

**State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report:
Part B**

**for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act**

**For reporting on
FFY18**

Oregon



PART B DUE February 3, 2020

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

Introduction

Instructions

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

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

The Oregon Department of Education's (ODE) Office of Enhancing Student Opportunities 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 students and youth experiencing disability. During FFY 2019, ODE implemented IDEA Part B through a system of coordinated General Supervision activities.

Part B indicator data presented in this Annual Performance Report demonstrate the continued need for Oregon to improve outcomes for students and youth experiencing disability.

The following sections present Oregon's processes for ensuring IDEA Part B school age general supervision, technical assistance, professional development, stakeholder engagement, and reporting to the public.

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

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 Enhancing Student Opportunities. 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 34 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 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 timelines. ODE uses the same due process hearing system and complaint contractors for Part B and Part C.

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.

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. ODE makes use of a state-wide, web-based mechanism to implement a cycle of continuous improvement called System Performance Review & Improvement (SPR&I). This web-based mechanism gives districts and programs access to data so that monitoring compliance/noncompliance can occur with regularity and accuracy and allows for timely corrective action to occur.

The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) provides Technical Assistance (TA) to Oregon's 197 school districts in several ways. An assigned Education Specialist provides technical assistance on a range of topics as requested by district. 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.

During FFY 2019, ODE provided 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.

The ODE website 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 provided.

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. 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 professional development focusing on the implementation of evidence based practices for students experiencing disability.

ODE works with stakeholder groups to identify topics and deliver professional development. The State Advisory Council for Special Education brings together a variety of partners (that may include but are not limited to parents, representatives from higher education, state and local officials, administrators, private school representatives and charter school representatives) to provide a channel for information to be shared among programs and stakeholders. ODE contracts with Family and Community Together (FACT) to provide workshops each year for families in both English and Spanish. Topics include procedural safeguards and navigating the IEP or IFSP. The Statewide Transition Technical Assistance Network supports districts with secondary and post-secondary students with disabilities. 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.

ODE coordinates with the Confederation of Oregon School Administrators to develop and present training on a wide variety of topics through annual conferences. The Office of Enhancing Student Opportunities provides leadership for a multi-day event focusing on topics in special education leadership.

The ODE uses IDEA discretionary funds to scale-up projects implementing evidence-based practices in schools. The ORTIi (Oregon Response to Instruction and Intervention) project continues to provide coaching support to district teams working to implement an MTSS for academics in elementary and middle schools. Through the SPDG, the SWIFT Education Center supports a network of regional MTSS coaches working with districts to implement an MTSS, scaled up through the Oregon Integrated Systems Framework (ORIS), leveraging the agency's aligned continuous improvement process.

Stakeholder Involvement

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

Oregon solicits stakeholder input as needed on technical issues such as target setting for the Annual Performance Report (APR) and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and on adaptive leadership topics such as how to reorient our system of general supervision from a focus on compliance towards a focus on results. Previous years' submissions of the SPP/APR detail the stakeholder engagement opportunities resulting in the current SPP/APR targets.

During September 2019, the Assistant Superintendent engaged district leaders in conversations about reimagining school age special education supports. Attendees included directors and executive leadership from districts statewide.

On October 2-4, 2019, the COSA conference featured the new special education director series, ODE staff led an input session on Part B IDEA redesign, and the Assistant Superintendent delivered a keynote address highlighting the importance of inclusive practices.

On December 2, 2019, the Office of Enhancing Student Opportunities hosted approximately 50 stakeholders representing school districts, educational service districts (regional support system), and family and community organizations. The group provided the SEA with input on the future direction of state supports for students experiencing disability, including input on a system of differentiated monitoring and supports. Two way participatory activities allowed participants to hold rich conversations and uncover assumptions about the role of the SEA in supporting LEAs to improve results for students experiencing disability. Stakeholders explored the intersectionality of race and disability within equity conversations, and provided the SEA with key input needed to move forward with a transformed vision of differentiated monitoring and support.

During January 2020, stakeholders provided input on the 2019 SPP/APR and SSIP targets through electronic survey. These targets are reported within each indicator.

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

YES

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY17 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 2017 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 2017 APR in 2019, is available.

The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) produces Special Education report cards 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 report cards display the indicators on the Annual Performance Report that are required for public reporting. The SEA reports indicators B6, B7, B8, and B12 to the public on the EI/ECSE report cards. Report Cards are given to parents of children with disabilities and available to the public on ODE's website.

These Special Education Report cards are released to the public within 120 days of the APR submission to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). ODE requires that districts distribute the report cards to all parents of students with IFSPs or IEPs. ODE has historically made all Special Education Report cards available to the public via the special education report card website. Moving forward, ODE intends for these special education reports to be available from the same site as our At-A-Glance School and District Profiles that are required under Oregon's ESSA Plan. Also, 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 on the SPP/APR webpage.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

While the State has publicly reported on the FFY 2016 (July 1, 2016-June 30, 2017) performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the State's performance plan as required by section 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) of IDEA, those reports did not contain, as specified in the OSEP Response, all of the required information. With its FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must provide a Web link demonstrating that the State has fully reported to the public on the performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR for FFY 2016. In addition, the State must report with its FFY 2018 SPP/APR, how and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2017 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR. The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2018 and 2019 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2019 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission, due February 3, 2020, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2018 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year 4; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2019); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities are impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

Intro - OSEP Response

Intro - Required Actions

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

Measurement

States may report data for children with disabilities using either the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA or an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, if the State has established one.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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.

Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.

States must continue to report the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and disaggregated by student subgroups including the children with disabilities subgroup, as required under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(iii)(II) of the ESEA, on State report cards under Title I of the ESEA even if they only report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the purpose of SPP/APR reporting.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2009	42.43%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	69.00%	72.00%	75.00%	78.00%	81.00%
Data	37.16%	51.11%	52.74%	55.50%	58.81%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	84.00%	86.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Oregon solicits stakeholder input as needed on technical issues such as target setting for the Annual Performance Report (APR) and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and on adaptive leadership topics such as how to reorient our system of general supervision from a focus on compliance towards a focus on results. Previous years' submissions of the SPP/APR detail the stakeholder engagement opportunities resulting in the current SPP/APR targets.

During September 2019, the Assistant Superintendent engaged district leaders in conversations about reimagining school age special education supports. Attendees included directors and executive leadership from districts statewide.

On October 2-4, 2019, the COSA conference featured the new special education director series, ODE staff led an input session on Part B IDEA redesign, and the Assistant Superintendent delivered a keynote address highlighting the importance of inclusive practices.

On December 2, 2019, the Office of Enhancing Student Opportunities hosted approximately 50 stakeholders representing school districts, educational service districts (regional support system), and family and community organizations. The group provided the SEA with input on the future direction of state supports for students experiencing disability, including input on a system of differentiated monitoring and supports. Two way participatory activities allowed participants to hold rich conversations and uncover assumptions about the role of the SEA in supporting LEAs to improve results for students experiencing disability. Stakeholders explored the intersectionality of race and disability within equity conversations, and provided the SEA with key input needed to move forward with a transformed vision of differentiated monitoring and support.

During January 2020, stakeholders provided input on the 2019 SPP/APR and SSIP targets through electronic survey. These targets are reported within each indicator.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	4,030
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	6,654
SY 2017-18 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695)	10/02/2019	Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	60.57%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
4,030	6,654	58.81%	84.00%	60.57%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using:

4-year ACGR

If extended, provide the number of years

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.

There are two different regular diplomas available to K-12 students in Oregon: the regular Oregon Diploma and a modified version of the Oregon Diploma. The requirements for a student to earn either the regular or modified Oregon Diploma are the same for all students, regardless of whether they receive special education support through an IEP.

Graduation Requirements for the regular Oregon Diploma are comprised of three distinct components: (1) High Academic Expectations, (2) Essential Skills, and (3) Personalized Learning. A student can demonstrate that they have met the requirement for high academic expectations through completion of at least 24 credits, with specific requirements for different subject areas. Students are also required to demonstrate proficiency in the Essential Skills of reading, writing, and math. Proficiency can be demonstrated in a number of ways, including through statewide standardized assessments or through locally determined measures. Students are also expected to personalize their learning pathway through the development and implementation of an education plan and education profile. Personalized Learning requirements also include career-related learning experiences and the ability and opportunity for students to apply and extend their knowledge in skills in ways that help them pursue their post-school goals.

The Modified version of the Oregon Diploma may be earned by students who have demonstrated an inability to meet the full set of academic content standards required for the regular Oregon Diploma, even with reasonable accommodations. To earn a Modified Diploma in Oregon, students are required to earn 24 credits in courses modified per student need, complete the Personalized Learning Requirements, and demonstrate proficiency in the required Essential Skills. 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. These graduation requirements apply to all students, including those students with IEPs.

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

NO

If yes, explain the difference in conditions that youth with IEPs must meet.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

1 - OSEP Response

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in ED Facts file specification C009.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Measurement

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

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

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2008	3.57%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	3.50%	3.40%	3.40%	3.30%	3.20%
Data	6.01%	6.10%	5.79%	5.65%	5.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	3.10%	3.10%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Oregon solicits stakeholder input as needed on technical issues such as target setting for the Annual Performance Report (APR) and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and on adaptive leadership topics such as how to reorient our system of general supervision from a focus on compliance towards a focus on results. Previous years' submissions of the SPP/APR detail the stakeholder engagement opportunities resulting in the current SPP/APR targets.

During September 2019, the Assistant Superintendent engaged district leaders in conversations about reimagining school age special education supports. Attendees included directors and executive leadership from districts statewide.

On October 2-4, 2019, the COSA conference featured the new special education director series, ODE staff led an input session on Part B IDEA redesign, and the Assistant Superintendent delivered a keynote address highlighting the importance of inclusive practices.

On December 2, 2019, the Office of Enhancing Student Opportunities hosted approximately 50 stakeholders representing school districts, educational service districts (regional support system), and family and community organizations. The group provided the SEA with input on the future direction of

state supports for students experiencing disability, including input on a system of differentiated monitoring and supports. Two way participatory activities allowed participants to hold rich conversations and uncover assumptions about the role of the SEA in supporting LEAs to improve results for students experiencing disability. Stakeholders explored the intersectionality of race and disability within equity conversations, and provided the SEA with key input needed to move forward with a transformed vision of differentiated monitoring and support.

During January 2020, stakeholders provided input on the 2019 SPP/APR and SSIP targets through electronic survey. These targets are reported within each indicator.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 2

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	3,615
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	501
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	146
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	1,128
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	22

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

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? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, provide justification for the changes below.

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

YES

Change numerator description in data table (yes/no)

NO

Change denominator description in data table (yes/no)

NO

If use a different calculation methodology is yes, provide an explanation of the different calculation methodology

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 2017-18 report presents dropout rates by school and district for students who dropped out of grades 9 through 12 between July 1, 2017 and June 30, 2018, along with rates for specific 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 student is counted towards the dropout rate if they withdrew from school and did not graduate or transfer to another school to work towards graduation. There are a number of reasons for which students may have withdrawn from school, or not be attending school, but not be included in the dropout rate. These reasons 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, or
- 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 consistent with the procedures developed by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) for uniform and comparable reporting of dropout rates by the states. Oregon uses the NCES data in its methodology. For FFY 2018, the reported data is from 2017-2018. The one-year statewide dropout rate calculation uses the NCES formula: the number of students (in grades 9-12) who have dropped out divided by the number of students (in graded 9-12) reported on the October Average Daily Membership (ADM) Collection, multiplied by 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.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
1,323	27,221	5.00%	3.10%	4.86%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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

A student is counted towards the dropout rate if they withdrew from school and did not graduate or transfer to another school to work towards graduation. There are a number of reasons for which students may have withdrawn from school, or not be attending school, but not be included in the dropout rate. These reasons 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? (yes/no)

NO

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

2 - OSEP Response

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall I	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B												
C												
D												
E												
F												
G												
H												
I												
J												
K												
L												

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
A	Overall	96.10%	Actual	98.22%	93.59%	92.19%	90.21%	88.79%
B			Target >=					
B			Actual					

C			Target >=					
C			Actual					
D			Target >=					
D			Actual					
E			Target >=					
E			Actual					
F			Target >=					
F			Actual					
G			Target >=					
G			Actual					
H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					
L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
A	Overall	97.30%	Actual	98.00%	93.16%	91.43%	89.43%	87.98%
B			Target >=					
B			Actual					
C			Target >=					
C			Actual					
D			Target >=					
D			Actual					
E			Target >=					
E			Actual					
F			Target ≥					
F			Actual					
G			Target >=					
G			Actual					
H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					

K			Target >=					
K			Actual					
L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=			
Reading	C >=			
Reading	D >=			
Reading	E >=			
Reading	F >=			
Reading	G >=			
Reading	H >=			
Reading	I >=			
Reading	J >=			
Reading	K >=			
Reading	L >=			
Math	A >=	Overall	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=			
Math	C >=			
Math	D >=			
Math	E >=			
Math	F >=			
Math	G >=			
Math	H >=			
Math	I >=			
Math	J >=			
Math	K >=			
Math	L >=			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Oregon solicits stakeholder input as needed on technical issues such as target setting for the Annual Performance Report (APR) and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and on adaptive leadership topics such as how to reorient our system of general supervision from a focus on compliance towards a focus on results. Previous years' submissions of the SPP/APR detail the stakeholder engagement opportunities resulting in the current SPP/APR targets.

During September 2019, the Assistant Superintendent engaged district leaders in conversations about reimagining school age special education supports. Attendees included directors and executive leadership from districts statewide.

On October 2-4, 2019, the COSA conference featured the new special education director series, ODE staff led an input session on Part B IDEA redesign, and the Assistant Superintendent delivered a keynote address highlighting the importance of inclusive practices.

On December 2, 2019, the Office of Enhancing Student Opportunities hosted approximately 50 stakeholders representing school districts, educational service districts (regional support system), and family and community organizations. The group provided the SEA with input on the future direction of state supports for students experiencing disability, including input on a system of differentiated monitoring and supports. Two way participatory activities allowed participants to hold rich conversations and uncover assumptions about the role of the SEA in supporting LEAs to improve results for students experiencing disability. Stakeholders explored the intersectionality of race and disability within equity conversations, and provided the SEA with key input needed to move forward with a transformed vision of differentiated monitoring and support.

During January 2020, stakeholders provided input on the 2019 SPP/APR and SSIP targets through electronic survey. These targets are reported within each indicator.

FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

YES

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

12/11/2019

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	7,199	7,610	7,826	7,275	6,873	6,633			5,577		
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	4,457	4,433	4,442	3,919	3,746	3,535			3,620		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	1,539	1,899	2,085	2,224	1,937	1,986			689		
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	475	522	549	495	511	454			489		

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

12/11/2019

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	7,215	7,622	7,841	7,272	6,879	6,641			5,574		
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	4,996	4,716	4,633	3,903	3,647	3,423			3,634		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	998	1,606	1,876	2,203	1,979	2,033			568		
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	463	520	532	494	511	452			486		

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	48,993	44,006	88.79%	95.00%	89.82%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
L								

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Overall	XXX
B		XXX
C		XXX
D		XXX
E		XXX
F		XXX
G		XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

Information regarding statewide assessment results can be found at the Statewide Assessment Results website.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

3B - OSEP Response

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3C - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Elementary	X	X	X								
B	Middle				X	X	X					
C	HS									X		
D												
E												
F												
G												
H												
I												
J												
K												
L												

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Elementary	2016	Target >=	72.00%	54.50%	54.50%	28.00%	35.00%
A	Elementary	23.15%	Actual	42.23%	29.70%	24.79%	23.15%	24.74%
B	Middle	2016	Target >=	72.00%	54.50%	54.50%	28.00%	35.00%
B	Middle	18.41%	Actual	31.24%	22.25%	19.86%	18.41%	19.16%

C	HS	2016	Target >=	85.00%	54.50%	54.50%	28.00%	35.00%
C	HS	29.33%	Actual	49.25%	31.73%	29.17%	29.33%	30.48%
D			Target >=					
D			Actual					
E			Target >=					
E			Actual					
F			Target >=					
F			Actual					
G			Target >=					
G			Actual					
H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					
L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Elementary	2016	Target >=	69.00%	40.00%	40.00%	25.00%	32.00%
A	Elementary	20.91%	Actual	32.96%	26.10%	21.89%	20.91%	20.80%
B	Middle	2016	Target >=	69.00%	40.00%	40.00%	25.00%	32.00%
B	Middle	13.57%	Actual	21.73%	17.01%	14.39%	13.57%	12.20%
C	HS	2016	Target >=	70.00%	40.00%	40.00%	25.00%	32.00%
C	HS	10.39%	Actual	24.83%	11.79%	10.24%	10.39%	8.46%
D			Target >=					
D			Actual					
E			Target >=					
E			Actual					
F			Target >=					
F			Actual					

G			Target >=					
G			Actual					
H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					
L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Elementary	41.00%	41.00%
Reading	B >=	Middle	41.00%	41.00%
Reading	C >=	HS	41.00%	41.00%
Reading	D >=			
Reading	E >=			
Reading	F >=			
Reading	G >=			
Reading	H >=			
Reading	I >=			
Reading	J >=			
Reading	K >=			
Reading	L >=			
Math	A >=	Elementary	39.00%	39.00%
Math	B >=	Middle	39.00%	39.00%
Math	C >=	HS	39.00%	39.00%
Math	D >=			
Math	E >=			
Math	F >=			
Math	G >=			
Math	H >=			
Math	I >=			
Math	J >=			
Math	K >=			
Math	L >=			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Oregon solicits stakeholder input as needed on technical issues such as target setting for the Annual Performance Report (APR) and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and on adaptive leadership topics such as how to reorient our system of general supervision from a focus on compliance towards a focus on results. Previous years' submissions of the SPP/APR detail the stakeholder engagement opportunities resulting in the current SPP/APR targets.

During September 2019, the Assistant Superintendent engaged district leaders in conversations about reimagining school age special education

supports. Attendees included directors and executive leadership from districts statewide.

On October 2-4, 2019, the COSA conference featured the new special education director series, ODE staff led an input session on Part B IDEA redesign, and the Assistant Superintendent delivered a keynote address highlighting the importance of inclusive practices.

On December 2, 2019, the Office of Enhancing Student Opportunities hosted approximately 50 stakeholders representing school districts, educational service districts (regional support system), and family and community organizations. The group provided the SEA with input on the future direction of state supports for students experiencing disability, including input on a system of differentiated monitoring and supports. Two way participatory activities allowed participants to hold rich conversations and uncover assumptions about the role of the SEA in supporting LEAs to improve results for students experiencing disability. Stakeholders explored the intersectionality of race and disability within equity conversations, and provided the SEA with key input needed to move forward with a transformed vision of differentiated monitoring and support.

During January 2020, stakeholders provided input on the 2019 SPP/APR and SSIP targets through electronic survey. These targets are reported within each indicator.

FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

YES

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

12/11/2019

Reading Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	6,471	6,854	7,076	6,638	6,194	5,975			4,798		
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,232	1,228	1,261	837	813	656			929		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	169	179	205	188	180	164			119		
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	181	236	230	212	211	161			246		

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

12/11/2019

Math Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	6,457	6,842	7,041	6,600	6,137	5,908			4,688		
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no	1,366	1,145	851	573	517	387			200		

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	94	101	74	77	80	80			14		
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	188	149	219	203	186	160			209		

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Elementary	20,401	4,921	24.74%	41.00%	24.12%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B	Middle	18,807	3,422	19.16%	41.00%	18.20%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C	HS	4,798	1,294	30.48%	41.00%	26.97%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
D								
E								
F								
G								
H								
I								
J								
K								
L								

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Elementary	XXX
B	Middle	XXX
C	HS	Oregon is continuing to monitor for factors that contribute to slippage. Currently, the state is focusing on increases in assessment opt-out and absentee rates as factors that contribute to slippage.
D		XXX
E		XXX
F		
G		XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
K		XXX
L		XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Elementary	20,340	4,187	20.80%	39.00%	20.59%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B	Middle	18,645	2,263	12.20%	39.00%	12.14%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C	HS	4,688	423	8.46%	39.00%	9.02%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
D								
E								
F								
G								
H								
I								
J								
K								
L								

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Elementary	XXX
B	Middle	XXX
C	HS	XXX
D		XXX
E		XXX
F		XXX
G		XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

Information regarding statewide assessment results can be found at the Statewide Assessment Results website.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

3C - OSEP Response

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of 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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

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

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2016	62.96%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	7.70%	7.20%	6.70%	68.65%	68.15%
Data	11.17%	13.71%	8.63%	62.96%	66.67%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	67.65%	62.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Oregon solicits stakeholder input as needed on technical issues such as target setting for the Annual Performance Report (APR) and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and on adaptive leadership topics such as how to reorient our system of general supervision from a focus on compliance towards a focus on results. Previous years' submissions of the SPP/APR detail the stakeholder engagement opportunities resulting in the current SPP/APR targets.

During September 2019, the Assistant Superintendent engaged district leaders in conversations about reimagining school age special education supports. Attendees included directors and executive leadership from districts statewide.

On October 2-4, 2019, the COSA conference featured the new special education director series, ODE staff led an input session on Part B IDEA redesign, and the Assistant Superintendent delivered a keynote address highlighting the importance of inclusive practices.

On December 2, 2019, the Office of Enhancing Student Opportunities hosted approximately 50 stakeholders representing school districts, educational service districts (regional support system), and family and community organizations. The group provided the SEA with input on the future direction of state supports for students experiencing disability, including input on a system of differentiated monitoring and supports. Two way participatory activities allowed participants to hold rich conversations and uncover assumptions about the role of the SEA in supporting LEAs to improve results for students experiencing disability. Stakeholders explored the intersectionality of race and disability within equity conversations, and provided the SEA with key input needed to move forward with a transformed vision of differentiated monitoring and support.

During January 2020, stakeholders provided input on the 2019 SPP/APR and SSIP targets through electronic survey. These targets are reported within each indicator.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

165

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
17	32	66.67%	67.65%	53.13%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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

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:

- Preparing and disseminating to all districts a discipline report for students with and without disabilities.
- Identifying districts that exceed the threshold with a significant discrepancy.
- Requiring districts with a significant discrepancy to answer questions about district policies, procedures, and practices related to this indicator. Questions regard the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions & supports (PBIS) and strategies, the 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.
- Requiring districts that have policies, procedures, or practices contributing to the significant discrepancy to submit an action plan to address significant discrepancies in the areas of behavior intervention and disciplinary removal.
- Reviewing district action plans and accompanying documentation to ensure correction of noncompliance with this indicator. In the event that a submitted plan does not adequately address noncompliance, ODE provides guidance to the district and requests revisions to ensure compliance or appropriate corrective action.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The state used 2016 as the baseline year for this indicator.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using FFY17- FFY18 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 2018, ODE reviewed plans for 17 districts identified with significant discrepancy based on 2017-2018 data. The planning 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 note progress or make plan adjustments, as necessary.

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

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.

The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.

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 2018, ODE reviewed plans for 17 districts identified with significant discrepancy. The planning 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 note progress or make plan adjustments, as necessary. All plans were submitted to ODE. Plans that did not meet State requirements were amended and resubmitted by the district to ODE until each met the State's established requirements.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
18	18	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In FFY 2017, using 2016-2017 data, ODE identified 18 (18/27) districts as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions/expulsions of greater than 10 days for more than three children with IEPs. ODE reviewed plans for the 18 districts identified with significant discrepancy. The planning 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 18 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 plans. For noncompliance identified in FFY 2016, pursuant to 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(b), ODE verified that all 18 districts showed 100% compliance within one year after the initial noncompliance was identified based on a review of the required plans.

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

Individual cases of noncompliance were identified through ODE's 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. All plans were submitted to ODE. In FFY 2017, ODE reviewed plans for each of the 18 districts identified with significant discrepancy. Plans that did not adequately address compliance were amended and resubmitted by the district to ODE until each met the State's established requirements.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

4A - OSEP Response

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- 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))

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons

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

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

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of districts that met the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those districts in which policies, procedures or practices 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.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below:

Historical Data

Baseline	2016	0.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	1.52%	1.52%	5.58%	0.00%	NVR

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

179

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies procedure, 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
12	0	18	NVR	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if not applicable

XXX

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using 2017-2018 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 reviewed plans for twelve districts identified with significant discrepancy based on 2017-2018 data. The planning 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 twelve identified districts were required to either develop a behavior intervention and disciplinary removal action plan or review its existing action plan and note progress or make plan adjustments, as necessary.

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.

The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.

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 2018, ODE reviewed plans for twelve districts identified with significant discrepancy. The plans included 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. Based on this review, twelve districts were required to develop a behavior intervention and disciplinary removal action plan or review their existing action plan and note progress or make plan adjustments, as necessary. All plans were submitted to ODE. District

plans that did not adequately address compliance were amended and resubmitted by the district to ODE until each met the State's established requirements.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
14	14	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In FFY 2017, using 2016-2017 data, ODE identified 14 districts that had a significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity and policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to significant discrepancy. Each district addressed each individual case of noncompliance through a planning process. This 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 14 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, ODE verified that these districts showed 100% compliance one year after the initial noncompliance was identified based on a review of the required plans.

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

Individual cases of noncompliance were identified through the planning process required for each district identified with a significant discrepancy. The planning 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.

Plans submitted by districts were reviewed to determine noncompliance. 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 2017, ODE reviewed plans for each of the fourteen districts identified with significant discrepancy. These plans discussed policies, procedures, or practices that could have contributed to their significant discrepancy. Each of the fourteen identified districts were required to complete 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. Plans that did not adequately address compliance were amended and resubmitted by each district to ODE until each met the State's established requirements. Each district corrected each individual case of noncompliance.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2017. The State must provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2018 in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR.

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

The State must explain why its data was erroneously reported as "9" instead of "0":

Those 9 districts were not identified with a significant discrepancy; however, due to human error, there was an inversion of the numerator and the denominator when reporting this indicator to OSEP.

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Education environments (children 6-21): 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))

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

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

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

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2005	Target >=	70.00%	72.00%	72.00%	72.00%	73.00%
A	70.60%	Data	72.91%	72.92%	73.37%	73.49%	73.66%
B	2005	Target <=	10.80%	10.80%	10.70%	10.70%	10.60%
B	11.30%	Data	10.60%	10.57%	10.15%	9.90%	9.84%
C	2005	Target <=	2.00%	1.80%	1.80%	1.80%	1.80%
C	2.20%	Data	1.18%	1.42%	1.19%	1.20%	1.44%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	73.00%	75.00%
Target B <=	10.60%	10.60%
Target C <=	1.80%	1.80%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Oregon solicits stakeholder input as needed on technical issues such as target setting for the Annual Performance Report (APR) and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and on adaptive leadership topics such as how to reorient our system of general supervision from a focus on compliance towards a focus on results. Previous years' submissions of the SPP/APR detail the stakeholder engagement opportunities resulting in the current SPP/APR targets.

During September 2019, the Assistant Superintendent engaged district leaders in conversations about reimagining school age special education supports. Attendees included directors and executive leadership from districts statewide.

On October 2-4, 2019, the COSA conference featured the new special education director series, ODE staff led an input session on Part B IDEA redesign, and the Assistant Superintendent delivered a keynote address highlighting the importance of inclusive practices.

On December 2, 2019, the Office of Enhancing Student Opportunities hosted approximately 50 stakeholders representing school districts, educational service districts (regional support system), and family and community organizations. The group provided the SEA with input on the future direction of state supports for students experiencing disability, including input on a system of differentiated monitoring and supports. Two way participatory activities allowed participants to hold rich conversations and uncover assumptions about the role of the SEA in supporting LEAs to improve results for students experiencing disability. Stakeholders explored the intersectionality of race and disability within equity conversations, and provided the SEA with key input needed to move forward with a transformed vision of differentiated monitoring and support.

During January 2020, stakeholders provided input on the 2019 SPP/APR and SSIP targets through electronic survey. These targets are reported within

each indicator.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	77,432
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	57,246
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	7,467
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	1,019
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	58
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	260

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

NO

Provide an explanation below

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	57,246	77,432	73.66%	73.00%	73.93%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	7,467	77,432	9.84%	10.60%	9.64%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1,337	77,432	1.44%	1.80%	1.73%	Met Target	No Slippage

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

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

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	XXX
B	XXX
C	XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

5 - OSEP Response

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

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

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

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2011	Target >=	35.00%	35.00%	35.50%	35.50%	36.00%
A	32.70%	Data	40.05%	37.00%	39.91%	45.25%	45.05%
B	2011	Target <=	24.60%	24.60%	24.00%	24.00%	23.50%
B	25.60%	Data	24.34%	22.93%	23.30%	19.80%	19.03%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	36.00%	36.00%
Target B <=	23.50%	23.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Oregon solicits stakeholder input as needed on technical issues such as target setting for the Annual Performance Report (APR) and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and on adaptive leadership topics such as how to reorient our system of general supervision from a focus on compliance towards a focus on results. Previous years' submissions of the SPP/APR detail the stakeholder engagement opportunities resulting in the current SPP/APR targets.

During September 2019, the Assistant Superintendent engaged district leaders in conversations about reimagining school age special education supports. Attendees included directors and executive leadership from districts statewide.

On October 2-4, 2019, the COSA conference featured the new special education director series, ODE staff led an input session on Part B IDEA redesign, and the Assistant Superintendent delivered a keynote address highlighting the importance of inclusive practices.

On December 2, 2019, the Office of Enhancing Student Opportunities hosted approximately 50 stakeholders representing school districts, educational service districts (regional support system), and family and community organizations. The group provided the SEA with input on the future direction of state supports for students experiencing disability, including input on a system of differentiated monitoring and supports. Two way participatory activities allowed participants to hold rich conversations and uncover assumptions about the role of the SEA in supporting LEAs to improve results for students experiencing disability. Stakeholders explored the intersectionality of race and disability within equity conversations, and provided the SEA with key input needed to move forward with a transformed vision of differentiated monitoring and support.

During January 2020, stakeholders provided input on the 2019 SPP/APR and SSIP targets through electronic survey. These targets are reported within

each indicator.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	11,693
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	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	5,211
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	2,187
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b2. Number of children attending separate school	54
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	1

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	5,211	11,693	45.05%	36.00%	44.57%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	2,242	11,693	19.03%	23.50%	19.17%	Met Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

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

Provide reasons for slippage for A

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	XXX
B	XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

6 - OSEP Response

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

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

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

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

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

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

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

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

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

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

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	2015	Target >=	74.80%	74.80%	75.00%	76.10%	76.10%
A1	75.62%	Data	75.06%	73.96%	75.62%	76.17%	79.61%
A2	2015	Target >=	32.80%	32.80%	33.00%	60.50%	60.50%
A2	60.20%	Data	30.81%	29.79%	60.20%	58.53%	56.21%
B1	2015	Target >=	61.00%	61.00%	61.50%	74.20%	74.20%
B1	73.66%	Data	55.55%	53.40%	73.66%	71.45%	74.18%
B2	2015	Target >=	23.90%	23.90%	24.00%	58.10%	58.10%
B2	57.84%	Data	24.09%	24.34%	57.84%	55.71%	54.46%
C1	2015	Target >=	45.30%	45.30%	45.50%	74.10%	74.10%
C1	73.63%	Data	43.35%	38.80%	73.63%	73.40%	76.35%
C2	2015	Target >=	32.00%	32.00%	32.20%	61.50%	61.50%
C2	61.21%	Data	30.37%	28.83%	61.21%	59.74%	57.30%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1 >=	76.10%	76.10%
Target A2 >=	60.50%	60.50%
Target B1 >=	74.20%	74.20%
Target B2 >=	58.10%	58.10%
Target C1 >=	74.10%	74.10%
Target C2 >=	61.50%	61.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Oregon solicits stakeholder input as needed on technical issues such as target setting for the Annual Performance Report (APR) and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and on adaptive leadership topics such as how to reorient our system of general supervision from a focus on compliance towards a focus on results. Previous years' submissions of the SPP/APR detail the stakeholder engagement opportunities resulting in the current SPP/APR targets.

During September 2019, the Assistant Superintendent engaged district leaders in conversations about reimagining school age special education supports. Attendees included directors and executive leadership from districts statewide.

On October 2-4, 2019, the COSA conference featured the new special education director series, ODE staff led an input session on Part B IDEA redesign, and the Assistant Superintendent delivered a keynote address highlighting the importance of inclusive practices.

On December 2, 2019, the Office of Enhancing Student Opportunities hosted approximately 50 stakeholders representing school districts, educational service districts (regional support system), and family and community organizations. The group provided the SEA with input on the future direction of state supports for students experiencing disability, including input on a system of differentiated monitoring and supports. Two way participatory activities allowed participants to hold rich conversations and uncover assumptions about the role of the SEA in supporting LEAs to improve results for students experiencing disability. Stakeholders explored the intersectionality of race and disability within equity conversations, and provided the SEA with key input needed to move forward with a transformed vision of differentiated monitoring and support.

During January 2020, stakeholders provided input on the 2019 SPP/APR and SSIP targets through electronic survey. These targets are reported within each indicator.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

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

	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	51	1.23%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	518	12.51%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,307	31.57%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	699	16.88%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,565	37.80%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	2,006	2,575	79.61%	76.10%	77.90%	Met Target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	2,264	4,140	56.21%	60.50%	54.69%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

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	58	1.40%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	585	14.13%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,319	31.86%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	517	12.49%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,661	40.12%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	1,836	2,479	74.18%	74.20%	74.06%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age	2,178	4,140	54.46%	58.10%	52.61%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. Calculation: $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$							

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	43	1.04%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	571	13.79%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,268	30.63%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	589	14.23%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,669	40.31%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	1,857	2,471	76.35%	74.10%	75.15%	Met Target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	2,258	4,140	57.30%	61.50%	54.54%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A1	XXX
A2	Slippage in performance occurred in our medium-sized and rural Part C programs. Enrollment in Part B 619 services for FFY 2018 increased 5.4% statewide in Oregon while funding for these services remained static. These factors may have negatively affected medium and rural programs who do not have the economies of scale of the large urban programs. Additionally, a new child outcome data entry system was instituted and through data analysis it was determined that many of the Part B 619 programs were making data entry errors which lowered their child outcome data results.
B1	XXX
B2	Slippage in performance occurred in our medium-sized and rural Part C programs. Enrollment in Part B 619 services for FFY 2018 increased 5.4% statewide in Oregon while funding for these services remained static. These factors may have negatively affected medium and rural programs who do not have the economies of scale of the large urban programs. Additionally, a new child outcome data entry system was instituted and through data analysis it was determined that many of the Part B 619 programs were making data entry errors which lowered their child outcome data results.
C1	XXX
C2	Slippage in performance occurred in our medium-sized and rural Part C programs. Enrollment in Part B 619 services for FFY 2018 increased 5.4% statewide in Oregon while funding for these services remained static. These factors may have negatively affected medium and rural programs who do not have the economies of scale of the large urban programs. Additionally, a new child outcome data entry system was instituted and through data analysis it was determined that many of the Part B 619 programs were making data entry errors which lowered their child outcome data results.

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

YES

Please explain why the State did not include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If the plan has changed, please provide sampling plan	

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

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

NO

If 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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

7 - OSEP Response

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling of **parents from whom response is requested** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

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

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

8 - Indicator Data

	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	YES
If yes, will you be providing the data for preschool children separately?	YES

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Oregon solicits stakeholder input as needed on technical issues such as target setting for the Annual Performance Report (APR) and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and on adaptive leadership topics such as how to reorient our system of general supervision from a focus on compliance towards a focus on results. Previous years' submissions of the SPP/APR detail the stakeholder engagement opportunities resulting in the current SPP/APR targets.

During September 2019, the Assistant Superintendent engaged district leaders in conversations about reimagining school age special education supports. Attendees included directors and executive leadership from districts statewide.

On October 2-4, 2019, the COSA conference featured the new special education director series, ODE staff led an input session on Part B IDEA redesign, and the Assistant Superintendent delivered a keynote address highlighting the importance of inclusive practices.

On December 2, 2019, the Office of Enhancing Student Opportunities hosted approximately 50 stakeholders representing school districts, educational service districts (regional support system), and family and community organizations. The group provided the SEA with input on the future direction of state supports for students experiencing disability, including input on a system of differentiated monitoring and supports. Two way participatory activities allowed participants to hold rich conversations and uncover assumptions about the role of the SEA in supporting LEAs to improve results for students experiencing disability. Stakeholders explored the intersectionality of race and disability within equity conversations, and provided the SEA with key input needed to move forward with a transformed vision of differentiated monitoring and support.

During January 2020, stakeholders provided input on the 2019 SPP/APR and SSIP targets through electronic survey. These targets are reported within each indicator.

Historical Data

Baseline	XXX	XXX			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	XXX	XXX

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

XXX

Percentage of respondent parents

XXX

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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

XXX

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Preschool	2014	Target >=	66.00%	82.18%	82.48%	82.68%	83.68%
Preschool	82.18%	Data	44.57%	82.18%	81.16%	86.23%	79.37%
School age	2014	Target >=	41.00%	76.23%	76.73%	77.73%	78.73%
School age	76.23%	Data	35.79%	76.23%	78.12%	78.74%	79.43%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	85.68%	85.68%
Target B >=	81.23%	81.23%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Preschool Children Reported Separately

	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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
Preschool	247	292	79.37%	85.68%	84.59%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
School age	1,383	1,751	79.43%	81.23%	78.98%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

The number of School-Age parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

22,709

Percentage of respondent School-Age parents

9.00%

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	NO
If yes, provide sampling plan.	XXX

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

The sampling methodology is designed to choose a representative set of districts/programs each year that is reflective of the state population as a whole. Within districts/programs, the Department uses either a census or sample, depending on district/program size. 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.

	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	XXX
The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.	YES

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

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.

Early Childhood

The representativeness of the Part B 619 results was assessed by examining the demographic characteristics of the children of the 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 age of the child and the primary disability of the child. For example, 38% of the population have a child with a primary disability of developmental delay, and the weighted results indicate that 37% 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 72% of parent respondents had a student with a race/ethnicity of white whereas 67% of preschool children with disabilities are white). However, compared to FFY 2017, the percentage of non-white parents who responded to the survey has increased. ODE will continue to encourage parents of students of all races and 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 the K-12 setting 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. Parents of white students were slightly over-represented (the weighted results indicated that 69% of parent respondents had a student with a race/ethnicity of white whereas 61% of special education students are white). In addition, parents of students with a learning disability were slightly under-represented (the weighted results indicated that 20% of parent respondents had a student with a learning disability whereas 32% of students in the population have a learning disability). Even though there were these differences in response rates by parents of white students and by parents of students with a specific learning disability, there were no systematic statistically significant differences for these respondents. Accordingly, ODE is confident in the representativeness of the results of the survey to the state. ODE will continue to encourage parents of students of all races and 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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

8 - OSEP Response

8 - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	0.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

27

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 and/or cell size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
10	0	170	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

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
- The district has at least ten IDEA eligible students in the same race/ethnicity category in special education.

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.

Districts identified as having Disproportionate Representation in Special Education (5.88%, or 10/170 districts) were required to complete 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. In this focused review, identified districts had to describe external factors, unique characteristics of their student population, or district policies, procedures or practices that may impact disproportionality. ODE then conducted an internal verification and validation of submitted analyses to make a 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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

9 - OSEP Response

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	0.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

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 and/or cell size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
38	0	155	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

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

- 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.

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
2. A weighted risk ratio analysis for each race/ethnicity category.
3. The number of IDEA eligible students in each race/ethnicity category.

- 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.
- Verifying district analysis to determine possible justification due to the unique characteristics of the district.
- 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.
- Plans that do not address the indicators are amended and resubmitted by the district to ODE.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).
Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

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

Instructions

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	94.30%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.69%	98.43%	98.32%	97.94%	98.09%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
20,283	20,001	98.09%	100%	98.61%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage

XXX

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

282

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.

Across the state, there were 282 children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received, but did not have a comprehensive evaluation to consider special education eligibility completed within 60 school days.

The range of days beyond the timeline follows:

- 1-10 days over time line - 169 students (60%)
- 11-20 days over time line - 44 students (16%)
- 21-30 days over time line - 29 students (10%)
- 31-151 days over time line - 40 students (14%)

The following reasons were provided for exceeding the timeline:

- Delay by district/program evaluation staff students - 230 students (82%)
- Parent/guardian did not attend eligibility meeting - 25 students (9%)
- Additional testing needed for a comprehensive evaluation - 14 students (5%)
- Delay by doctor/medical staff - 13 students (4%)

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

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

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

An initial evaluation must be completed within 60 school days from written parent consent to the date of the meeting to consider eligibility.

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

Districts/programs submit data about all initial evaluations they complete as part of the consolidated collection process required by the Oregon Department of Education.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
382	382	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In FFY 2017, 100% (382) of identified noncompliance was corrected within one year. Noncompliance was identified in 56 districts and programs across the state.

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

- Is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), and
- Has completed the evaluation for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district/program.

The standard operating procedures for this indicator include:

- Providing training and technical support to districts/programs on the Special Education Child Find requirements, procedures, and data collection process.
- Providing districts/programs with an Indicator B11 Child Find data report that includes detailed information on each student reported in the district/program Child Find submission and whether the district/program was compliant
- Requiring districts/programs that were identified with noncompliance for Indicator B11 to develop a Corrective Action Plan that addresses the cause(s) of noncompliance.
- Reviewing each district's/program's Corrective Action Plans to ensure that activities developed are appropriate to ensure future compliance with this indicator.

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

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 that addressed the cause(s) of noncompliance.

Districts were required to bring files into compliance within one year.

In FFY 2017, 100% (383/383) of identified noncompliance was corrected within one year (i.e., each district/program corrected each individual case of noncompliance unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the district). ODE verified that all districts/programs showed 100% compliance

within one year after the initial noncompliance was identified through a review of updated data provided by the district/program.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

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

Measurement

- # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	97.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.56%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	99.31%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	152
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	0

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	149
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	2
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	0
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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	149	150	99.31%	100%	99.33%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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

1

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

One child had their eligibility determined and IEP developed one day after their third birthday. There was insufficient documentation to explain the cause of delay.

Attach PDF table (optional)

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

State monitoring

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 Early Intervention (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 EI, EI Transition, and Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE). Individual child procedural compliance data is collected by programs and submitted to ODE electronically through the SPR&I system. 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 34 CFR §300.600-609 are met.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In FFY 2017, 99.31% (144/145) of child files reviewed for transition from Part C to Part B demonstrated eligibility determination and IFSP implementation by the third birthdays.

ODE verified that 100% (1/1) finding of noncompliance in FFY 2017 was corrected within one year and that the program with noncompliance demonstrated correction of practices that contributed to the noncompliance as well as current compliance with 34 CFR §300.124 based on a review of new files submitted in SPR&I.

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

There was one individual incident of noncompliance that resulted in one finding for one program.

ODE verified through data submission to SPR&I that 100% (1/1) of incidents of noncompliance in FFY 2017 were corrected within one year and that the

program with noncompliance developed an IFSP for each child, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the EI program. Additionally, the program with noncompliance was required to provide through SPR&I the cause of the noncompliance, and demonstrate correction of practices that contributed to the noncompliance through subsequent data submission to SPR&I.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Secondary transition: 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))

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2009	77.20%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	81.68%	76.24%	83.24%	79.73%	83.94%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
426	527	83.94%	100%	80.83%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Oregon measures compliance with Indicator 13: Secondary Transition through a file review process called "Procedural Compliance Reviews". In this process, each school district must review selected files for transition aged students to ensure that the required transition components of the IEP process are completed. Oregon requires districts to review these files for eight transition related standards. If any of the eight standards for a student are found to be non-compliant, the student's entire record is considered non-compliant. If any of the standards for any of the students reviewed are found to be non-compliant, the district does not meet requirements in the area of Secondary Transition.

In the 2016-17 PCR process, 49 districts did not meet requirements in the area of Secondary Transition. Of those, roughly half (25 districts, or 51%) met requirements in the area of Secondary Transition in the subsequent year's PCR process. For the remainder of the districts (24 districts, or 49%), there was no discernible pattern in the standards which contributed to non-compliance.

In the 2017-18 PCR process, 54 districts were found non-compliant in the area of Secondary Transition. There was no discernible pattern in the standards which contributed to these district's non-compliance. This finding includes 30 districts identified as non-compliant in this year that had met requirements as a result of the 2016-17 PCR process. Slippage occurred due to the 30 districts that did not meet requirements in the 2017-18 school year and the 24 who did not meet requirements in either year. Specific reasons for the increase in the number of districts being identified as non-compliant could not be identified.

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

State monitoring

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 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 are required by 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 34 CFR 300.600-609 are met.

Districts must report on whether the student file meets the following standards:

1. The IEP Team Meeting Notices must:
 - o Invite the student.
 - o Inform the parent and student that consideration of the post-secondary goals and transition services would be addressed.
 - o 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:
 - o The student's preferences, needs, and interests.
 - o 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.
 - o Requiring districts to engage in self-assessment through data collection, review, and analysis to inform meaningful improvement.
 - o Requiring districts to report on secondary transition services for a predetermined number of student files selected for review.
 - o 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.
 - o Providing training to districts on the relationship among Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14.

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

If no, please explain

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
84	84	0	0

FFY 2017 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.

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 34 CFR 300.600-609 are met.

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

- 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.
- 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;
- 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.
- 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.
- The IEP contains a statement of measurable annual goals including academic and functional goals.
- The IEP includes appropriate, measurable postsecondary goals based upon age-appropriate transition assessments related to training/education, employment, and, where appropriate, independent living skills.
- The IEP includes transition services needed to assist the student to reach the post-secondary goals.
- 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:
 - o Requiring districts to engage in self-assessment through data collection, review, and analysis to inform meaningful improvement.
 - o Requiring districts to report on secondary transition services for a predetermined number of student files selected for review.
 - o 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.
 - o Providing training to districts on the relationship among Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14.

In FFY 2018 ODE reviewed and verified district/program data and file submissions to confirm that 100% (84/84) incidents of noncompliance in FFY 2017 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 on site 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.

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

In FFY 2018 ODE reviewed and verified district/program data and file submissions to confirm that 100% (84/84) incidents of noncompliance in FFY 2017 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 on site 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 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2019 on students who left school during 2017-2018, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2017-2018 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

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

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment” in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, due February 2020:

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

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, 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.

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

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

II. Data Reporting

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

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

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

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

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

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

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

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

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

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

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2009	Target >=	27.00%	28.00%	29.00%	30.00%	31.00%
A	24.18%	Data	23.99%	22.37%	24.41%	24.56%	22.82%
B	2009	Target >=	53.00%	55.00%	55.00%	55.50%	55.50%
B	50.60%	Data	53.92%	56.40%	59.52%	60.46%	61.99%
C	2009	Target >=	69.00%	70.00%	72.00%	72.00%	72.00%
C	66.04%	Data	69.71%	71.34%	73.24%	74.59%	74.20%

FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	32.00%	32.00%
Target B >=	56.00%	56.00%
Target C >=	74.00%	74.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Oregon solicits stakeholder input as needed on technical issues such as target setting for the Annual Performance Report (APR) and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and on adaptive leadership topics such as how to reorient our system of general supervision from a focus on compliance towards a focus on results. Previous years' submissions of the SPP/APR detail the stakeholder engagement opportunities resulting in the current SPP/APR targets.

During September 2019, the Assistant Superintendent engaged district leaders in conversations about reimagining school age special education supports. Attendees included directors and executive leadership from districts statewide.

On October 2-4, 2019, the COSA conference featured the new special education director series, ODE staff led an input session on Part B IDEA redesign, and the Assistant Superintendent delivered a keynote address highlighting the importance of inclusive practices.

On December 2, 2019, the Office of Enhancing Student Opportunities hosted approximately 50 stakeholders representing school districts, educational service districts (regional support system), and family and community organizations. The group provided the SEA with input on the future direction of state supports for students experiencing disability, including input on a system of differentiated monitoring and supports. Two way participatory activities allowed participants to hold rich conversations and uncover assumptions about the role of the SEA in supporting LEAs to improve results for students experiencing disability. Stakeholders explored the intersectionality of race and disability within equity conversations, and provided the SEA with key input needed to move forward with a transformed vision of differentiated monitoring and support.

During January 2020, stakeholders provided input on the 2019 SPP/APR and SSIP targets through electronic survey. These targets are reported within each indicator.

FFY 2018 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	3,080
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	774
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	657
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)	201
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).	880

	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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	774	3,080	22.82%	32.00%	25.13%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	1,431	3,080	61.99%	56.00%	46.46%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	2,512	3,080	74.20%	74.00%	81.56%	Met Target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	XXX
B	Oregon reviewed the raw data and notes that, due to what Oregon understood as mandatory changes to the definition of competitive employment to contain integrated, we included questions on our survey to capture this additional component. This change in survey questions caused a drastic reduction in the number of students found to be competitively employed. However, a similar number of students were then automatically included in either the "other employment" or "other training" categories. This allowed Oregon's overall engagement rate (Part C) to continue to rise.
C	XXX

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

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

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

	Yes / No
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If yes, provide sampling plan.	

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

	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	YES
If yes, attach a copy of the survey	XXX

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Oregon does not collect demographic data on the person answering the survey. We do collect whether the respondent was the student or their representative. Thus, we cannot analyze "... the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of the youth ...". However, we can analyze the representativeness of the respondent group to the target leaver group. This analysis follows. 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. Data slightly under-represents students who dropped out, but this is expected, as these students are more difficult to reach due to lack of current contact information and general difficulty in tracking students who leave school unexpectedly. These data show no substantive difference in the characteristics between those who responded to the survey and those who did not.

	Yes / 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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

14 - OSEP Response

14 - Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results Indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	0
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	0

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

NO

Provide an explanation below.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Oregon solicits stakeholder input as needed on technical issues such as target setting for the Annual Performance Report (APR) and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and on adaptive leadership topics such as how to reorient our system of general supervision from a focus on compliance towards a focus on results. Previous years' submissions of the SPP/APR detail the stakeholder engagement opportunities resulting in the current SPP/APR targets.

During September 2019, the Assistant Superintendent engaged district leaders in conversations about reimagining school age special education supports. Attendees included directors and executive leadership from districts statewide.

On October 2-4, 2019, the COSA conference featured the new special education director series, ODE staff led an input session on Part B IDEA redesign, and the Assistant Superintendent delivered a keynote address highlighting the importance of inclusive practices.

On December 2, 2019, the Office of Enhancing Student Opportunities hosted approximately 50 stakeholders representing school districts, educational service districts (regional support system), and family and community organizations. The group provided the SEA with input on the future direction of state supports for students experiencing disability, including input on a system of differentiated monitoring and supports. Two way participatory activities allowed participants to hold rich conversations and uncover assumptions about the role of the SEA in supporting LEAs to improve results for students experiencing disability. Stakeholders explored the intersectionality of race and disability within equity conversations, and provided the SEA with key input needed to move forward with a transformed vision of differentiated monitoring and support.

During January 2020, stakeholders provided input on the 2019 SPP/APR and SSIP targets through electronic survey. These targets are reported within each indicator.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	11.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	29.50%	29.50%	29.50%	29.50%	29.50%
Data	25.00%	0.00%	14.29%	100.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	29.50%	

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0.00%	29.50%		N/A	N/A

Targets

FFY	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

N/A

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

15 - OSEP Response

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1 Mediations held	34
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	7
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	15

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

NO

Provide an explanation below

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Oregon solicits stakeholder input as needed on technical issues such as target setting for the Annual Performance Report (APR) and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and on adaptive leadership topics such as how to reorient our system of general supervision from a focus on compliance towards a focus on results. Previous years' submissions of the SPP/APR detail the stakeholder engagement opportunities resulting in the current SPP/APR targets.

During September 2019, the Assistant Superintendent engaged district leaders in conversations about reimagining school age special education supports. Attendees included directors and executive leadership from districts statewide.

On October 2-4, 2019, the COSA conference featured the new special education director series, ODE staff led an input session on Part B IDEA redesign, and the Assistant Superintendent delivered a keynote address highlighting the importance of inclusive practices.

On December 2, 2019, the Office of Enhancing Student Opportunities hosted approximately 50 stakeholders representing school districts, educational service districts (regional support system), and family and community organizations. The group provided the SEA with input on the future direction of state supports for students experiencing disability, including input on a system of differentiated monitoring and supports. Two way participatory activities allowed participants to hold rich conversations and uncover assumptions about the role of the SEA in supporting LEAs to improve results for students experiencing disability. Stakeholders explored the intersectionality of race and disability within equity conversations, and provided the SEA with key input needed to move forward with a transformed vision of differentiated monitoring and support.

During January 2020, stakeholders provided input on the 2019 SPP/APR and SSIP targets through electronic survey. These targets are reported within each indicator.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	86.36%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	88.00%	88.00%	89.00%	89.00%	90.00%
Data	84.38%	86.67%	83.78%	86.67%	72.97%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	90.00%	

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
7	15	34	72.97%	90.00%	64.71%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Targets

FFY	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

While down 3 from last year (37 for 2017 APR; 34 for 2018 APR), convened mediations remain higher than the number of mediations convened in previous years (e.g., 30 mediations convened in APR 2016). The Department attributes this to ongoing efforts to promote participation in alternate dispute resolution, even in contentious cases.

The overall percentage of successful mediations fell. This can be attributed to parties' willingness to mediate cases that may not have a high probability of resolution. Also, the number of mediation agreements reached related to due process cases fell from 12 to 7, but this decrease must be understood in the context of the concomitant drop in due process cases filed (44 in APR 2017, 17 in APR 2018).

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

16 - OSEP Response

16 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

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

Certify

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

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name:

Candace Pelt

Title:

Assistant Superintendent

Email:

candace.pelt@ode.state.or.us

Phone:

503-947-5702

Submitted on:

01/30/20 4:14:42 PM