Ready Indicators; (2) Equity and Disproportionality Indicators; (3) Statewide Assessment Indicator; and (4) Child Find Indicator. Each section requires each district analyze its indicator data and articulate an action plan (e.g., goal, intervention, policy revision) for identified area(s) of slippage and/or noncompliance. Within the Equity and Disproportionality Indicators, disproportionate representation is addressed directly by engaging districts to describe external factors, unique characteristics of their student population, or district policies, procedures or practices that may impact disproportionality.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015**

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

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories**

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY	2015
Target	0%
Data	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement?  Yes  No

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 totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. 41

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
36	0	156	0%	0%	0%

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?  Yes  No

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).

Oregon defines Disproportionate Representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services as:

- The percentage of IDEA eligible students disaggregated by race/ethnicity differs by +/- 20% from the percentage of all students within the district disaggregated by race/ethnicity in at least one race/ethnicity category, and
- A weighted risk ratio analysis shows a value of >2.0 in the same race/ethnicity category within the same disability category, and,
- At least ten IDEA eligible students in the same race/ethnicity category within the same disability category in special education

Oregon examines race/ethnicity data for all children with disabilities who receive special education and related services as reported in Part B, Table 1 of the 618 Data.

Based on FFY 2016 data, 20.81% (41/197) of districts were excluded from the calculation due to the minimum "n" size requirement of at least ten IDEA eligible students in the same race/ethnicity category in Specific Disability Categories. Of the remaining 156 districts, 120 or 76.92% (120/156) of districts fell within the threshold on their Disproportionate Representation in Special Education by Disability Type Report. The remaining 23.08% of districts (36/156) were required to complete a Consolidated Plan, a focused review of data and report of analysis, to determine whether Disproportionate Representation was the result of inappropriate identification or was justified due to unique characteristics of the district. For these 36 districts, ODE conducted an internal verification and validation of submitted analyses and determined that none of the districts identified with Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories was the result of inappropriate identification

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

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.

The Oregon Department of Education's standard operating procedures for this indicator include:

- Preparing and disseminating a Disproportionate Representation in Special Education Report to all districts with the following information:
  1. The percentage of IDEA eligible students disaggregated by race/ethnicity compared to all students within district disaggregated by race/ethnicity.
  2. A weighted risk ratio analysis for each race/ethnicity category.
  3. The number of IDEA eligible students in each race/ethnicity category.
- Providing training to all districts on the components of SPR&I.
- Identifying districts that are outside the threshold for Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories.
- Requiring districts with Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories to complete a focused review of their race/ethnicity data and report analysis results using the ODE Consolidated Plan.
- Verifying district analysis to determine possible justification due to the unique characteristics of the district.
- Requiring districts not justified based on their analysis to complete a Policy-to-Practice review that includes individual student file review focusing on identification of students with disabilities specific to the race/ethnicity category(s) identified with apparent Disproportionate Representation.
- Verifying the Policy-to-Practice review submission, and determining if the Disproportionate Representation is due to unique characteristics of the district or identifying the district as a district with Disproportionate Representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.
- Providing districts written notification of findings.
- Requiring districts identified with Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories that is the result of inappropriate identification to submit an action plan which must include: revisions of policies, procedures, and/or practices that contributed to the Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories and evidence of compliance with federal and state requirements for identification.
- Reviewing and approving action plans and providing written notice of approval to districts.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015**

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

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 11: Child Find**

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))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		94.30%	95.70%	94.80%	96.50%	97.00%	97.30%	98.60%	98.40%	98.69%	98.43%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	98.32%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

**FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
19,180	18,785	98.32%	100%	97.94%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	395
---	-----

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.

As noted above, 395 children (students) were included within the total number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received, but not within the total number of children whose evaluations were completed within the 60 school days. Of the 395 children who did not have their evaluation completed within the established time line, 185 (46.84%) had evaluations completed within 10 days of the 60 school day time line and another 57 (14.43%) were completed within 11-20 days of the 60 school day time line. These 242 children account for 61.27% of the total group of children whose evaluations did not meet the state established time line of 60 school days. Forty evaluations were completed between 31-151 days after the time line due date.

Delays were coded as follows:

- parent/guardian did not attend eligibility meeting 20 students (5.06% of students)
- additional testing for comprehensive evaluation 19 students (4.81% of students)
- delay by doctor/medical personal 19 students (4.81% of students)
- delay by district/program evaluation staff 246 students (62.28% of students)
- Exempt coding 91 students (23.04% of students)

Number of days over time lines were as follows:

- 1-10 days over time line 185
- 11-20 days over time line 57
- 21-30 days over time line 22
- 31-151 days over time line 40

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

- The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.
- The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.

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

- State monitoring
- 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.

School districts/programs in Oregon are required to complete special education eligibility evaluations within 60 school days of receiving written parent consent for evaluation. ODE integrated the Child Find collection into the consolidated collection process used by the Department in an effort to reduce the reporting burden on districts/programs. In order to address potential issues with data accuracy, ODE established an additional verification period for the collection, provided technical assistance to districts/programs, and updated all data collection documents. ODE also revised the Systems Performance Review and Improvement (SPR&I) system to include an Indicator B11 Child Find report, and required districts/programs with noncompliance to complete a Corrective Action Plan to address the reasons for noncompliance.

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
325	325	0	0

### FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In FFY 2016, 100% (325/325) of identified noncompliance from FFY 2015 were corrected within one year. These 325 files were associated with 57 districts and programs across the state.

#### ODE verified that each district with noncompliance reflected in the Child Find collection data:

- Is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on an ODE review of subsequent evaluation data.
- Has completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district/program, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02.

#### The standard operating procedures for this indicator include:

- Providing training to districts on the Special Education Child Find requirements and procedures, as well as technical support to districts regarding the data collection process.
- Providing districts with a Child Find data report through the SPR&I system that includes the status of their timely evaluations. The Indicator B11 Child Find report to districts includes detailed information on each student reported in the district/program Child Find submission.
- Requiring districts identified with noncompliance through the Child Find data collection to address reasons for not completing the evaluation and eligibility process within the 60-school-day timeline in their SPR&I Corrective Action Plan.
- Reviewing district Corrective Action Plans to ensure that activities developed are appropriate to ensure compliance with this indicator.

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

In FFY 2016, 100% (325/325) of identified noncompliance from FFY 2015 was corrected within one year.

Consistent with the requirement of OSEP Memo 09-02, each district has corrected each individual case of noncompliance unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district. ODE verified that all districts showed 100% compliance within one year after the

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

initial noncompliance was identified based on a review of updated data, including data subsequently collected through onsite monitoring and the SPR&I system.

ODE provided technical assistance and required districts/programs with noncompliance to complete the eligibility process and provide services to eligible children, explain the reasons for the noncompliance, demonstrate compliance through additional file reviews, and develop a Corrective Action Plan which consisted of reviewing and correcting the practices that contributed to the noncompliance. Districts were required to bring files into compliance within one year.

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition**

Monitoring Priority: 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))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		97.00%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	98.56%	100%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	100%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	147
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.	0
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	144
d. Number of children 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.	0
e. Number of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	3
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

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
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. $[c/(a-b-d-e-f)] \times 100$	144	144	100%	100%	100%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f	0
--	---

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

- State monitoring
- 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 EI programs in Oregon receiving IDEA funds are required to participate in the Oregon Department of Education (ODE) System Performance Review & Improvement (SPR&I) system of annual accountability and performance reporting. This system focuses on procedural compliance and performance indicators identified through federal and state regulation and previous state monitoring findings. Programs conduct individual child file reviews annually to collect procedural compliance data. These data are collected on a specified number of child files determined by ODE and are evenly split between Early Intervention, Early Intervention Transition, and Early Childhood Special Education. Individual child procedural compliance data is collected by programs and submitted to ODE electronically through the SPR&I database. ODE works collaboratively with programs on comprehensive data collection, analyses, performance reporting, improvement planning, implementation, and reporting of progress. The SPR&I system provides ODE the mechanism for review of district/program policies, procedures, and systems, to ensure the requirements set forth in 43 CFR §300.600-609 and CFR 4/23/2018

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

§303.501 are met.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

As per the Part B 2018 SPP/APR Measurement Table, category "f" was not used in calculations as Oregon does not have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015**

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

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition**

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 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))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data						77.20%	81.50%	80.30%	73.20%	81.68%	76.24%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	83.24%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

**FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
409	513	83.24%	100%	79.73%

**Reasons for Slippage**

Oregon received stakeholder input on the difficulty of the questions that were asked for the standards used in IDEA transition requirement. Often, multiple requirements were embedded in a single standard, which led to confusion at the monitor level. Due to this feedback, Oregon altered the language in the standards used to populate this data. These alterations led to more one-to-one alignment with IDEA transition requirements for an IEP. As such, some fluctuation in the reported rate was to be expected.

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

- State monitoring
- 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.**

From FFY 2015 to FFY 2016, Oregon altered the language in the standards from its System Performance Review & Improvement (SPR&I) application to better align with IDEA Transition requirements for students aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition. Each standard reviewed as part of the SPR&I self assessment reflects more direct alignment to IDEA transition requirements.

All districts in Oregon receiving IDEA funds are required to participate in the Oregon Department of Education (ODE) System Performance Review & Improvement (SPR&I) application for annual accountability and performance reporting.

This system focuses on procedural compliance and performance indicators identified through federal and state regulation and previous state monitoring findings. ODE works collaboratively with districts/programs on comprehensive data collection, analyses, performance reporting, improvement planning, implementation, and reporting of progress.

In SPR&I, districts are provided a list of transition age student files, selected for review each school year. Compliance of eight individual transition standards is tracked for all submitted transition-age files. All eight secondary transition standards begin with the first IEP in

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

effect when the student turns 16. The SPR&I system is the mechanism for review of district/program policies, procedures, and systems, to ensure the requirements set forth in 43 CFR 300.600-609 and CFR 303.501 are met.

**Districts must report that the student file includes the following standards:**

1. The IEP Team Meeting Notices must:
  - Invite the student.
  - Inform the parent and student that consideration of the post secondary goals and transition services would be addressed.
  - Identify any other agency that would be invited to send a representative, if appropriate.
2. If the student attended the IEP meeting or if the student did not attend there is documentation that other steps were taken to ensure that the student’s preferences, interests, and needs were considered as part of the IEP development;
3. The district has documentation that the most recent IEP meeting included, to the extent appropriate and with the consent of the parent or adult student, a representative of any participating agency that was likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services.
4. The IEP contains Present Levels of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance including:
  - The student’s preferences, needs, and interests.
  - The results of age-appropriate transition assessments.
5. The IEP contains a statement of measurable annual goals including academic and functional goals.
6. The IEP includes appropriate, measurable postsecondary goals based upon age-appropriate transition assessments related to training/education, employment, and, where appropriate, independent living skills.
7. The IEP includes transition services needed to assist the student to reach the post secondary goals.
8. The IEP includes courses of study needed to assist the student to reach the post secondary goals.

**The standard operating procedures ODE uses for this indicator include:**

- Requiring districts to engage in self-assessment through data collection, review, and analysis to inform meaningful improvement.
- Requiring districts to report on secondary transition services for a predetermined number of student files selected for review.
- Requiring districts to address noncompliance with transition services through corrective action documented in SPR&I that includes verifying that services were provided to students, an explanation for the cause of the noncompliance, correction of practices that contributed to the noncompliance, and demonstration of current compliance through subsequent data collection.
- Providing training to districts on the relationship among Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14.

Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?

Yes  No

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
90	90	0	0

**FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

All districts in Oregon receiving IDEA funds are required to participate in the Oregon Department of Education (ODE) System Performance Review & Improvement (SPR&I) application for annual accountability and performance reporting.

This system focuses on procedural compliance and performance indicators identified through federal and state regulation and previous state monitoring findings. ODE works collaboratively with districts/programs on comprehensive data collection, analyses, performance reporting, improvement planning, implementation, and reporting of progress.

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

In SPR&I, districts are provided a list of transition age student files, selected for review each school year. Compliance of eight individual transition standards is tracked for all submitted transition-age files. All eight secondary transition standards begin with the first IEP in effect when the student turns 16. The SPR&I system is the mechanism for review of district/program policies, procedures, and systems, to ensure the requirements set forth in 43 CFR 300.600-609 and CFR 303.501 are met.

Districts must report that the student file includes the following standards:

1. The IEP Team Meeting Notices must: · Invite the student. · Inform the parent and student that consideration of the postsecondary goals and transition services would be addressed. · Identify any other agency that would be invited to send a representative, if appropriate.
2. If the student attended the IEP meeting or if the student did not attend there is documentation that other steps were taken to ensure that the student's preferences, interests, and needs were considered as part of the IEP development;
3. The district has documentation that the most recent IEP meeting included, to the extent appropriate and with the consent of the parent or adult student, a representative of any participating agency that was likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services.
4. The IEP contains Present Levels of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance including: The student's preferences, needs, and interests. The results of age-appropriate transition assessments.
5. The IEP contains a statement of measurable annual goals including academic and 5. functional goals.
6. The IEP includes appropriate, measurable postsecondary goals based upon age-appropriate transition assessments related to training/education, employment, and, where appropriate, independent living skills.
7. The IEP includes transition services needed to assist the student to reach the post-secondary goals.
8. The IEP includes courses of study needed to assist the student to reach the post-secondary goals.

The standard operating procedures ODE uses for this indicator include:

- Requiring districts to engage in self-assessment through data collection, review, and analysis to inform meaningful improvement.
- Requiring districts to report on secondary transition services for a predetermined number of student files selected for review.
- Requiring districts to address noncompliance with transition services through corrective action documented in SPR&I that includes verifying that services were provided to students, an explanation for the cause of the noncompliance, correction of practices that contributed to the noncompliance, and demonstration of current compliance through subsequent data collection.
- Providing training to districts on the relationship among Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14.

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

In FFY 2016, ODE reviewed and verified district/program data and file submissions to confirm that 100% (90/90) individual cases of noncompliance in FFY 2015 were corrected within one year.

Consistent with the requirement of OSEP Memo 09-02, each district has corrected each individual case of noncompliance unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district. ODE verified that all districts showed 100% compliance within one year after the initial noncompliance was identified based on a review of updated data, including data subsequently collected through onsite monitoring and the SPR&I system.

Districts/programs were required to provide through SPR&I the cause of the noncompliance for each transition standard and demonstrate correction of practices that contributed to the noncompliance through subsequent data submission to SPR&I.

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes**

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))

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2009	Target ≥							25.00%	26.00%	27.00%	27.00%	28.00%
		Data						24.18%	25.30%	25.10%	25.70%	23.99%	22.37%
B	2009	Target ≥							51.00%	52.00%	53.00%	53.00%	55.00%
		Data						50.60%	54.10%	55.30%	54.40%	53.92%	56.40%
C	2009	Target ≥							67.00%	68.00%	69.00%	69.00%	70.00%
		Data						66.04%	67.70%	71.80%	70.00%	69.71%	71.34%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	29.00%
	Data	24.41%
B	Target ≥	55.00%
	Data	59.52%
C	Target ≥	72.00%
	Data	73.24%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	30.00%	31.00%	32.00%
Target B ≥	55.50%	55.50%	56.00%
Target C ≥	72.00%	72.00%	74.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	2936.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	721.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	1054.00
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)	224.00
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).	191.00

	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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	721.00	2936.00	24.41%	30.00%	24.56%

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

	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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	1775.00	2936.00	59.52%	55.50%	60.46%
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)	2190.00	2936.00	73.24%	72.00%	74.59%

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

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: 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.

**Was a survey used?** Yes

**Is it a new or revised survey?** No

**Was sampling used?** No

**Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school?** Yes

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

All students ages 14-21 who were reported on the 618 exit collection as leaving special education services are included in the required lists of students to be interviewed by school districts the following year. Districts report if the interview is completed, or not completed for each student. Demographic analyses on Oregon's Target Leaver and Respondent groups showed reported data is representative across Disability, Gender, Race/Ethnicity, and Limited English Proficiency. These data show no substantive difference in the characteristics between those who responded to the survey and those who did not.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions**

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)))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥				28.50%	28.50%	29.00%	29.50%	29.50%	29.50%	29.50%	29.50%
Data		11.00%	28.60%	60.00%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	25.00%	0%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	29.50%
Data	14.29%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	29.50%	29.50%	29.50%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/1/2017	<a href="#">3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements</a>	n	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/1/2017	<a href="#">3.1 Number of resolution sessions</a>	n	null

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
4	4	14.29%	29.50%	100%

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 16: Mediation**

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)))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			86.50%	86.50%	87.00%	87.50%	88.00%	88.00%	88.00%	88.00%	88.00%
Data		86.36%	77.80%	80.00%	78.38%	89.20%	90.48%	89.47%	82.86%	84.38%	86.67%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	89.00%
Data	83.78%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	89.00%	90.00%	90.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	<a href="#">2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints</a>	8	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	<a href="#">2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints</a>	18	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	<a href="#">2.1 Mediations held</a>	30	null

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
8	18	30	83.78%	89.00%	86.67%

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan**

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

**Reported Data**

Baseline Data: 2014

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016
Target ≥		54.50%	44.50%	45.50%
Data	42.80%	30.56%		

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  
 Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	46.50%	47.50%

Key:

**Description of Measure**

The State-Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) for Students with Disabilities, Kindergarten through age 21, is to *increase the percentage of third grade students with disabilities reading at grade level, as measured by state assessment.*

This SIMR is aligned with Indicator B3 Assessment and the proficiency rate in reading of third grade students with disabilities. This SIMR is also strongly linked to Graduation Rates (B1), Dropout Rates (B2), and is a child-level outcome that is directly connected to ODE's Goal 1/Objective 2: Implement statewide literacy programs so all students read by third grade.

**Target Note:** Oregon is transitioning between the Oregon Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (OAKS) to Smarter Balanced for the statewide assessment. Based on ODE's initial data analysis and research, ODE is predicting slippage in student achievement results with the first Smarter Balanced 2015 test administration. Once we establish a baseline for Smarter Balanced, ODE will review and determine if new targets need to be identified.

**Note:** Baseline data and targets are included as an attachment.

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**Overview**

Oregon's Phase III (2) SSIP is included as an attachment.

**Data Analysis**

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

*1a. Analysis of key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other data as applicable to determine the SIMR and the root causes contributing to low performance.*

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The development of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) began with an examination of data collections related to the SPP/APR indicators and Oregon's Strategic Education Plan. Oregon's plan has several goals, but the one with the most significant importance to the SSIP is: Goal 1 – Learners: *Every student graduates from high school and is ready for college, career, and civic life*. The following are the two objectives of Goal 1 that focuses on student achievement and specifically, closing the achievement gap for students with disabilities:

- 1.2 – Implement statewide literacy programs so all students read by third grade.
- 1.5 – Improve quality of special education services to close achievement gaps.

The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) manages many statewide data collections designed to meet federal and state reporting requirements, to inform statewide policy development, and to guide practice. All data collections have an ODE staff member designated as the primary owner who provides specific documentation, instruction, and training for the particular data collection.

ODE's data systems collect data electronically from the programs and school districts. All data submitted through the electronic systems are reviewed upon submission for errors to ensure valid and accurate data are collected. The data systems include a unique identifier for each child and staff member for whom data are reported in each data collection. These identifiers allow for comparison and reliability checks across data collections. As part of most data collections, reports are provided to programs and school districts to review and verify the data they submitted are accurate. ODE analyzes the collected data to ensure they are valid, reliable, and reported in a timely and accurate manner.

In addition, ODE utilizes the online System Performance Review and Improvement (SPR&I) application to collect and disseminate data related to general supervision. Through SPR&I, ODE monitors school district and program implementation of special education practices and procedures. All school districts and ESDs with state programs such as Oregon School for the Deaf (OSD), Long Term Care and Treatment (LTCT), Hospital Programs, Youth Correction Education Programs (YCEP), and Juvenile Justice Education Programs (JDEP) are monitored annually. The SPR&I application generates reports which provide comparisons to statewide data and district or program level data. School districts and ESDs have access to specific measurable indicators for use in self-assessment, review, and documentation of evidence of change via school district improvement plans. School districts and ESDs review current practices in relation to compliance standards and performance profile data. Data analysis and interpretation are used to inform local improvement planning decisions and activities, and to correct of any identified noncompliance.

The collected data was analyzed to inform development and selection of the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR). The following data sources were identified as part of the broad data analysis:

- SPP/APR data for School Age indicators
- School Age indicator data from Oregon's online System Performance Review and Improvement (SPR&I) monitoring application
- Special Education Child Count (SECC)
- Average Daily Membership (ADM) for Leaver Data
- Assessment Data Collection – participation and performance data
- Child Find Data Collection
- Discipline Incidents Data Collection
- Post School Outcomes Data Collection

The following is the review process used as part of the broad data analysis:

- Performance on each SPP/APR indicator was reviewed and summarized for the current five year period.
- Compliance and performance indicator data was disaggregated to drill down to identify potential focus areas for the SIMR.
- Data analysis was reviewed internally with EI/ECSE and School-Age teams in the spring of 2014 and as a result, additional analysis was conducted to narrow down the potential focus areas of the SIMR.
- Data analysis was presented to both internal and external stakeholders throughout the year for review and feedback.

The following are additional data considered during the broad analysis:

- Kindergarten Assessment: The Oregon Kindergarten Assessment looks at skills in literacy, math, and approaches to learning as children enter kindergarten. Kindergarten children across Oregon generally scored low on all three areas of the assessment, but especially in approaches to learning.
- Focus, Priority & Model Schools: As part of the federal ESEA Flexibility Waiver, Oregon developed a new accountability system which uses multiple measures to rate schools.
- Oregon Response to Intervention (OrRTI): OrRTI provides technical assistance and coaching to elementary school staff with an expected outcome of improving student literacy.

## Root Cause Analysis

Based on a review of resources which focused on the development of the Oregon Literacy Framework, Oregon's Strategic Education Plan, and Oregon's 40-40-20 higher education vision, the identified root causes for low performance in students with disabilities reading at grade level by third grade are attributable to districts and schools:

- Non-implementation of evidence-based literacy core curriculum based on common core state standards across all 197 Oregon

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

- districts;
- Non-implementation of systematic academic and behavioral multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS) across all 197 Oregon districts;
- Non-implementation of culturally relevant pedagogy across all 197 Oregon districts;
- No cohesion between early learning educational programs and elementary programs.

Research shows that for all students, one of the most influential indicators of increased graduation rates is reading at grade level by 3rd grade.

- Hernandez, R. (2012), *Double Jeopardy: How third-grade reading skills and poverty influence high school graduation*. The Annie E. Casey Foundation, Baltimore, MD.
- Hernandez, R. (2013), *Early Warning Confirmed: A Research Update on Third-Grade Reading*. The Annie E. Casey Foundation, Baltimore, MD.

The initial work which led to the current focus in Oregon to get all students reading at grade level by 3<sup>rd</sup> grade started 10 years ago when the Literacy Leadership State Steering Committee (LLSSC) began focusing on K-12 literacy in 2005. Guided by Dr. Michael Kamil, a Stanford University researcher on early reading and adolescent literacy, the LLSSC wrote the “Oregon Literacy Plan,” a design for a complete comprehensive reading model for Oregon. The Oregon K-12 Literacy Framework is the culmination of that earlier design. In 2007, the Center on Teaching and Learning (CTL) in the College of Education at the University of Oregon began working on the Framework documents and a series of resources to support school and district efforts to increase student reading achievement. The guidance in the Framework provides a step-by-step approach to the state, districts, and schools on how to use evidence-based literacy instruction to ensure that all students read well.

**Resources on Oregon’s Literacy Framework:**

The Oregon Literacy Plan Framework (2006) – <http://www.ode.state.or.us/teachlearn/subjects/elarts/reading/literacy/oregon-literacy-plan.pdf>

Oregon K-12 Literacy Framework – <http://www.ode.state.or.us/search/page/?id=2568>

Oregon K-12 Literacy Framework-Brief (2010) – <http://www.ode.state.or.us/pubs/eii/literacyframeworkprimer.pdf>

Oregon K-12 Literacy Framework-Preface (2009) – <http://www.ode.state.or.us/teachlearn/subjects/elarts/reading/literacy/preface.pdf>

“Meeting” on OAKS Reading at 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade (2011) – [http://www.ode.state.or.us/wma/teachlearn/testing/resources/reading\\_achievement\\_gr3.pdf](http://www.ode.state.or.us/wma/teachlearn/testing/resources/reading_achievement_gr3.pdf)

*1(b) Description of how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables such as LEA, region, race/ethnicity, disability category, placement, etc.*

Compliance and performance indicator data was disaggregated to drill down to identify potential focus areas for the SIMR. During the broad data analysis, data was disaggregated by county, school district, disability, race/ethnicity, grade level, and gender. The following table shows how each indicator was disaggregated during the broad analysis:

	B1	B2	B3	B4	B5	B9	B10	B11	B13	B14
County	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
School District	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Disability	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x
Race/Ethnicity			x	x	x	x	x	x		x
Grade Level			x	x						
Gender			x							

During the focused analysis, ODE examined disaggregated data of the following performance indicators:

- B1 – Graduation Rate
- B3 – Statewide Assessment
- B5 – Placement in the Least Restrictive Environment

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

The following data table shows the 4-year and 5-year cohort graduation rates for students with disabilities leaving school with a regular diploma.

**Four-year Cohort Methodology**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>2010</b>		
(Using 2009-2010 data)	65.0%	41.8%
High School Entry 2006-2007		
<b>2011</b>		
(Using 2010-2011 data)	67.0%	42.2%
High School Entry 2007-2008		
<b>2012</b>		
(Using 2011-2012 data)	67.0%	38.2%
High School Entry 2008-2009		

**Five-year Cohort Methodology**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>2010</b>		
(Using 2009-2010 data)	70.0%	46.7%
High School Entry 2005-2006		
<b>2011</b>		
(Using 2010-2011 data)	72.0%	46.8%
High School Entry 2006-2007		
<b>2012</b>		
(Using 2011-2012 data)	72.0%	47.2%
High School Entry 2007-2008		

\* Data Source: State's Annual Performance Report FFY 2010 through FFY 2012

The following two data tables show the 4-year cohort graduation rate for students with disabilities leaving school with a regular diploma. Data was disaggregated by primary disability category and by race/ethnicity.

<b>Primary Disability Category</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Intellectual Disability	1.8%
Hearing Impairment	41.9%
Communication Disorder	54.5%
Visual Impairment	39.1%
Emotional Disturbance	23.0%
Orthopedic Impairment	30.4%
Other Health Impairment	35.5%
Specific Learning Disabilities	45.4%
Deafblind	0.0%

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

**Primary Disability Category      Percent**

Autism Spectrum Disorder	40.3%
Traumatic Brain Injury	35.0%
OVERALL	38.2%

\* Data Source: Graduation Rate – Students entering high school 2008-2009, leaving in 2011-2012 that were identified as special education students within that four year period

**Race/Ethnicity                      Percent**

Hispanic/Latino	35.1%
American Indian/Alaska Native	25.6%
Asian	43.8%
Black or African American	26.1%
Pacific Islander	37.5%
White	40.2%
Multiple Races/Ethnicities	36.4%
OVERALL	38.2%

\* Data Source: Graduation Rate – Students entering high school 2008-2009, leaving in 2011-2012 that were identified as special education students within that four year period

**Statewide Graduation Data Conclusions**

Data conclusions for statewide graduation rates for student with disabilities based on disaggregation by overall statewide performance, primary disability category and by race/ethnicity:

- Based on APR 2013 data, there has been a decline of 4.0% of students with disabilities graduating with a regular diploma from the previous year in the 4-year cohort; however there has been a steady increase in the percentage of students with disabilities in the 5-year cohort graduating with a regular diploma.
- Students identified with the disability categories of Communication Disorder, Specific Learning Disabilities and Autism Spectrum Disorder are graduating at higher rates, 54.5%, 45.4% and 40.3% respectively, than students identified with the categories of Emotional Disturbance (23.0%), Intellectual Disability (1.8%) and Deafblind (0.0%).
- Statewide race/ethnicity disaggregates show highest number of graduates to be Asian (43.8%) and Whites (40.2%) whereas lowest are Blacks or African Americans (26.1%) and American Indians or Alaska Natives (25.6%).
- Largest gap of 18.2% in graduation rate between Asians and American Indians or Alaska Natives.

**B3 – STATEWIDE ASSESSMENT**

The following data table shows the performance of students with disabilities enrolled in 3<sup>rd</sup> grade from FFY 2010 to FFY 2013. There has been an overall decline in performance from one year to the next with the more significant decline occurring in 2011. This was most likely due to a change in cut scores which occurred at that time.

Children with IEPs	3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade Reading Assessment (Performance)			
	FFY 2010	FFY 2011	FFY 2012	FFY 2013
Proficient or above in regular assessment with no accommodations	45.4%	30.6%	26.5%	24.2%
Proficient or above in regular assessment with accommodations	6.5%	4.8%	6.1%	6.0%
Proficient or above in alternate assessment against alternate standards	12.3%	12.9%	11.8%	12.6%

\* Data Source: State's Annual Performance Report FFY 2010 through FFY 2013

Primary Disability Category	% Met/Exceeded	% Met/Exceeded	% Participated
	Standard Assessment	Combined Assessments (Standard & Alternate)	
Intellectual Disability (ID)	3.85%	41.92%	94.44%
Hearing Impairment (HI)	47.37%	50.79%	93.65%
Communication Disorder (CD)	51.29%	53.86%	99.44%
Visual Impairment (VI)	18.75%	29.17%	87.50%
Emotional Disturbance (ED)	39.43%	45.39%	95.39%
Orthopedic Impairment OI)	25.81%	23.44%	95.31%
Other Health Impairment OHI)	33.18%	40.91%	97.16%
Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD)	16.80%	29.30%	99.25%
Deafblind	----	----	----
Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD)	47.49%	47.15%	97.06%
Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI)	40.00%	62.50%	100%
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>39.09%</b>	<b>44.46%</b>	<b>98.42%</b>

\* Data Source: FFY 2012-2013 Statewide Assessment Performance Data by Disability Category

Race/Ethnicity	% Met/Exceeded Standard Assessment	% Met/Exceeded Combined Assessments (Standard & Alternate)	% Participated
Hispanic/Latino	21.74%	33.84%	98.28%
American Indian/Alaska Native	31.07%	38.28%	99.22%
Asian	45.31%	45.22%	95.54%
Black/African American	27.27%	35.26%	96.53%
Pacific Islander	27.09%	34.48%	100%
White	45.09%	48.97%	98.55%
Multiple Races/Ethnicities	36.88%	40.82%	99.18%
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>39.09%</b>	<b>44.46%</b>	<b>98.42%</b>

\* Data Source: FFY 2012-2013 Statewide Assessment Performance Data by Race/Ethnicity

**Statewide Assessment Data Conclusions**

Data conclusions for Full Academic Year (FAY)/Not Full Academic Year (NFAY) for Oregon Assessment of Knowledge & Skills (OAKS) & Extended:

- Statewide gender disaggregates show that males outperform females by 3.0%±. Typically, this would not be considered significant since it is less than 10%.
- Statewide race/ethnicity disaggregates show highest performers to be Asians (45.22%) and whites (48.97%) whereas lowest are Hispanics (33.84%) and blacks (35.26%). It should also be noted that all categories are performing well below the 2012-2013 statewide target of 69%. The widest gap is for Hispanics at 35.16% from the target and the narrowest is whites at 20.03% from the

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

target. For race/ethnicity, the gap is significant at 15.13% between Hispanics (33.84%) and whites (48.97%).

- Statewide data disaggregated by disability category are suspect. Data are collected by a SPED Flag Y/N for each respective student. Matching special education child count data to Full Academic Year data for 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 indicates disability category is unknown for 174 students in the numerator and 272 unknown in the denominator. This could change the performance calculations for a respective disability category. With this in mind, the following data conclusions are viewed with caution:
  - The highest performers are TBI (62.5% met/exceeded) but they only represent 0.13% of 3<sup>rd</sup> grade enrollment. CD is the next highest at 53.86% met/exceeded, representing 39.87% of enrollment. Given this fact, CD merit greater attention. The lowest performers include OI (23.44%), VI (29.17%) and SLD (29.30%). The latter notably represents 27.48% of 3<sup>rd</sup> grade enrollment. It was also noted that a significant number of students with SLD take the extended assessment rather than the OAKS, i.e. 270 of the 1721 students who scored met/exceeded took the extended. It is not fully understood why so many students with SLD take the extended assessment since they do not have significant cognitive functioning issues, and correspondingly why their performance so poor. For instance, 16.8% students with SLD scored met/exceeded on the OAKS.
- Statewide data disaggregated by county indicated the highest performers are Clatsop and Grant, with met/exceeded at 60.76% and 68.75% respectively. The lowest are Curry and Wasco at 25.93% and 25.53%. The highest performing districts all have 3<sup>rd</sup> grade SPED enrollment <10. This makes it difficult to draw conclusions about these data. The size of districts and counties varies greatly in the state of Oregon suggesting district data should perhaps be disaggregated by district size to see how districts of similar size compare.

Patterns or variations of data by schools/districts/programs/regions:

- When comparing districts by size, a few patterns emerge. The highest performing districts are very small, i.e. met/exceeded were 80%-90% (all had ten or less 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students). Of those that met/exceeded the target, all were very small or small, with the exception of one medium-sized district.
- Zero large districts met the target; all were at minimum 13.59% to maximum of 37.10% away from the target. The median distance from the target was 20.13%.
- No specific patterns seem to emerge with respect to counties. It should be noted that trends may emerge should the data be compared to socioeconomic data, i.e. Free or Reduced Lunch (FRL).

**B5 – PLACEMENT IN LEAST RESTRICTIVE ENVIRONMENT**

The following three data tables show the placement of students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment. Data was disaggregated by overall statewide performance, primary disability category, and by race/ethnicity.

<b>Federal Placement</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>State</b>
<b>Distribution Measurement</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Performance</b>
Children with IEPs inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	70.0% or more	72.6%
Children with IEPs inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	10.8% or less	10.8%
Children with IEPs in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	2.0 or less	1.4%

Data Source: Special Education Child Count FFY 2013-2014

<b>Primary Disability Category</b>	<b>Regular Class (80% or more)</b>	<b>Regular Class (40% or less)</b>	<b>Separate School, Home, Hospital</b>
Intellectual Disability	13.91%	53.22%	1.39%
Hearing Impairment	63.89%	10.28%	13.22%
Communication Disorder	91.15%	2.53%	0.08%
Visual Impairment	57.69%	24.83%	7.69%
Emotional Disturbance	57.42%	20.67%	5.26%
Orthopedic Impairment	33.24%	45.90%	4.32%

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Other Health Impairment	74.00%	9.52%	1.16%
Specific Learning Disabilities	83.03%	1.39%	0.20%
Deafblind	44.44%	44.44%	11.11%
Autism Spectrum Disorder	50.97%	29.86%	1.91%
Traumatic Brain Injury	52.59%	21.12%	2.79%

Data Source: Special Education Child Count FFY 2013-2014

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>Regular Class (80% or more)</b>	<b>Regular Class (40% or less)</b>	<b>Separate School, Home, Hospital</b>
Hispanic/Latino	73.78%	8.94%	0.88%
American Indian/Alaska Native	70.82%	10.41%	1.25%
Asian	70.38%	15.19%	1.10%
Black/African American	69.81%	11.12%	3.18%
Pacific Islander	75.39%	9.33%	0.78%
White	73.99%	11.18%	1.11%
Multiple Races/Ethnicities	74.08%	11.19%	0.69%

Data Source: Special Education Child Count FFY 2013-2014

**Statewide Placement Data Conclusions**

Data conclusions for placement for all students with disabilities based on disaggregation by overall statewide placement, primary disability and race/ethnicity:

- Oregon has met or exceeded its statewide targets with regards to placement in each of the three Federal Placement Distribution Measurements.
- Statewide primary disability disaggregates show :
  - For the Federal Placement of 80% or more in the regular class, more students who are eligible as Communication Disorder, Specific Learning Disabilities, and Other Health Impairment are placed in this setting.
  - For the Federal Placement of 40% or less in the regular class, more students who are eligible as Intellectual Disability, Orthopedic Impairment, and Deafblind are placed in this setting
  - For the Federal Placement of a separate school, home or hospital, more students who are eligible as Hearing Impairment, Deafblind, and Visual Impairment are placed in this setting.
  - For students who are eligible as Emotional Disturbance, Traumatic Brain Injury, and Autism Spectrum Disorder, the primary setting for instruction is within the regular class for 80% or more of the day.
  -
- Statewide race/ethnicity disaggregates show:
  - For the Federal Placement of 80% or more in the regular class, more students who identify as Pacific Islander and Multiple Races/Ethnicities are placed in this setting.
  - For the Federal Placement of 40% or less in the regular class, more students who identify as Asian are placed in this setting.
  - For the Federal Placement of a separate school, home or hospital, more students who identify as Black or African American are placed in this setting.

**KINDERGARTEN ASSESSMENT**

This is the second year that Oregon has assessed children’s skills and knowledge when they first enter kindergarten. Statewide results are used to identify opportunity gaps in order to inform decision-making in allocating resources to the communities with the greatest need and to measure statewide progress in the years to come. District and school level results, in partnership with local providers of early learning services, help districts and schools better understand the strengths and gaps in selected domains of development for the population of Oregon’s entering kindergarteners overall and by student subgroups. These results can be used to monitor patterns in

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

district- and school-level data over time and identify opportunity gaps among student subgroups. This information can inform instructional decisions and be used to target professional development, resources, and supports on the areas of greatest need.

The following data table shows the Kindergarten Assessment results for Early Literacy for the first two administrations (FFY 2013 and FFY 2014) of the assessment. Data was disaggregated by race/ethnicity and gender.

Subgroups	EARLY LITERACY			
	English Letter Names		English Letter Sounds	
	Average Number Correct		Average Number Correct	
	(0-100)		(0-100)	
	FFY 2013	FFY 2014	FFY 2013	FFY 2014
<b>Total Population</b>	<b>18.5</b>	<b>17.7</b>	<b>6.7</b>	<b>6.6</b>
<b>Female</b>	<b>19.2</b>	<b>18.4</b>	<b>7.1</b>	<b>6.9</b>
<b>Male</b>	<b>17.8</b>	<b>17.1</b>	<b>6.4</b>	<b>6.3</b>
Hispanic/Latino	9.8	8.9	2.9	2.8
American Indian/Alaskan Native	14.5	14.3	4.7	4.5
Asian	29.9	28.7	12.3	11.5
Black/African American	19.1	18.5	6.2	5.9
Pacific Islander	14.7	13.3	4.2	3.8
White	20.9	20.2	7.8	7.7
Multiple Races/Ethnicities	21.3	21.1	7.9	7.8

\* FFY 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 Oregon Kindergarten Assessment

**Kindergarten Assessment Data Conclusions**

Data conclusions for kindergarten assessment for all students statewide based on disaggregation by gender and race/ethnicity:

- Female kindergarteners score higher than male kindergarteners for both letter names and letter sounds.
- Among all races/ethnicities, entering kindergarteners can identify more letters names than letter sounds.
- Asian kindergarteners score more than three times higher than Hispanic kindergarteners with a difference of 19.8.
- Growth comparison for all data points indicate an overall decline in performance ranging from 0.2-1.4% for Letter Names and 0.1% to-08% for Letter Sounds from FFY 2013 to FFY 2014.
- The biggest gap between performance in FFY 2014 for Letter Names and Letter Sounds is between Asian kindergartens and Hispanic kindergartens at 19.8% and 8.7% respectively.

**PRIORITY, FOCUS & MODEL SCHOOLS**

Oregon has identified 92 Oregon schools that will receive additional supports and interventions from the state to help increase student achievement and close persistent achievement gaps. Identification of these schools is one component of Oregon's new accountability system, approved July 2012 by the U.S. Department of Education. Schools are identified as:

- Priority Schools – Bottom 5% of high poverty schools and identified as most in need of assistance in improving achievement and growth;
- Focus Schools – Bottom 15% of high poverty schools and struggling with achievement and growth;
- Model Schools – High poverty schools identified as examples of successful student outcomes.

As part of the federal ESEA Flexibility Waiver, Oregon developed a new accountability system that uses multiple measures to rate schools. For high schools, these measures include academic achievement, academic growth, subgroup growth, graduation rates, and subgroup graduation. For elementary and middle schools, the first three measures are used. Schools receive an overall rating based on how well they are doing in each of these areas.

In order to provide support to the schools that need it most, ODE identified high poverty (Title I) Priority schools for additional supports and interventions. These 20 schools represent the bottom 5% of high poverty schools in the state and have been identified as most in need of assistance in turning around student achievement and growth. Also identified as Priority schools are the 13 schools currently receiving ESEA School Improvement Grants (SIG). In addition, the state has identified 60 Focus schools which are in the bottom 15% of

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

high poverty schools and have faced challenges with closing the achievement gap and getting all students to achieve at high levels. These schools also receive additional supports from the state. The final category of schools identified are Model schools. These high poverty schools have been identified as examples of successful student outcomes and serve as models and mentors to other schools around the state. These schools help share best practices and guide other schools on the journey toward better student outcomes and our state's 40-40-20 Goal.

The follow table shows the percentage of 3<sup>rd</sup> graders with disabilities enrolled in priority and focus schools that met or exceeded grade level proficiency on the statewide assessment.

ESEA Designation	3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade Reading Level – Percentage Met or Exceeded		
	FFY 2011-2012	FFY 2012-2013	FFY 2013-2014
Priority Schools	35.5%	34.7%	23.4%
Focus Schools	37.9%	42.8%	42.3%

\* Data Source: Oregon Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (OAKS)

**ESEA Designation Data Conclusions**

Data conclusions for 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students with disabilities meeting or exceeding grade level proficiency enrolled in priority and focus schools from FFY 2011 to FFY 2013:

- In FFY 2013, 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students with disabilities enrolled in the targeted priority schools have shown slippage in performance over the previous two years.
- In FFY 2013, 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students with disabilities enrolled in the targeted focus schools have shown an overall improvement in performance from the previous two years.
- Preliminary 2013-14 OAKS Reading data indicate that:
  - 54.8% of 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students in priority/focus districts read at grade level;
  - 22 schools reported gains in 3<sup>rd</sup> grade reading;
  - Average gain was an increase of 8% of students reading at grade level;
  - 9 schools reported low gains (less than 5%);
  - 7 schools reported moderate gains (between 5% and 10%);
  - 6 schools reported high gains (greater than 10%).

**OREGON RESPONSE TO INTERVENTION (OrRTI)**

OrRTI has been in existence in Oregon since 2004 and has provided technical assistance and coaching to over 80 of the 197 districts in Oregon to date. OrRTI currently has a cohort of 18 districts in the 2nd year of exploration. Fifteen new districts have begun exploration in the 2014-2015 school year. These districts represent all geographic areas of the state and range from small to large districts. The primary focus of OrRTI is to cultivate the thinking and skills in leadership at all levels to build and sustain a comprehensive multi-level system of core instruction and intervention that identifies and serves the instructional needs of all children.

Based on the data reviewed, the overall average percentage in reduction of students identified as Specific Learning Disability (out of the total number of students in each district identified as Special Education) is 2%. This data was calculated from the percentage of students identified as Specific Learning Disability out of the overall students identified as Special Education from the first year each district began implementation to the 2013-2014 implementation year.

Average Percentage of Students Eligible as SLD during 1 <sup>st</sup> Year of OrRTI Implementation	Average Percentage of Students Eligible as SLD during 2013-2014 of OrRTI Implementation	Average Percentage of Change for Districts Implementing OrRTI
43%	41%	2% Reduction

\*Date Note: Above calculation was based on districts which have participated in OrRTI for four or more years and have 100 or more students receiving Special Education services.

Preliminary 2013-14 OAKS Reading data indicate that:

- 65.78% of 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students in OrRTI districts reading at grade level;
- 66.5% of 8<sup>th</sup> grade students statewide read at grade level;
- 66.2% of 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students statewide reading at grade level.

As a result of the focused data analysis and ODE's ultimate goals of increasing graduation rates (B1), decreasing dropout rates for students with disabilities (B2), and improving post school outcomes for students with disabilities (B14), ODE identified a SIMR that is not only aligned with the Oregon's Statewide 40-40-20 Initiative and ODE's Strategic Education Plan, but supported by national research: the most influential indicator to increase graduation rates and to lower drop-out rates is a student's ability to read at grade level by 3<sup>rd</sup> grade.

*1(c) Description of any concerns about the quality of the data and if so, how the State will address these concerns.*

Based on the data analysis, there are a few concerns and questions with the quality of data that will need to be addressed during the next phase of SSIP implementation. The following is a summary of the data concerns and questions:

- Concerns have been raised with respect to disability category; SPED Flag for Full Academic Year does not align/match December Child Count. It is unclear as to the effect of this issue on data analyses. Further disaggregation could potentially compound the issue resulting in inaccurate conclusions about the data.
- Why do Full Academic year students with SPED Flag marked Y not match data reported on December Child Count?
- Are students with disabilities being missed because the SPED Flag is marked N?
- Why are so many students with SLD taking the alternate assessment? The alternate assessment is intended for students with significant cognitive disabilities. Are compliant decisions being made regarding primary disability category? Are eligibility criteria being adhered to, or circumvented for other reasons?
- Professional development/technical assistance may be needed to ensure good decisions about who should take the Alternate Assessment.
- Professional development may be needed to ensure sound and compliant decisions concerning determination of primary disability.
- Data indicate efforts to improve the performance of students with disabilities who identify as Hispanic should be explored.

Based on the data analysis, the State has identified a systematic plan to address each of the above concerns and questions raised by reviewers. The plan will focus on professional development/technical assistance for all school districts and programs in the areas of data reporting that have created inconsistencies with the primary disability categories. In addition, statewide professional development/technical assistance will need to take place to support IEP team members when making the decision around which assessment would be most appropriate for an individual student, especially for students who are eligible as Specific Learning Disability.

*1(d) Description of how the State considered compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement.*

During the broad analysis, ODE examined disaggregated data for the following compliance indicators to identify potential barriers to statewide improvement:

- B9 – Disproportionate Representation
- B10 – Disproportionate Representation by Disability
- B11 – Timely Evaluation within 60 School Days
- B13 – Secondary Transition Goals and Services

Based on the broad analysis which included a disaggregation by counties, school districts, primary disability categories and race/ethnicity, ODE determined that there are no significant barriers to improvement. With the focus on increasing the number of 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students with disabilities reading at grade level, there are no potential barriers with respect to the following compliance indicators. The following data tables indicate that the State is in a position to make improvements without barriers related to disproportionate representation, untimely evaluations, and secondary transition goals and services. None of the compliance indicators impact the State's Strategic Education Plan nor the SIMR as identified in this SSIP.

**B9 – DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION**

FFY	Outside the threshold for over or under representation	Justified due to unique district characteristics based on guided self-analysis worksheet	Justified due to unique district characteristics based on formal policy-to-practice review	Number of districts identified with disproportionate representation (over or under)
2012	8 over	7	1	0
2011	16 over	14	2	0
2010	5 over	5	N/A	0
2009	8 over	8	N/A	0
2008	17 over	14	3	0

\* Date Source: System Performance Review and Improvement (SPR&I)

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
B10 – DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION BY DISABILITY**

FFY	Outside the threshold for over or under representation in specific disability category	Justified due to unique district characteristics based on guided self-analysis worksheet	Justified due to unique district characteristics based on formal policy-to-practice review	Number of districts identified with disproportionate representation (over or under)
2012	43 over	40	3	0
2011	56 over	56	N/A	0
2010	48 over, 1 under	49	N/A	0
2009	34 over, 1 under 6 over/under	40	1	0
2008	45 over, 1 under 1 over/under	41	6	0

\* Date Source: System Performance Review and Improvement (SPR&I)

**B11 – TIMELY EVALUATIONS WITHIN 60 SCHOOL DAYS**

FFY	Target	Percentage of Timely Evaluations Completed Within 60 School Days
2012	100%	98.4%
2011	100%	98.6%
2010	100%	97.3%
2009	100%	97.0%
2008	100%	96.5%

\* Data Source: State's Annual Performance Report FFY 2008 through FFY 2012

**B13 – SECONDARY TRANSITION GOALS AND SERVICES**

Initial Compliance – Standards	Federal Reporting Year			
	2009	2010	2011	2012
Invite the Student	91.9%	92.8%	94.2%	88.1%
Preferences, Interests, Needs, and Strengths	96.9%	97.8%	98.4%	97.0%
Other Agencies Identified and Invited as Appropriate	94.6%	96.7%	96.3%	93.3%
Age Appropriate Transition Assessment	87.1%	87.8%	93.0%	89.3%
Annual Goals	94.3%	98.2%	98.1%	95.6%
Post-Secondary Goals	85.3%	90.3%	92.0%	90.9%
Transition Services	89.7%	94.8%	95.1%	92.6%
Course of Study	89.1%	92.1%	92.7%	89.2%
<b>OVERALL Files in Compliance</b>	<b>77.2%</b>	<b>81.5%</b>	<b>80.3%</b>	<b>73.2%</b>

\*Date Source: System Performance Review and Improvement (SPR&I)

1(e) Description of the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

*1(f) Description of stakeholder involvement in the data analysis.*

Stakeholder involvement in the analysis of the data occurred on multiple occasions during FFY 2013-2014 and FFY 2014-2015.

The Oregon Department of Education Office of Learning/Student Services holds a general stakeholder meeting each November. Invitees include parents, representatives of school districts, EI/ECSE service providers, education service districts, higher education, charter schools, private schools, and state agencies. Members of the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) and the State Advisory Council for Special Education (SACSE) also participate.

During the annual general Oregon Department of Education, Office of Learning/Student Services stakeholder meeting on November 7, 2013, information concerning the upcoming SSIP writing process was shared. Sixty-three stakeholders from EI/ECSE programs, school districts, education service districts, other state agencies, community groups and higher education provided feedback and guidance on how data for the SSIP for Part C and Part B should be examined, in addition to providing input on the SPP/APR indicator targets.

In January 2014, ODE designed a data analysis plan that entailed EI/ECSE and school age staff analyzing the data from their Part C and B APR responsibilities and sharing their analysis at a series of team meetings. Those meetings occurred on March 11, 18, and 28, April 1, 8 and 15, and June 30, 2014. These data analysis presentations included statewide data for their indicators as well as disaggregated data by race/ethnicity, eligibility, gender, and school district.

In 2014, Sarah Drinkwater, PhD, Assistant Superintendent, Office of Learning/Student Services conducted a series of meetings with school districts and EI/ECSE programs throughout Oregon. One of the agenda items of these meetings was the discussion of the B17 and C11 SSIPs. The meetings occurred on the following dates and locations:

- May 16 – Douglas ESD–Roseburg including Douglas, Coos, Curry, Jackson, Josephine, Klamath, and Lake Counties;
- May 30 – Intermountain ESD–Pendleton including Umatilla, Morrow, Baker, Union, Malheur, Grant, and Wallowa Counties;
- June 4 – High Desert ESD–Redmond including Jefferson, Crook, Deschutes, Harney, Gilliam, Wheeler, and Sherman Counties;
- September 25 – NW Regional ESD–Hillsboro including Clatsop, Columbia, Tillamook, Washington, Marion, Polk, and Yamhill Counties;
- October 7 – LBL ESD–Albany including Linn, Benton, Lincoln, and Lane Counties;
- October 10 – Clackamas ESD–Clackamas including Clackamas, Multnomah, Hood River, and Wasco Counties.

On August 19, 2014, an all-day Part B SSIP small stakeholders meeting was conducted to analyze data and infrastructure. Stakeholders at this meeting represented a wide range of personnel representing other offices and programs within the Oregon Department of Education.

On October 1, 2014, Sarah Drinkwater, PhD, Assistant Superintendent, Office of Learning, Student Services addressed an audience of over 500 special education administrators, educators, service providers and parents of students with disabilities at the annual ODE Special Education Administrators Conference. In her keynote, Dr. Drinkwater provided an update of the SSIP, including data analysis, infrastructure, SPP/APR 5-year targets and areas of focus as the state's SIMR.

Every October, Oregon Department of Education EI/ECSE and school age special education staff travel to seven regional sites throughout the state to provide training and technical assistance to school districts, educational service districts and EI/ECSE programs. Topics focus on the use of Oregon's System Performance and Review and Improvement monitoring mechanism, SPP/APR indicators, and issues related to general supervision. The October 2013 school age regional training included a brief review of all SPP/APR indicators as well as a presentation of the SSIP. The October 2014 training included a brief update of the progress of the SSIP and informed participants of the upcoming annual Oregon Department of Education, Office of Learning, Student Services general stakeholder meeting. Dates and sites for these sessions were:

- October 7, 2014 – Salem, OR
- October 9, 2014 – Oregon City, OR
- October 14, 2014 – Redmond, OR
- October 16, 2014 – Baker City, OR
- October 21, 2014 – Eugene, OR
- October 23, 2014 – Ashland, OR
- October 28, 2014 – Portland, OR

The focus of the November 7, 2014 general stakeholder meeting was the presentation of the ODE data analysis in the framework of the SSIP to the 31 stakeholders in attendance. Feedback from the participants regarding their support of the data analysis, infrastructure analysis, and the proposed SIMR for the Part C (EI/ECSE) and Part B SSIP was gathered via a discussion and written poll. Thirty of the thirty-one stakeholders chose to fill out the poll with all 30 respondents choosing the option that they would support the SSIP process and the proposed SIMR.

A joint State Interagency Coordinating Committee and State Advisory Council for Special Education meeting took place on March 12, 2015. Stakeholder from both of these groups were provided an update from Dr. Drinkwater on the SSIP, including data analysis,

### Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

*2(a): A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities.*

Initial work on the development of Oregon's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) began with an intensive review of key data, though infrastructure review is not a new exercise within the Oregon Department of Education (ODE) when new initiatives or goals are undertaken. As discussed in the section above, ODE utilizes the online System Performance Review and Improvement application to collect and disseminate data related to general supervision in collaboration with the statewide data collection system for all students and districts/programs. With the data analysis well under way in Spring 2014, the team began a series of work group meetings to dissect the infrastructure of Oregon's Department of Education (ODE), and to identify our capability to support improvement and build capacity of Local Education Agencies serving students with disabilities.

The Student Services team met first with Western Regional Resource Center staff in May of 2014 to better understand the scope of the infrastructure analysis and to learn about resources/tools available for use. This meeting also included an exercise to develop a template to assist with the Infrastructure Analysis through identification of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT). Internal meetings with Student Services educational specialists and directors were held in June 2014 and July 2014 to hone our understanding of the analysis and to generate informational lists regarding ODEs current infrastructure, focusing on governance and leadership, fiscal organization, quality standards, professional development for educational staff (administrative, educator, support), information technology and accountability. Specific initiatives facilitated by the Student Services unit were identified, as well as their connection to ODE's Strategic Plan goals. Funded priorities by the Legislature were also highlighted. This process generated a lengthy list of initiatives, highlighted the funded priority investments, delineated governance connections, and specified the data collected or to be collected over the next few years. In August 2014 a select group of cross-office/unit specialists and directors were convened to broaden the infrastructure analysis through a guided process of discussion. Input was gathered on agency-wide initiatives and priority programs, and their associated areas of support, as well the relative strengths and areas for improvement for each of the initiatives/priority programs. How coordination occurred within ODE and with LEAS across the state was also shared and discussed. Information was captured within a grid format for easy reference and discussion. All participants commented on the value of this meeting, and requested continued collaborative work across units. The members of the work group represented the following units within ODE: Equity, Focus and Priority Schools, Educator Effectiveness, Title Programs, Research and Data Analysis, Assessment, Common Core State Standards, School Improvement, and Technology.

Both the agency's Strategic Plan (biennial goals 2013-15) and the funded initiatives provide an effective foundation and their connections to Oregon's SIMR are highlighted below.

ODE's Strategic Plan:

- Goal 1 (Learners): Every student graduates from high school and is ready for college, career, and civic life.
- Integrate early learning programs across the relevant state agencies so every student enters kindergarten ready to learn.
- Implement statewide literacy programs so all students read by third grade.
- Design and implement an integrated and comprehensive system to ensure every student graduates ready for college, career, and civic life.
- Help districts implement effective practices in order to close achievement gaps.
- Improve quality of special education services to close achievement gaps.
- Goal 2 (Educators): Every P-12 organization is led by an effective administrator, and every student is taught by an effective teacher.

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- Help districts implement the new educator evaluation system, and start to connect evaluation results to meaningful professional development.
- Launch Quality Teaching and Learning Network focused on developing exceptional educators and implementing effective practices.
- Close the educator equity gap to ensure equitable distribution of the most effective educators and have educators reflect the student population.
- Work with OEIB and TSPC to improve the preparation, licensure, retention, and effectiveness of new educators.
- Goal 3 (Schools and Districts): Increase performance for all schools and districts in order to create systems of excellence across the state.
  - Systematically help districts implement Common Core, Next Generation Standards, and new statewide assessments.
  - Identify and improve Oregon's chronically underperforming schools.
  - Measure, analyze, and report out Oregon's progress to 40/40/20.
  - Ensure districts provide healthy and safe learning environments for students.
  - Conduct all federal compliance and on-site monitoring visits in a positive and respectful way that leads to improved outcomes for students.
- Goal 4 (Communities): ODE meaningfully engages parents, stakeholders, and the larger community to help make Oregon's schools the best in the country.
  - Prioritize building and maintaining partnerships with historically underserved communities.
  - Provide clear and timely information to customers and stakeholders.
  - Proactively inform and engage the legislature and implement 2013 and 2014 legislation.
  - Proactively and strategically work with relevant state agencies to deliver services to students' and families' overall well-being, so schools can attend to students' educational needs.
- Goal 5 (ODE): Make ODE the best place to work.
  - Attract, retain, and develop top talent to ODE.
  - Increase diversity of ODE's workforce.
  - Reorganize ODE to ensure integration and collaboration across all offices.
  - Deliver excellent internal customer service and improve communication and efficiency within ODE.

Each of these five goals, with its accompanying objectives and metrics is reviewed every six months to assess progress towards all outcomes. These 'stocktakes', based on the model of Education Delivery Institute, utilize a systematic process by which education leaders can drive progress and deliver results. Delivery incorporates proven practices from management disciplines across the public and private sectors. These tools help education system leaders answer four questions: 1) What are you trying to do? 2) How are you planning to do it? 3) At any given moment, how will you know if you're on track? 4) If not on track, what are you going to do about it? Delivery is about asking and answering these questions in a consistent, disciplined, and rigorous way throughout the system.

Oregon's Legislature passed two priority education initiatives at the end of the 2013 Session. House Bill 3232 and House Bill 3233 have directed much of ODE's work with LEAs, Education Service Districts (ESD) and education professionals over the last two years. Several projects will continue into the next biennium. House Bill 3232 directs the Oregon Education Investment Board to design and implement programs that make strategic investments to: (a) Advance the educational goals of this state, as described in ORS 351.009; (b) Improve the employability of graduates from Oregon public schools; (c) Close the achievement gap that exists between historically underserved student groups, as defined by the board by rule; (d) Assist public education in all regions of this state; (e) Promote collaboration and alignment among early childhood service providers, school districts, community colleges, public universities and employers; (f) Leverage private, public and community resources; (g) Engage parents and child care providers, support families and motivate students; (h) Develop and disseminate evidence-based models and best practices that are likely to improve student outcomes; (i) Collect data to monitor student progress; (j) Establish networks that allow for the replication of successful practices across this state.

In support of this work, House Bill 3233 established the Network of Quality Teaching and Learning which consists of the Oregon Education Investment Board, the Department of Education and public and private entities that receive funding to accomplish the following purposes: (a) To enhance a culture of leadership and collaborative responsibility for advancing the profession of teaching among providers of early learning services, teachers and administrators in kindergarten through grade 12, education service districts and teacher education institutions, (b) To strengthen and enhance existing evidence-based practices that improve student achievement, and (c) To improve recruitment, preparation, induction, career advancement opportunities and support of educators.

House Bill 3232, Strategic Initiatives for Student Success, enacted in 2013, funded the following initiatives/programs in support of early literacy and reading: (a) Early Reading Initiative, web-based and print resources to families and caregivers, (b) Ready to Read through the State Library, (c) Extended time and individualized support at select Focus/priority schools, (d) Scaling up the Oregon Response to Intervention Network, (e) Early literacy instruction for families/caregivers and early childhood educators, and (f) Expanded access to libraries/resources. The SIMR aligns well with all of these initiatives in that it equips special education students with the skills necessary to read at grade level by third grade.

Currently, leadership staff at ODE are reviewing and re-working the strategic plan for 2015-2017. The goals and objectives for Learners (Goal 1) will remain, with an increased and intensive focus on all students reading by third grade. The Governor's Budget, having been

## **FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

presented to the Legislature includes funds for all-day kindergarten for every student across the state, as well as intentional support for students K-3 who struggle with literacy and reading skills (\$85 million combined for both projects). The components of this intentional support include extended day opportunities, summer school, and intensive instruction.

OrRTI (Oregon Response to Intervention program) is one evidenced-based initiative that has seen results over the past several years. Cohort 1 began in 2005-2006, with additional districts joining each year. OrRTI has worked with over 80 school districts since its inception. The core elements of the Oregon Response to Intervention project address all of these components directly, by using implementation science principles to:

- Help districts implement evidenced-based, high quality reading programs that have proven effective in moving students to high standards;
- Help districts differentiate reading instruction through a data driven structure that matches specific instructional strategies to identified student needs;
- Support the use of assessment practices that assess student's instructional needs frequently in real-time and in an quick and efficient manner that enhances, rather than detracts from, instructional time;
- Broaden the network of technical assistance throughout the state by creating regional RTI centers and partnering with ESDs and other entities to train implementation facilitators;
- Help districts implement RTI as a method for identifying Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD). RTI, however, goes far beyond a practice for identifying students with specific learning disabilities.

The essential framework of RTI is an integrated system of:

- Research-based, effective core instructional practices in general education that is differentiated to meet individual student needs;
- Research-based interventions delivered to students that need a greater level of instructional focus and intensity than can be provided through the core program alone;
- Data-based decision making and teaming practices that includes universal screening of all students early and on a regular basis to identify struggling learners;
- Frequent progress monitoring of at-risk students that informs instructional practices and allows for adjustments to ensure success of individualized and intensive diagnostic assessment for students that do not respond to standardized interventions

The increase in support of the OrRTI project through legislative strategic investment funds has enhanced and expanded the scope of the project in several critical ways including:

- Expanded the number of districts that participate in the project
- Created/expanded three Regional RTI Centers in Roseburg, Bend, and Ontario to bring services closer to districts in remote parts of the state
- Increased partnerships with ESDs and other entities to broaden and deepen support resources
- Provided support through a state level conference to districts not formally participating in the project.

*2(b): A description of the State's systems infrastructure (at a minimum the governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring).*

### **Governance**

This component concerns the decision-making structure of the Oregon Department of Education (ODE), and includes the agency's policies, procedures, practices and priorities to implement its purpose.

Oregon's Department of Education (ODE) is organized to focus on teaching and learning. The Office of the Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction oversees the entire agency, inclusive of the Early Learning Division (ELD) and the Youth Development Division (YDD). The units within ODE are comprised of the Office of Research and Data Analysis, the Office of Learning (Equity, Student Services, and Instruction, Standards, Assessment and Accountability Units), the Office of Finance and Administration, and the Office of Informational Technology. ODE also works collaboratively with the Oregon Education and Investment Board, and the State Board of Education to implement and oversee education policy and programs for children and families P-20. The Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction sits as a non-voting member of the State Board. Attached is ODE's organizational chart for reference.

ODE's Management Team is comprised of the Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Directors of ELD and YDD, six Assistant Superintendents, the Government and Legal Affairs Manager, and the Chief Information Officer. The team meets weekly to coordinate priorities, trouble-shoot areas of concerns and support the work of the agency. In addition, once a month the Management Teams meets with all Directors to share and communicate updates, and changes, and to solicit feedback. Several smaller leadership teams meet regularly, such as the Office of Learning Assistant Superintendents and Unit Directors, to collaborate and to keep the focus on the priority initiatives and projects. Many educational staff work across offices and units to support complimentary projects. An example of this relates to Common Core State Standards work. The CCSS work team includes staff from Student Services, Educator Effectiveness, Equity and Title programs.

The Assistant Superintendents of 1) Equity; 2) Instruction, Standards, Assessment and Accountability; 3) Student Services as well as the Chief of Staff meet weekly to coordinate implementation of initiatives, professional development, focus and priority schools work, and to problem-solve issues. In addition, Director meetings are held regularly to discuss unit concerns and priorities, and to support team projects. Each team lead holds meetings and/or check-ins with staff to help problem-solve and make decisions.

**Fiscal**

This component focuses on sufficiency and use of fiscal resources to support ODE's purposes, goals and outcomes. Elements include funding sources, allocation decisions, accounting and purchasing processes. ODE ensures that funds provided by the State and the IDEA Part B grant are available to districts to support all appropriate and required Part B activities.

The Office of Finance and Administration provides the financial structural support needed for a large statewide educational institution. Financial support is provided in the areas of accounting, budget and analysis, procurement services and school finance. Each of these sections has a director or lead staff who manages the projects and priorities and supervises staff. In addition, each program and grant is assigned a fiscal analyst who works closely with the director or lead staff in budget development, allocation, review, and reporting. This fiscal analyst is also an important member of internal audit functions. Regular meetings occur with fiscal analyst staff to monitor budget revenues and expenditures. Yearly agency fiscal reports are provided to the Department of Administrative Services, and ODE was just awarded the State of Oregon's Chief Financial Offices' Gold Star Certificate for achieving statewide accounting goals and excellence in financial reporting for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2014.

Overall, the budget of ODE for 2013-15 State School Fund is \$6.55 billion and represents a critical reinvestment in education in our state. HB 3232 was awarded \$29.3 million across all agencies supporting the initiative (Focusing on **early literacy** with the aim of getting all students reading at grade level by the end of third grade; **Connecting students to the world of work** through expanding Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) and Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs; and **Creating a college-going culture** in Oregon schools through supporting programs that prepare students for a successful transition to college and encourage the completion of college credits while in high school.) The total appropriation to ODE for HB 3233 was \$45 million.

**Quality Standards**

This component focuses on the quality learning standards that guide curriculum for students, as well as the qualifications of personnel to implement those standards.

Academic Content Standards identify what Oregon's students are expected to know and be able to do in the content areas of English language arts, mathematics, health, physical education, science, second language, social sciences, and the arts. These standards are one way to ensure that all Oregon students will have the opportunity to meet the rigorous demands of the 21st Century.

Since the early 1990s Oregon, has been a leader in standards work. The adoption in October 2010 of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in English language arts and mathematics keeps Oregon moving education forward. As implementation of the CCSS progresses, ODE is committed to working with its partners in education to make the transition a smooth one for students and teachers. Students with disabilities should be challenged to excel within the general curriculum and be prepared for success in their post-school lives. The implementation of the Common Core Standards provides an historic opportunity to improve collaborative practices and access to rigorous academic content for students with disabilities.

The state of Oregon is transitioning this spring to the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) as the state's accountability and assessment system, and testing has already started in some districts. Oregon uses the Common Core Standards as its foundation for all curricular development K through 12. In addition, the state's previous accountability and assessment system (OAKs) was aligned with the Common Core. Oregon is a member of SBAC's governance committee and has been intimately involved in all aspects of the development of Smarter Balanced, including cut score determination, accommodations, modifications and alignment.

Oregon's percentage of teachers rated as meeting the standard of Highly Qualified (NCLB and Title I regulations), has been consistently high, with 98.3% of **all** classes taught by highly qualified teachers in 2013-14. In the 2012-13 school year, the percentage was 98.2% and in the 2011-2012 school year, the percentage was 98.3%. Oregon teachers are required to hold a bachelor's degree or higher, be fully licensed, and meet state requirements to demonstrate mastery of subject knowledge. Subject knowledge can be demonstrated either by passing a rigorous state exam, having a major in the core academic area, or holding a graduate degree in the core academic area. All teachers of core academic subjects must meet the definition of a highly qualified teacher.

**Professional Development**

Professional development is a critical component of an educational system's work. This encompasses development of educator and administrative staff, with ongoing support and technical assistance.

The Network of Quality Teaching is at the forefront of ODE's professional development system, and involves staff from all offices within ODE (e.g., Student Services; Instruction, Standards, Assessment and Accountability; Equity; Finance). This work is supported, in part, by HB 3233. The purpose of the Educator Effectiveness/Common Core State Standards Strategic Investment funds is to help build school district capacity for high quality professional learning to support implementation of Educator Effectiveness (SB290/ESEA Waiver) and the Common Core State Standards to improve educator practice and student learning. Specifically, over the past two years the funds have supported Professional Learning Teams from many school districts, and regional institutes were offered three times per year (Fall, late Winter, and late Spring). Teams of educators, inclusive of general and special educators, as well as administrators have found these on-going professional development opportunities to be highly valuable and effective. The trainings have built upon one another, and offered teams time to plan, prepare and develop ongoing instructional support.

In addition, mentoring grants have allowed districts to develop local models of support for new educators and administrators. The foundational components have to include individual mentor/mentee dyads with in-person communication on a regular basis. Most

districts are able to support new educators/administrators with close to 75 hours of individual support.

Student Services and the Title programs have developed systems of professional development and support through regional assignments. Educational Specialists are assigned as the designated contacts for all the districts within a specific county. This allows for efficient technical assistance and desired professional development sessions through regional support. Within Student Services, over 100 professional development sessions have been conducted based on district request and agency review. Topics have included: Common Core State Standards, developing standards-based IEPs, secondary transition and transitioning planning, monitoring and compliance indicators, and services for students with assistive technology needs, discipline and expulsion/suspension issues, Oregon's Extended Assessment. Focus and Priority School Teams have also utilized a regional approach with quarterly support and review from ODE.

In order to provide support to the schools that need it most, ODE identified high poverty (Title I) Priority schools for additional supports and interventions. These 20 schools represent the bottom 5% of high poverty schools in the state and have been identified as most in need of assistance in turning around student achievement and growth. Also identified as Priority schools are the 13 schools currently receiving ESEA School Improvement Grants (SIG). In addition, the state has identified 60 Focus schools in the bottom 15% of high poverty schools that faced challenges with closing the achievement gap and getting all students to achieve at high levels. These schools also receive additional supports from the state. The final category of schools identified is Model schools. These high poverty schools have been identified as examples of successful student outcomes and serve as models and mentors to other schools around the state. These schools help share best practices and guide other schools on the journey toward better student outcomes and our state's 40-40-20 Goal. The state will not meet the demanding requirements for improving student achievement without effective teachers and leaders. Oregon educational partners and stakeholders are working collaboratively to create a supportive state policy infrastructure focused on educator effectiveness leading to improved student learning. Oregon's framework for evaluations has been built on a strong foundation of legislative action and collaborative support, as part of a coherent and comprehensive system of educator effectiveness. Together, Oregon partners and stakeholders are developing a comprehensive educator effectiveness system spanning the career continuum of teachers and leaders, including preparation, licensing, induction, mentoring, professional learning, and educator evaluation.

## **Data**

The importance of quality data as tool of change cannot be understated. Data-driven decisions at the classroom, district, regional and state levels are extremely important drivers in increasing achievement or decreasing equity gaps. As described in the Data Analysis section, Oregon has a robust and collaborative statewide data system, that informs statewide policy development, guides practice and is designed to meet federal reporting requirements. The Special Education Unit uses the SPR&I data collection and monitoring system for special education data collections, in concert with the larger, statewide system for all students.

All data collections have an assigned data owner and research analyst who work together to run the collection. Specific documentation guides or instructions are provided to all districts, as well as instruction via webinars and PowerPoints. All collections have validation procedures to ensure the data are reliable and accurate. Testing of the data collection system or templates also takes place prior to opening of the data system. Data from the data systems are used for program review and monitoring (general supervision), completing required reports like the SPP/APR Part B, making IDEA determinations to districts, and completing the annual Special Education Report Card.

## **Technical Assistance**

Technical assistance goes hand-in-hand with accountability and monitoring, and provides needed and requested opportunities to further review performance and achievement. All offices within ODE provide technical assistance to local school districts and support programs and partner agencies. The goal is to collaboratively and positively impact the educational lives of students and families in Oregon. The Offices of Learning, Finance and Administration, Informational Technology, Research and Data Analysis, and the Deputy Superintendent all have a model of technical assistance inclusive on on-site or in-person support, as well as use of technical/online methods to provide support. District visits, regional meetings, webinars, and posted presentations are several of the ways ODE provides assistance to educational partners. In addition, regular communications, such as formal memorandums, newsletters and Deputy Superintendent Rob Saxton's education blog and videos provide important information guidance.

## **Accountability/Monitoring**

Each ODE office has methods for measuring accountability and conducting monitoring activities. The ISAA unit utilizes a tool called *INDISTAR* for collecting information about each district as well as specific tools to monitor the progress of our focus and priority schools. The *INDISTAR* tool is also connected to each district's Continuous Improvement Plan which includes district school board priorities and goals. State and district report cards are developed each year, inclusive of the special education report card. This provides several different vehicles of communication with our community and stakeholders and showcases progress towards goals on a yearly basis.

Specifically in Student Services, for special education programs, the data-driven monitoring and accountability system is based on SPP/APR indicators and CFR requirements for conducting special education programs. LEAs submit sampling data and review information, as well as other improvement plans as necessary, which are then approved and monitored by ODE. This system, the System Performance Review and Improvement (SPR&I) provides databased supports and general supervision activities that allow for yearly review and reflection by districts.

## **FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Investment Board (OEIB). K-12 school districts, required to report to their governing boards by May 1, have adopted a three year method, and report to ODE by October 15. The OEIB identified two specific areas for further refinement and clarification within the recommendations: 1) Maintaining system-wide focus through achievement compacts on target-setting and implementation of strategies to ensure student attendance and readiness for college and career; and 2) stronger alignment between achievement compacts developed by education entities and parallel decision-making processes for resource allocation, planning and improvement. Through the compacts, institutions set ambitious but attainable goals for student success around key outcomes considered critical for student success in college and in the workforce. The key outcomes for K-12 districts include **3rd grade reading proficiency**, 5th grade math proficiency, 6th grade chronic absenteeism, 9th grade on-track, college credits earned in high school, high school completion, and post-secondary enrollment. Key outcomes for colleges and universities include connections with other sectors, persistence (15/30 credits earned), and certificates and degrees awarded. Each of these outcomes is predictive in some critical way of student achievement and career readiness. Together, they comprise a compelling snapshot of our collective progress toward the 40-40-20 Goal.

*2(c): A description of the current strengths, the extent the systems or coordinated, and areas for improvement within and across the systems.*

### **Governance (Strengths/Areas for Improvement)**

The governance structure of ODE and its offices focuses our work on the Strategic Plan. All work is discussed through the lens of the mission and goals, with a focus on equity for all students. This strength leads to cohesive work streams and commitment to our collaborative goals. In addition, this laser focus leads to progress and achievement of goals, as efforts, resources and decision-making are all filtered through the same lens.

An area for continued improvement in an agency this large is the tendency to silo work within different units as workload increases. It can be easy to work independently with a small group of staff who work in close proximity to each other. A way that ODE is attempting to ameliorate this tendency is through specific cross-office teams, and the weekly meetings of the Assistant Superintendents. It takes extra effort and awareness to keep collaboration at the forefront of our work. Also, maintaining a balance between state agency rules and policies, and pragmatic work procedures is always important, so as not to get sidetracked or bogged down by administrivia.

### **Fiscal (Strengths/Areas for Improvement)**

Fiscally, ODE itself, and the Offices supporting educational programs, are in a strong place to continue progress towards our 40-40-20 goal, with a focus on literacy and college-going skills. The Oregon Legislature has supported these goals by financing initiatives focusing specifically on early literacy and reading skills, as well as college-going skills through STEM and educator effectiveness programs (Common Core). The Legislature is currently poised to support additional funding to the Age 3 to Grade 3 Literacy Program, inclusive of all-day Kindergarten across the state.

An area of improvement in this fiscal component is the coordination of grant activities and awards so the funds are maximized and not 'watered-down' through small grant activities. Statewide movement and progress requires strategic allocation with sufficient funds to make a difference. Oregon will need to guard against small, individual activities that do not 'move the dial' on the larger goal of increased literacy that will improve graduation rates and successful transition to post-secondary education and employment.

### **Quality Standards (Strengths/Areas for Improvement)**

Oregon's adoption in October 2010 of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in English language arts and mathematics keeps Oregon moving education forward, and is the foundation of quality standards across the curriculum for all students. The development of the Professional Learning Teams (PLTs) in each district has strengthened this foundation. Student Services, in tandem with this work, has focused on 'standards-based IEPs' so that students with disabilities are challenged with grade-level curriculum and expectations aligned with the Common Core. This collaborative work is a strength area within Oregon.

However, Oregon needs to make sure that educator effectiveness work related to Common Core and high quality teachers includes support for all teachers to build skills to work effectively with a range of student needs. Cultural competency, as well as universal design techniques, will help support all students within the general education curriculum and provide respectful relationships between educators and students.

### **Professional Development (Strengths/Areas for Improvement)**

As mentioned above, professional development is a critical component of an educational system's work, and encompasses development of educator and administrative staff, with ongoing support and technical assistance. ODE has components of a strong professional development system across the Office of Learning, inclusive of a regular calendar of opportunities throughout the year, utilization of best practices in adult learning, and collaboration with the Confederation of School Administrators (COSA) on topical conferences such as assessment and accountability, equity, special education and English language learners. The mentorship grant provides a model of ongoing and personalized support for 'new to the field' teachers and administrators. ODE has moved from an agency that focused mainly on compliance and monitoring to one that combines support and assistance within the context of monitoring to maximize opportunities to change and progress.

One area of professional development that requires attentiveness from ODE and stakeholders is coordinated communication regarding opportunities for school and program teams to organize and scaffold a program of professional development that meets the needs of

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

the school/program or district. Focused professional development, tailored to specific characteristics and skills of the educators is the foundation for maximizing change through change agents (i.e., educators).

### Data (Strengths/Areas for Improvement)

The Oregon Department of Education is a 'data-rich' agency with decisions based on data that will help us meet our 40-40-20 goal in 2025. The Office of Research and Data Analysis was designed to assist units within the agency to dig deeper into data analysis so that strategies and interventions would be based on the needs of our students, and not just general statewide or national trends.

However, that availability of data can lead to analysis not directly applicable to practical application. Disaggregated data analysis should drive coordinated work across offices and not be viewed in isolation. To analyze data beyond usefulness at a programmatic level is easy, and can deter from the focused goal. In addition, strong data analysis should conclude with specific recommendations and be shared and communicated in a coordinated manner.

### Technical Assistance (Strengths/Areas for Improvement)

The transition of ODE from an agency solely focused on compliance and monitoring to one that combines quality educational program for students with achievement of results-driven outcomes has been met with approval and enthusiasm from the field. Program and district staff across the state have shared their positive feedback of this transformation which has led to intentional work specific to the environment and characteristics of the students served.

Our technical assistance efforts still remain somewhat disjointed across units. Districts shared confusion with differing guidance or multiple monitoring visits that are not coordinated. One of the objectives within Goal 3 is focused on coordinated technical assistance efforts and feedback loops. This is an area where improvement would assist in overall cohesion towards positive outcomes for students.

### Accountability/Monitoring (Strengths/Areas for Improvement)

This SSIP, a revised accountability system under the IDEA, shifts accountability efforts from a primary emphasis on compliance to a framework that focuses on improved results for students with disabilities, while continuing to assist in ensuring compliance with the IDEA's requirements. The emphasis will be on child outcomes to increase the achievement of students with disabilities. ODE has moved in this same direction with focused goals and objectives with determined metrics to measure the progress towards and achievement of our goals. This component is strong within the agency and the utilization of the Education Delivery Institute model of getting results will greatly support this SSIP. The goal of improved reading skills at 3<sup>rd</sup> grade is already of major focus of ODE's work.

Sometimes competing agendas or emergency issues can cloud or temporarily derail work, even with focused and committed personnel. Adherence to our foundational model of delivering results will remain 'front and center' to our everyday work.

2(d): The identification of current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives and the extent to which they are aligned, and how they are, or could be integrated with the SSIP.

The most important State-level improvement plans and initiatives focus on student learning and educator effectiveness, and the State's 40/40/20 plan. In 2011, the Oregon Legislature adopted Senate Bill 253, which frames what has come to be known as 40-40-20. By 2025, this goal aims for 40 percent of Oregonians to have a baccalaureate degree or higher; for 40 percent to have an associate's degree or certificate in a skilled occupation; and for the remaining 20 percent without a postsecondary credential to have at least a high school diploma or its equivalent credential. On-going data collection and monitoring of the class of 2025 is at the forefront of this goal.

Several data indicators that provide formative information as to the progress towards this goal are: the percentage of 9<sup>th</sup> grade students on-track to graduate with a total of 6 credits at the end of their 9<sup>th</sup> grade year; the percentage of students taking AP or IB classes; the percentage of students enrolled in college-level courses during their high school career, as well as the graduation rate (4-year and 5-year cohorts).

HB 3232 in 2013-2015 has focused on literacy skills in early childhood, as well as the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade reading benchmark. This initiative will continue, if approved by the Legislature, through the Age 3 to Grade 3 Literacy Initiative that specifically spans from age 3 to grade 3 (or 8-year-olds). While there are pockets of collaboration throughout the state between Early Learning and the K-12 system, this is the first time that ODE has laid out a plan, in a qualitative way, that ties it all together. Utilizing this strategy of combining an initiative between early childhood and school-age is an effective model as evidenced in other states, as well as in certain parts of Oregon. By having shared professional development, alignment of the academic and social-emotional standards, and working on the transition from the early years to the early grades, we know this will make a difference for our children. Last year, Oregon had 68% of its students reading by third grade, with 32% of students not meeting that standard. Most of the students who were not successful were students of color, living in poverty or with disabilities. This indicates that students are not being identified early enough as needing more strategic intervention or support, or are just referred for special education services, which may not be appropriate. This comprehensive initiative is needed to significantly change the trajectory of students as they moved toward successful graduation and we reach our goal of 40-40-20. Specifically, the Age 3 to Grade 3 Literacy Initiative will support and enhance regional and local efforts to connect, integrate, and align early learning and K-12 systems, and help prevent the opportunity and achievement gaps.

We have aligned our SSIP directly to the Age 3 to Grade 3 Literacy Initiative with the selection of 3<sup>rd</sup> grade reading as our State-identified Measurable Result (SIMR). The Age 3 to Grade 3 Literacy Initiative supports ODE's overall Goal 1/Objective 2, to *Implement statewide*

2(e): A list of representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) who were involved in the development of Phase I and will be involved in the development and implementation of Phase II of the SSIP.

Oregon is very proud of the involvement of many individuals and groups in the development of Phase I of our State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). We found that stakeholders are invested in the outcome of our State-Initiated Measurable Result, and have requested continued involvement with Phase II. Their contribution has been invaluable with all components, including data analysis, infrastructure analysis, determination of the SIMR and appropriate coherent strategies. Oregon's Theory of Action is constructed to meet our State's needs, specifically directed at increased reading skills at 3<sup>rd</sup> grade for our students with disabilities. The following is a list of agencies whose representatives participated with us for the past 16 months in activities related to our systemic review of data and infrastructure in order to determine Oregon's measurable result tied to coherent intervention strategies:

- Oregon Department of Education: Office of Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction, Office Finance and Administration, Office of Learning (ISAA, Student Services, Equity, Early Learning Division, Youth Development Division), Office of Informational Technology, Office of Research and Analysis
- Department of Human Services – Office of Developmental Disabilities, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. Office of Child Welfare
- Oregon Education and Investment Board
- Family and Community Together –Parent Training Institute
- Parents of Students with Disabilities
- Oregon Council on Developmental Disabilities
- State Advisory Council on Special Education
- State Interagency Coordinating Council
- Colleagues from the following Universities and Colleges: University of Oregon, Portland State University, Western Oregon University, Pacific University, Lewis and Clark College
- Educational Service District Partners – administrative and service providers
- Local School Districts (197) – teachers and administrators

The list represents over 150 individuals who have been involved in the development and review of Phase I of Oregon's State Systemic Improvement Plan and the selection of our State-Identified Measurable Result for students with disabilities. We will continue to invite and involve these individuals and groups as we transition into Phase II.

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

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

*Statement*

**The State-Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) for Students with Disabilities, Kindergarten through age 21, is to increase the percentage of third grade students with disabilities reading at grade level, as measured by state assessment.**

*Description*

A description of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities.)

As shared above, Oregon's State-Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) for Students with Disabilities, Kindergarten through age 21 is *to increase the percentage of third grade students with disabilities reading at grade level, as measured by state assessment*. This SIMR is aligned with Indicator B3 Assessment and the proficiency rate in reading of third grade students with disabilities. This SIMR is also strongly linked to Graduation Rates (B1), Dropout Rates (B2). This child-level outcome is directly connected to ODE's Goal 1/Objective 2, to *Implement statewide literacy programs so all students read by third grade.*

Longitudinal research has found warning signs early in a student's career that indicate lack of success in completing high school. Some of the research found warning signs in 6<sup>th</sup> grade, including chronic absences, failing language arts or math, and poor behavior (Balfanz, R.). Research conducted by Donald Hernandez (2012) of 3<sup>rd</sup> grade reading skills was highlighted as an earlier warning sign leading to poor graduation rates. His research found that "a student who cannot read at grade level by 3<sup>rd</sup> grade is four times less likely to graduate by age 19 than a child who does read proficiently by that time." In addition, if poverty is also a factor, the student is 13 times less likely to graduate high school on time as compared to his/her more skilled and wealthier peer. Dr. Hernandez posits that students are taught to read during their first three years of school (1<sup>st</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> grades), and then begin using their reading skills to learn other subjects,

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

so if children have not mastered reading skills to a certain level by 3<sup>rd</sup> grade, they have more difficulty succeeding in school and remediating any deficits.

Hernandez, D. (2012), *Double jeopardy: how third-grade reading skills and poverty influence high school graduation*. The Annie E. Casey Foundation, Baltimore, MD.

**Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies**

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

**Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies**

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified results. The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

**Component #4: Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies**

**4(a) A description that demonstrates how the improvement strategies were selected and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s).**

Based on data and infrastructure analysis, the Oregon Department of Education (ODE) has selected four evidence-based coherent improvement strategies to implement to support and build capacity. The coherent strategies that ODE has chosen to implement using a cohort structure are:

- Oregon Response to Instruction and Intervention (OrRTI)
- School-wide Implementation Framework for Transformation (SWIFT)
- Effective Behavioral and Instructional Support Systems(EBISS) via Oregon's State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG)
- Age 3 to Grade 3 Literacy Initiative

The ODE's overarching goal is:

*Every student graduates from high school and is ready for college, career, and civic life.* To reach this goal, ODE believes that when these four coherent improvement strategies are implemented with fidelity, the literacy achievement of 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students with disabilities will increase. Increased literacy achievement of 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students is key to reaching the overarching goal that every student graduates from high school and is ready for college, career, and civic life. Oregon's State Initiated Measurable Result (SIMR) and Goals 1.2, 1.5 of the Oregon Department of Education's Strategic Plan are all aligned so that the primary goal of increasing the reading achievement of 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students with disabilities will occur. These improvement strategies are based on data and infrastructure analysis as detailed in sections one and two of this document. Further, these improvement strategies are also based on Goal 1.2 in the ODE Strategic Plan: *Implement Statewide Literacy Programs so ALL Students Read by 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade; and Goal 1.5 in the ODE Strategic Plan, which specifically focuses on children with disabilities: Improve Quality of Special Education Services to Close Achievement Gaps.*

**Key data that was used in Coherent Improvement Strategies Selection**

**B3 – STATEWIDE ASSESSMENT**

The following data table shows the performance of students with disabilities enrolled in 3<sup>rd</sup> grade from FFY 2010 to FFY 2013. An overall decline in performance is evident from one year to the next with the more significant decline occurring in 2011. This was most likely due to a change in cut scores which occurred at this time.

Children with IEPs	3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade Reading Assessment (Performance)			
	FFY 2010	FFY 2011	FFY 2012	FFY 2013
Proficient or above in regular assessment with no accommodations	45.4%	30.6%	26.5%	24.2%

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Proficient or above in regular assessment with accommodations	6.5%	4.8%	6.1%	6.0%
Proficient or above in alternate assessment against alternate standards	12.3%	12.9%	11.8%	12.6%

\* Data Source: State's Annual Performance Report FFY 2010 through FFY 2013

**2013-14 OAKS Reading data indicate that...**

- 66.2% of 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students statewide reading at grade level (41,768 students)
- 54.8% of 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students in F/P districts reading at grade level (3,567 students)
- 65.78% of 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students in OrRTI districts reading at grade level (10,288 students)
- 66.5% of 8<sup>th</sup> grade students statewide reading at grade level (42,710 students)

**B1 – GRADUATION RATE**

**Four-year Cohort Methodology**

FFY	Target	Percentage
<b>2010</b>		
(Using 2009-2010 data)	65.0%	41.8%
High School Entry 2006-2007		
<b>2011</b>		
(Using 2010-2011 data)	67.0%	42.2%
High School Entry 2007-2008		
<b>2012</b>		
(Using 2011-2012 data)	67.0%	38.2%
High School Entry 2008-2009		

**Five-year Cohort Methodology**

FFY	Target	Percentage
<b>2010</b>		
(Using 2009-2010 data)	70.0%	46.7%
High School Entry 2005-2006		
<b>2011</b>		
(Using 2010-2011 data)	72.0%	46.8%
High School Entry 2006-2007		
<b>2012</b>		
(Using 2011-2012 data)	72.0%	47.2%
High School Entry 2007-2008		

\* Data Source: State's Annual Performance Report FFY 2010 through FFY 2012

**Five-Year Graduation Rate: Students with Disabilities vs. All Students:**

- **56.4 %** of students with disabilities graduated in the 5-year cohort compared to **75.9%** of all students (a **19.5** percentage point gap)

Data conclusions for statewide graduation rates for students with disabilities based on overall statewide performance:

- Based on APR 2013 data, there has been a decline of 4.0% of students with disabilities graduating with a regular diploma from the previous year in the 4-year cohort; however there has been a steady increase in the percentage of students with disabilities in the 5-year cohort graduating with a regular diploma. This increase is encouraging; however as noted in the 2013-2014 graph data, significantly fewer students with disabilities are graduating than all students.

Research supports ODE's beliefs that increasing literacy achievement in 3rd grade will positively impact and increase graduation rates. For example, Hernandez (2012) reported that one of the most influential indicators of increased graduation rates for all students is at grade level literacy skills by 3rd grade. Hernandez, R. (2012), *Double Jeopardy: how 3rd-grade reading skills and poverty influence high school graduation*. The Annie E. Casey Foundation, Baltimore, MD.

Hernandez, R. (2013), *Early Warning Confirmed: A Research Update on 3rd-Grade Reading*. The Annie E. Casey Foundation, Baltimore, MD.

**Identification Data Analysis of Districts involved with OrRTI**

Data analysis of districts involved with OrRTI for four or more years, with 100 or more special education students, have resulted in an overall 2% reduction of students identified with a specific learning disability. The overall average percentage in reduction of students identified as Specific Learning Disability is based on the total number of students in each district identified as Special Education. This data was calculated from the percentage of students identified as Specific Learning Disability out of the overall students identified as Special Education from the first year each district began implementation to the 2013-2014 implementation year.

This indicates that when multi- tiered systems of support (MTSS) are implemented with fidelity, fewer students are identified as disabled and in need of the specially designed instruction provided from Individual Education Plans (IEPs), thus reducing special education misidentification. When all students receive evidence-based core instruction, and appropriately delivered interventions based on data, fewer students may be identified as having a disability and requiring specially designed instruction.

Average Percentage of Students Eligible as SLD during 1 <sup>st</sup> Year of OrRTI Implementation	Average Percentage of Students Eligible as SLD during 2013-2014 of OrRTI Implementation	Average Percentage of Change for Districts Implementing OrRTI
43%	41%	2% Reduction

\*Date Note: Above calculation was based on districts which have participated in OrRTI for four or more years and have 100 or more students receiving Special Education services.

**Infrastructure Analysis:**

The infrastructure analysis was instrumental in selecting the coherent improvement strategies. Specific key components of the state infrastructure that led to the coherent strategies selection are:

- ODE's Strategic Plan
  - Goal 1.2 Implement statewide literacy programs so all students read by 3rd grade
  - Goal 1.5 Improve quality of special education services to close achievement gaps
  - Fiscal: Oregon Legislature passing HB 3232 in 2013. One of the specific goals cited in HB 3232 is to increase the percentage of students reading at benchmark by 3rd grade. This Strategic Initiatives for Student Success Bill specifically funded the initiative: Scaling up the Oregon Response to Intervention Network.
  - Strategic Plan for 2015-2017: Evidence-Based Systems Implementation Age 3 to Grade Three Literacy Initiative
  - Professional Development:
    - Oregon's State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) awarded from the Federal Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) supports the Effective Behavioral and Instructional Student Support (EBISS) Initiative
    - School-wide Implementation Framework for Transformation (SWIFT)
- ODE Staffing Structure that supports the Coherent Improvement Strategies- the ODE staff involved with these coherent strategies work in a collaborative, cross-unit approach from the three units that comprise the Office of Learning. Specifically, the Best Practices Team from the Student Services Unit, along with the School Improvement Team from the Instruction, Standards, Assessment, and Accountability Unit, and the Equity Team from the Equity Unit are all involved with these coherent improvement strategies as more specifically denoted below:
- OrRTI: One ODE Director coordinates the work via contract with Tigard/Tualatin School District and sub-grant with Roseburg School District. The contract funds a total of 6 FTE staff, located in various geographic areas of the state.
- SWIFT: ODE Core implementation team currently includes three directors and three education specialists. In order to scale up to

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

include additional districts and schools, ODE has committed to adding a 1.0 FTE education specialist beginning in the 2015-2016 school year to work specifically with districts/schools in SWIFT framework implementation.

- **EBISS (SPDG):** Working with the Best Practices Director, one education specialist coordinates all SPDG professional development activities and expenditures. Multiple content area experts provide professional development/technical assistance to districts and ESDs as SPDG contractors.
- **Age 3 to Grade 3 Literacy Initiative:** One director from the Deputy Superintendent's office currently coordinates the work. Multiple directors and education specialists from the Early Learning Division and Office of Learning support the work.

### THIS IS A COMBINED SECTION OF 4(b) and 4(d):

**4(b) A description that demonstrates how the improvement strategies are sound, logical, and aligned.**

**4(d) A description of how the selection of coherent improvement strategies include the strategies, identified through the data and State infrastructure analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified measurable result(s) for children with disabilities.**

The improvement strategies are all evidence-based and aligned using a tiered systems approach based on implementation science principles. Three of the coherent strategies are currently part of the existing state infrastructure. The Age 3 to Grade Three Literacy Initiative planning is complete, and is expected to receive funding from the Legislature for the 2015-2017 biennium.

Districts must apply to participate in any of the coherent strategies to ensure the districts are committed, and have met baseline expectations which support positive student outcomes. Implementation requires a coordinated, cross-unit approach from the ODE Office of Learning. Each coherent strategy is sound, logical, and aligned with the SIMR and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result as detailed in each strategy in the following specific coherent strategy sections:

#### **Coherent Strategy: OREGON RESPONSE TO INTERVENTION (OrRTI)**

The OrRTI mission is to cultivate the thinking and skills in leadership at all levels to build and sustain a comprehensive multi-level system of core instruction and intervention that identifies and serves the instructional needs of all children.

OrRTI provides technical assistance and coaching to elementary schools with an expected outcome of improving student literacy outcomes. OrRTI has been in existence in Oregon since 2004, and has provided technical assistance and coaching to over 80 of the 197 districts in Oregon to date. Districts receive basic, targeted, and intensive technical assistance based on specific district needs for three to four years. These supports include on-site, imbedded technical assistance in addition to basic, group level professional development via regional and/or state conferences. After that time, districts continue to participate in basic, group level professional development via regional and/or state conferences. OrRTI currently has a cohort of 18 districts in the 2nd year moving from exploration to initial implementation. Fifteen new districts have begun exploration in 2014-2015 school year.

To be selected, districts must have core/Tier 1 curriculum in place, and they must certify that district and school-based leadership are committed to lead the implementation process. To obtain a baseline and assess implementation growth, district level and school level leadership teams assess key implementation components using the following tools:

[OregonRTI District Implementation Evaluation Tool- District Based \(DIET-DB\)](#) [OregonRTI District Implementation Evaluation Tool- School Based \(DIET-SB\)](#)

In collaboration with ODE, six staff provide project-wide trainings, region-wide trainings, and on-site imbedded specific coaching based on a Tier 1 Universal, Tier 2 Targeted, and Tier 3 Intensive assistance/professional development model in the following areas to all school staff:

- **Leadership:** Build leadership skills in school and district leaders for developing the infrastructure, implementation, accountability and sustainability of an RTI system.
- **Professional Development:** Help districts develop the capacity to identify staff needs and provide the training, coaching, and support necessary to maintain a high level of system implementation and effectiveness.
- **Instruction:** Support districts in providing high quality, effective core instruction and tier 2, tier 3 interventions matched to student need that raises the achievement of all students in all sub-groups.
- **Data-Based Decision Making:** Support districts in establishing data-based decision making systems and teaming structures that drive an ongoing cycle of instructional improvement to include:
  1. Universal screening of all students early and on a regular basis to identify struggling learners;
  2. Frequent progress monitoring of at-risk students that informs instructional practices and allows for adjustments to ensure success; and
  3. Individualized and intensive diagnostic assessment for students that do not respond to standardized interventions.
- **Assessment Systems:** Support districts to develop, use, and maintain assessment systems that improve the quality and effectiveness of instruction, screen students to determine their instructional needs, monitor the progress of students in interventions, and evaluate the implementation integrity of the system overall.
- **SLD Identification:** Support districts in developing the capacity and confidence to make SLD eligibility decisions that are appropriate and meaningful through the RTI process.
- **Outreach:** Increase statewide awareness and accurate understanding of RTI systems and the benefits to students and educators, and help districts develop their readiness and commitment to implement RTI.

## **FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

The schools and the district are assessed on systems implementation throughout the year to ensure fidelity of implementation. The District Implementation Evaluation Tool (DIET) is an assessment for districts to use 2 times per year to determine level of implementation with fidelity. In addition to this tool, student level formative and summative evaluation data is utilized to assess progress and inform instruction.

The maps below denote the districts from all around Oregon that came into the project in 2013-2014, and in 2014-2015 as a result of HB 3232. These districts are categorized as Cadres 9.2 and Cadre 10 respectively. OrRTI technical assistance centers are denoted in the maps below as the red dots. Cadre 9.2 is color-coded in brown on the first map below, and Cadre 10 is color-coded in navy blue in the second map below:

### **Coherent Strategy: SCHOOLWIDE IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK FOR TRANSFORMATION (SWIFT)**

In spring 2013, Oregon was selected as one of five states to receive intensive technical assistance support from the SWIFT Center. The SWIFT Center is part of the University of Kansas higher education system, and is funded by OSEP to improve outcomes for students with disabilities in inclusive settings. The technical assistance is unique in that it utilizes implementation science principles in working with state, district, and school level systems simultaneously. Oregon is now in the second of four years in this work. Four school districts and 16 elementary and middle schools in these districts are working directly with ODE and the SWIFT Center.

To be selected, each of the districts and schools demonstrated a commitment that district and school-based leadership were committed to lead the implementation process.

The Oregon map below denotes where the school districts involved in this project are located:

- Portland Public Schools- the largest district in the state serving approximately 48,750 students and an urban district (denoted on map as green smiley face);
- Redmond School District-located in central Oregon, and considered semi-rural, and serving 7,000 students (denoted on map as blue smiley face);
- Pendleton School District-located in eastern Oregon, a rural district and serves 3,150 students (denoted on map as pink smiley face);
- Sisters School District-located in central Oregon, a very small district, serving 1,300 students.

The domains and features illustrated on the graphic below are the foundation of the transformation work that the Oregon Department of Education is engaged in with the SWIFT Center, and the four Oregon school districts and 16 schools simultaneously.

SWIFT is a framework for changing schools, especially those that are struggling with low achievement, high rates of problem behavior, and segregated delivery of specialized services. The SWIFT framework assists schools to transform academic and behavioral instruction from fragmented systems into fully integrated organizations that deliver effective education and extra-curricular activities to all students in the school community. The SWIFT framework encourages integrated systems and services and facilitates collaborative teaching at all grades and levels of intervention. The framework employs a systems approach that considers multiple levels of engagement and support at the following levels:

#### **State:**

Policy and guidance for instruction and behavior, organizational leadership, and resource management collectively serve as the foundation for district and school-wide implementation of SWIFT. Ongoing leadership and feedback loops allow for policy-enabled practice and practice-informed policy.

#### **District:**

Organizational leadership; integrated resources and staffing models; coordinated delivery of general education, special education, and other student support services; and structures and policies to promote the placement of all students requiring specialized services and supports in the school they would ordinarily attend guide the provision of resources and LEA support to schools implementing SWIFT.

#### **School:**

Instructional and behavioral expectations and supports for all students and staff, across all school settings, serve as the foundation for classroom and targeted student interventions that are aligned and coordinated with the curriculum, and result from collaborative planning and implementation.

#### **Administrative Leadership**

Strong and actively engaged leadership committed to improving teaching and learning and a system that empowers educators and school personnel.

The two features of this domain:

- Strong and Engaged Site Leadership -valued leadership to implement and sustain system transformation that continuously improves teaching and learning. All educators and families contribute to core school decisions with empowered opportunities through the principal and the leadership team.

## **FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

- Strong Educator Support System- sufficient supports for instruction (professional learning and instructional coaching) to improve teaching and learning. Personnel evaluation is supportive and useful for educators to build instructional knowledge and skills.

### **Multi-Tiered System of Support**

Continuum of research-based, system wide practices to meet the identified academic and behavior instructional needs of students using data.

The two features of this domain are:

#### 1) Inclusive Academic Instruction

School-wide systems to prevent academic failure and needed supplemental academic supports to ensure achievement for all students. Multi-level instructional strategies for both reading and math to include all students with various needs in the general education curriculum activities.

#### 2) Inclusive Behavior Instruction

Systems to prevent behavior challenges and provide supplemental social/behavior supports to ensure achievement for all students. Use of research-based multi-tiered interventions based on functions of behavior with fidelity. For both academics and behavior, the school identifies instructional priorities based on analyzing multiple sources of data.

### **Integrated Education Framework**

Encompasses ALL students, personnel and stakeholders within a positive school culture and ensures full access for ALL students to participate in all school-related activities.

The two features of this domain are:

- Fully-Integrated Organizational Structure: All students participate in the general education curriculum instruction/activities of their grade-level peers. The school embraces non-categorical service delivery to support diverse needs of students.
- Strong and Positive School Culture:-All students, including those with IEPs, have equal access to extracurricular learning activities with appropriate supports. All school personnel (i.e., instructional & other personnel) have shared responsibility to educate all students.

### **Family & Community Engagement**

Families, community members and schools form a partnership where each benefit from and support the other.

The two features of this domain are:

- Trusting Family Partnerships: The school provides families with opportunities/resources to participate in the decision-making about their children's education. All personnel in the school understand the importance of building positive partnerships with their students' families.
- Trusting Community Partnerships: The school collaborates with a variety of community partners to match resources and services in the community with identified school needs. The school offers various resources to benefit the surrounding community

### **Inclusive Policy Structure & Practice**

A supportive, reciprocal partnership between the school and its LEA.

The two features of this domain are:

- Strong LEA/School Relationship;-The LEA actively and adequately supports implementation of SWIFT features. The LEA addresses and removes policy and other barriers to success.
- LEA Policy Framework:-The LEA supports SWIFT practices by linking multiple initiatives, revising policies, and extending successful implementation cases to other schools. The LEA uses school-building information to support and ensure training regarding research and/or research-based practices.

ODE plans to scale this practice up to include additional districts in the state and to increase the number of schools in the current districts. Beginning in the 2015-2016 school year, two additional districts will be added to include up to four elementary/middle schools. In addition, ODE plans to increase the number of schools involved in the current districts as well. To do this, ODE has committed to adding an additional 1.0 FTE education specialist beginning with the 2015-2016 school year focused solely on schools/district implementation of this framework.

A variety of tools are used to assess fidelity of implementation across state, district, and schools:

- FIT-Fidelity of Implementation Tool
- FIA-Fidelity Integrity Assessment
- DCA-District Capacity Assessment
- SCA-State Capacity Assessment

In addition, student level formative and summative assessment data are also systematically reviewed.

### **Coherent Strategy: EBISS**

The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) is in the fourth year of current SPDG funding to improve student outcomes. Oregon's State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) awarded from the Federal Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) supports the Effective Behavioral and Instructional Student Support (EBISS) Initiative. School districts and Education Service Districts (ESDs) receive technical assistance/professional development to implement and sustain a continuum of multi-tiered systems of supports for literacy and behavior. A blended model of Response To Intervention (RTI) and Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) allows districts and programs to be able to meet the academic and behavioral needs of all students. This model is known as Effective Behavioral and Instructional Support Systems. The Oregon Department of Education and their contractual partners provide on-going professional development and technical assistance to EBISS District Leadership Teams on a variety of literacy and behavior topics. To be selected, each of the districts and schools must certify that district and school-based leadership are committed to lead the implementation process.

EBISS professional development sessions are designed for district/school leadership teams and will continue to occur regionally through 2016. Districts and ESDs receive funding to support their participation. The EBISS project began in 2011, and will continue through 2016. In 2014-2015, the schools, districts and ESDs in the Coos, Curry, Douglas, Jackson, Josephine, and Klamath are eligible to participate. School districts and ESDs in central and eastern Oregon counties will be invited to participate in 2015-2016. As noted above, districts and schools leadership teams will demonstrate commitment to the implementation process. The map below indicates regional participation from 2012-2016.

EBISS is organized into two strands known as Breadth and Depth. Districts and ESDs select into Depth or Breadth strands based on implementation science principles. Districts/ESDs who are new to engagement in a multi-tiered systematic approach to instruction participate in a Breadth strand component beginning with implementation science principles, then move into PBIS universal systems Tier 1 or Literacy Coaching/Data Teams.

Districts that have participated in a Breadth strand have the opportunity to participate in one of the following Depth strands:

- Best Practices-Secondary Literacy
- Implementing CCSS w/Oregon's Literacy Framework
- RTI implementation
- RTI for Specific Learning Disability eligibility
- PBIS Tiers 2 & 3 (Advanced)

All participating districts and ESDs utilize the EBISS data portal to access the following assessment tools to determine their level of implementation with fidelity:

[Team Functioning Survey Instructions](#) [School Implementation Scale Instructions](#) [Spring Data Report Template](#) [Strategies for Overcoming Barriers](#)

Depth Strand-Specific Tools:

RTI [OregonRTI District Implementation Evaluation Tool- District Based \(DIET-DB\)](#) [OregonRTI District Implementation Evaluation Tool- School Based \(DIET-SB\)](#) PBIS [Monitoring Advanced Tiers Tool \(MATT\)](#) [Benchmarks of Quality \(BoQ\)](#) Secondary Literacy [Inventory of Practices V.2](#) RTI for SLD Eligibility [RTI Infrastructure Checklist](#)

The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) is beginning to plan for visioning a new SPDG expected to begin in 2017 which will further the coherent work of SWIFT, OrRTI, and Age 3 to Grade 3 Literacy Initiative specifically in the areas noted below:

- Multi-tiered systems of support for academics and behavior (MTSS)
- Integrated Education Framework (Pre-K to elementary)
- Family & Community Engagement

### **Coherent Strategy: Age 3 to Grade 3 Literacy Initiative**

This scaling up initiative is designed to increase the percentage of students in Oregon reading at grade level in 3rd grade to 90% or more in five years. This initiative will:

- Support summer transition between early learning programs and kindergarten programs for incoming kindergarten students.
- Support shared professional development between early learning providers and K-3 teachers to scale highly effective literacy programs around the state of Oregon.

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

- As part of this initiative, state funding is secured for districts to implement full day kindergarten programs beginning in the fall of 2015. Full-day kindergarten programs must be robust, and focus on literacy.
- Provide summer and after-school programs for students that are not on trajectory for attaining literacy goals.
- Consistently implement robust and highly effective literacy programs.

Districts will need to apply to receive support and funding that will come with the support. Districts will need to demonstrate they are committed to implementation, using implementation science principles, of the following components:

- Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS)
- Set goals/objectives that address the achievement gap for typically underachieving student groups including students with disabilities
- Certify that district and school-based leadership are committed to lead the implementation process
- Family and Community Engagement
- Utilizing Instructional Coaches
- Professional development plan for staff and Early Learning Providers

Selected school districts will utilize the 2015-2016 school year for planning, with implementation to begin in the fall of 2016. ODE cross-unit staff from the Office of Learning will coordinate the provision of technical assistance to selected districts and schools.

The coherent improvement strategies are outlined in the grid below as a visual representation demonstrating all four coherent strategies alignment. The areas denoted in the same color indicate areas of alignment:

<b>Initiative Name</b>	<b>Organizational Structure</b>	<b>Target Population</b>	<b>Strategy listed in ODE Strategic Plan</b>	<b>Scale-Up Initiative</b>	<b>Expected Student Outcomes</b>
<b>OrRTI</b>	ODE-Office of Learning staff Contractor staff	Elementary/Middle	Yes	Yes	Increased student literacy outcomes at the 3rd grade level. Fewer students identified for special education
<b>EBISS</b>	ODE-Office of Learning staff Contractor staff	Elementary/Middle/ High	Yes for 15-17	Yes	Increased student literacy outcomes. Fewer students identified for special education
<b>SWIFT</b>	ODE-Office of Learning staff SWIFT Center staff	Elementary/Middle	Yes	Yes	Increased student literacy outcomes at 3rd grade level
<b>3 to Three</b>	ODE-Office of Learning staff	Early Learning/Elementary	Yes for 15-17	Yes	Increased student literacy outcomes at 3rd grade level

**4(c) A description of how implementation of improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build capacity to achieve the SIMR for children with disabilities.**

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

As written in Section I of this document, the **identified root causes** for low performance in students with disabilities reading at grade level by third grade are attributable to districts and schools:

- Non-implementation of evidence-based literacy core curriculum based on common core state standards across all 197 Oregon districts
- Non-implementation of systematic academic and behavioral multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS) across all 197 Oregon districts
- Non-implementation of culturally relevant pedagogy across all 197 Oregon districts
- No cohesion between Early learning educational programs and elementary programs

In addition, the Oregon Department of Education (ODE) has not implemented a truly braided, coherent multi-tiered system supporting districts and schools to implement with fidelity. For more information related to the root cause analysis, the Preface of the Oregon K-12 Literacy Framework can be found at this link:

<http://www.ode.state.or.us/teachlearn/subjects/elarts/reading/literacy/preface.pdf>

**Implementation Science Principles** are adhered to in scaling up each of the coherent strategies within schools, districts, and ODE as discussed below:

### OrRTI

ODE continues to scale up OrRTI using Implementation Science principles of Exploration, Installation, Initial Implementation and Full Implementation. One ODE Director coordinates the work via contract with Tigard/Tualatin School District and sub-grant with Roseburg School District. A total of 6 FTE staff are funded by the Contract. The staff are located in various geographic areas of the state and provide a three-tiered level of technical assistance based on individual school/district need. This approach consists of universal supports, targeted supports, and intensive supports.

Implementation Science principles are explicitly reviewed with district and school-level leadership teams when they first begin working with OrRTI. The following assessments are used with district and school leadership teams twice per year to evaluate the progression from exploration to implementation, and to determine appropriate actions:

[OregonRTI District Implementation Evaluation Tool- District Based \(DIET-DB\)](#) [OregonRTI District Implementation Evaluation Tool- School Based \(DIET-SB\)](#)

### SWIFT:

Using implementation science principles, ODE plans to scale this practice up to include additional districts in the state and to increase the number of schools in the current districts. Beginning in the 2015-2016 school year, two additional districts will be added which will include up to four elementary/middle schools. In addition, ODE is planning to increase the number of schools involved in the current districts as well. To do this, ODE has committed to adding an additional 1.0 FTE education specialist beginning with the 2015-2016 school year. ODE Core implementation team currently includes three directors and three education specialists who work closely with the SWIFT Center LEA Facilitator and SEA Facilitator. These two facilitators provide on-site intense technical assistance to the schools, districts and ODE. When the technical assistance ends in two years, ODE will have the capacity to continue to provide this level of technical assistance to new districts and schools coming on board.

A variety of tools are used to assess fidelity of implementation across state, district, and schools:

FIT-Fidelity of Implementation Tool

FIA-Fidelity Integrity Assessment

DCA-District Capacity Assessment

SCA-State Capacity Assessment

Currently, the 16 SWIFT schools are in the exploration stage. Two of the schools have completed the Installation vote with more than 80% of the staff in each school voting to support or strongly support SWIFT installation.

### SWIFT IMPLEMENTATION SCIENCE FOUNDATION:

SWIFT Technical Assistance (TA) employs the Active Implementation Framework as the research base to support the strategies for SWIFT Implementation. Policy Technical Assistance is an integral part of the SWIFT Implementation strategy, and is directed toward a goal of aligning policy at all levels to support implementation, sustainability, and replication. This document articulates the application of the Active Implementation Framework to SWIFT.

### 1) EXPLORATION

The goal of the Exploration Stage is to examine the degree to which a particular program or innovation meets the district's needs and is feasible.

## **FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

derive from policy. This stage involves active communication between State Education Agency (SEA) and Local Education Agency (LEA) leadership, and includes engaging stakeholders, seeking input, and gathering relevant data.

### **2) INSTALLATION**

Installation Stage begins as the decision is made to move ahead, and looks at the practical preparations needed to make the change.

SWIFT Policy TA: As it relates to policy alignment, Installation involves thorough review of documents, confirmation/clarification of barriers, establishment of authority (individual and procedural), and establishment of multi-dimensional communication protocols to engage stakeholders at each stage. Installation Stage also involves significant training and coaching for those involved in the implementation of new programs.

#### **• INITIAL IMPLEMENTATION**

Initial Implementation begins when a new program or practice is first being put to use. As challenges emerge, the team develops and engages in strategies to promote continuous improvement and rapid-cycle problem-solving based upon data.

SWIFT Policy TA: When policy barriers are confirmed, identification of short-term work-arounds and long-term solutions occurs. This phase will focus on creative problem solving in the short term, while creating parallel processes/strategies to achieve long-term solutions. This stage involves coaching while LEA and SEA Teams create solutions.

#### **• FULL IMPLEMENTATION**

Full Implementation is in place when the processes and procedures are in place and the system has largely been recalibrated to accommodate and support the new methods.

SWIFT Policy TA: Strategies have been implemented to affect lasting change. Allies/stakeholders are involved and engaged to support the lasting change. Leadership teams are empowered to use data and Improvement Cycles to identify and remove barriers and support full implementation.

### **EBISS:**

Implementation Science Principles are at the core of the EBISS work, as evidenced by the organization of depth and breadth components. Working with the Best Practices Director, one education specialist coordinates all SPDG professional development activities and expenditures. Multiple content area experts provide professional development/technical assistance to districts and ESDs as SPDG contractors.

All participating districts and ESDs utilize the data portal to access the following assessment tools to determine their level of implementation with fidelity:

[Team Functioning Survey Instructions](#) [School Implementation Scale Instructions](#) [Spring Data Report Template](#) [Strategies for Overcoming Barriers](#)

Depth Strand-Specific Tools:

[RTI Oregon RTI District Implementation Evaluation Tool- District Based \(DIET-DB\)](#) [Oregon RTI District Implementation Evaluation Tool- School Based \(DIET-SB\)](#) [PBIS Monitoring Advanced Tiers Tool \(MATT\)](#) [Benchmarks of Quality \(BoQ\)](#)

### **Age 3 to Grade 3 Literacy Initiative:**

Implementation Science Principles will be utilized to scale up the Age 3 to Grade 3 Literacy Initiative. To be considered for selection, districts will be expected to provide documentation as to how implementation science principles of exploration, installation, initial implementation, and full implementation will be utilized effectively. Selected districts will further refine this in their planning during the 2015-2016 school year with guidance from Oregon Department of Education Office of Learning staff.

### **4(e) A description of stakeholder involvement in the selection of coherent improvement strategies.**

Oregon is very proud of the involvement of many individuals and groups in the development of Phase I of our State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). We found that stakeholders are invested in the outcome of our State-Initiated Measurable Result, and the specific strategies that will be used. Many stakeholders have requested continued involvement with Phase II. Their contribution has been invaluable with all components, including data analysis, infrastructure analysis, determination of the SIMR and appropriate coherent strategies. Oregon's Theory of Action is constructed to meet our State's needs, specifically directed at increased reading skills at 3<sup>rd</sup> grade of our students with disabilities. The following is a list of representatives who participated with us for the past 16 months:

- Oregon Department of Education: Office of Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction, Office Finance and Administration, Office of Learning (ISAA, Student Services, Equity, Early Learning Division, Youth Development Division), Office of Informational Technology, Office of Research and Analysis
- Department of Human Services – Office of Developmental Disabilities, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation
- Oregon Education and Investment Board

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- Family and Community Together –Parent Training Institute
- Parents of Students with Disabilities
- Oregon Council on Developmental Disabilities
- State Advisory Council on Special Education
- State Interagency Coordinating Council
- Colleagues from the following Universities and Colleges: University of Oregon, Portland State University, Western Oregon University, Pacific University, Lewis and Clark College
- Educational Service District Partners – administrative and service providers
- Local School Districts (197) – teachers and administrators
- NWPBIS Network
- SWIFT Center-University of Kansas
- Confederation of Oregon School Administrators (COSA)

The list represents over 150 individuals who have been involved in the development and review of Phase I of Oregon's State Systemic Improvement Plan and the selection of our State-Identified Measurable Result for students with disabilities. We will continue to invite and involve these individuals and groups as we transition into Phase II.

### Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

**Submitted Theory of Action:** No Theory of Action Submitted

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Description of Illustration

#### *Optional Description*

A theory of action, by definition, is a set of underlying assumptions about how an organization will move from its current state to its desired future by aligning theory with the real environment. When actions and relationships are connected to strategies critical to excellent teaching and student learning (evidenced-based) then improvement is achieved. A quality theory of action is grounded in the specific steps that describes the desired changes in a system and practices that lead to the measurable outcome (Skupa, J., 2010)

Oregon's graphic illustration shows the relationship between the state level and practitioner level to achieve the result of increased number of 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students with disabilities reading at grade level. Implementing a coherent set of improvement strategies will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in school districts. The capacity of a strong relationship built upon evidence-based practices is the key to shifting culture within a complex educational environment. This construct is the basis of the 'Leading by Convening' theory proposed by Cashman, J, et.al, 2014. (Cashman, J., Linehan, P. Purcell, L., Rosser, M., Schultz, S., & Shalski, S., 2014) which offers a blueprint for genuine engagement.

In summary, Oregon has identified the State and local level issues at play surrounding literacy and reading skills in young children. We have outlined the strategic activities (coherent interventions) and supports to be provided to local education agencies that will lead to our desired outcome of increasing the percentage of 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students with disabilities reading at grade level.

### Infrastructure Development

- Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

Oregon's Phase II SSIP is included as an attachment.

### Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

- Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
- Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Oregon's Phase II SSIP is included as an attachment.

### Evaluation

- (a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- (c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
- (d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

Oregon's Phase II SSIP is included as an attachment.

### Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

Oregon's Phase II SSIP is included as an attachment.

### Phase III submissions should include:

- Data-based justifications for any changes in implementation activities.
- Data to support that the State is on the right path, if no adjustments are being proposed.
- Descriptions of how stakeholders have been involved, including in decision-making.

### A. Summary of Phase 3

1. Theory of action or logic model for the SSIP, including the SIMR.
2. The coherent improvement strategies or principle activities employed during the year, including infrastructure improvement strategies.
3. The specific evidence-based practices that have been implemented to date.
4. Brief overview of the year's evaluation activities, measures, and outcomes.
5. Highlights of changes to implementation and improvement strategies.

Oregon's 2018 Phase III (2) SSIP is included as an attachment.

### B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP

1. Description of the State's SSIP implementation progress: (a) Description of extent to which the State has carried out its planned activities with fidelity—what has been accomplished, what milestones have been met, and whether the intended timeline has been followed and (b) Intended outputs that have been accomplished as a result of the implementation activities.
2. Stakeholder involvement in SSIP implementation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing implementation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing implementation of the SSIP.

Oregon's 2018 Phase III (2) SSIP is included as an attachment.

### C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes

1. How the State monitored and measured outputs to assess the effectiveness of the implementation plan: (a) How evaluation measures align with the theory of action, (b) Data sources for each key measure, (c) Description of baseline data for key measures, (d) Data collection procedures and associated timelines, (e) [If applicable] Sampling procedures, (f) [If appropriate] Planned data comparisons, and (g) How data management and data analysis procedures allow for assessment of progress toward achieving intended improvements
2. How the State has demonstrated progress and made modifications to the SSIP as necessary: (a) How the State has reviewed key data that provide evidence regarding progress toward achieving intended improvements to infrastructure and the SIMR, (b) Evidence of change to baseline data for key measures, (c) How data support changes that have been made to implementation and improvement strategies, (d) How data are informing next steps in the SSIP implementation, and (e) How data support planned modifications to intended outcomes (including the SIMR)—rationale or justification for the changes or how data support that the SSIP is on the right path
3. Stakeholder involvement in the SSIP evaluation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP

Oregon's 2018 Phase III (2) SSIP is included as an attachment.

### D. Data Quality Issues: Data limitations that affected reports of progress in implementing the SSIP and achieving the SIMR

1. Concern or limitations related to the quality or quantity of the data used to report progress or results
2. Implications for assessing progress or results
3. Plans for improving data quality

Oregon's 2018 Phase III (2) SSIP is included as an attachment.

### E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements

1. Infrastructure changes that support SSIP initiatives, including how system changes support achievement of the SIMR, sustainability, and scale-up
2. Evidence that SSIP's evidence-based practices are being carried out with fidelity and having the desired effects
3. Outcomes regarding progress toward short-term and long-term objectives that are necessary steps toward achieving the SIMR
4. Measurable improvements in the SIMR in relation to targets

Oregon's 2018 Phase III (2) SSIP is included as an attachment.

**F. Plans for Next Year**

1. Additional activities to be implemented next year, with timeline
2. Planned evaluation activities including data collection, measures, and expected outcomes
3. Anticipated barriers and steps to address those barriers
4. The State describes any needs for additional support and/or technical assistance

Oregon's 2018 Phase III (2) SSIP is included as an attachment.

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Certify and Submit your SPP/APR**

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.

**Selected:** 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: Sarah Drinkwater, Ph.D.

Title: Assistant Superintendent

Email: sarah.drinkwater@ode.state.or.us

Phone: 503-947-5702