

OK Part B

FFY2014 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

On most accountability indicators, Oklahoma improved its score. Some highlights include:

- In reading and math assessment participation, Oklahoma jumped more than five percentage points to achieve nearly a 99 percent participation rate (Indicators 3B).
- Educational environment scores improved for older and preschool students, and show that special education children are spending a substantial portion of their days with general education children (Indicators 5 & 6).
- Preschool outcomes show tremendous improvement for both growth and peer-level functioning scores. In every case, Oklahoma scores well above state targets (Indicators 7).
- Secondary transition compliance increased, moving closer to full compliance (Indicator 13).
- Post-secondary outcomes also improved in FFY 2014, with nearly 27 percent of 2014 graduates in higher education and nearly 86 percent in school or employed (Indicators 14; data is based on survey responses).

In some areas, Oklahoma declined on indicator scores. Specifically:

- The 2014 graduation rate of special education children decreased by a percentage point and is nearly ten points below the state target (Indicator 1).
- Reading and math proficiency ratings decreased substantially, from the mid-50s to the mid-30s and are now far below target (Indicators 3B).
- The long-term suspension/expulsion rate increased above the state target, although no districts were cited as having policies and procedures that promoted disproportionate identification (Indicators 4).
- Parents' rating of districts' efforts to involve parents decreased slightly, although it is still above target (Indicator 8).

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	Remove
part b spp-apr certificate.pdf	Erik Friend		<input type="button" value="R"/> e m o v e

In order to ensure consistent data across indicators, provide the number of districts in this field and the data will be loaded into the applicable indicator data tables.

546

This data will be prepopulated in indicators B3A, B4A, B4B, B9, and B10.

General Supervision System:

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

Oklahoma's general supervision system is designed to ensure the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA) of 2004. The main purpose of the State system is to support and build capacity for effective implementation of the (IDEA) by the State, as well as local education agencies (LEAs) in order to improve outcomes for students with disabilities in Oklahoma. This system is designed to: a) ensure compliance with federal and state regulations and b) improve services and results for students with disabilities. General supervision of LEAs in Oklahoma includes the review of quantitative and

qualitative data, according to the targets identified with stakeholder input, in the Oklahoma State Performance Plan (SPP). These indicators measure compliance and performance in the areas of a free appropriate public education (FAPE), least restrictive environment (LRE), child find (including disproportionate representation by race/ethnicity that is the result of inappropriate identification), dispute resolution, and transition services.

To coordinate the development of the Annual Performance Report (APR) for annual submission, the Oklahoma State Department of Education - Special Education Services (OSDE-SES) maintains a team of personnel with specific indicator assignments. This team collects and analyzes data, drafts responses, shares progress with internal staff and external stakeholders and evaluates implementation and impact of improvement activities for each indicator. In accordance with the IDEA, the OSDE-SES employs general supervision activities that include monitoring LEAs with particular emphasis on improving educational results and functional outcomes for all students with disabilities while ensuring that LEAs meet the requirements of the IDEA Part B. The OSDE-SES implements procedures for monitoring activities in accordance with the IDEA Part B, federal regulation 34 CFR § 300.600 State monitoring and enforcement.

Multiple data sources are used to monitor special education programs for continuous examination of performance for compliance and improvement. These data sources include, but are not limited to, the Oklahoma Special Education Child Count System, Oklahoma's A-F Grading System, Phone Log data, Complaint Log, other qualitative data, and critical and/or special investigative audits and findings related to special education. Oklahoma's comprehensive monitoring system for continuous improvement is designed to: a) identify areas of compliance and noncompliance from a variety of sources; b) assist LEAs in correction of identified noncompliance with the IDEA Part B requirements and Special Education policies and procedures (within 12 months of the notification of non-compliance); c) assist LEAs with the development of corrective action and program improvement plans; d) ensure that identified noncompliance is corrected as soon as possible, but no later than one year from the time of identification; e) provide the LEA sites with support and technical assistance; f) verify that the data reported reflect actual practice; and g) ensure consistency with the requirements set forth in the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02.

In 2014-2015, our system was improved by adding the Critical Questions Framework (Attachment 1), which drives Oklahoma's comprehensive monitoring system. This framework classifies the seventeen IDEA Indicators using four questions, which highlight the relationship among the indicators. It is designed to assist LEAs in their focus on indicator data to improve services and results for students with disabilities. The Critical Questions Framework informs each component of the comprehensive monitoring system. These components are Tiered Compliance Review and Systemic Improvement Review.

Tiered Compliance Review - The OSDE-SES monitors every LEA in the State each year, using the data available for each of the compliance indicators identified in the SPP. For each LEA, data submitted through the Oklahoma Special Education Child Count System (i.e., Child Count and Data/End of Year Report) are compared to the targets for each compliance indicator identified in the SPP. District Determinations identify any areas of noncompliance for each LEA based on the data in each DDP. The OSDE-SES determines whether each LEA: a) Meets Requirements, b) Needs Assistance, c) Needs Intervention, or d) Needs Substantial Intervention. Determinations are made annually and LEA superintendents are notified of district status.

Issuance of Finding(s) - Whenever a finding of noncompliance is identified, the LEA is notified, in writing, of the area(s) of noncompliance and may be required to develop either an Improvement Plan and/or Corrective Action Plan (CAP) (Attachment 3) that addresses identified areas of noncompliance and includes improvement strategies to ensure correction. The LEA is informed of the area(s) of noncompliance and the timeline for correction in writing. The OSDE-SES assists the LEA in completing the required improvement plan or CAP and provide ongoing technical assistance until requirements are completed. The LEA must demonstrate child-specific corrections and systemic compliance through data verification conducted by the OSDE-SES, in accordance with the U.S. Department of Education, the OSEP Memo 09-02. LEAs must demonstrate both prongs (child-specific-Prong I and systemic Prong II) of correction as soon as possible, but no later than one year from the notification of non-compliance.

LEAs identified as Meets Requirements demonstrate adequate compliance regarding the implementation of the IDEA. However, activities may be required based on level of noncompliance. In addition, LEAs will be required to demonstrate timely correction of noncompliance. The LEA may request Targeted Technical Assistance (TTA) from the OSDE-SES at any time.

When an LEA is identified as Needs Assistance, the LEA will be required to develop an Improvement Plan to address the identified areas of noncompliance. The OSDE-SES will also advise the LEA of available sources of technical assistance to address the area(s)

needing improvement. These sources may include assistance from the OSDE-SES, other federal agencies, technical assistance providers approved by the OSDE-SES, and other federally funded nonprofit agencies. Technical assistance may include— (i) The provision of advice by experts to address the area(s) in which the LEA needs assistance, including explicit plans for addressing the area for concern within a specified period of time; and (ii) Assistance in identifying and implementing professional development, instructional strategies, and methods of instruction that are based on scientifically based research.

When an LEA is identified as Needs Intervention, the LEA will be required to develop (in consultation with the OSDE-SES) a CAP that addresses all identified areas of noncompliance and a timeline for systemic improvement that will occur within one year. The LEA will also be required to participate in an on-site review. The OSDE-SES will advise the LEA of available sources of technical assistance to address the areas needing improvement. These sources may include assistance from the OSDE-SES, other federal agencies, technical assistance providers approved by the OSDE-SES, and other federally funded nonprofit agencies. Technical assistance may include— (i) The provision of advice by experts to address the areas in which the LEA needs assistance, including explicit plans for addressing the area for concern within a specified period of time; and (ii) Assistance in identifying and implementing professional development, instructional strategies, and methods of instruction that are based on scientifically based research.

When an LEA is identified as Needs Substantial Intervention the LEA will be required to develop a CAP that addresses all identified areas of noncompliance and a timeline for systemic improvement that will occur within one year. The LEA will also be required to participate in an on-site review. The OSDE-SES will also advise the LEA of available sources of technical assistance to address the areas needing improvement. These sources may include assistance from the OSDE-SES, other federal agencies, technical assistance providers approved by the OSDE-SES, and other federally funded nonprofit agencies. Technical assistance may include— (i) The provision of advice by experts to address the areas in which the LEA needs assistance, including explicit plans for addressing the area for concern within a specified period of time; and (ii) Assistance in identifying and implementing professional development, instructional strategies, and methods of instruction that are based on scientifically based research.

Federal Fiscal Management - IDEA funds are provided for the excess cost of special education and related services for students with disabilities. IDEA funds are intended to supplement and not supplant State, local or other federal funds. Funds are awarded to the OSDE by the United States Department of Education (USDE), Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), to "flow-through" to the LEA contingent upon an LEA's application for Part B funds. Flow-through funds are formula based on the number of students with disabilities ages 3 through 21 served on December 1st, 1999, as well as the total student enrollment in the LEA (in both public and private schools located in the LEA) and the poverty level of the LEA (defined as the free and reduced lunch count within the LEA). The OSDE must ensure fiscal accountability at each phase in the distribution and use of the IDEA Part B funds. Annual independent audits of financial transactions and compliance of each LEA are required by Oklahoma State law (70 O.S. § 22-103). Federal regulations (OMB Circular A-133) require a financial and compliance audit of all programs receiving federal funds in excess of \$500,000. These regulations (34 CFR Part 74) ensure that audits will be made on an organization-wide basis rather than a grant-by-grant basis, according to the standards and procedures expressed therein. Oklahoma's system of general supervision includes a process to provide oversight in the distribution and use of IDEA funds at the State and local level. Information on these processes can be found in the Special Education Funding Manual for IDEA Part B found at ok.gov/sde/finance.

The purpose of the OSDE's online Special Education Funding Manual is to provide a comprehensive overview of fiscal policies, procedures, and mechanisms by which the OSDE accounts for the IDEA funds requirements, including: Use of Amounts, Private School Proportionate Share, Coordinated Early Intervening Services, School-wide Programs, Additional Fiscal Requirements, and Allocations to LEAs. Each LEA must complete Assurances and Agreements annually at the beginning of each fiscal year. This activity must take place before the IDEA Consolidated Application is available for LEAs to budget IDEA Part B funds. Each LEA must submit a count of children with disabilities ages 3 through 21 who are on IEPs; specific district-level data, and fulfill all required fiscal activities set forth by the IDEA. Fiscal information is entered into and monitored by the Online Grants Management System. Fiscal budgeting and claims processing are monitored by personnel dedicated to providing technical assistance for LEAs in finance, data, and compliance. When conducting an On-Site Review, the LEA will be required to complete the IDEA Part B Financial Monitoring Checklist (see Attachment 4).

Data on Processes and Results - As part of Oklahoma's general supervision responsibilities, data are used for decision making about program management and improvement. This process includes: (1) Data collection and verification, (2) Data examination and

analysis, (3) Public reporting of data, (4) Status determination, and (5) Improvement activities.

Data Collection and Verification - IDEA requires that data are collected from LEAs through a state-reported data collection system and reported in the APR. The State requires LEAs to regularly update the data, and the State routinely examines the collected data. The State uses the data, as well as information from other sources, such as other state-collected data, patterns, and trends in dispute resolution data and previous findings, to evaluate the performance of the State and the LEAs on the SPP indicators. These data are also useful in identifying the LEAs in need of monitoring, especially when these data can be compared across SPP/APR indicators. The State requires that data collected from the LEAs are accurate, as well as submitted in a timely manner. Accuracy has multiple levels, including that the data follow rules of entry or submission and that they reflect actual practice.

Data Examination and Analysis - The State examines data in a variety of ways to identify and determine patterns and trends.

Public Reporting of Data - The SPP is available on the OSDE-SES website, and is also distributed through public agencies. Each year, special education reporting dates are posted to build capacity for LEAs to report timely and accurate data. Additional information about the special education reports and due dates are included in the Oklahoma Special Education Data Manual found at sde.ok.gov/sde/documents/2012-10-01/special-education-data-and-reporting-part-b-children-ages-3-through-21.

Improvement Activities - As described in the SPP, ongoing State activities are used for program improvement and progress measurement. Oklahoma also coordinates The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) school improvement activities with SPP improvement activities. Technical assistance activities, designed to address the needs of each individual LEA, are based on data that are collected.

On-Site Review - LEAs receiving a determination of Needs Substantial Intervention will receive an On-Site Review. Districts that receive a district determination of "Meets Requirements", "Needs Assistance", or "Needs Intervention" may also receive an On-site Review. In addition to an LEA's level of determination for the tiered compliance review, the OSDE-SES may conduct an on-site review with regard to phone logs, concern-specific correspondence with the public as well as LEA personnel, and formal complaints filed with the state education agency, or other considerations. On-Site Reviews are comprehensive in nature and may include (but are not limited to): 1) IDEA Part B fiscal reviews; 2) review of student records; 3) data verification review; 4) interviews with LEA personnel; 5) individual student tracking; 6) parent interviews; or 7) other issues as identified. A finding is issued for each area of noncompliance identified. The OSDE-SES may prescribe a CAP or Improvement Plan that addresses identified areas of non-compliance and includes improvement strategies to ensure correction.

Continuous Compliance Review - The OSDE-SES must ensure that the LEA has demonstrated systemic compliance for each individual case of noncompliance that was identified. This verification of systemic compliance must occur as soon as possible. In ensuring that the LEA is demonstrating systemic compliance, the OSDE-SES will: a) Notify the LEA of the Continuous Compliance Review within 6 months of the issuance of findings; b) Require each LEA to submit a reasonable sample of confidential student records and other documentation necessary for the OSDE-SES to verify systemic compliance. The reasonable sample will be determined based on the current enrollment of students receiving special education services; c) Obtain records via mail request; on-site visit; or electronic Individualized Education Program (IEP) database; d) Review the records utilizing the Verification of Continuous Compliance process to determine if the LEA continues to be in compliance with IDEA Part B requirements within 30 days of receipt of the requested documents. The LEA will be contacted by the OSDE-SES if additional documentation is necessary to verify compliance. When the LEA is determined to be in compliance, the LEA will be notified via U.S. Mail. All areas of noncompliance must be corrected within one year of the OSDE-SES notification to the LEA. If an LEA does not meet requirements through the verification of continuous compliance the finding(s) will not be closed and the LEA will be notified in writing of the requirement to participate in an on-site compliance review and subsequent verification of continuous compliance. All documents related to the Continuous Compliance Review are located at: sde.ok.gov/sde/compliance.

Part B Funding - The OSDE-SES may require LEAs to set aside funding allocations to address areas of noncompliance or to re-budget funding allocations. The LEA or State agency will be given reasonable notice and an opportunity for a hearing prior to the redirection of funds. Hearing procedures shall be in accordance with federal regulations for State Administered Programs (34 CFR §§ 76.401 and 34 CFR 76.783) and the General Education Provisions Act (34 CFR §§ 81.30-81.45).

Oklahoma Dispute Resolution in Special Education: Several mechanisms are available through the OSDE to assist in resolving disputes. The processes provide IEP facilitation, mediation, formal complaints, due process hearings, facilitated resolution sessions,

and expedited due process hearings. The Special Education Resolution Center (SERC) manages the special education due process hearing system for the State of Oklahoma. SERC's duties have been expanded to include innovative programs to assist parents and LEAs to settle disputes at the earliest stage possible. At no cost to either party, SERC provides highly trained mediators to assist with disputes which may develop at any time during the relationship of the parties over special education issues. Additionally, SERC provides highly trained facilitators during required resolution sessions of due process. SERC provides stakeholder training that supports mutual collaboration. More information on SERC can be located at ok.gov/abletech/Special_Education_Resolution_Center/.

IEP Facilitation - IEP facilitation is a voluntary process for which a facilitator is appointed to facilitate an IEP team meeting. The role of the facilitator is to help team members communicate more effectively and efficiently. IEP facilitation supports early dispute resolution, providing assistance to the IEP team before a potential conflict develops into a more serious dispute. The facilitator is an impartial third party, not a member of the IEP team, and has no stake in decisions made by the team. A request for IEP facilitation may be made by the parent and/or adult student or by an LEA representative, such as the director of special education. Requests may be made in writing or by phone to SERC.

Mediation - The OSDE has developed a mediation system (see Attachment 5) to help resolve disagreements between LEAs and parents and/or adult students regarding the identification, evaluation, educational placement, and the provision of a FAPE. A request for mediation may be made by the parent and/or adult student or the LEA at any point without the necessity of requesting a due process hearing. Requests may be made in writing or by phone to the resolution center. The ultimate goal of mediation is to obtain a written agreement that is acceptable to both parties. Mediation agreements are legally binding. Even if a written agreement is not achieved, mediation may be helpful in clarifying issues. Following a request for mediation, the SERC will contact the other party and ask whether they are willing to participate in mediation. Mediation may not be used to deny or delay the right to a due process hearing or any other rights afforded to students and parents.

Formal Complaints - The OSDE-SES utilizes complaint procedures outlined in the IDEA Part B, federal regulation 34 CFR § 300.152 Minimum State complaint procedures. A formal complaint (see Attachment 6) may be filed with the OSDE by any individual or organization who believes the LEA or other education agency has violated a requirement of IDEA. The OSDE will accept a complaint received by mail, fax or hand delivery. The complaint must be in writing and include the following information: a) The name, address, and telephone number of the person making the complaint (or available contact information); b) The signature of the person making the complaint; c) If alleging violations regarding a specific student, the name and address of the student involved (or available contact information in the case of a homeless student or family); d) The school and LEA or other education agency that is the subject of the complaint; e) One or more statements (allegations) that the LEA has violated one or more requirements of IDEA Part B; f) The facts and/or a description of the events that support each allegation; and g) Proposed resolution of the problem or the relief sought to the extent known and available to the party at the time.

Due Process Hearings Requests - The OSDE-SES provides due process complaint procedures as outlined in the IDEA Part B, federal regulations 34 CFR § 300.507-518. A comprehensive outline of these regulations can be found in the United States Department of Education Federal Register, 34 CFR Parts 300 and 301. A request for a due process hearing may be made by a parent, adult student, and attorney representing the parent/adult student or the LEA (see Attachment 7). A parent and/or adult student or LEA may file a request for hearing with the other party. The request must be mailed, faxed, or hand delivered. When the request is filed the requesting party must send copies to the Dispute Resolution Coordinator at the OSDE. All applicable timelines for due process hearing and resolution sessions will start when the request has been filed with the other party and the OSDE. Oklahoma's due process system has 2 types of hearings, a regular due process hearing and an expedited due process hearing: 1. A regular due process hearing is an administrative hearing to resolve disputes on any matter related to the identification, evaluation, educational placement, and the provision of a FAPE; and 2. An expedited due process hearing is an administrative hearing to resolve disputes concerning discipline. The expedited hearing will occur within 20 school days of the request, with a decision rendered within 10 school days of the hearing.

A due process hearing may be requested on behalf of a student by a parent, by the adult student, or by an attorney representing the student. A due process hearing must be initiated within 2 years of the date the parent and/or adult student knew or should have known of the dispute. The 2 year timeline will not apply if the parent and/or adult student were prevented from requesting a hearing due to misrepresentations that the issues had been resolved or the withholding of information by the LEA required to be provided under the IDEA. A due process hearing can be initiated regarding issues pertaining to identification, evaluation, educational placement, or the provision of a FAPE if:

1. The LEA proposes to initiate or change any of these matters; or
2. The LEA refuses the parent's and/or adult student's request to initiate or change any of these matters. Additional information regarding due process complaints can be found in the Oklahoma Special Education Handbook or by contacting the SERC.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	Remove
attachment1-criticalquestionsframework.pdf	Erik Friend		<input type="button" value="R"/> e m o v e
attachment3-correctiveactionplansample.pdf	Erik Friend		<input type="button" value="R"/> e m o v e
attachment4-financialmonitoringchecklist.pdf	Erik Friend		<input type="button" value="R"/> e m o v e
attachment5-mediationbrochure.pdf	Erik Friend		<input type="button" value="R"/> e m o v e
attachment6-formalcomplaintform.pdf	Erik Friend		<input type="button" value="R"/> e m o v e
attachment7-dueprocessrequest.pdf	Erik Friend		<input type="button" value="R"/> e m o v e

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.

Targeted Technical Assistance (TTA) and Professional Development (PD) are ongoing activities and are a major part of the OSDE-SES general supervision system. Technical Assistance (TA) is designed to link directly to indicators in the SPP/APR) and to improve the level of compliance in Oklahoma LEAs. The State's comprehensive approach to technical assistance enables the Department to differentiate the scope of services provided for LEAs based on local needs. For example, the OSDE-SES makes TA available for all LEAs, such as meetings with local LEAs, webinars to support compliant implementation of the IDEA, updates via email, webinars, and training on the Oklahoma Special Education Handbook and special education forms. TA provides a framework for LEAs to build their

general supervision.

Basic TA includes providing documentation of evidence-based practices and disseminating examples of success to assist others in planning, implementation and use of tools to achieve positive outcomes. TA ranges from general levels, such as the State providing a review of best practices, to providing TTA, which includes more focused levels of support such as the state directing root cause analysis and monitoring of CAP development and subsequent correction. Successful TTA requires an ongoing negotiated and collaborative relationship. TTA includes a purposeful and planned series of activities that result in changes to policy, program, or operations that support increased capacity at the state/system/school levels. PD ranges from a basic level of providing general information to targeted and intensive PD, which is focused on data driven school improvement in LEAs, schools and classrooms. Successful research based PD involves system-wide commitment to a multi-year process of improvement. TA, TTA and PD are designed to build the capacity of individuals, schools and LEAs to plan, implement and support desired outcomes for their students. LEAs can access and request technical assistance, targeted technical assistance, or professional development in order to improve student outcomes. The State is divided into regions for various agency initiatives including TTA and PD for special education.

The OSDE-SES's role in this process is to: a) Provide data and information as requested; b) Provide technical assistance and professional development; c) Provide guidance on the development and implementation of improvement plans; and d) Ensure compliance with the IDEA and State regulations regarding the provision of special education services.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

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.

Professional Development (PD), in conjunction with TA, are an important part of the Oklahoma General Supervision System. Professional Development ranges from a basic level of providing general information to targeted and intensive PD, which is focused on data driven school improvement in LEAs, schools and classrooms. Successful research based PD involves system-wide commitment to a multi-year process of improvement. Although PD may be requested, the OSDE-SES may also offer PD or suggest PD resources based on various concerns. PD is provided in three ways: 1) As requested by LEAs, school sites, teachers, or other interested stakeholders; 2) Providing professional development resources for use by LEAs, school sites, teachers, or other interested stakeholders; and 3) As part of the Targeted Technical Assistance Process. The OSDE-SES offers many PD resources through our webpage. For the 2014-2015 school year, we created Professional Development Modules for use by LEAs, schools, and other interested stakeholders (see Attachments 8 and 9). These modules are intended for use in a workshop or other professional development settings.

When LEAs or schools identify a particular PD need for special education, they can easily access PD modules and provide local PD in a timely fashion. Importantly, these modules are intended to build coherence around best practices for the provision of special education services. Each module includes relevant background information, activities/materials, and a scripted PowerPoint presentation for a particular topic area. Presenters are free to use the modules in any way they choose. For example, a presenter might spend more time on part of a presentation depending on whether the audience is a group of special education teachers, general education teachers, administrators, or parents. If an LEA has specific procedures for the topic being discussed, those procedures should be added to the presentation. Some PD modules can be presented in at least two time formats. PD Modules include: Special Education 101; Accommodations, Early Childhood Outcomes; Policies, Handbook, Process; Secondary Transition; Academic Interventions; Universal Design for Learning; Early Childhood Environments; and Assistive Technology. Other critical PD modules are in development process. All materials related to professional development are available for download on the webpage, including the purpose and detailed instructions for usage and implementation at the district level. Requests for technical assistance and professional development from the OSDE-SES can be made through an online helpdesk. Requests are tracked to determine areas of district need.

Attachments				
File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	Remove	
attachment8-professionaldevelopmentmodulesample.pdf	Erik Friend		<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">R</div> e m o v e	
attachment9-professionaldevelopmentpptsample.pdf	Erik Friend		<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">R</div> e m o v e	

Stakeholder Involvement: apply this to all Part B results indicators

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

Targets were not revised in FFY 2014, though stakeholder involvement continued through discussions of target achievement. The OSDE focuses on achieving high outcomes for all students in the State. The vision of the OSDE is to ensure all students are college, career and citizenship ready when they graduate.

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

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2013 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 2013 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 2013 APR in 2015, is available.

The State's performance plan is available on the OSDE-SES Part B data webpage located at sde.ok.gov/sde/documents/2012-10-01/special-education-data-and-reporting-part-b-children-ages-3-through-21, and is also distributed through public agencies. Each year, special education reporting dates are posted to build capacity for LEAs to report timely and accurate data. Additional information about the special education reports and due dates are included in the Oklahoma Special Education Data Manual. Oklahoma reports annually on the targets in the SPP/APR in writing to each LEA located in the State. Additionally, the State will report annually to the public on the performance of each LEA located in the State by posting current DDPs and District Determinations on the OSDE Website. The reports are posted online as soon as is practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b) (1)(i)(A).

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

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Because it did not do so with its FFY 2013 SPP/APR, with its FFY 2014 SPP/APR, the State must provide a link showing that it has publicly reported on the FFY 2012 (July 1, 2012-June 30, 2013) and FFY 2011 (July 1, 2011-June 30, 2012) performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the State's performance plan for Indicators 1 and 3 as required by section 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) of IDEA.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response



The Indicator 1 and 3 reports for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 are posted on the OSDE-SES Part B data webpage: sde.ok.gov/sde/documents/2012-10-01/special-education-data-and-reporting-part-b-children-ages-3-through-21. FFY 2013 reports are posted on the same site.

ALSO:

"In the FFY 2012 SPP/APR, Oklahoma reported in prior Part B Indicator 15 (Timely Correction of Noncompliance) that there were 12 remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011, six remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010, and three findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 that were not corrected. With the FFY 2013, SPP/APR, Oklahoma reported that these findings remained uncorrected. The State must report, with its FFY 2014 SPP/APR, that it has corrected the 12 remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011, six remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010, and three findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2013 SPP/APR. When reporting with the FFY 2014 SPP/APR on the correction of the remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011, FFY 2010 and FFY 2009, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with a remaining finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011, FFY 2010 and FFY 2009: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02."

OSDE-SES RESPONSE: The OSDE-SES conducted compliance procedures to ensure the 12 remaining findings of noncompliance identified FFY 2011, six remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010, and three findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 have been corrected. Each LEA was notified of the areas of non-compliance and the required activities to ensure correction. Each LEA provided the OSDE-SES with documentation and data to demonstrate the corrections had been made. To ensure the LEAs were implementing the specific regulatory requirements in accordance with the IDEA, the OSDE-SES verified those corrections by reviewing an additional set of documentation and data. The OSDE-SES was able to ensure the LEA had made the child-specific corrections and maintained systemic compliance in accordance with OSEP Memo 09-02.

OSEP Response

OSEP's response to the State's FFY 2013 SPP/APR required the State to provide, with its FFY 2014 SPP/APR, a link showing that it has publicly reported on the FFY 2012 (July 1, 2012-June 30, 2013) and FFY 2011 (July 1, 2011-June 30, 2012) performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the State's performance plan for Indicators 1 and 3, as required by section 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) of IDEA. The State provided the required link.

Required Actions

Indicator 1: Graduation

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			89.78%	84.60%	67.80%	67.80%	82.40%	82.40%	82.40%	85.00%
Data		88.26%	82.89%	84.22%	82.30%	82.30%	84.95%	84.50%	80.02%	78.49%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%

Key:

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

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	12/2/2015	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	4,694	
SY 2013-14 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	12/2/2015	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	6,078	null
SY 2013-14 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	12/2/2015	2012-13 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	77.23%	Calculate <input type="checkbox"/>

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data	FFY 2014 Target	FFY 2014 Data
4,694	6,078	78.49%	87.00%	77.23%

Explanation of Slippage

Oklahoma has been moving toward more rigorous academic standards and assessments for all students. Students with disabilities need more intensive support to meet proficiency levels required for graduation. In addition, students with disabilities need more support in meeting course requirements required for graduation.

Graduation Conditions Field

Provide the four-year graduation cohort rate. The four-year graduation rate follows a cohort, or a group of students, who begin as first-time 9th graders in a particular school year and who graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years or less. An extended-year graduation rate follows the same cohort of students for an additional year or years. The cohort is "adjusted" by adding any students transferring into the cohort and by subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die during the years covered by the rate.

Under 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1)(iv), a "regular high school diploma" means the standard high school diploma awarded to students in a State that is fully aligned with the State's academic content standards and does not include a GED credential, certificate of attendance, or any alternative award. The term "regular high school diploma" also includes a "higher diploma" that is awarded to students who complete requirements above and beyond what is required for a regular diploma.

The Oklahoma four-year graduation cohort rate for FFY 2014 was 82.72 percent for all Oklahoma students.

In order to graduate from a public high school accredited by the State Board of Education with a standard diploma, students shall either complete the requirements for the college preparatory or the work ready curriculum.

The Achieving Classroom Excellence (ACE) law states that, beginning with students entering the ninth grade in the 2008-2009 school year, every student shall demonstrate mastery of the state academic content standards in the following subject areas in order to graduate from a public high school with a standard diploma: Algebra I; English II; and Two of the following five: Algebra II, Biology I, English III, Geometry, and United States History. To graduate high school, Oklahoma students must show proficiency in four of seven subject areas by scoring satisfactory or advanced. For some students, alternate tests are made available when necessary for each subject area. Approved projects may also be completed independently and scored by the LEA to demonstrate proficiency. In addition to these options, there are accommodations and certain exceptions for English Language Learners (ELL) and students who have an Individualized Education Program (IEP).

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≤			6.33%	5.95%		5.19%	4.81%	4.43%	4.05%	19.40%
Data		4.65%	4.22%	7.25%	3.50%	3.00%	2.90%	20.70%	19.50%	19.40%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	19.40%	18.00%	17.00%	16.00%	15.00%

Key:

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

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/4/2015	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	4,549	4,687
SY 2013-14 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/4/2015	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	null	n
SY 2013-14 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/4/2015	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	n	n
Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	6/4/2015	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	1,048	1,202
SY 2013-14 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/4/2015	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	28	31

Explanation of Alternate Data

The overwrite data ensures that all children who dropped out or moved/not known to be continuing after their 14th birthday are included in the data. The EdFacts data that was initially submitted used a threshold date for determining who would be included in the 14-21 year old cohort. The calculation method is being corrected for future submissions.

The State of Oklahoma does not use certificates as a means of graduation.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of high school students with IEPs	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
1,202	5,922	19.40%	19.40%	20.30%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥										0.79%
Data										0.79%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	1.00%	1.50%	2.00%	2.50%	3.00%

Key:

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

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Does your State have an ESEA Flexibility Waiver of determining AYP?

Yes No

Are you reporting AYP or AMO?

AYP AMO

Number of districts in the State	Number of districts that met the minimum "n" size	Number of districts that meet the minimum "n" size AND met AMO	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
546	null	null	0.79%	1.00%	

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

Indicator 3A is not applicable for FFY 2014.

Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			100%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	99.14%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		98.60%	95.18%	94.80%	98.30%	95.70%	98.70%	99.14%	87.46%	93.19%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			100%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		98.70%	95.20%	99.00%	100%	96.30%	98.70%	99.12%	88.29%	93.27%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Key:

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

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Overall	60,023	59,233	93.19%	95.00%	98.68%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A	60,619	59,836	93.27%	95.00%	98.71%

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
Overall					

Public Reporting Information

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

<http://sde.ok.gov/sde/documents/2012-10-01/special-education-data-and-reporting-part-b-children-ages-3-through-21>

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response**Required Actions**

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			31.00%	52.00%	62.13%	60.93%	60.93%	70.67%	80.40%	53.00%
			Data		35.04%	48.40%	55.50%	59.27%	56.74%	46.32%	56.91%	49.31%	53.00%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			31.00%	54.00%	60.93%	62.13%	71.60%	57.35%	81.07%	58.80%
			Data		34.19%	50.70%	61.80%	54.23%	63.80%	49.63%	57.35%	51.52%	58.86%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	54.00%	55.00%	56.00%	58.00%	60.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	60.00%	61.70%	63.50%	65.20%	67.00%

Key:

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

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Overall	56,875	18,783	53.00%	54.00%	33.03%

Explanation of Group A Slippage

The Oklahoma Alternate Assessment Program (OAAP) utilized a new alternate assessment system for Math and English Language Arts in 2014-2015. This new system, Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM), offers a better way to assess the knowledge and skills of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. Due to 2014-2015 being the first year that the new system

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

was implemented, proficiency levels in the subject areas of Math and English Language Arts have decreased. We believe this is due to the implications of a new assessment system, the more precise assessment of this population’s skills and knowledge, and the increased academic expectations of the new alternate achievement standards.

In addition, more students with disabilities are being assessed through the regular assessment with accommodations since the removal of modified assessments as an option after the 2012-2013 school year.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENT:

FFY 2013 was the last year that special education students could participate in the Oklahoma Modified Alternative Assessment Program (OMAAP). It was Oklahoma’s AA-MAS (Alternative Assessment based on Modified Achievement Standards). With the elimination of this assessment option, most students with disabilities previously assessed with OMAAP are now participating in assessments aligned to general academic standards (the Oklahoma Core Curriculum Tests or OCCT). Achieving proficiency on the OCCT requires meeting more rigorous standards than on the OMAAP, resulting in lower passing rates for many students with disabilities.

To illustrate, in 2006-07, the fourth grade participation rate in the OMAAP was 4.8 percent of the *total population* tested and the seventh grade participation rate was 5.6 percent. Further, in 2008-2009, a full 50 percent of special education students took the AA-MAS OMAAP eighth grade reading exam. Less than 40 percent took the general assessment which students without IEPs were required to take. These rates, which were similar in adjacent years on all exams, were substantially higher than in other states that used a modified assessment option, and illustrate the large numbers of students with disabilities who moved from OMAAP to OCCT.

The higher number of special education students transitioning from the OMAAP to the OCCT coupled with the more rigorous standards of the general assessment justifiably results in lower proficiency rates.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Overall	57,409	20,575	58.86%	60.00%	35.84%

Explanation of Group A Slippage

The Oklahoma Alternate Assessment Program (OAAP) utilized a new alternate assessment system for Math and English Language Arts in 2014-2015. This new system, Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM), offers a better way to assess the knowledge and skills of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. Due to 2014-2015 being the first year that the new system was implemented, proficiency levels in the subject areas of Math and English Language Arts have decreased. We believe this is due to the implications of a new assessment system, the more precise assessment of this population’s skills and knowledge, and the increased academic expectations of the new alternate achievement standards.

In addition, more students with disabilities are being assessed through the regular assessment with accommodations since the removal of modified assessments as an option after the 2012-2013 school year.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENT:

FFY 2013 was the last year that special education students could participate in the Oklahoma Modified Alternative Assessment Program (OMAAP). It was Oklahoma’s AA-MAS (Alternative Assessment based on Modified Achievement Standards). With the elimination of this assessment option, most students with disabilities previously assessed with OMAAP are now participating in assessments aligned to general academic standards (the Oklahoma Core Curriculum Tests or OCCT). Achieving proficiency on the OCCT requires meeting more rigorous standards than on the OMAAP, resulting in lower passing rates for many students with disabilities.

To illustrate, in 2006-07, the fourth grade participation rate in the OMAAP was 4.8 percent of the *total population* tested and the seventh grade participation rate was 5.6 percent. Further, in 2008-2009, a full 50 percent of special education students took the AA-MAS OMAAP eighth grade reading exam. Less than 40 percent took the general assessment which students without IEPs were required to take. These rates, which were similar in adjacent years on all exams, were substantially higher

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

than in other states that used a modified assessment option, and illustrate the large numbers of students with disabilities who moved from OMAAP to OCCT.

The higher number of special education students transitioning from the OMAAP to the OCCT coupled with the more rigorous standards of the general assessment justifiably results in lower proficiency rates.

Public Reporting Information

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

<http://sde.ok.gov/sde/documents/2012-10-01/special-education-data-and-reporting-part-b-children-ages-3-through-21>

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Oklahoma did not provide FFY 2013 data, and the BIE must provide the required data for FFY 2013 in the FFY 2014 APR. Within 90 days of the receipt of Oklahoma 2015 determination letter, Oklahoma must provide a Web link that demonstrates it has reported, for FFYs 2012 and 2013, to the public on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds Oklahoma that in the FFY 2014 APR, Oklahoma must continue to include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 CFR §300.160(f) for FFY 2014.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

The required documents have been posted at the following website for public viewing.

<http://sde.ok.gov/sde/documents/2012-10-01/special-education-data-and-reporting-part-b-children-ages-3-through-21>

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≤			2.41%	1.91%	1.91%	10.19%	9.19%	8.19%	7.19%	7.10%
Data		7.59%	2.41%	10.02%	10.02%	8.85%	10.30%	6.80%	8.42%	6.81%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	7.10%	7.00%	6.60%	6.30%	6.00%

Key:

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

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
46	546	6.81%	7.10%	8.42%

Explanation of Slippage

Identification of students with Autism and other disabilities associated with mental health issues and challenging behaviors is on the rise in Oklahoma. State funding has been cut. Few long-term in-State placements, such as residential treatment facilities, exist within the borders of our State to meet the educational needs of students who need intense behavior interventions. The OSDE-SES has concentrated financial and collaborative efforts with other agencies and LEAs to implement school and districtwide positive behavior supports through the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) and other interagency agreements/contracts. However, slippage confirms that State support needs to increase. Currently, the OSDE has increased efforts to build capacity and partnership support within districts which can model capacity-building to neighboring districts. Also, the Oklahoma Parent Center and Dispute Resolution Center have broadened their efforts to support the LEAs with parent training and resources statewide.

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

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

State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology

The OSDE-SES, with stakeholder input from its IDEA Part B advisory group, has defined “significant discrepancy” as a risk ratio of suspension or expulsion of 2.5 or greater for students with disabilities compared to students in the general education classroom within a district/LEA. The OSDE has chosen the following comparison method (one of the methods recommended by the OSEP): The rates of expulsions and suspensions that total more 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 (34 CFR §300.170(a)). To be included in the analysis, a group must have at least 10 students with disabilities in the LEA. Any findings of significant discrepancies will generate an analysis of policies, procedures, and practices. LEAs will be required to conduct this review (consistent with CFR § 300.170(b)). If appropriate, the LEAs will revise policies, practices, and procedures relating to each of the following topics: development and implementation of IEPs; the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports; and procedural safeguards to comply with the requirements of the IDEA. In reporting any findings of noncompliance, the corrections must be consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02 dated October 17, 2008.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Oklahoma uses a minimum "n" size of ten members in a group to include districts in the discipline analysis. No districts were identified as having fewer than 10 students in a group in FFY 2014. Thus, all districts were included in the analysis.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2014 using 2013-2014 data)

Description of review

All Districts were notified of any discrepancies when they receive their annual District Data Profile. Based on the FFY 2013 data, 37 LEAs were identified to have significant discrepancies by special education status. These districts were required to review policies and procedures with attention to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

The OSDE-SES contacted each of the 37 LEAs identified with significant discrepancies, and each of the LEAs provided copies of their policies, procedures, and practices to be reviewed by the OSDE-SES. A review of the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports was also conducted by the OSDE-SES, and it was determined that none of the districts reported had inappropriate procedures in place and that all LEAs were determined to be 100% compliant. A review of policies, procedures and practices for each LEA also occurs during the annual submission of Assurances and LEA Agreements and all comprehensive on-site monitoring activities.

The OSDE-SES conducted activities in FFY 2014 to offer technical assistance and instruction to LEAs, regarding best practices in reporting data to the SEA. The OSDE-SES also, through professional development and supporting agency goals, has increased opportunities for LEAs to strengthen behavior interventions and supports for all students through statewide initiatives for reading, and implementation of the Oklahoma Tiered Intervention Support System (OTISS) with web hosted resources. Because of these

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

activities, the OSDE-SES found no districts in noncompliance. No districts were found to have inappropriate procedures that would impact the identification of significant discrepancy.

- The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)
- The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:
 - The State DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.
 Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.
 - The State did NOT ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
0	0	546	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The OSDE-SES, with stakeholder input from its IDEA Part B advisory group, has defined "significant discrepancy" as a risk ratio of suspension or expulsion of 2.5 or greater for students with disabilities compared to students in the general education classroom within a district/LEA. The OSDE has chosen the following comparison method (one of the methods recommended by the OSEP): The rates of expulsions and suspensions that total more 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 (34 CFR §300.170(a)). To be included in the analysis, a group must have at least 10 students with disabilities in the LEA. Any findings of significant discrepancies will generate an analysis of policies, procedures, and practices. LEAs will be required to conduct this review (consistent with CFR § 300.170(b)). If appropriate, the LEAs will revise

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

policies, practices, and procedures relating to each of the following topics: development and implementation of IEPs; the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports; and procedural safeguards to comply with the requirements of the IDEA. In reporting any findings of noncompliance, the corrections must be consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02 dated October 17, 2008.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Oklahoma uses a minimum "n" size of ten members in a group to include districts in the discipline analysis. No districts were identified as having fewer than 10 students in a group in FFY 2014. Thus, all districts were included in the analysis.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2014 using 2013-2014 data)

Description of review

All Districts were notified of any discrepancies when they receive their annual District Data Profile. Based on the FFY 2013 data, no LEAs were identified to have significant discrepancies by race or ethnicity.

The OSDE-SES continued to conduct activities in FFY 2014 to offer technical assistance and instruction to LEAs, regarding best practices in reporting data to the SEA. The OSDE-SES also, through professional development and supporting agency goals, has increased opportunities for LEAs to strengthen behavior interventions and supports for all students through statewide initiatives for reading, and implementation of the Oklahoma Tiered Intervention Support System (OTISS) with web hosted resources. Because of these activities, the OSDE-SES found no districts in noncompliance. No districts were found to have inappropriate procedures that would impact the identification of significant discrepancy.

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

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.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2005	Target ≥			49.04%	49.04%	50.04%	50.54%	51.04%	51.04%	51.04%	64.68%
		Data		49.27%	54.93%	59.12%	61.22%	61.99%	62.37%	62.52%	62.88%	64.68%
B	2005	Target ≤			10.24%	10.24%	10.04%	9.94%	9.84%	9.84%	9.84%	9.84%
		Data		9.70%	10.05%	9.89%	9.72%	9.79%	9.61%	9.86%	9.66%	9.51%
C	2005	Target ≤			1.64%	2.20%	1.85%	1.85%	1.85%	1.85%	1.85%	1.85%
		Data		1.84%	1.90%	1.47%	1.34%	1.42%	1.40%	1.36%	1.37%	1.30%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	65.00%	65.50%	65.50%	66.00%	66.00%
Target B ≤	9.84%	9.50%	9.50%	9.25%	9.25%
Target C ≤	1.85%	1.85%	1.85%	1.85%	1.83%

Key:

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

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	6/4/2015	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	96,752	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	63,750	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	9,222	null

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
C002; Data group 74)				
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	266	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	386	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	611	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	63,750	96,752	64.68%	65.00%	65.89%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	9,222	96,752	9.51%	9.84%	9.53%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1,263	96,752	1.30%	1.85%	1.31%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2011	Target ≥									37.23%	40.66%
		Data									39.29%	73.80%
B	2011	Target ≤									18.40%	18.40%
		Data									18.60%	16.67%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	41.25%	42.00%	42.50%	43.00%	43.75%
Target B ≤	18.40%	17.75%	17.00%	16.50%	16.00%

Key:

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

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	8,919	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	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	3,925	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	1,178	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	b2. Number of children attending separate school	45	null

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	18	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	3,925	8,919	40.66%	41.25%	44.01%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	1,241	8,919	16.16%	18.40%	13.91%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A1	2008	Target ≥						94.78%	96.17%	90.00%	91.00%	89.30%
		Data					93.30%	89.20%	89.00%	91.20%	89.30%	92.63%
A2	2008	Target ≥						57.44%	58.41%	58.00%	59.00%	58.00%
		Data					54.50%	57.60%	57.00%	60.00%	58.00%	55.53%
B1	2008	Target ≥						93.84%	95.12%	89.00%	92.00%	88.80%
		Data					92.80%	89.10%	88.50%	90.00%	88.80%	92.02%
B2	2008	Target ≥						56.49%	56.88%	57.00%	58.00%	57.30%
		Data					55.00%	55.70%	55.90%	59.10%	57.30%	54.50%
C1	2008	Target ≥						94.03%	95.02%	91.00%	92.00%	90.80%
		Data					92.90%	90.00%	90.10%	92.60%	90.80%	92.90%
C2	2008	Target ≥						68.25%	68.73%	71.00%	72.00%	72.00%
		Data					67.70%	69.70%	70.50%	74.90%	72.70%	69.84%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	89.50%	89.75%	90.00%	90.50%	93.40%
Target A2 ≥	58.00%	58.25%	58.50%	58.75%	59.00%
Target B1 ≥	89.00%	89.25%	89.50%	89.75%	92.90%
Target B2 ≥	57.30%	57.30%	57.30%	57.30%	58.30%
Target C1 ≥	91.00%	91.25%	91.50%	91.75%	93.00%
Target C2 ≥	72.00%	72.00%	72.00%	72.00%	73.00%

Key:

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

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	3760.00
--	---------

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	9.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	186.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1242.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1769.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	554.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	3011.00	3206.00	92.63%	89.50%	93.92%
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	2323.00	3760.00	55.53%	58.00%	61.78%

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	20.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	206.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1231.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1759.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	544.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	2990.00	3216.00	92.02%	89.00%	92.97%
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	2303.00	3760.00	54.50%	57.30%	61.25%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	14.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	149.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	736.00

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Number of Children
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1927.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	934.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	2663.00	2826.00	92.90%	91.00%	94.23%
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	2861.00	3760.00	69.84%	72.00%	76.09%

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? No

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? No

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			84.00%	85.50%	88.50%	90.00%	84.00%	84.00%	87.00%	87.00%
Data		82.11%	86.80%	90.80%	91.50%	92.50%	93.30%	93.40%	91.77%	90.01%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	88.25%	89.50%	90.50%	91.75%	93.00%

Key:

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

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
2639.00	2969.00	90.01%	88.25%	88.89%

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

The Parent Survey used to calculate this indicator does not differentiate between preschool children and school age children. The data collected is collected regardless of student age and is therefore inherently combined.

Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.

VALIDITY & RELIABILITY

The Part B program uses a multi-question survey to query parents about their school IEP experience. Indicator 8 is measured by an

index variable that reflects 25 components of parent experience, increasing the validity of the measure of parents' perception of a school's performance in facilitating parental involvement. The data are reliable because the index variable measures precise experiences and not broad perceptions of quality. Parents are likely to answer similarly across time if their experiences are the same. Personnel do not influence parents' responses at any time. However, the response data are not necessarily representative because of the low response rate (although they reflect overall SoonerStart demographics fairly well, as shown below).

DEMOGRAPHICS

In FFY 2014, 2969 parents of children with disabilities submitted complete surveys, which equates to a response rate of approximately 2.8 percent (using a Oct. 1, 2014 child count of 103,150). Overall, respondents' children reflect the gender and age demographics of the entire Oklahoma IEP student population (please refer to the "additional information" box: Tables 1 & 2, Response rate versus IEP rate). The reported racial demographics of respondents' children roughly reflect the racial distribution of IEP students (Table 3). For both gender and race, IEP students (and respondents) differ substantially from the full student population in Oklahoma.

BACKGROUND

The State contracts with the Oklahoma Parents Center, Inc. (OPC), the federally funded Parent Training and Information Center, to provide delivery and collection of the Parent Survey throughout Oklahoma. In August, the OPC disseminates Parent Survey brochures in English and in Spanish to 546 LEA special education departments in the State. Each school is mailed the number of requested brochures, along with a hard-copy Parent Survey, and an order form for easy access to additional Parent Survey brochures throughout the school year. The Parent Survey brochures offer three ways to participate in the Parent Survey: telephone survey, mail survey, and online web survey via Survey Monkey. The brochure describes the importance of the survey and includes instructions for accessing the survey. SoonerStart personnel do not assist families in the actual completion of the surveys; the completed surveys are collected directly by the Oklahoma Parents Center to ensure that response data is valid and reliable. The results are given to the Part C Data Manager to report in the Annual Performance Report (APR).

Was sampling used? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? No

- Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State
- No, the data does not accurately represent the demographics of the State

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Table 1: Respondents' Child Age Groups

Age Group	Count	Response rate	IEP rate
Ages 3-5	427	14.4%	4.8%
6-11	1357	45.7%	41.1%
12-14	576	19.4%	24.1%
15-18	546	18.4%	27.2%
18+	19	0.6%	2.8%
No response	44	1.5%	N/A
Total	2969	100.0%	100.0%

Table 2: Respondents' Child Gender

Gender	Count	Response rate	IEP rate	State Students
Male	1812	61.0%	64.9%	51.3%
Female	983	33.1%	35.1%	48.7%
No response	174	5.9%	N/A	N/A
Total	2969	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 3: Respondents' Reported Racial Identity

Racial Group	Count	Response Rate	2014 Est*	State Students
American Indian/Alaska Native	485	16.3%	8.9%	14.3%
Asian or Pacific Islander	28	0.9%	2.1%	2.3%
African American	137	4.6%	7.7%	8.9%
Hispanic or Latino	83	2.8%	9.8%	16.2%
White	1777	59.9%	66.0%	50.0%
Multi-Racial	380	12.8%	5.9%	8.4%
Not reported	79	2.7%	N/A	N/A
Total	2969	100.0%	100%	100.0%

*US Census Bureau

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0.56%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

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 in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
58	0	546	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

The OSDE-SES has defined “disproportionate representation” as a risk ratio of 2.5 or greater (overrepresentation). When disproportionate representation is determined for a district, the OSDE-SES will determine if the disproportionate identification is the result of inappropriate identification. Data for each district and charter school was analyzed for all racial and ethnic groups.

Step One: Calculating Disproportionate Representation

OSDE-SES used the OSEP disproportionality IDEA template to calculate a risk ratio identifying districts with 2.5 or greater risk of disproportionate representation for each of the seven racial/ethnic categories. The data source for Oklahoma’s analysis was Table 1 (Child Count) of Information Collection 1820-0043 (Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education under Part B of the IDEA) for all children with disabilities aged 6 through 21 served under the IDEA.

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Step Two: Determining if Disproportionate Representation is the Result of Inappropriate Identification

Districts are notified of any disproportionality when they receive their annual District Data Profile. Those with identification of significant disproportionality are required to review policies, procedures, and practices with attention to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. Additionally, a review of policies, procedures, and practices occurs during all general supervision and monitoring activities.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0.56%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

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 in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
183	0	546	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

The OSDE-SES has defined “disproportionate representation” as a risk ratio of 2.5 or greater (overrepresentation). When disproportionate representation is determined for a district, the OSDE-SES will determine if the disproportionate identification is the result of inappropriate identification. Data for each district and charter school was analyzed for all racial and ethnic groups.

Step One: Calculating Disproportionate Representation

OSDE-SES used the OSEP disproportionality IDEA template to calculate a risk ratio identifying districts with 2.5 or greater risk of disproportionate representation for each of the seven racial/ethnic categories. The data source for Oklahoma’s analysis was Table 1 (Child Count) of Information Collection 1820-0043 (Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education under Part B of the IDEA) for all children with disabilities aged 6 through 21 served under the IDEA.

Step Two: Determining if Disproportionate Representation is the Result of Inappropriate Identification

Districts are notified of any disproportionality when they receive their annual District Data Profile. Those with identification of significant disproportionality are required to review policies, procedures, and practices with attention to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. Additionally, a review of policies, procedures, and practices occurs during all general supervision and monitoring activities.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		90.89%	92.45%	98.90%	96.56%	97.17%	96.10%	96.65%	96.67%	95.84%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
18,717	17,841	95.84%	100%	95.32%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	876
---	-----

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Table of Reasons for Difference Between (A) and (B)	
Child changed districts prior to eligibility determination	240
Parent failed or refused to produce the child	187
Parent refusal to sign consent for evaluation caused delays in evaluation or initial services	49
All other late evaluations	400
Maximum days needed to complete an evaluation beyond 45 days	228

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

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

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

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

All LEAs are required to enter specific data into the End-of-Year Report through the Single Sign-On System of the OSDE-SES. LEAs can manually enter this data or transfer the data from the SEAS electronic IEP Software to the Single Sign-On System. Indicator 11 data are self-reported by each LEA and the LEA is monitored through District Data Profiles, technical assistance provided by the Compliance, Data, and Finance (CDF) specialists, and/or on-site comprehensive monitoring. The district superintendent must login to the End-of-Year Report and certify the data being submitted is accurate and true.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
42	42	0	0

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The OSDE-SES conducted monitoring activities for 100% of the State’s LEAs to determine if all LEAs were in compliance for Indicator 11. After analyzing data collected for Indicator 11, noncompliance was identified in 33 LEAs. The 33 LEAs identified as non-compliant were required to make child specific corrections, complete an Improvement Plan, and demonstrate systemic compliance through a Verification of Continuous Compliance activity.

In addition to non-compliance identified through the State’s data collection system, 9 LEAs were identified as having non-compliance for Indicator 11 through on-site student file review. Those 9 LEAs also were required to make child-specific corrections, attend an OSDE-SES compliance workshop, and demonstrate systemic compliance through a Verification of Continuous Compliance activity. In total, 42 LEAs were identified as non-compliant for Indicator 11 and all 42 LEAs corrected the non-compliance within one year.

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

All 42 LEAs identified as being non-compliant demonstrated that they had corrected child specific (Prong I) noncompliance. LEAs identified as being non-compliant were notified within 60 days of identification, regarding the specific student files needing correction and the timeline for completion. Within 30 days of the receipt of the letter of findings, the LEA was required to submit evaluation and eligibility documentation for identified students. The OSDE-SES reviewed Parent Consent forms, as well as, Multidisciplinary Evaluation and Eligibility Group Summary (MEEGS) forms submitted by all districts in order to determine that evaluations were conducted in accordance with the regulatory requirements. OSDE-SES staff then reviewed documentation to determine if the child-specific corrections had been made. In addition, the OSDE-SES conducted follow-up phone calls to ensure the necessary education records were available for review through the Special Education Automated System (SEAS), if necessary.

Within one-year of the issuance of findings, the 42 LEAs identified as being non-compliant for Indicator 11 were notified via US mail

that the OSDE-SES would be conducting Verification of Continuous Compliance (Prong 2) procedures to ensure systemic compliance across the district. All of the 42 LEAs, were required to submit data through the State data collection system, including Indicator 11 data. In addition, the OSDE-SES conducted on-site Verification of Continuous Compliance reviews for LEAs receiving findings of noncompliance due to on-site student file review. All 42 LEAs were verified as being compliant at both the child-specific and systemic level, according to the regulatory requirements set forth in the OSEP Memo 09-02.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

Required Actions

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		86.72%	86.97%	91.33%	95.55%	98.20%	97.10%	97.75%	90.00%	92.40%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	1,261
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	134
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	941
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	112
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	63

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e)	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. $[c/(a-b-d-e)] \times 100$	941	952	92.40%	100%	98.84%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e	11
--	----

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

Table of Explanations for Indicator 12	
The maximum number of days needed to implement an IEP past the 3rd birthday	47
Reasons why evaluations were not completed within 45 days:	
LEA failure to follow appropriate procedures	2
Lack of appropriate resources	1

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Breaks in school calendars and/or staff not on contract	4
Late referral from SoonerStart	4

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

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

All LEAs are required to enter specific data into the End-of-Year Report through the Single Sign-On System of the OSDE-SES. LEAs can manually enter this data or transfer the data from the SEAS electronic IEP Software to the Single Sign-On System. Indicator 12 data are self-reported by each LEA and the LEA is monitored through District Data Profiles, technical assistance provided by the Compliance, Data, and Finance (CDF) specialists, and/or on-site comprehensive monitoring. The district superintendent must login to the End-of-Year Report and certify the data being submitted is accurate and true.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
9	9	0	0

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The OSDE-SES conducted monitoring activities for 100% of the State’s LEAs to determine if all LEAs were in compliance for Indicator 12. After analyzing data collected for Indicator 12, noncompliance was identified in 9 LEAs. The LEAs identified as being non-compliant for Indicator 12 were required to make child specific corrections, complete an Improvement Plan, and demonstrate systemic compliance through a Verification of Continuous Compliance activity. All 9 LEAs corrected findings of non-compliance within one year.

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

LEAs identified as non-compliant for Indicator 12 were notified within 60 days of identification regarding the specific student files needing correction and the timeline for completion. Within 30 days of the receipt of the letter of findings, the LEA was required to submit the completed Individualized Family Service Plans (IFSP) and Individualized Education Programs (IEP) for identified students. In addition, the OSDE-SES conducted follow-up phone calls to ensure the necessary education records were available for review through the Special Education Automated System (SEAS), if necessary. It was then determined that 100% of the LEAs corrected all instances of non-compliance for Indicator 12.

Within one year of the issuance of findings, 9 LEAs identified as non-compliant for Indicator 12 were notified via US mail that the OSDE-SES would be conducting Verification of Continuous Compliance (Prong 2) procedures to ensure systemic compliance across the district. After analyzing new data collected for Indicator 12 and conducting follow-up phone calls to verify information, the

OSDE-SES determined that all 9 LEAs had corrected non-compliance within one year in accordance with the requirements set forth in the OSEP Memo 09-02.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data						95.21%	98.70%	87.14%	92.64%	95.47%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
24,913	25,493	95.47%	100%	97.72%

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

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

All LEAs are required to enter specific data into the End-of-Year Report through the Single Sign-On System of the OSDE-SES. LEAs can manually enter this data or transfer the data from the SEAS electronic IEP Software to the Single Sign-On System. Indicator 13 data are self-reported by each LEA and the LEA is monitored through District Data Profiles, technical assistance provided by the Compliance, Data, and Finance (CDF) specialists and or on-site comprehensive monitoring. The district superintendent must login to the End-of-Year Report and certify the data being submitted is accurate and true.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
19	19	0	0

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The OSDE-SES conducted monitoring activities for 100% of the State’s LEAs to determine if all LEAs were in compliance for Indicator 13. After analyzing data collected for Indicator 13, noncompliance was identified in 10 LEAs. The LEAs identified as being non-compliant were required to make child specific corrections, complete an Improvement Plan, and demonstrate systemic compliance through a Verification of Continuous Compliance activity.

In addition to non-compliance identified through the State’s data collection system, 9 LEAs were identified as having non-compliance for Indicator 13 through on-site student file review. Those 9 LEAs also were required to make child-specific corrections, attend an OSDE-SES compliance workshop, and demonstrate systemic compliance through a Verification of Continuous Compliance activity. In total, 19 LEAs were identified as being non-compliant on Indicator 13 and all 19 LEAs corrected the non-compliance within one year.

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

All 19 LEAs identified as being in noncompliance for FFY 2013 demonstrated that they had corrected child specific (Prong 1) noncompliance. LEAs identified as being in noncompliance were notified within 60 days of identification, regarding the specific student files needing correction and the timeline for completion. Within 30 days of the receipt of the letter of findings, the LEA was required to submit documentation regarding IEPs, secondary transition plans, and other documents as necessary in accordance with the regulatory requirements. OSDE-SES staff reviewed documentation to determine if the child-specific corrections had been made. In addition, the OSDE-SES conducted follow-up phone calls to ensure the necessary education records were available for review through the Special Education Automated System (SEAS), if necessary.

Within one-year of the issuance of findings, the 19 LEAs identified as being noncompliant for Indicator 13 were notified via US mail that the OSDE-SES would be conducting Verification of Continuous Compliance (Prong 2) procedures to ensure systemic compliance across the district. All of the 19 LEAs were required to submit data through the State data collection system, including Indicator 13 data. In addition, the OSDE-SES conducted on-site Verification of Continuous Compliance reviews for LEAs receiving findings of noncompliance due to on-site student file review. All 19 LEAs were verified as being compliant at both the child-specific and systemic level, according to the regulatory requirements set forth in the OSEP Memo 09-02.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

Required Actions

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2009	Target ≥							31.90%	31.90%	31.90%	31.90%
		Data						31.42%	33.00%	31.20%	17.00%	15.59%
B	2009	Target ≥							46.90%	46.90%	46.90%	46.90%
		Data						46.45%	57.00%	62.40%	57.00%	48.92%
C	2009	Target ≥							73.50%	73.50%	75.40%	59.68%
		Data						73.50%	91.00%	80.60%	71.00%	59.68%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	32.00%	32.00%	32.00%	32.00%	32.75%
Target B ≥	47.00%	47.25%	47.50%	48.00%	49.00%
Target C ≥	60.00%	60.25%	60.50%	61.00%	73.60%

Key:

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

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2014 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	833.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	221.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	325.00
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	75.00
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	92.00

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	221.00	833.00	15.59%	32.00%	26.53%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	546.00	833.00	48.92%	47.00%	65.55%
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)	713.00	833.00	59.68%	60.00%	85.59%

Was sampling used? Yes

Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No

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

The OSDE-SES collaborated with the University of Oklahoma Public Opinion Learning Laboratory to utilize the protocol developed by National Post School Outcomes to assess post-secondary goals and outcomes of special education students with IEPs from throughout Oklahoma. This effort is in support of the state reporting requirement to assure compliance with the federal mandate to understand the “percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of post-secondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school” (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B)).

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥				85.00%	100%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	0%
Data		95.00%	80.00%	80.00%	100%	73.33%	38.89%	66.67%	62.50%	66.67%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014			2015			2016			2017			2018		
Target	0%	-	100%	0%	-	100%	0%	-	100%	0%	-	100%	0%	-	100%

Key:

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

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	9	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	9	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
9	9	66.67%	0.00% - 100.00%	100%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2014. The State is not required to meet its targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	81.20%
Data		92.31%	66.67%	53.33%	100%	66.67%		91.67%	87.50%	81.25%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	82.00%	82.75%	83.50%	84.25%	85.00%

Key:

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

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	n	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	20	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1 Mediations held	23	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
2	20	23	81.25%	82.00%	95.65%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014
Target ≥		54.00%
Data	53.00%	

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	55.00%	56.00%	58.00%	60.00%

Key:

Description of Measure

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

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Overview

Data Analysis

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

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

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

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

Statement

Description

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

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

Theory of Action

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

[Oklahoma's Theory of Action Plan](#) Oklahoma's Theory of Action Plan

Illustration

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Description of Illustration

Infrastructure Development

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

Please see attachments.

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

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

Please see attachments.

Evaluation

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

Please see attachments.

Technical Assistance and Support

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

Please see attachments.

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

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

Selected: Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name: Erik Friend

Title: Director of Data Analysis

Email: erik.friend@sde.ok.gov

Phone: 405-521-2198