

Arkansas SPP/APR Summary of Stakeholder Involvement for Target Setting and Improvement Activities

In Spring 2021, Arkansas began developing a plan of action to establish a representative broad stakeholder group from across the state to complement the work of the Special Education Advisory Council. Invitations were sent to 46 individuals of which many have dual roles. Only one person declined the invitation. This select stakeholder group represented the five regions of the state, multiple race/ethnicities and included both males and females. Further the representation was composed of 12 parents, 4 related service providers, 8 early childhood providers, 2 early childhood coordinators, 12 district special education supervisors, 7 general/special education teachers, 4 personnel from state agencies, and 4 superintendents/principals. This stakeholder group, as well as advisory members, DESE OSE staff and TA providers, participated in a series of webinars on indicator target setting and improvement activities. Each session was split into breakout rooms so the groups were small enough to encourage discussion.

Each virtual session was scheduled for 1.5 hours and began with an overview of the indicator(s) being discussed. Stakeholders were provided data sheets which included the historical data for the indicator(s) based on the new measurements. The data sheets also provided proposed target setting methodologies and the projected targets for each methodology. Stakeholders were asked to select the methodologies the State could apply. Each data set also had a set of questions to guide the discussion of baseline and target setting. The baseline guiding questions were:

1. What year do you think is appropriate for a baseline year?
2. What is the justification for selecting that year?

Target setting guiding questions asked stakeholders to look at the different methodologies presented and discuss:

1. Which methodology do you believe provides a realistic projection?
2. Are there any methodologies that would not exceed the baseline year?
3. Is there a different methodology that you would like to see applied such as a flat rate?
4. Could we apply a methodology differently than presented? Such as adding .79 to the baseline for average difference and showing incremental increases over the years.
5. Other discussion(s) around the indicator.

The first virtual session was held April 27, 2021 and focused on Indicator 1: Graduation and Indicator 2: Dropout. The participants were split into two breakout groups. Graduation was discussed and then the groups were brought back together for reporting out on their thoughts and discussions. Then the same process occurred for dropout. For each virtual stakeholder meeting the same process was followed. The second virtual session was held on May 11, 2021 and focused on

Indicator 3: Assessment. The stakeholder group was split into two groups with a total of four breakout sessions being conducted to cover all four sub-indicators. The third virtual session was held on May 25, 2021 and had two breakout groups. The school age group covered Indicators 5: Education Environment (k-12), Indicator 8: Family Involvement, and Indicator 14: Post-school Outcomes. The early childhood group covered Indicators 6: Preschool Environments, Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes, and Indicator 8: Family Involvement.

The State Special Education Advisory Council was a second group of stakeholders who were involved in providing target and improvement activities. The virtual State Advisory meetings held in April, July, and October 2021, and January 2022 focused on setting new targets and discussion of improvement strategies. The Advisory Council representation includes: Parents (10), Adult Corrections, Advocates (2), AR Rehabilitation Services (2), Career & Technical Education (2), Center for Exceptional Families (PTI), Foster Care, Higher Education, Juvenile Corrections, LEA Special Education Supervisors, McKinney-Vento Administrator, Teachers (4), Private School, and Public Charter Schools. During these meetings, the council members and public participants were provided updates on the previously held stakeholder input sessions; compliance indicators were discussed (Indicator 4B: Discipline, Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation, Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in a Specific Disability Category, Indicator 11: Child Find, Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition, Indicator 13: Secondary Transition), dispute resolution Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions and Indicator 16: Mediation, and Indicator 17 which is the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Information was provided on how the local APR profiles would be affected by the new measurements, especially around Indicator 1: Graduation & Indicator 2: Dropout. A breakdown of each Advisory meeting discussion is provided below.

- April 2021: Overview of the SPP/APR package measurement table.
- July 2021: Overview of stakeholder engagement meetings and additional input on baseline and target setting for Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 17.
- October 2021: Discussed the effect of the new graduation and drop out measurements on the local APRs; Indicator 3: Assessment was presented with the 2021 assessment data; compliance indicators, and Indicator 17.
- January 2022: Presentation of the APR with the targets set for the next six years and any feedback which could lead to changes for the final submission.

Opportunities were also provided at four state conferences: ADE Summit, Arkansas School-Based Therapy Conference, Arkansas Collaborative Consultants Fall Convening, and the LEA Academy. An overview is provided below.

- The ADE Summit was held in June 2021 and had two sessions.
 - The first was on Indicators 1 and 2 while the second was on Indicator 6.
 - Ten participants provided feedback and represented district administrators (2), special education administrators (7), early childhood coordinators (3), teachers (2) and parents (5).
 - For each session participants were provided handouts with datasets and guiding questions.
 - An overview of the data was presented and the questions discussed.
 - Stakeholders wrote their comments on the handout and returned them at the end for compilation.

The handout also had a few questions about demographics and group/organization affiliation(s).
- The Arkansas School-Based Therapy Conference was held in September 2021 with 220 participants, and the Arkansas Collaborative Consultants Fall Convening was held in October 2021 with 84 participants.
 - At both meetings, components of the Indicator 17: SSIP improvement strategies were discussed and feedback solicited on the messaging, inclusion of initiatives and overall direction of the SSIP.
 - Feedback was provided on the SSIP Theory of Action, and as a result, Universal Design for Learning will be added as an initiative of focus within the coherent system of support.
- The LEA Academy was held in October 2021.
 - This conference is attended primarily by special education administrators and early childhood coordinators.
 - One session at the LEA Academy focused on Indicator 3: Assessment.
 - There were approximately 25 special education administrators in attendance and 15 provided feedback.
 - The data presented included the 2020/21 statewide assessment results.
 - Participants received a copy of the historical data, two methodologies for target setting, along with the guiding questions.
 - They had the option to submit comments/feedback through a google form as well as returning the handout.

To gather more family input, a special stakeholder session was held with a group of parents organized by one of State's PTI centers, in December 2021. Although many families were invited to participate only three were available to attend. However, the information shared was also sent to the families who were unable to attend that day with instructions

on how they could provide feedback. We provided an overview of previous stakeholder input results on those indicators with major changes and provided them the opportunity to provide additional feedback on the final targets and activities.

Besides discussing Indicator 17 at each quarterly Advisory Council meeting, there was a separate Indicator 17 SSIP stakeholder input session with the school districts/buildings participating in the project in January 2022. This session focused on SSIP updates surrounding state initiatives, and the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR) targets through FFY2025. The current state initiatives involved with inclusive practices and outlined in the SSIP theory of action are being scaled to include greater numbers of educators and administrators across Arkansas, and to build capacity for job-embedded coaching supports. As more educators are trained in how to implement major initiatives, it is anticipated that progress towards the targets outlined in the SPP/APR will be accelerated.

The following section provides an overview of stakeholder input and the final targets for each indicator.

Indicator 1: Graduation		Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))				
Baseline Year	Baseline Data	Arkansas selected the 2017-18 of the 618-exiting data for the baseline year. Through various stakeholder input sessions, the stakeholders wanted an average of the three years prior to 2019-20 because of the effects from the pandemic. School year 2017-18 best represented the three-year average. Discussions were held around using a standard deviation, moving average, annual percentage point change or selecting a flat rate similar to what the state had under NCLB. The final decision was to set a flat rate of 88% as the target for all years.				
2017	87.56%					
FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	88.00%	88.00%	88.00%	88.00%	88.00%	88.00%
Indicator 2: Dropout		Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))				
Baseline Year	Baseline Data	Arkansas selected the 2017-18 of the 618-exiting data for the baseline year. Through various stakeholder input sessions, the stakeholders wanted to align the drop out baseline year with graduation. Target setting discussions were held around using a standard deviation, moving average, annual percentage point change or selecting a flat rate. The final decision was to set a flat rate of 10% as the target for all years. Ten percent is the average rate for the past few years prior to the pandemic. In addition, by setting the drop out targets to 10% and the graduation target to 88%, this allows Arkansas to account for the future alternate pathway graduates in the remaining 2% along with those students reaching maximum age and graduating with a certificate.				
2017	10.69%					
FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%
Indicator 3: Assessment		Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: A. Participation rate for children with IEPs. B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards. C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards. D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school.				
Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs on Statewide Assessments		Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)].				
		During the stakeholder virtual and in person meetings on assessment, stakeholders agreed to maintain the 95% participation requirement of ESEA for all grade levels and subject matters across the years of the SPP. The baseline is most recent assessment data, school year 2020-21.				

Baseline Data - Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs on Statewide Assessments

Subject	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	Grade 4	2020	97.85%
Reading	Grade 8	2020	95.28%
Reading	Grade HS	2020	93.00%
Math	Grade 4	2020	98.04%
Math	Grade 8	2020	95.75%
Math	Grade HS	2020	93.85%

Targets - Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs on Statewide Assessments

Subject	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

<p>Indicator 3B: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)].</p> <p>During the stakeholder virtual and in person meetings on assessment, stakeholders agreed to establish the baseline using the most recent assessment data, school year 2020-21. Additionally, stakeholder feedback recommended increasing the targets for each grade and subject by one standard deviation by FFY 2025. Standard deviations were calculated for each grade and subject using current and historical data. The standard deviation(s) were proportionately applied to establish the year to year increases from baseline for each grade level and subject matter.</p>
---	--

Baseline Data - Indicator 3B: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards

Subject	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	Grade 4	2020	6.68%
Reading	Grade 8	2020	4.46%
Reading	Grade HS	2020	3.56%
Math	Grade 4	2020	14.23%
Math	Grade 8	2020	3.54%
Math	Grade HS	2020	2.58%

Targets - Indicator 3B: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards

Subject	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	Grade 4	6.68%	6.91%	7.13%	7.36%	7.59%	7.81%
Reading	Grade 8	4.46%	4.73%	5.01%	5.27%	5.55%	5.83%
Reading	Grade HS	3.56%	3.71%	3.85%	3.99%	4.14%	4.29%
Math	Grade 4	14.23%	14.57%	14.90%	15.24%	15.57%	15.91%
Math	Grade 8	3.54%	3.83%	4.11%	4.40%	4.69%	4.98%
Math	Grade HS	2.58%	2.71%	2.83%	2.96%	3.08%	3.21%

<p>Indicator 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment)].</p> <p>During the stakeholder virtual and in person meetings on assessment, stakeholders agreed to establish the baseline using the most recent assessment data, school year 2020-21. Additionally, stakeholder feedback recommended increasing the targets for each grade level and subject matter using a full or partial standard deviation. Standard deviations were calculated for each grade and subject using current and historical data. Based on the historical and current data, math targets were set to increase by 1/3 of a standard deviation by FFY 2025 for all grades. For reading language arts, fourth grade targets are set to increase by a full standard deviation by FFY 2025; eighth grade will increase by 1/2 of a standard deviation, and high school will increase by 1/4 of a standard deviation. All interim year targets were proportionately increased for grade level and subject matter, accordingly.</p>
---	---

Baseline Data - Indicator 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards

Subject	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	Grade 4	2020	30.57%
Reading	Grade 8	2020	15.00%
Reading	Grade HS	2020	11.21%
Math	Grade 4	2020	11.50%
Math	Grade 8	2020	12.04%
Math	Grade HS	2020	15.21%

Targets - Indicator 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards

Subject	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	Grade 4	30.57%	32.66%	34.74%	36.83%	38.91%	40.99%
Reading	Grade 8	15.00%	17.87%	19.96%	22.05%	24.13%	26.22%
Reading	Grade HS	11.21%	16.35%	18.43%	20.52%	22.60%	24.69%
Math	Grade 4	11.50%	14.92%	18.35%	21.77%	25.20%	28.62%
Math	Grade 8	12.04%	16.30%	20.56%	24.82%	29.08%	33.33%
Math	Grade HS	15.21%	19.22%	23.24%	27.25%	31.26%	35.28%

Indicator 3D: Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year)].

During the stakeholder virtual and in person meetings on assessment, stakeholders agreed to establish the baseline using school year 2018-19 pre-covid assessment data. They believed the pre-covid data was more of an accurate representation of the GAP than the 2020-21 assessment results. Additionally, stakeholders recommended decreasing the targets for each grade level and subject matter using a full standard deviation. Standard deviations were calculated for each grade and subject using current and historical data. The targets are to decrease by one standard deviation by FFY 2025. The standard deviation is proportionately applied for the interim year targets.

Baseline Data – Indicator 3D: Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

Subject	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	Grade 4	2020	35.74%
Reading	Grade 8	2020	43.30%
Reading	Grade HS	2020	38.02%
Math	Grade 4	2020	34.34%
Math	Grade 8	2020	41.47%
Math	Grade HS	2020	28.71%

Targets - Indicator 3D: Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards

Subject	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	Grade 4	35.24%	34.74 %	34.24%	33.74%	33.24%	32.74%
Reading	Grade 8	42.75%	42.20%	41.65%	41.10%	40.55%	40.00%
Reading	Grade HS	37.35%	36.69%	36.02%	35.35%	34.69%	34.02%
Math	Grade 4	33.83%	33.32%	32.81%	32.30%	31.79%	31.28%
Math	Grade 8	40.12%	38.77%	37.42%	36.07%	34.72%	33.37%
Math	Grade HS	28.24%	27.78%	27.31%	26.84%	26.38%	25.91%

Indicator 4: Discipline

Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Indicator 4A: Rates of Suspension and Expulsion		Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs				
Baseline Year	Baseline Data	The measurement of the indicator was discussed with stakeholders and they agreed to keep the current methodology and criteria for identifying districts as having a significant discrepancy in discipline. With the 2019-20 and 2020-21 discipline data being highly affected by the pandemic, the decision was made with stakeholder feedback to decrease the targets annually by 0.3 percentage points. There is no change to the baseline year.				
2016	30.14%					
FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	29.80%	29.50%	29.20%	28.90%	28.60%	28.30%
Indicator 4B: Rates of Suspension and Expulsion by Race/Ethnicity		Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.				
Baseline Year	Baseline Data	The indicator was discussed with stakeholders, it is a compliance indicator and all targets are 0.00%				
2016	0.00%					
FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Indicator 5: Education Environments (k-12)		Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served: A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.				
Indicator 5A: Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.				
Baseline Year	Baseline Data	During the stakeholder virtual and in person meetings on school age educational environment stakeholders were informed that the baseline year was already established in the prior SPP/APR when we changed the data set. For the FFY 2020-2025 targets they recommended setting the targets for 5A to increase and 5B to decrease by one standard deviation by FFY 2025 and set 5C at a flat rate of 1.99%.				
2019	56.94%					
FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	57.32%	57.70%	58.07%	58.45%	58.82%	59.20%
Indicator 5B: Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.				
Baseline Year	Baseline Data	During the stakeholder virtual and in person meetings on school age educational environment stakeholders were informed that the baseline year was already established in the prior SPP/APR when we changed the data set. For the FFY 2020-2025 targets they recommended setting the targets for 5A to increase and 5B to decrease by one standard deviation by FFY 2025 and set 5C at a flat rate of 1.99%.				
2019	12.18%					
FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	12.08%	11.98%	11.88%	11.78%	11.68%	11.58%
Indicator 5C: In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.		Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.				
Baseline Year	Baseline Data	During the stakeholder virtual and in person meetings on school age educational environment stakeholders were informed that the baseline year was already established in the prior SPP/APR when we changed the data set. For the FFY 2020-2025 targets they recommended setting the targets for 5A to increase and 5B to decrease by one standard deviation by FFY 2025 and set 5C at a flat rate of 1.99%.				
2019	2.01%					
FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	1.99%	1.99%	1.99%	1.99%	1.99%	1.99%

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments		Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a: A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility. C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.					
Indicator 6A: Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program		Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.					
Baseline Year	Baseline Data	During the stakeholder virtual and in person meetings on preschool educational environment stakeholders were informed that the baseline year was already established in the prior SPP/APR for 6A and 6B when we changed the data set. The stakeholders agreed on using the FFY2020 data for the 6C baseline. Additional, discussions resulted in selecting a full or partial standard deviation to establish the FFY 2020-2025 targets. Indicator 6A and 6C will improve by a one standard deviation by FFY 2025 and 6B will improve by 1/2 of a standard deviation.					
2019	20.74%						
FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	
Target >=	21.44%	22.13%	22.83%	23.53%	24.22%	24.92%	
Indicator 6B: Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.					
Baseline Year	Baseline Data	During the stakeholder virtual and in person meetings on preschool educational environment stakeholders were informed that the baseline year was already established in the prior SPP/APR for 6A and 6B when we changed the data set. The stakeholders agreed on using the FFY2020 data for the 6C baseline. Additional, discussions resulted in selecting a full or partial standard deviation to establish the FFY 2020-2025 targets. Indicator 6A and 6C will improve by a one standard deviation by FFY 2025 and 6B will improve by 1/2 of a standard deviation.					
2019	20.21%						
FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	
Target >=	19.73%	19.25%	18.77%	18.29%	17.81%	17.31%	
Indicator 6C: Receiving special education and related services in the home.		Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.					
Baseline Year	Baseline Data	During the stakeholder virtual and in person meetings on preschool educational environment stakeholders were informed that the baseline year was already established in the prior SPP/APR for 6A and 6B when we changed the data set. The stakeholders agreed on using the FFY2020 data for the 6C baseline. Additional, discussions resulted in selecting a full or partial standard deviation to establish the FFY 2020-2025 targets. Indicator 6A and 6C will improve by a one standard deviation by FFY 2025 and 6B will improve by 1/2 of a standard deviation.					
2020	1.08%						
FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	
Target >=	1.99%	1.99%	1.99%	1.99%	1.99%	1.99%	
Indicator 7: Early Childhood Outcomes		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.					
Summary Statements and Measurements 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.					

Indicator 11: Child Find		Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.				
Baseline Year	Baseline Data	The indicator was discussed with stakeholders; however, it is a compliance indicator and the targets are always 100.00%				
2005	91.91%					
FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Indicator 12: Early Child Transition		Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.				
Baseline Year	Baseline Data	The indicator was discussed with stakeholders; however, it is a compliance indicator and the targets are always 100.00%				
2005	75.91%					
FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition		Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs...				
Baseline Year	Baseline Data	The indicator was discussed with stakeholders; however, it is a compliance indicator and the targets are always 100.00%				
2009	96.34%					
FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Indicator 14: 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: A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school. B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school. C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school				
Indicator 14 A: Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.						
Baseline Year	Baseline Data	Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.				
2009	12.86%					
FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	13.06%	13.26%	13.46%	13.66%	13.86%	14.06%
Indicator 14 B: Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.						
Baseline Year	Baseline Data	Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.				
2009	48.55%					
FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	49.21%	49.87%	50.53%	51.19%	51.85%	52.51%
Indicator 14 C: Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school						
Baseline Year	Baseline Data	Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.				
2009	59.34%					
FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	59.89%	60.44%	60.99%	61.54%	62.09%	62.64%

Indicator 15: Resolution Session		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))				
Baseline Year	Baseline Data	Stakeholders were presented with various methodologies that could be applied to setting targets for Indicator 15. Actual data for this indicator fluctuates widely from year to year. After the discussions, it was decided to repeat the targets from the previous SPP.				
2005	50.00%					
FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	56.96%	58.92%	60.88%	62.84%	64.80%	66.76%
Indicator 16: Mediation		Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements				
Baseline Year	Baseline Data	Stakeholders were presented the data and various methods which could be applied to setting targets for Indicator 16. After reviewing the data sets, stakeholders agreed that with the uncertainty of the data from year to year, especially in relation to the pandemic that a flat rate would be the best targets through FFY 2025.				
2005	52.00%					
FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan		The State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR) is the percent of students with disabilities (SWD) in grades 3-5, from the targeted schools, whose value-added score (VAS) in reading is moderate or high for the same subject and grade level in the state.				
Baseline Year	Baseline Data	Stakeholders were presented the data and various methods which could be applied to setting targets for Indicator 17. After reviewing the data sets, stakeholders agreed that with the uncertainty of the data from year to year, especially in relation to the pandemic that a flat rate would be the best targets through FFY 2025.				
2016	59.53%					
FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	60.66%	61.50%	62.33%	63.16%	63.37%	64.50%