

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2019**

Oregon



**PART B DUE
February 1, 2021**

**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.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

All activities in the State's General Supervision system were impacted starting in March 2020 due to COVID-19. The State incurred additional challenges during FFY 2019 with Oregon's wildfires beginning September 7, 2020. Unless otherwise noted, data reported for indicators were collected during the 2019-2020 school year. Any slippage or changes to past trajectories for these indicators may be due to these unprecedented statewide challenges.

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 State 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.

The State's general supervision system is coordinated by 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:

System Performance Review & Improvement (SPR&I): All school districts and EI/ECSE programs in the State are required to participate in this annual accountability and performance reporting process. 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 the State. Individual child procedural compliance data is collected by districts and programs and submitted to the State electronically through the SPR&I database. The SPR&I system provides the State with the mechanism for review of district/program policies, procedures, and systems, to ensure the requirements set forth in 34 CFR § 300.600-609.

Complaints and dispute resolution: While the State 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. The State uses independent contractors to conduct mediations and complaint investigations, with support, coordination, and additional assistance by the State's special education legal specialist. The State provides training and oversight for these complaint contractors. When a complaint final order identifies noncompliance and orders corrective action, State staff work with district and program staff to ensure completion of corrective action within required timelines. The State uses the same complaint resolution system and complaint contractors for Part B and Part C.

The State 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 the State have trained OAH administrative law judges to conduct special education hearings. When a due process hearing final order identifies noncompliance and orders corrective action, State staff work with district and program staff to ensure completion of corrective action within required timelines. The State 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.

The State 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 experiencing disabilities. The State uses a statewide, 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 State provides Technical Assistance (TA) to the 197 school districts in several ways. An assigned Education Specialist provides technical assistance on a range of topics as requested by the 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, the State provided web-based and on-site 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 State website provides up-to-date forms, statutes and regulations, policies and procedures, and program operation guidelines at the following link: <https://www.oregon.gov/ode/students-and-family/SpecialEducation/GeneralSupervision/Pages/default.aspx>.

The State uses email distribution lists and virtual events such as webinars 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 State has several systems in place to provide professional development to its 197 school districts. As the State undergoes reorganization, the State continues to work to braid multiple federal programs to improve outcomes for students historically and currently marginalized, including students experiencing disability.

For example, the State allocates IDEA discretionary funds and State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) funds to offer targeted professional development focusing on the implementation of evidence based practices for students experiencing disability. The ORTIi (Oregon Response to Instruction and Intervention) project continues to provide coaching support to district teams working to implement a multi-tiered system of supports (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.

Additionally, the State maintains relationships with a number of partners working directly with districts, students, and families to deliver professional learning in local contexts. The State contracts with FACT Oregon 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 (TTAN) supports districts with secondary and post-secondary students experiencing disabilities. The TTAN includes professional development and technical assistance for teachers, administrators, and other educational service providers regarding transition-related curricula/instructional approaches, outcome-based transition planning approaches, facilitation interagency teams and resources.

The State Advisory Council for Special Education (SACSE) brings together a variety of partners to provide a channel for information to be shared among programs and stakeholders. SACSE membership includes families, representatives from higher education, state and local officials, administrators, private school representatives and charter school representatives.

The State coordinates with the Coalition of Oregon School Administrators (COSA) to develop and offer professional learning for district special education administrative teams on a wide variety of topics. Engagement mechanisms include conferences, virtual events, and individual supports with Agency staff. The Office of Enhancing Student Opportunities provided leadership for a multi-day event focusing on topics in special education leadership during October 2019. During this reporting period, the State began offering monthly support calls for new special education directors, providing a foundation for standards of practice statewide.

Stakeholder Involvement

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

The State solicited broad input on target setting for indicators of the State Performance Plan (SPP) and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) through electronic survey during January 2020. These targets are reported within each indicator. These targets remain the same as the targets submitted in FFY 2019. The State continues to refine the differentiated monitoring and support opportunities available for LEAs, using community input gathered at regionally hosted listening sessions during the 2019-2020 school year. The State is increasingly looking towards working closer with the community to provide input on how the State can better support LEAs to meet the outcomes established in the SPP/APR.

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 FFY18 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 2018 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 2018 APR in 2020, is available.

The State produces At-A-Glance Special Education Profiles for each of the 197 school districts and 35 Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE) county programs. An additional EI/ECSE profile 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 State reports on Indicators B6, B7, B8, and B12 to the public on the EI/ECSE profiles. The State requires that districts distribute the profiles to all parents of students with IFSPs or IEPs. At-A-Glance Special Education Profiles are released to the public within 120 days of the APR submission to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP).

The At-A-Glance Special Education Profiles are available alongside the accountability reports required through ESSA for each LEA: <https://www.ode.state.or.us/data/reportcard/ReportList.aspx>. Additional information about the At-A-Glance Special Education Profiles (e.g., technical assistance documents) is available at: <https://www.oregon.gov/ode/schools-and-districts/reportcards/SpEdReportCards/Pages/default.aspx>

The State's SPP is posted at: <https://www.oregon.gov/ode/reports-and-data/SpEdReports/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-and-Annual-Performance-Report-for-Special-Education.aspx>.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2019 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 Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (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-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2019 and 2020 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2020 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 2019 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2021, 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR

As per OSEP's determination, Oregon engaged with TA centers to focus on the following areas of results and compliance.

Results

1. Indicator 1: Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma

Compliance

1. Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.

The State received technical assistance from the following organizations targeting the above areas of results and compliance:

1. Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy)
2. IDEA Data Center (IDC)
3. National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI)
4. Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR)
5. Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA)
6. National Center for Intensive Intervention (NCII)
7. The CEEDAR Center

As a result of technical assistance from the above organizations, the State:

1. Increased internal capacity for priority-driven improvement planning including data collection and analysis
2. Adapted LEA monitoring and support activities to continue work with LEAs begun prior to COVID-19 to reduce discrepancy and disproportionate representation in IDEA's equity indicators, including indicator 4B
3. Installed new mechanisms for LEA procedural compliance review
4. Reduced burden on LEAs through streamlining improvement plan submissions
5. Revised protocols related to State and LEA use of IDEA funds
6. Increased State staff capacity to effectively monitor district use of IDEA funds
7. Continued developing internal State organizational structures to allow for successful collaboration among programs supporting similar needs in LEAs
8. Rebalanced the State's human and fiscal resources to support increased State organization and collaboration
9. Developed plans to implement new strategies for increasing participation of underrepresented populations in parent involvement data collections
10. Adapted LEA monitoring and support activities to continue work with LEAs begun prior to COVID-19 to reduce discrepancy and disproportionate representation in IDEA's equity indicators

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 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), 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 Year	Baseline Data
2009	42.43%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	72.00%	75.00%	78.00%	81.00%	84.00%
Data	51.11%	52.74%	55.50%	58.81%	60.57%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	86.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The State solicited broad input on target setting for indicators of the State Performance Plan (SPP) and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) through electronic survey during January 2020. These targets are reported within each indicator. These targets remain the same as the targets submitted in FFY 2019. The State continues to refine the differentiated monitoring and support opportunities available for LEAs, using community input gathered at regionally hosted listening sessions during the 2019-2020 school year. The State is increasingly looking towards working closer with the community to provide input on how the State can better support LEAs to meet the outcomes established in the SPP/APR.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	07/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	4,162
SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	07/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	6,568
SY 2018-19 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695)	07/27/2020	Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	63.37%

FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
4,162	6,568	60.57%	86.00%	63.37%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Graduation Conditions

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

4-year ACGR

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

The State offers 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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

COVID-19 did not impact this indicator.

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs 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 EDFacts file specification FS009.

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 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019). 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 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), 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 Year	Baseline Data
2008	3.57%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target <=	3.40%	3.40%	3.30%	3.20%	3.10%
Data	6.10%	5.79%	5.65%	5.00%	4.86%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target <=	3.10%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The State solicited broad input on target setting for indicators of the State Performance Plan (SPP) and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) through electronic survey during January 2020. These targets are reported within each indicator. These targets remain the same as the targets submitted in FFY 2019. The State continues to refine the differentiated monitoring and support opportunities available for LEAs, using community input gathered at regionally hosted listening sessions during the 2019-2020 school year. The State is increasingly looking towards working closer with the community to provide input on how the State can better support LEAs to meet the outcomes established in the SPP/APR.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 2

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	3,518
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	464
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	154
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	1,003
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	12

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

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

The State collects dropout data 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 2018-19 report presents dropout rates by school and district for students who dropped out of grades 9 through 12 between July 1, 2018 and June 30, 2019, along with rates for specific student groups 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. A number of reasons exist 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 State ensure a complete accounting of students who drop out during the school year and students who drop out between school years.

The State'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. The State uses the NCES data in its methodology. For FFY 2019, the reported data is from 2018-2019. 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 grades 9-12) reported on the October 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 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
1,285	27,319	4.86%	3.10%	4.70%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

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, or
- 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)

COVID-19 did not impact this indicator.

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

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	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
A	Overall	96.10%	Actual	93.59%	92.19%	90.21%	88.79%	89.82%

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
A	Overall	97.30%	Actual	93.16%	91.43%	89.43%	87.98%	89.05%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	95.00%
Math	A >=	Overall	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The State solicited broad input on target setting for indicators of the State Performance Plan (SPP) and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) through electronic survey during January 2020. These targets are reported within each indicator. These targets remain the same as the targets submitted in FFY 2019. The State continues to refine the differentiated monitoring and support opportunities available for LEAs, using community input gathered at regionally hosted listening sessions during the 2019-2020 school year. The State is increasingly looking towards working closer with the community to provide input on how the State can better support LEAs to meet the outcomes established in the SPP/APR.

FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

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

YES

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards											

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards											

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall			89.82%	95.00%		N/A	N/A

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall			89.05%	95.00%		N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in

those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

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

<https://www.oregon.gov/ode/educator-resources/assessment/Pages/Assessment-Results.aspx>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

COVID-19 impacted this indicator.

The impact on data completeness, validity, and reliability for the indicator

COVID-19 impacted data completeness, validity, and reliability for Indicator B3 in the following ways: The State received a waiver from the U.S. Department of Education that allowed the state to suspend statewide summative assessments in English language arts, mathematics, and science.

An explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator

On March 12, 2020, Governor Brown implemented a mandate that closed all schools. The purpose of this mandate was to lessen the spread of the COVID-19 virus. Beginning on April 13, 2020, school districts were mandated to provide only distance learning instruction for all students. In-person interactions between school district personnel and students were not permitted.

COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for B3 because the state received a testing waiver from the U.S. Department of Education, and suspended statewide summative assessments in English language arts, mathematics, and science for the 2019-2020 school year.

Any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection

The State received a testing waiver from the U.S. Department of Education that allowed Oregon to suspend statewide assessments in English language arts and mathematics for the 2019-2020 school year. There is no mitigation when data are not available.

Assessment participation data was not collected due to COVID-19. For more information, see the section called File Specifications Not Collected Due to COVID-19 at the following URL: <https://www2.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/edfacts/sy-19-20-nonxml.html>

This Department's public webpage includes documentation that the 2019-2020 Statewide Assessment was suspended:

<https://www.oregon.gov/ode/schools-and-districts/reportcards/reportcards/Pages/Adapted-At-A-Glance-1920.aspx>.

The Statewide Assessment Technical manual also specifies that statewide assessment was suspended https://www.oregon.gov/ode/schools-and-districts/reportcards/reportcards/Documents/Adapted_At-A-Glance_Technical_Manual_1920.pdf.

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

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		

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Elementary	2016	Target >=	54.50%	54.50%	28.00%	35.00%	41.00%
A	Elementary	23.15%	Actual	29.70%	24.79%	23.15%	24.74%	24.12%
B	Middle	2016	Target >=	54.50%	54.50%	28.00%	35.00%	41.00%
B	Middle	18.41%	Actual	22.25%	19.86%	18.41%	19.16%	18.20%
C	HS	2016	Target >=	54.50%	54.50%	28.00%	35.00%	41.00%
C	HS	29.33%	Actual	31.73%	29.17%	29.33%	30.48%	26.97%

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Elementary	2016	Target >=	40.00%	40.00%	25.00%	32.00%	39.00%
A	Elementary	20.91%	Actual	26.10%	21.89%	20.91%	20.80%	20.59%
B	Middle	2016	Target >=	40.00%	40.00%	25.00%	32.00%	39.00%
B	Middle	13.57%	Actual	17.01%	14.39%	13.57%	12.20%	12.14%
C	HS	2016	Target >=	40.00%	40.00%	25.00%	32.00%	39.00%
C	HS	10.39%	Actual	11.79%	10.24%	10.39%	8.46%	9.02%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2019
Reading	A >=	Elementary	41.00%
Reading	B >=	Middle	41.00%
Reading	C >=	HS	41.00%
Math	A >=	Elementary	39.00%
Math	B >=	Middle	39.00%
Math	C >=	HS	39.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The State solicited broad input on target setting for indicators of the State Performance Plan (SPP) and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) through electronic survey during January 2020. These targets are reported within each indicator. These targets remain the same as the targets submitted in FFY 2019. The State continues to refine the differentiated monitoring and support opportunities available for LEAs, using community input gathered at regionally hosted listening sessions during the 2019-2020 school year. The State is increasingly looking towards working closer with the community to provide input on how the State can better support LEAs to meet the outcomes established in the SPP/APR.

FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

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

YES

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

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											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

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											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no											

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											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											

FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Elementary			24.12%	41.00%		N/A	N/A
B	Middle			18.20%	41.00%		N/A	N/A
C	HS			26.97%	41.00%		N/A	N/A

FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Elementary			20.59%	39.00%		N/A	N/A
B	Middle			12.14%	39.00%		N/A	N/A
C	HS			9.02%	39.00%		N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

<https://www.oregon.gov/ode/educator-resources/assessment/Pages/Assessment-Results.aspx>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

COVID-19 impacted this indicator.

The impact on data completeness, validity, and reliability for the indicator

COVID-19 impacted data completeness, validity, and reliability for Indicator B3 in the following ways: The State received a waiver from the U.S. Department of Education that allowed the state to suspend statewide summative assessments in English language arts, mathematics, and science.

An explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator

On March 12, 2020, Governor Brown implemented a mandate that closed all schools. The purpose of this mandate was to lessen the spread of the COVID-19 virus. Beginning on April 13, 2020, school districts were mandated to provide only distance learning instruction for all students. In-person interactions between school district personnel and students were not permitted.

COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for B3 because the state received a testing waiver from the U.S. Department of Education, and suspended statewide summative assessments in English language arts, mathematics, and science for the 2019-2020 school year.

Any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection

The State received a testing waiver from the U.S. Department of Education that allowed Oregon to suspend statewide assessments in English language arts and mathematics for the 2019-2020 school year. There is no mitigation when data are not available.

Assessment participation data was not collected due to COVID-19. For more information, see the section called File Specifications Not Collected Due to COVID-19 at the following URL: <https://www2.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/edfacts/sy-19-20-nonxml.html>

This Department's public webpage includes documentation that the 2019-2020 Statewide Assessment was suspended:

<https://www.oregon.gov/ode/schools-and-districts/reportcards/reportcards/Pages/Adapted-At-A-Glance-1920.aspx>.

The Statewide Assessment Technical manual also specifies that statewide assessment was suspended https://www.oregon.gov/ode/schools-and-districts/reportcards/reportcards/Documents/Adapted_At-A-Glance_Technical_Manual_1920.pdf.

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

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 = $\left[\frac{\text{\# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs}}{\text{\# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable)}} \right] \times 100$.

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 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	62.96%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target <=	7.20%	6.70%	68.65%	68.15%	67.65%
Data	13.71%	8.63%	62.96%	66.67%	53.13%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target <=	62.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The State solicited broad input on target setting for indicators of the State Performance Plan (SPP) and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) through electronic survey during January 2020. These targets are reported within each indicator. These targets remain the same as the targets submitted in FFY 2019. The State continues to refine the differentiated monitoring and support opportunities available for LEAs, using community input gathered at regionally hosted listening sessions during the 2019-2020 school year. The State is increasingly looking towards working closer with the community to provide input on how the State can better support LEAs to meet the outcomes established in the SPP/APR.

FFY 2019 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.

166

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
21	31	53.13%	62.00%	67.74%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Multiple factors contributed to slippage in this category. The count of Districts with a significant discrepancy grew in 2018-19 from 17 districts to 21 districts. Six of the districts from 2017-18 were no longer identified with a significant discrepancy. Of the 21 districts currently identified, ten were newly identified and eleven were districts previously identified in 2017-18. For the eleven repeater districts, six demonstrated a reduction in their risk ratio. Seven of the repeater eleven districts either stayed the same or varied in their count by one to two individual students.

Although slippage occurred in this indicator, the statewide special education discipline rate for B4A reduced from 0.57% in APR 2019 to 0.54% in APR 2020. The State has a low suspension/expulsion incidence rate among students receiving special education services. Slight changes will cause wide differences in the resulting data and year-to-year variation in the number and frequency of districts that are flagged, as these are small numbers to start.

During statewide training and when providing guidance to districts regarding discipline, the State emphasized the importance of accurately reporting all out-of-school suspensions (e.g., assuring documentation of a removal event in the event that parents/guardians are asked to pick up early for behavioral infractions). Specifically, school districts have been better trained to formally document all removals from classrooms and/or schools. This additional training and guidance resulted in more accurate reporting of disciplinary exclusions.

Finally, districts described increased challenges in supporting the social, emotional and behavioral needs of students experiencing disabilities, as well as those students experiencing disabilities who have been impacted by trauma. Oregon districts have variability in effectiveness of identifying the need for, and then supporting the appropriate interventions for students, beginning at the universal Tier I level of support. As Tier I serves as the universal foundation upon which all other tiers are built, Tier II and III supports are consequently impacted. The State continues to work with districts to support: (a) team structures, data analysis, application of consistent interventions/supports and program evaluation; and (b) the delivery of meaningful professional development to ensure instructional alternatives to exclusionary discipline that include positive behavior interventions and supports, healing-centered/trauma-informed, racial equity-centered, strengths-based, social emotional learning practices that are deployed systemically with effectiveness.

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

The State 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. The State 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 State discipline incidents collection.

The standard operating procedures for this indicator include:

1. Preparing and disseminating to all districts a discipline report for students with and without disabilities.
2. Identifying districts that exceed the threshold with a significant discrepancy.
3. 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).
4. Providing written notification of noncompliance to districts that have policies, procedures, and practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy.
5. 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.
6. 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, the State provides guidance to the district and requests revisions to ensure compliance or appropriate corrective action.
7. The State's procedural compliance review system requires districts that exceed the threshold for this indicator to complete and submit additional file reviews specific to students with discipline incidences, to assure compliance.

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The State used 2016 as the baseline year for this indicator.
The COVID-19 pandemic had no impact on the data for this indicator for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR report.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2019 using 2018-2019 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 2019, the State reviewed plans for 21 districts identified with significant discrepancy based on 2018-2019 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 21 identified districts either developed a behavior intervention and disciplinary removal action plan or reviewed their existing action plan and noted progress or made 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.

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 2019, ODE reviewed plans for 21 (21/31) 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 developed 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 reviewed their existing action plan and note progress or make plan adjustments, as necessary. All plans were submitted to the State. Plans that did not meet State requirements were amended and resubmitted by the district until each met the State's established requirements.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

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

FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In FFY 2018, using 2017-2018 data, the State identified 17 (17/32) districts as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions/expulsions of greater than 10 days for more than three children with IEPs. The State reviewed plans for the 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.

Based on these extensive reviews, each of the 17 districts developed a behavior intervention and disciplinary removal action plan and corrected all identified non-compliance within one year. Each district developed, submitted, and obtained State approval for their plans. The State verified, by review of revised policies and procedures and a review of documentation from district Procedural Compliance Review (PCR) file reviews on files from the discipline incidents collection, that each LEA with non-compliance identified in FFY 2018 was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements and that 100% (17/17) of findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018 were corrected within one year. Districts with noncompliance demonstrated correction of practices that contributed to the noncompliance as well as current compliance with 34 C.F.R. §300.170(b) based on a State review of updated district plans.

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

The following steps were completed for the verification process for each individual noncompliance: Individual cases of noncompliance were identified through the State's review process. Districts flagged for noncompliance articulated a plan for correcting noncompliance, as well as the process by which they reviewed subsequent data to ensure there are no other systemic issues of noncompliance. All plans were submitted to the State.

In FFY 2018, the State reviewed plans for each of the 17 districts identified with significant discrepancy. Plans that did not adequately address compliance were amended and resubmitted by the district until each met the State's established requirements.

Additionally, within the Systems Performance Review & Improvement (SPR&I) system B4 report tab, flagged districts are able to view discipline incident details for any students suspended/expelled greater than 10 days as part of their required data review.

Additionally, file reviews specific to students with discipline incidences are triggered into the PCR system for identified districts. Districts completed file reviews on individual student discipline files to assure compliance. Districts with noncompliance completed additional reviews of further student discipline files to assure any non-compliance is not systemic in nature. At this stage, if any of the additional files reviewed were to be found non-compliant, districts completed a systemic correction. Utilizing the State file review system, the State was able to ensure that any noncompliance was corrected as soon as possible, but in no case more than one year from identification.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	0.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	1.52%	5.58%	0.00%	NVR	NVR

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	0%

FFY 2019 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.

183

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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
10	0	14	NVR	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The State 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)

In collaboration with the National Center for Systemic Improvement, Oregon began working on a redesign of the general supervision system in the Fall of 2019. As part of that process, ODE discontinued a component of the Part B general supervision system to reimagine how we could further align our system to results based accountability and support. That component, the Consolidated Plan, provided a mechanism by which ODE collected data to identify and verify correction of noncompliance for this indicator. With its discontinuation, ODE developed bridge procedures to identify and verify correction of noncompliance that were planned to be implemented in the Spring of 2020, but those procedures have not yet been implemented. ODE recognizes that the delay in implementation of these procedures impacts the completeness of this submission. ODE is working with districts to finalize identification and verification of correction of noncompliance and anticipates completing that work by April 1, 2021.

COVID-19 did not directly impact ODE's ability to collect the initial data for this indicator, or the data completeness, validity, and reliability of that initial data. Oregon's response to COVID-19 caused significant stress in most, if not all, statewide systems. The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) and the Office of Enhancing Student Opportunities (OESO) are no exception, having experienced a disruption of normal work processes in order to respond to the COVID-19 crisis, school closures, movement of nearly all Oregon students to Comprehensive Distance Learning, and communities in economic crisis. In the Fall of 2020 Oregon also experienced widespread, historic, and catastrophic wildfires. The wildfires added another layer of stress and trauma to districts; destroying and damaging buildings, including schools, district offices, and homes. Thousands of Oregonians, including students and their families and LEA and SEA staff, were impacted by the toxic smoke and fires. Finally, the Office of Enhancing Student Opportunities experienced a major leadership change in the fall of 2020 with the leave and subsequent resignation of the OESO Assistant Superintendent, who served as the state special education director.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2019 using 2018-2019 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.

The State is working with the ten districts identified with significant discrepancy based on 2018-2019 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. The State anticipates having this work with districts completed by April 1, 2021 and updating this response during the SPP/APR clarification period.

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
12	12	0	0

FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In FFY 2018, using 2017-2018 data, the State identified 12 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.

These 12 districts to completed a corrective action plan to address the discrepancy 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 2018, the State verified that these districts showed 100% (12/12) compliance one year after the initial noncompliance was identified based on a review of the required plans. Districts with noncompliance demonstrated correction of practices that contributed to the noncompliance as well as current compliance with 34 C.F.R. §300.170(b) based on a State review of updated district 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 2018, the State reviewed corrective action plans for each of the twelve districts identified with significant discrepancy. These plans discussed policies, procedures, or practices that could have contributed to their significant discrepancy. Districts evaluated their data and decision-making processes and corrected instances of noncompliance and made adjustments, as warranted. All plans were submitted to the State. Plans that did not adequately address compliance were amended and resubmitted by each district to ODE until each met the State's established requirements. Although the districts were flagged for noncompliance, they were able to show through their district plan that systemic policies, procedures, or practices did not contribute to significant discrepancy. The State verified that these districts showed 100% (12/12) compliance corrected within one year after the initial noncompliance was identified based on a review of the required plans.

Additionally, file reviews specific to students with discipline incidences are triggered into the Procedural Compliance Review (PCR) system for identified districts. File reviews were completed by districts on student discipline files to assure compliance. Districts with noncompliance completed additional reviews of further files to assure any non-compliance is not systemic in nature. At this stage, if any of the additional files reviewed were to be found non-compliant, districts completed a systemic correction. Utilizing the State file review system, the State was able to ensure that any noncompliance was corrected as soon as possible, but in no case more than one year from identification.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 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

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

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2018. The State must provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2019 in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR.

Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR

The State has provided valid and reliable data for FFY 2019 in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR.

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

Part	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2005	Target >=	72.00%	72.00%	72.00%	73.00%	73.00%
A	70.60%	Data	72.92%	73.37%	73.49%	73.66%	73.93%
B	2005	Target <=	10.80%	10.70%	10.70%	10.60%	10.60%
B	11.30%	Data	10.57%	10.15%	9.90%	9.84%	9.64%
C	2005	Target <=	1.80%	1.80%	1.80%	1.80%	1.80%
C	2.20%	Data	1.42%	1.19%	1.20%	1.44%	1.73%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The State solicited broad input on target setting for indicators of the State Performance Plan (SPP) and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) through electronic survey during January 2020. These targets are reported within each indicator. These targets remain the same as the targets submitted in FFY 2019. The State continues to refine the differentiated monitoring and support opportunities available for LEAs, using community input gathered at regionally hosted listening sessions during the 2019-2020 school year. The State is increasingly looking towards working closer with the community to provide input on how the State can better support LEAs to meet the outcomes established in the SPP/APR.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	82,484
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment	07/08/2020	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	61,528

Source	Date	Description	Data
Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)			
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	7,888
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	1,135
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	52
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	286

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

NO

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	61,528	82,484	73.93%	75.00%	74.59%	Did Not Meet Target	N/A
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	7,888	82,484	9.64%	10.60%	9.56%	Met Target	N/A
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1,473	82,484	1.73%	1.80%	1.79%	Met Target	N/A

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

COVID-19 did not impact this indicator.

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2011	Target >=	35.00%	35.50%	35.50%	36.00%	36.00%
A	32.70%	Data	37.00%	39.91%	45.25%	45.05%	44.57%
B	2011	Target <=	24.60%	24.00%	24.00%	23.50%	23.50%
B	25.60%	Data	22.93%	23.30%	19.80%	19.03%	19.17%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The State solicited broad input on target setting for indicators of the State Performance Plan (SPP) and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) through electronic survey during January 2020. These targets are reported within each indicator. These targets remain the same as the targets submitted in FFY 2019. The State continues to refine the differentiated monitoring and support opportunities available for LEAs, using community input gathered at regionally hosted listening sessions during the 2019-2020 school year. The State is increasingly looking towards working closer with the community to provide input on how the State can better support LEAs to meet the outcomes established in the SPP/APR.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	9,009
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	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	4,339

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	2,168
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	b2. Number of children attending separate school	40
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	1

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

NO

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 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	4,339	9,009	44.57%	36.00%	48.16%	Met Target	N/A
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	2,209	9,009	19.17%	23.50%	24.52%	Did Not Meet Target	N/A

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The COVID-19 pandemic had no impact on the data for this indicator for the FFY 19 SPP/APR report.

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

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

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

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

Instructions

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

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A1	2015	Target >=	74.80%	75.00%	76.10%	76.10%	76.10%
A1	75.62%	Data	73.96%	75.62%	76.17%	79.61%	77.90%
A2	2015	Target >=	32.80%	33.00%	60.50%	60.50%	60.50%

A2	60.20%	Data	29.79%	60.20%	58.53%	56.21%	54.69%
B1	2015	Target >=	61.00%	61.50%	74.20%	74.20%	74.20%
B1	73.66%	Data	53.40%	73.66%	71.45%	74.18%	74.06%
B2	2015	Target >=	23.90%	24.00%	58.10%	58.10%	58.10%
B2	57.84%	Data	24.34%	57.84%	55.71%	54.46%	52.61%
C1	2015	Target >=	45.30%	45.50%	74.10%	74.10%	74.10%
C1	73.63%	Data	38.80%	73.63%	73.40%	76.35%	75.15%
C2	2015	Target >=	32.00%	32.20%	61.50%	61.50%	61.50%
C2	61.21%	Data	28.83%	61.21%	59.74%	57.30%	54.54%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The State solicited broad input on target setting for indicators of the State Performance Plan (SPP) and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) through electronic survey during January 2020. These targets are reported within each indicator. These targets remain the same as the targets submitted in FFY 2019. The State continues to refine the differentiated monitoring and support opportunities available for LEAs, using community input gathered at regionally hosted listening sessions during the 2019-2020 school year. The State is increasingly looking towards working closer with the community to provide input on how the State can better support LEAs to meet the outcomes established in the SPP/APR.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	67	1.85%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	465	12.81%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,206	33.22%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	585	16.12%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,307	36.01%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 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>	1,791	2,323	77.90%	76.10%	77.10%	Met Target	No Slippage

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	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>	1,892	3,630	54.69%	60.50%	52.12%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	61	1.68%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	569	15.67%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,197	32.98%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	422	11.63%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,381	38.04%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 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>	1,619	2,249	74.06%	74.20%	71.99%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	1,803	3,630	52.61%	58.10%	49.67%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	47	1.29%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	506	13.94%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,184	32.62%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	539	14.85%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,354	37.30%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who	1,723	2,276	75.15%	74.10%	75.70%	Met Target	No Slippage

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
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>							
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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	1,893	3,630	54.54%	61.50%	52.15%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A2	The State uses the AEPS I and II as its one statewide tool for determining the B7 child outcome data. The AEPS is administered at eligibility or the initial IFSP, at least at the annual IFSP, and at the time of exiting from ECSE. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, administering an exit AEPS was not possible. Subsequently, the annual IFSP AEPS score was used as the exit score for these children or some of the exiting children's data were not available because they were in service for less than a year. These factors resulted in depressing the child outcome data for B7: A2.
B1	The State uses the AEPS I and II as its one statewide tool for determining the B7 child outcome data. The AEPS is administered at eligibility or the initial IFSP, at least at the annual IFSP, and at the time of exiting from ECSE. Due to the COVID-19, administering an exit AEPS was not possible. Subsequently, the annual IFSP AEPS score was used as the exit score for these children or some of the exiting children's data were not available because they were in service for less than a year. These factors resulted in depressing the child outcome data for B7: B1.
B2	The State uses the AEPS I and II as its one statewide tool for determining the B7 child outcome data. The AEPS is administered at eligibility or the initial IFSP, at least at the annual IFSP, and at the time of exiting from ECSE. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, administering an exit AEPS was not possible. Subsequently, the annual IFSP AEPS score was used as the exit score for these children or some of the exiting children's data were not available because they were in service for less than a year. These factors resulted in depressing the child outcome data for B7: B2.
C2	The State uses the AEPS I and II as its one statewide tool for determining the B7 child outcome data. The AEPS is administered at eligibility or the initial IFSP, at least at the annual IFSP, and at the time of exiting from ECSE. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, administering an exit AEPS was not possible. Subsequently, the annual IFSP AEPS score was used as the exit score for these children or some of the exiting children's data were not available because they were in service for less than a year. These factors resulted in depressing the child outcome data for B7: C2.

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

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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 State EI/ECSE programs 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 the State's children in ECSE programs. The review team, State 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 that the State should use for reporting to the ECSE child outcomes. The consensus was to use the 80% cut off level. 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 the State 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 this indicator.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Impact of COVID -19 on data completeness, validity, and reliability for the indicator

As documented in the slippage statements, the emergence of the COVID-19 pandemic in March 2020 reduced the ability of EI/ECSE programs to complete exit AEPS 1 assessments resulting in reverting to the annual administration of the AEPS 1 as the exit data, or having no exit data at all, and resulting in the elimination of that child record from the data. This resulted in the reduction of the number of records submitted by programs for this indicator.

Explanation of how COVID-19 specifically affected the state's ability to collect the data for the indicator

The inability of the EI/ECSE programs to administer some of the exit AEPS I assessments resulted in reverting to the annual administration of the AEPS 1 as the exit data, or having no exit data at all and the elimination of that child record from the data. This resulted in the reduction of the number of records utilized for this indicator.

Any steps the state took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection

The State supplied its EI/ECSE programs with guidance and training materials concerning how to administer the AEPS 1 virtually, which helped some programs and practitioners gather accurate exit data for FFY 2019.

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

Question	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

The State solicited broad input on target setting for indicators of the State Performance Plan (SPP) and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) through electronic survey during January 2020. These targets are reported within each indicator. These targets remain the same as the targets submitted in FFY 2019. The State continues to refine the differentiated monitoring and support opportunities available for LEAs, using community input gathered at regionally hosted listening sessions during the 2019-2020 school year. The State is increasingly looking towards working closer with the community to provide input on how the State can better support LEAs to meet the outcomes established in the SPP/APR.

Historical Data

Group	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Preschool	2014	Target >=	82.18%	82.48%	82.68%	83.68%	85.68%
Preschool	82.18%	Data	82.18%	81.16%	86.23%	79.37%	84.59%
School age	2014	Target >=	76.23%	76.73%	77.73%	78.73%	81.23%
School age	76.23%	Data	76.23%	78.12%	78.74%	79.43%	78.98%

Targets

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

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Preschool Children Reported Separately

Group	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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
Preschool	190	214	84.59%	85.68%	88.79%	Met Target	No Slippage
School age	1,675	2,005	78.98%	81.23%	83.54%	Met Target	No Slippage

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

21,260

Percentage of respondent parents

10.44%

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	NO

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

The sampling methodology 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 State 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.

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	YES
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	ORpartB619survey1920and Rept
The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.	NO

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

Informed by Oregon's participation in the Early Childhood TA Center (ECTA) & The Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy) Family Outcomes CoP, ODE continues to work with FACT (Oregon's PTI Center) to collect the following data so as to inform districts support of the SEA's parent involvement survey efforts to capture response data that are representative of Oregon's survey demographics:

1. Identify current communication and dissemination strategies districts are utilizing.
2. Collect district input as to why the response rate of parents of students of color is low.
3. Identify additional communication and/or dissemination strategies for increasing the response rate of parents--especially, parents of students of color.
4. Ask districts if there are actions ODE and/or its survey vendor could do in terms of survey design/format/administration that would increase the likelihood parents of students of color responding.

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.

Part B 619

Note: The State used statistical significance testing to determine if one group was over- or under-represented in the response rate.

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 experiencing disabilities in the Part B 619 population. This comparison indicates the results are generally representative by: (1) age of the child, and (2) primary disability of the child. For example, 18% of the population has a child who was age 3 as of December 1st, and 17% of the respondents had a child who was age 3 as of December 1st. Further, 32% of the population have a child identified as experiencing a developmental delay, and the results indicate that 33% of the respondents have a child identified as experiencing a developmental delay.

Parents of white students were slightly over-represented (the results indicate that 66% of parent respondents had a student who is white whereas 61% of preschool children experiencing disabilities are white), and parents of Hispanic students were under-represented. However, there were no significant differences in the positivity of responses on the survey itself between parents across demographic characteristics, so the overall results are representative of Oregon. Furthermore, results were weighted by program to ensure that the parent survey results reflected the population of parents. The State will continue to encourage parents of children of all races/ethnicities to complete the survey. To that end, the State plans to collect the following data to inform and support programs parent involvement survey efforts:

1. Identify current communication and dissemination strategies used by programs.
2. Collect program input as to why the response rate of parents of students of color is low.
3. Identify additional communication and/or dissemination strategies for increasing the response rate of parents, especially parents of students of color.
4. Ask programs if there are actions that the State and/or its survey vendor could take in terms of survey design, format, and administration that would increase the response rate of parents of students of color.

Part B

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 experiencing disabilities in K-12 in the population. This comparison indicates the results are generally representative by: (1) size of the district, and (2) grade level of the child. For example, 4% of the population has a child who was age 5 as of December 1st, and 5% of the respondents had a child who was age 5 as of December 1st. Parents of white students were slightly over-represented (the results indicated that 72% of parent respondents had a student who is white whereas 64% of students receiving special education services are white). Additionally, parents of Hispanic students were slightly under-represented (the results indicated that 15% of parent respondents had a student who is Hispanic whereas 25% of students receiving special education services are Hispanic).

In addition, parents of students experiencing a specific learning disability were slightly under-represented (the results indicated that 24% of parent respondents had a student experiencing a specific learning disability whereas 31% of students in the population experience a learning disability). However, there were no significant differences in the parent involvement percentage between parents of white children and parents of children of other races/ethnicities or between parents of students experiencing specific learning disabilities and parents of students experiencing other disabilities, so the overall results are representative of Oregon. Furthermore, results were weighted by district to ensure that the parent survey results reflected the population of parents. The State will continue to encourage parents of children of all races/ethnicities to complete the survey. To that end, the State plans to collect the following data to inform and support programs parent involvement survey efforts:

1. Identify current communication and dissemination strategies used by programs.
2. Collect program input as to why the response rate of parents of students of color is low.
3. Identify additional communication and/or dissemination strategies for increasing the response rate of parents, especially parents of students of color.
4. Ask programs if there are actions that the State and/or its survey vendor could do in terms of survey design, format, and administration that would increase the response rate of parents of students of color.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Part B & Part B 619

The State does not think that COVID-19 had an impact on the response rate given that the same process was used as before (mail). The State has no reason to suspect that COVID-19 had an impact on the positivity of the survey responses. The parent involvement percentage did increase from 2018-19 to 2019-20 and item responses also increased from 2018-19 to 2019-20, but the State has no reason to believe that was a function of COVID-19.

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

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 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 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.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	0.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	0%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

26

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
7	0	171	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

The State 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.

ODE used district-provided data to identify if there was Disproportionate Representation in Special Education. This disproportionate representation was identified in 7/171 districts (4.09%). As described below (in the section labeled “provide additional information about this indicator (optional)), ODE continues to work with districts to finalize the determination as to whether the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In collaboration with the National Center for Systemic Improvement, Oregon began working on a redesign of the general supervision system in the Fall of 2019. As part of that process, ODE discontinued a component of the Part B general supervision system to reimagine how we could further align our system to results based accountability and support. That component, the Consolidated Plan, provided a mechanism by which ODE collected data to identify and verify correction of noncompliance for this indicator. With its discontinuation, ODE developed bridge procedures to identify and verify correction of noncompliance that were planned to be implemented in the Spring of 2020, but those procedures have not yet been implemented. ODE recognizes that the delay in implementation of these procedures impacts the completeness of this submission. ODE is working with districts to finalize identification and verification of correction of noncompliance and anticipates completing that work by April 1, 2021.

COVID-19 did not directly impact ODE’s ability to collect the initial data for this indicator, or the data completeness, validity, and reliability of that initial data. Oregon’s response to COVID-19 caused significant stress in most, if not all, statewide systems. The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) and the Office of Enhancing Student Opportunities (OESO) are no exception, having experienced a disruption of normal work processes in order to respond to the COVID-19 crisis, school closures, movement of nearly all Oregon students to Comprehensive Distance Learning, and communities in economic crisis. In the Fall of 2020 Oregon also experienced widespread, historic, and catastrophic wildfires. The wildfires added another layer of stress and trauma to districts; destroying and damaging buildings, including schools, district offices, and homes. Thousands of Oregonians, including students and their families and LEA and SEA staff, were impacted by the toxic smoke and fires. Finally, the Office of Enhancing Student Opportunities experienced a major leadership change in the fall of 2020 with the leave and subsequent resignation of the OESO Assistant Superintendent, who served as the state special education director.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Response to actions required in FFY 2018 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 2019, 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 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 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.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	0.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	0%

FFY 2019 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.

38

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
38	0	159	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

The State 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.

ODE used district-provided data to identify if there was disproportionate overrepresentation in specific disability categories. The State prepared and disseminated 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.

As described below (in the section labeled “provide additional information about this indicator (optional)), ODE continues to work with districts to finalize the determination as to whether the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In collaboration with the National Center for Systemic Improvement, Oregon began working on a redesign of the general supervision system in the Fall of 2019. As part of that process, ODE discontinued a component of the Part B general supervision system to reimagine how we could further align our system to results based accountability and support. That component, the Consolidated Plan, provided a mechanism by which ODE collected data to identify and verify correction of noncompliance for this indicator. With its discontinuation, ODE developed bridge procedures to identify and verify correction of noncompliance that were planned to be implemented in the Spring of 2020, but those procedures have not yet been implemented. ODE recognizes that the delay in implementation of these procedures impacts the completeness of this submission. ODE is working with districts to finalize identification and verification of correction of noncompliance and anticipates completing that work by April 1, 2021.

COVID-19 did not directly impact ODE’s ability to collect the initial data for this indicator, or the data completeness, validity, and reliability of that initial data. Oregon’s response to COVID-19 caused significant stress in most, if not all, statewide systems. The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) and the Office of Enhancing Student Opportunities (OESO) are no exception, having experienced a disruption of normal work processes in order to respond to the COVID-19 crisis, school closures, movement of nearly all Oregon students to Comprehensive Distance Learning, and communities in economic crisis. In the Fall of 2020 Oregon also experienced widespread, historic, and catastrophic wildfires. The wildfires added another layer of stress and trauma to districts; destroying and damaging buildings, including schools, district offices, and homes. Thousands of Oregonians, including students and their families and LEA and SEA staff, were impacted by the toxic smoke and fires. Finally, the Office of Enhancing Student Opportunities experienced a major leadership change in the fall of 2020 with the leave and subsequent resignation of the OESO Assistant Superintendent, who served as the state special education director.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

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

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 2020 on students who left school during 2018-2019, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2018-2019 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 2019 SPP/APR, due February 2021:

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

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2009	Target >=	28.00%	29.00%	30.00%	31.00%	32.00%
A	24.18%	Data	22.37%	24.41%	24.56%	22.82%	25.13%
B	2009	Target >=	55.00%	55.00%	55.50%	55.50%	56.00%
B	50.60%	Data	56.40%	59.52%	60.46%	61.99%	46.46%
C	2009	Target >=	70.00%	72.00%	72.00%	72.00%	74.00%
C	66.04%	Data	71.34%	73.24%	74.59%	74.20%	81.56%

FFY 2019 Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The State solicited broad input on target setting for indicators of the State Performance Plan (SPP) and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) through electronic survey during January 2020. These targets are reported within each indicator. These targets remain the same as the targets submitted in FFY 2019. The State continues to refine the differentiated monitoring and support opportunities available for LEAs, using community input gathered at regionally hosted listening sessions during the 2019-2020 school year. The State is increasingly looking towards working closer with the community to provide input on how the State can better support LEAs to meet the outcomes established in the SPP/APR.

FFY 2019 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	2,399
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	596
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	858
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)	153
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).	244

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	596	2,399	25.13%	32.00%	24.84%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	1,454	2,399	46.46%	56.00%	60.61%	Met Target	No 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)	1,851	2,399	81.56%	74.00%	77.16%	Met Target	No Slippage

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

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

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

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

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.

The State analyzed the representativeness of the respondent group to the target leaver group, which is a census of all leavers in the state. This survey follows all students ages 16-21 who were reported on the 618 exit collection as leaving special education services and 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 was conducted using the NPSO/NTACT Response Calculator. This analysis showed respondents were representative of targeted leavers across disability, gender, race/ethnicity, and English learners. Data underrepresented (-5.51%) students who dropped out. The underrepresentation of dropouts is not uncommon, 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. The NPSO/NTACT Response Calculator uses a difference of greater than +/-3% as an indicator of an important difference between respondent groups and targeted leaver groups. With the exception of dropouts, these data show no substantive difference in the characteristics between those who responded to the survey and those who did not.

Oregon had a response rate of 50% (total number of leavers, N = 4797, divided by the total number of respondents, n = 2399). Using the NPSO/NTACT Response Calculator, in which a difference of greater than +/-3% is an important difference, respondents were representative in all categories except dropouts (i.e., disability, gender, race/ethnicity, English learners). As shown in the data table, dropouts were underrepresented by 5.51% in the respondent group.

Question	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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

COVID-19 impacted this indicator.

Impact of COVID-19 on data completeness, validity, and reliability for the indicator:

COVID-19 impacted data completeness, validity and reliability for this indicator during the time of the collection (June 1, 2020 through September 30, 2020) as districts and schools were preparing for in-person instruction and the possibility of needed transitions to Comprehensive Distance Learning models for the 2020-21 school year. Districts had to prepare staff by providing professional learning for staff on virtual platforms, training on new protocols, setting up physical spaces, designing instruction, setting up technology, and cleaning and disinfecting. Therefore teachers' time was cut short to make the phone calls to do the survey and collect the data.

Explanation of how COVID-19 specifically affected the state's ability to collect the data for the indicator:

The State's ability to collect the data for indicator 14 in the SPR&I system was not impacted but the input of data from the school districts was impacted due to COVID-19 and wildfires as teachers and families had a significant and widespread loss of their homes, internet connectivity, and technology devices. Teachers and students who were displaced from their homes were not able to connect with each other to complete the survey over the phone or in person like years past.

Any steps the state took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection:

School districts have filled out a paper copy of the follow-up survey and the State offered to input the data into the system if districts needed help with the task.

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

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 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/04/2020	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	1
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/04/2020	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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The State solicited broad input on target setting for indicators of the State Performance Plan (SPP) and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) through electronic survey during January 2020. These targets are reported within each indicator. These targets remain the same as the targets submitted in FFY 2019. The State continues to refine the differentiated monitoring and support opportunities available for LEAs, using community input gathered at regionally hosted listening sessions during the 2019-2020 school year. The State is increasingly looking towards working closer with the community to provide input on how the State can better support LEAs to meet the outcomes established in the SPP/APR.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	11.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	29.50%	29.50%	29.50%	29.50%	29.50%
Data	0.00%	14.29%	100.00%	0.00%	

Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
0	1			0.00%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

This indicator was not impacted by COVID-19.

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFACTS 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 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1 Mediations held	25
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	5
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	6

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The State solicited broad input on target setting for indicators of the State Performance Plan (SPP) and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) through electronic survey during January 2020. These targets are reported within each indicator. These targets remain the same as the targets submitted in FFY 2019. The State continues to refine the differentiated monitoring and support opportunities available for LEAs, using community input gathered at regionally hosted listening sessions during the 2019-2020 school year. The State is increasingly looking towards working closer with the community to provide input on how the State can better support LEAs to meet the outcomes established in the SPP/APR.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	86.36%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	88.00%	89.00%	89.00%	90.00%	90.00%
Data	86.67%	83.78%	86.67%	72.97%	64.71%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	90.00%

FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
5	6	25	64.71%	90.00%	44.00%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Slippage occurred due to the need to conduct virtual mediations rather than the in-person meetings held prior to COVID-19. While both mediators and parties have worked hard to make this process more streamlined, challenges exist due to technological issues and the greater difficulty in building trusting relationships through virtual meeting modes. The State also notes more requests for mediation filed in cases where the likelihood of successful mediation is fairly low due to heightened emotions and complex issues.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

COVID-19 impacted this indicator.

Impact on data completeness, validity, and reliability for the indicator:

Fewer mediation sessions occurred during the 2019-20 school year (41) than the previous year, and the number of completed mediation sessions also dropped (25 compared to 34). The percentage of successful mediations also dropped to 44% (previously 73%). On March 12, 2020, Governor Brown implemented a mandate that closed all schools. The purpose of this mandate was to lessen the spread of the COVID-19 virus. Beginning on April 13, school districts were mandated to provide only distance learning instruction for all students. Data completion was impacted in that numerous scheduled mediations had to be delayed. In many instances, it was difficult to schedule appointments with families that were struggling with daily COVID-19 related activities and/or relocating for economic reasons. The impact of school district personnel to access necessary information to prepare for mediation sessions was also impacted. COVID-19 related planning also disrupted the schedules of many district personnel, making mediation sessions more difficult to schedule.

Explanation of how COVID-19 specifically affected the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator:

The State's ability to collect data for B16 was impacted in the following ways: The overall situation made tracking down individual cases to see where they were in the process and getting signed agreements difficult to accomplish. On March 12, 2020, Governor Brown implemented a mandate that closed all schools. The purpose of this mandate was to lessen the spread of the COVID-19 virus. Beginning on April 13, school districts were mandated to provide only distance learning instruction for all students. Data completion was impacted in that numerous scheduled mediations had to be delayed. In many instances, it was difficult to schedule appointments with families that were struggling with daily COVID-19 related activities and/or relocating for economic reasons. The impact of school district personnel to access necessary information to prepare for mediation sessions was also impacted. COVID-19 related planning also disrupted the schedules of many district personnel, making mediation sessions more difficult to schedule.

Any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection:

The State tried to mitigate this through the use of virtual mediations and scheduling mediations outside of standard operating hours. Training opportunities for conducting virtual mediation sessions were also provided to mediators. The State has tried to provide as much flexibility as appropriate to all parties to navigate this situation while still meeting the needs of students while satisfying reporting requirements.

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

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:

Sara E. Green

Title:

Interim Assistant Superintendent

Email:

sara.e.green@ode.state.or.us

Phone:

971-388-4233

Submitted on:

02/01/21 8:00:10 PM