

Oklahoma's
Annual Performance Report (APR)
FFY 2010
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), Part B



Oklahoma State Department of Education
Special Education Services
February 2012

Part B Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010 (2010-2011)**Overview of the Annual Performance Report (APR) Development:**

The Oklahoma State Department of Education (OSDE), Special Education Services (SES), developed the Annual Performance Report (APR) in accordance with the detailed procedures prescribed by the Secretary of the United States Department of Education (USDE). The OSDE-SES incorporated input from the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part B Advisory Panel, which met on September 19, 2005, November 21, 2005, February 13, 2006, July 17, 2006, November 20, 2006, January 22, 2007, February 12, 2007, May 14, 2007, July 16, 2007, September 10, 2007, November 5, 2007, January 14, 2008, March 10, 2008, July 21, 2008, August 1, 2008, September 11, 2008, December 12, 2008, January 12, 2009, March 23, 2009, May 12, 2009, September 14, 2009, and January 11, 2010, as well as a broad group of stakeholders, including individuals with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, local educational agency (LEA) administrators and teachers, legal counsel, advocates, and representatives from higher education and other state agencies. The SPP/Annual Performance Report (APR) Stakeholder Group met on August 26, 2005, October 7, 2005, November 18, 2005, October 16, 2006, October 29, 2007, January 14, 2008, and January 12, 2009, January 11, 2010, December 6, 2010, January 20, 2010, and January 13, 2012. In addition, the following groups supported the development of and will participate in the improvement activities, timelines, and resources associated with the APR:

- Access Center;
- Alternative Dispute Resolution Center (ADRC);
- Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS);
- Consortium for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE);
- Cooperative Council for Oklahoma School Administration (CCOSA);
- Curriculum Access Resource Guide (CARG) Taskforce;
- Data Accountability Center (DAC);
- Disproportionality Stakeholder Group;
- Down Syndrome Association of Central Oklahoma;
- Due Process Advisory Council;
- Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Center;
- Focused Monitoring Stakeholder Group;
- Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC);
- Learning Disabilities Association of Oklahoma (LDAO);
- National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE);
- National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO);
- National Center on Secondary Education and Transition (NCSET);
- National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM);
- National Center on Student Progress Monitoring;
- National Dissemination Center for Children with Disabilities (NICHCY);
- National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD);
- National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC);
- National Post-School Outcomes (NPSO) Center;
- NIMAS Advisory Council;
- Oklahoma Alternate Assessment Program (OAAP) Advisory Council;
- Oklahoma Alternate Assessment Program (OAAP) Standard Setting Committee;
- Oklahoma Assistive Technology Center (OATC);
- Oklahoma Directors of Special Services (ODSS);
- Oklahoma Family Network (OFN);

- Oklahoma Federation of the Council for Exceptional Children (OFCEC);
- Oklahoma Parent Center;
- Oklahoma School Psychology Association (OSPA);
- Oklahoma State Department of Education, Office of Accountability and Assessment;
- Oklahoma State Department of Education, Office of Accreditation;
- Oklahoma State Department of Education, Office of Alternative Education;
- Oklahoma State Department of Education, Office of Standards and Curriculum;
- Oklahoma State Department of Education, Reading First Program;
- Oklahoma State School Boards Association (OSSBA);
- Oklahoma State University – Assisting Brighter Living with Enabling Technology (OSU-ABLE Tech);
- Oklahoma Transition Council (OTD);
- Part C Quality Assurance Stakeholder Group;
- Payne Education Center;
- Post-School Outcomes Committee;
- Response to Intervention (RtI) Stakeholder Group;
- Risk Pool Stakeholder Group;
- Southeast Regional Resource Center (SERRC);
- Special Education Resolution Center (SERC);
- United Suburban School Association (USSA);
- University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center (OUHSC) – Child Study Center; and
- Westat.

The OSDE-SES will make available and report statewide data to the public regarding progress and/or slippage in meeting the measurable and rigorous targets identified in the APR. In addition, the state will report disaggregated data based on the performance of each LEA on the targets in the APR (see Attachment 1 for the statewide sample). The OSDE-SES will deliver the APR to all LEA superintendents and special education directors, the IDEA Part B Advisory Panel, and the SPP/APR Stakeholder Group. The SPP, APR and public reporting will be posted on the OSDE-SES Web site <www.sde.state.ok.us> for public viewing and will be shared at open public meetings such as the State Superintendent's Special Education Conference and IDEA Part B Advisory Panel Meeting.

Input from the IDEA Part B Advisory Panel, a broad group of stakeholders, and other interested parties was used for each of the 20 indicators in the APR. These groups will serve as the resources used for the improvement activities for each of the 20 indicators. Each of the 20 indicators will be reported to the public through electronic delivery, the OSDE-SES Web site, and open public meetings.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.

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

Measurement: States must report using the graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the ESEA.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010	82.4% of youth with IEPs will graduate with a regular diploma.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2010:

In FFY 2010, 84.95% (5,029 of 5,920) of youth on an Individualized Education Program (IEP) graduated with a regular diploma.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

The FFY 2010 data of 84.95% represented displays progress from OSDE’s FFY 2009 data of 82.30%. All data reported used the ESEA data collection and targets. The OSDE-SES did meet the FFY 2010 target of 82.40%.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010:

As required in Federal Fiscal Year 2008, the OSDE-SES began adopting the targets that are set and reported in the Consolidated State Application Workbook for ESEA.

The state definition, as reported in our Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook, of graduation rate calculates the percentage of students, measured from the beginning of the school year, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a General Education Diploma (GED) or any other diploma not fully aligned with the state’s academic standards) in the standard number of years. The state must avoid counting a dropout as a transfer.

According to the Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook, beginning in 2005-2006, the graduation rate was calculated using an estimated cohort group rate which was a recommended method by the National Center of Educational Statistics. The calculation is listed below:

Number of Students Graduating in the standard number of years (4) with a Regular Diploma Including summer graduates in (current year – 1)

$$\frac{\text{*Total number of Students Graduating with a Regular Diploma including summer graduates in (current year – 1) + Number of Grade 12 Dropouts in (current year – 1) + Number of Grade 11 Dropouts in (current year – 2) + Number of Grade 10 Dropouts in (current year – 3) + Number of Grade 9 Dropouts in (current year – 4)}}{\text{* 100}}$$

Information regarding Oklahoma’s graduation rate for students with disabilities can be found at the following link: <http://sde.state.ok.us/AcctAssess/pdf/GraduationRates/2008.pdf>.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010:

Status	Activity	Timeline
Continuing	A. Provide technical assistance to LEAs on methods of increasing graduation rates (e.g., offering incentives to students who stay in school and have perfect attendance, developing smaller learning communities, implementing self-directed IEPs, self-determination and self-advocacy, and/or increasing involvement in extracurricular activities), through a breakout session at the State Superintendent’s Special Education Conference, Counselors Only Conference, and Encyclomedia.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	B. Provide personnel development activities to LEAs on topics such as secondary transition, co-teaching, team teaching, and inclusion.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	C. Provide resources (e.g., books, software, etc.) to LEAs on topics such as secondary transition, co-teaching, team teaching, and inclusion.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	D. Publicize graduation and dropout data on the OSDE-SES Web site by LEA as part of the district data profiles, where sample sizes allow.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	E. Provide data collection and reporting workshops in each of the five regions in Oklahoma to assist LEAs in the requirements of reporting graduation rates and to offer tips for the timeliness and accuracy of data submissions.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	F. Request information and technical assistance from resource and specialty centers such as National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD), and National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO).	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	G. Encourage schools to use student information systems to monitor student progress or flag at-risk signs (grades, absences, referrals, etc.) and assign peer mentors or teacher mentors.	FFY 2008-2012

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

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

Measurement: States must report using the dropout data used in the ESEA graduation rate calculation and follow the timeline established by the Department under the ESEA.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010	<4.81% of youth with IEPs will be reported as dropouts.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2010:

In FFY 2010, 2.9% (781 of 26,665) of youth on IEPs in grades 9 through 12 dropped out.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

The FFY 2010 data of 2.9% represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 3.0%. OSDE did meet its FFY 2010 target of <5.19%.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010:

In FFY 2008, the OSDE-SES reviewed the targets that were set and reported in the Consolidated State Application Workbook for ESEA. Since Oklahoma’s dropout rate for ESEA is 0%, Oklahoma has determined, based on broad stakeholder input and analysis of the data utilizing the new calculation, that the dropout rate targets will remain unchanged from the previously identified targets in the SPP. The SPP targets are consistent with our data utilizing the new measurement requirements. Oklahoma’s goal is to meet the ESEA target of 0% in the next SPP.

Oklahoma’s definition of a dropout is a student enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; has not graduated from high school or completed a State or district-approved educational program; and does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or State- or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death. Information regarding Oklahoma’s dropout rate for students with disabilities can be found at the following link: <http://sde.state.ok.us/Programs/DropoutPrevention/pdf/0708.pdf>

Status	Activity	Timeline
Continuing	A. Provide technical assistance to LEAs on methods of increasing graduation rates (e.g., offering incentives to students who stay in school and have perfect attendance, developing smaller learning communities, implementing self-directed IEPs, self-determination and self-advocacy, and/or increasing involvement in extracurricular activities), through a breakout session at the State Superintendent’s Special Education Conference, Counselors Only Conference, and Encyclomedia.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	B. Provide personnel development activities to LEAs on topics such as secondary transition, co-teaching, team teaching, and inclusion.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	C. Provide resources (e.g., books, software, etc.) to LEAs on topics such as secondary transition, co-teaching, team teaching, and inclusion.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	D. Publicize graduation and dropout data on the OSDE-SES Web site by LEA as part of the district data profiles, where sample sizes allow.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	E. Provide data collection and reporting workshops in each of the five regions in Oklahoma to assist LEAs in the requirements of reporting graduation rates and to offer tips for the timeliness and accuracy of data submissions.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	F. Request information and technical assistance from resource and specialty centers such as National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD), and National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO).	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	G. Encourage schools to use student information systems to monitor student progress or flag at-risk signs (grades, absences, referrals, etc.) and assign peer mentors or teacher mentors.	FFY 2008-2012

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

- Indicator 3:** 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 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))

Measurement:

- A. AYP percent = [(# of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP targets for the disability subgroup) divided by the (total # of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size)] times 100.
- B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in the assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window, calculated separately for reading and math)]. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.
- C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year scoring at or above proficient) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year, calculated separately for reading and math)].

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. 59.00% of districts will meet AYP for math, and 54.00% of district will meet AYP for reading. B. 95.00% of children with IEPs will participate in assessment of math and reading. C. 71.60% of children with IEPs will be proficient in math; 60.93% will be proficient in reading.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2010:

- A. In FFY 2010, 90.60% of districts (387 of 427) met AYP for Math, and 86.80% of districts (371 of 427) met AYP for reading.
- B. In FFY 2010, 98.65% of children with IEPs (55,648 of 56,411) participated in assessment of math; 98.72% of children with IEPs (55,093 of 55,806) participated in assessment of reading.
 - a. In FFY 2010, 55,648 of children with IEPs participated in assessments of math; 55,093 children with IEPs participated in assessments of reading.

- b. In FFY 2010, 4,389 of 55,648 (7.89%) children with IEPs participated in regular assessments with no accommodations in math; 4,703 of 55,093 (8.54%) children with IEPs participated in regular assessments with no accommodations in reading.
 - c. In FFY 2010, 19,428 of 55,648 (34.91%) children with IEPs participated in regular assessments with accommodations in math; 17,198 of 55,093 (31.22%) children with IEPs participated in regular assessments with accommodations in reading.
 - d. In FFY 2010, 0 (0%) children with IEPs participated in alternate assessment against grade level standards in math and reading.
 - e. In FFY 2010, 27,697 of 55,648 (49.77%) children with IEPs participated in alternate assessment against modified achievement standards in math; 29,149 of 55,093 (52.91%) children with IEPs participated in alternate assessment against modified achievement standards in reading.
 - f. In FFY 2010, 4,134 of 55,648 (7.43%) children with IEPs participated in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards in math; 4,043 of 55,093 (7.34%) children with IEPs participated in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards in reading.
- C. In FFY 2010, 49.63% of children with IEPs (27,620 of 55,648) were proficient in math, and 46.32% of children with IEPs (25,517 of 55,093) were proficient in reading.
- a. In FFY 2010, 11,918 of 55,648 (21.42%) children with IEPs who participated in regular assessment were proficient in math and 9,999 of 55,093 (18.15%) were proficient in reading.
 - b. In FFY 2010, 0 (0.00%) children with IEPs who participated in alternate assessments against grade level standards were proficient in math and 0 (0.00%) were proficient in reading.
 - c. In FFY 2010, 12,110 of 55,648 (21.76%) children with IEPs who participated in alternate assessments against modified achievement standards were proficient in math and 12,283 of 55,093 (22.30%) were proficient in reading.
 - d. In FFY 2010, 3,592 of 55,648 (6.45%) children with IEPs who participated in alternate assessments against alternate achievement standards were proficient in math and 3,235 of 55,093 (5.87%) were proficient in reading.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

- A. The OSDE's FFY 2010 data of 90.60% for districts who met AYP in math represent progress from its FFY 2009 data of 88.4% %. The OSDE met its FFY 2010 target of 59.00%. The OSDE's FFY 2010 data of 86.8% for reading also represents progress from its FFY 2009 data of 85.2% and the OSDE did meet its FFY 2009 target of 54.00%.
- B. The OSDE's FFY 2010 data of 98.65% participation for math assessment represent progress from 96.3% last year and OSDE did meet the state's FFY 2010 target of a 95% participation rate. Participation for reading assessment of 98.72% represents progress from 95.70% last year and OSDE did meet the state's FFY 2010 target of 95% participation rate.
- C. The OSDE's FFY 2010 proficiency data of 49.63% for math represent slippage from FFY 2009 of 63.80%. The OSDE's FFY 2010 proficiency data of 46.32% for reading represents slippage from FFY 2009 data of 56.74%. The OSDE did meet its FFY 2010 target of 71.60% for math. The OSDE did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 70.67% for reading.

In FFY 2008, the OSDE-SES began adopting the targets that are set and reported in the Consolidated State Application Workbook for ESEA. In compliance with NCLB regulations, statewide timelines have been established for reading and math, both ending in the goal of 100 percent proficiency by 2013-2014.

In FFY 2010 the State raised the bar on academic expectations for students. These raised expectations changed the performance results of student's academic success within the Oklahoma School Testing Program (OSTP). Formulas within the API calculations were re-normed to adjust for the changes in state averages due to the raised expectations. The slippage identified in the proficiency data can be attributed to the raised expectations.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010:

As required in FFY 2008, due to new data source and collection, scores of students with disabilities who were not full academic year students were not used in calculations for ESEA. Oklahoma's definition of a *full academic year* (FAY) was revised and approved by the United States Department of Education in June 2008. Beginning in school year 2008-2009 Oklahoma's revised definition is a uniform definition for grades 3-8 and high school. The uniform FAY definition reads: "A student receives a full academic year status for the exams if that student has been continuously enrolled beginning within the first ten days of the school year and has not experienced an enrollment lapse of ten or more consecutive days." The new FAY definition applies to the AYP determinations for FFY 2009.

Information regarding Oklahoma's assessment results for students with disabilities can be found at the following link: <http://www.sde.state.ok.us/ActAssess/API.html>

Status	Activity	Timeline
Continuing	A. Collaborate with other sections within the OSDE, including Reading Sufficiency, and the Office of Standards and Curriculum to provide professional development opportunities.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	B. Collaborate with the Oklahoma Alternative Assessment Program (OAAP) Advisory Council and OAAP Standard Setting Committee to review scoring procedures for OAAP.	FFY 2008-2012
Completed	C. Align all assessments to grade level achievement.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	D. Provide training to LEAs on all assessment options.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	E. Provide technical assistance regarding appropriate accommodations and the use of accommodations on state assessments.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	F. Provide software to LEAs for mathematics and reading computer labs for schools identified as in need of improvement.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	G. Provide technical assistance to LEAs to participate in reading initiatives (e.g., Payne Education Center) for schools identified as in need of improvement.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	H. Provide training for LEAs on aligning grade level concepts while still meeting the functional needs of students with significant cognitive disabilities.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	I. Publicize assessment data on the OSDE-SES Web site by LEA as part of the district data profiles, where sample sizes allow.	FFY 2008-2010

Status	Activity	Timeline
Completed	J. Disseminate Oklahoma Accommodations Manual completed by the General Supervisory Enhancement (GSEG) Grant.	FFY 2009-2012
Continuing	K. Provide training to general education teachers on assessment and accommodations.	FFY 2009-2012
Continuing	L. Offer incentives to LEAs to participate in reading initiatives (e.g., Payne Education Center) for schools identified as in need of improvement.	FFY 2009-2012
Continuing	M. Provide general education teachers with preventative training rather than mandatory corrective action training.	FFY 2009-2010
Continuing	N. Provide training on assessment and portfolio development at First Year Special Education Teacher Academy.	FFY 2009-2012
Continuing	O. Provide training on assessment and portfolio development to Institutes of Higher Education as requested.	FFY 2009-2012
Continuing	P. Provide training on assessment to student teachers and graduating special education majors.	FFY 2009-2010
Continuing	Q. Collaborate with the Oklahoma Parent Center to train parents about the importance of assessment, ACE legislation, and Oklahoma's different assessment options.	FFY 2009-2012

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 4: 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))

Measurement:

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

OSDE has defined “significant discrepancy” as a weighted risk ratio of suspension or expulsion of 2.5 or greater for students with disabilities compared to students in the general education classroom.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010	9.19% of LEAs will have significant discrepancies in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2010:

In FFY 2010, 10.30% (54 of 522) LEAs in Oklahoma had significant discrepancies in rates of suspensions or expulsions between students with disabilities and students without disabilities. However, in FFY 2010, there were no findings of LEA noncompliance related to discipline based on inappropriate policies, procedures and/or practices.

LEAs with Significant Discrepancy in Rates for Suspension and Expulsion

*Oklahoma has identified a minimum n size of 10 children on child count for each LEA. The “total number of LEAs” represents the number of districts that met the minimum n size. 6 districts did not meet the minimum n size.

Year	Total Number of LEAs*	Number of LEAs that have Significant Discrepancies	Percent
FFY 2010 (using 2009-2010 data)	522	54	10.30%

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices:

Based on the identification of significant discrepancies, in each of the LEAs identified based on FFY 2010 data, the OSDE-SES reviewed, consistent with CFR § 300.170(b), and if appropriate, revised (or required the affected LEAs to 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 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), for each LEA with a significant discrepancy.

The OSDE-SES determined through this review that none of the LEAs identified as having a significant discrepancy based on FFY 2010 data were significantly discrepant due to inappropriate policies, procedures, and/or practices. As reported in the FFY 2009 APR, the OSDE had no findings of noncompliance related to this indicator in FFY 2009.

The review process for determining inappropriate procedures is multi-layer. First each district is required to submit an assurance statement and those statements are reviewed prior to the release of funding. Second, a review of policies and procedures occurs during all general supervision activities. Lastly, if a district is identified as being discrepancy, they are required to review their policies, submit those policies to the OSDE, and those policies are review for inappropriate identification.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

The FFY 2010 data of 10.30% represents slippage from the FFY 2009 of 8.85%. The OSDE did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 9.19%.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010:

In FFY 2008, with broad stakeholder input, Oklahoma revised the targets for percent of LEAs that will have significant discrepancies in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than ten days in a school year. Upon review, the previous targets identified in FFY 2007 were based on students who were suspended and/or expelled for greater than ten days in a school year statewide rather than LEAs who had a significant discrepancy. The targets set were not based on the appropriate measurement for this indicator, therefore, Oklahoma’s performance and the expected targets were not comparable. In the baseline year (FFY 2004), 15.19% of LEAs in Oklahoma had significant discrepancies in rates of suspensions or expulsions between students with disabilities and students without disabilities. Oklahoma has determined that adopting the previously outlined targets in the SPP from 2005 that were based on the appropriate measurements, provides a more reliable measurement of the performance of LEAs in the area of significant discrepancies in rates of suspensions or expulsions between students with disabilities and students without disabilities.

Status	Activity	Timeline
Continuing	A. Provide a breakout session at the annual State Superintendent's Special Education Conference regarding behavioral interventions and/or manifestation determinations.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	B. Provide a breakout session at the annual Alternative Education Conference regarding behavioral interventions, manifestation determinations, and/or discipline placement alternatives for students with disabilities.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	C. Provide technical assistance to LEAs with significant discrepancies in rates of suspensions/expulsions on discipline placement alternatives for students with disabilities.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	D. Provide technical assistance and resource materials (e.g., books, software, etc.) on Positive Behavior Intervention System (PBIS) to LEAs for personnel training and professional development.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	E. Publicize suspension and expulsion data on the OSDE-SES Web site by LEA as part of the district data profiles, where sample sizes allow.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	F. Request additional assistance from NCCRESt, OSPA, and other agencies, stakeholder groups, taskforces, and technical assistance providers listed in the SPP overview	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	G. Provide a breakout session at the annual state Counselors Only Conference regarding behavioral interventions and/or manifestation determinations.	FFY 2009-2012
Continuing	H. Require LEAs with significant discrepancies in rates of suspensions/expulsions to set aside 15% of their IDEA Part B Flow Through funds for Early Intervening Services (EIS).	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	I. Offer incentives for PBIS to LEAs for personnel training and professional development.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	J. Provide data collection and reporting workshops in each of the five regions in Oklahoma to assist LEAs in the requirements of the reports and to offer tips for the timeliness and accuracy of data submissions.	FFY 2008-2012

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010
Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 4B: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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))

Measurement:

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

OSDE has defined “significant discrepancy” as a weighted risk ratio of suspension or expulsion of 2.5 or greater for students with disabilities compared to students in the general education classroom.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

In FFY 2008, the OSDE-SES obtained from each LEA a variety of student level data (i.e., 618 data) through the OSDE Special Education Data Report/Annual Performance Report system. This system allows the OSDE-SES staff to analyze data by district to determine the percent of districts with significant discrepancies by race or ethnicity among the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year for children with disabilities.

The OSDE-SES applied a risk ratio to calculate the FFY 2008 baseline data regarding the percent of districts with significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year for children with disabilities by race and ethnicity. The risk ratio compares the relative risk of suspension or expulsion by dividing the proportion of students receiving special education and related services who were suspended or expelled by the proportion of students by race or ethnicity who were suspended or expelled. That is, a relative risk ratio of 1.0 suggests no discrepancy between the rates of suspensions and expulsions for students between race or ethnicity. The OSDE-SES has defined “significant discrepancy” as a risk ratio of 2.5 or greater (significantly higher rates) for students with disabilities compared by race or ethnicity. The risk ratio method was also used to calculate the FFY 2008 baseline data regarding the percent of districts with significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year for children with disabilities by race/ethnicity. Similarly, the OSDE-SES has defined “significant discrepancy” in rates of suspensions/expulsions by race/ethnicity as a risk ratio of 2.5 or greater.

The OSDE-SES determined that LEAs in which there is a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions/expulsions of children with disabilities (by race/ethnicity) that is the result of inappropriate policies, procedures, and/or practices would be required to review, consistent with CFR § 300.170(b), and if appropriate, revise (or require the affected LEAs to 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 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

Definition of Significant Discrepancy and Methodology

OSDE has defined “significant discrepancy” as a weighted risk ratio of suspension or expulsion of 2.5 or greater for students with disabilities compared to students in the general education classroom.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2010 (using 2009-2010 data)

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2010 (using 2009-2010 data)	0% of districts had (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

For this indicator, report data for the year before the reporting year (use 2009-2010 data).

In FFY 2010, 11.40% (60 of 522) LEAs in Oklahoma had a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs. However, in FFY 2010, there were no findings of LEA noncompliance related to 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.

4B(a). Districts with Significant Discrepancy, by Race or Ethnicity*, in Rates of Suspension and Expulsion:

*Oklahoma has identified a minimum n size of 10 children on child count for each LEA. The “total number of LEAs” represents the number of districts that met the minimum n size. 6 districts did not meet the minimum n size.

Year	Total Number of Districts**	Number of Districts that have Significant Discrepancies by Race or Ethnicity	Percent**
FFY 2010 (using 2009-2010 data)	522	60	11.40%

4B(b). Districts with Significant Discrepancy, by Race or Ethnicity, in Rates of Suspensions and Expulsions; and 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.

*Oklahoma has identified a minimum n size of 10 children on child count for each LEA. The “total number of LEAs” represents the number of districts that met the minimum n size. 6 districts did not meet the minimum n size.

Year	Total Number of Districts*	Number of Districts that have Significant Discrepancies, by Race or Ethnicity, and 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.	Percent**
FFY 2010 (using 2009-2010 data)	522	0	0%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2010:

In FFY 2010, 11.40% (60 of 522) LEAs in Oklahoma had significant discrepancies in rates of suspensions or expulsions between students with disabilities and students without disabilities this is an increase in the FFY 2009 data of 8.85% (47 of 531). However, in FFY 2010, there were no findings of LEA noncompliance related to discipline based on inappropriate policies, procedures and/or practices. It is important to note that this is the first year that Oklahoma has used the seven categories for race.

The review process for determining inappropriate procedures is multi-layer. First each district is required to submit an assurance statement and those statements are reviewed prior to the release of funding. Second, a review of policies and procedures occurs during all general supervision activities. Lastly, if a district is identified as being discrepancy, they are required to review their policies, submit those policies to the OSDE, and those policies are review for inappropriate identification.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011(if applicable):

Status	Activity	Timeline
Continuing	Provide a breakout session at the annual State Superintendent's Special Education Conference regarding behavioral interventions and/or manifestation determinations	FFY 2009-2012
Continuing	Provide a breakout session at the annual Alternative Education Conference regarding behavioral interventions, manifestation determinations, and/or discipline placement alternatives for students with disabilities.	FFY 2009-2012
Continuing	Provide technical assistance to LEAs with significant discrepancies in rates of suspensions/expulsions on discipline placement alternatives for students with disabilities.	FFY 2009-2012
Continuing	Require LEAs with significant discrepancies in rates of suspensions/expulsions to set aside 15% of their IDEA Part B Flow Through funds for Early Intervening Services (EIS).	FFY 2009-2012
Continuing	Offer incentives for PBIS to LEAs for personnel training and professional development.	FFY 2009-2012

Status	Activity	Timeline
Continuing	Request additional technical assistance and information from the SERRC on strategies for reducing rates of significant discrepancies or policies from other states.	FFY 2009-2012
Continuing	Request additional assistance from NCCRESt, OSPA, and other agencies, stakeholder groups, taskforces, and technical assistance providers listed in the SPP overview.	FFY 2009-2012
Continuing	Publicize suspension and expulsion data on the OSDE-SES Web site by LEA as part of the district data profiles, where sample sizes allow.	FFY 2009-2012
Continuing	Provide data collection and reporting workshops in each of the five regions in Oklahoma to assist LEAs in the requirements of the reports and to offer tips for the timeliness and accuracy of data submissions.	FFY 2009-2012

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 5: 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))

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010	>51.04% of students with disabilities will be inside the Regular Class at least 80% of the day. <9.84% of students with disabilities will be inside the Regular Class 40-79% of the day. <1.85% of students with disabilities will be in Separate Schools/Facilities.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2010:

- A. In FFY 2010, 62.30% of students with disabilities (55,475 of 88,952) will be inside the Regular Class at least 80% of the day.
- B. In FFY 2010, 9.60% of students with disabilities (8,544 of 88,952) will be inside the Regular Class less than 40% of the day.
- C. In FFY 2010, 1.30% of students with disabilities (1,245 of 88,952) will be in Separate Schools/Facilities.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

- A. The OSDE’s FFY 2010 data of 62.30% represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 61.99%. The OSDE met its FFY 2010 target of >51.04%.

- B. The OSDE’s FFY 2010 data of 9.60% represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 9.79%. The OSDE met its FFY 2010 target of <9.84%.
- C. The OSDE’s FFY 2010 data of 1.30% represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 1.42%. The OSDE met its FFY 2010 target of <1.85%.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010:

Status	Activity	Timeline
Continuing	A. Provide professional development for special education and general education teachers on how to successfully implement various co-teaching models in the general education classroom.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	B. Provide additional technical assistance to LEAs through the dissemination of resources. For example, provide LEAs with materials specific to certain primary disability categories.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	C. Request technical assistance and information from national centers, the Access Center, Learning Disabilities Association of Oklahoma (LDAO), Oklahoma Assistive Technology Center (OATC), the Risk Pool Stakeholder Group, and the Oklahoma University Health Science Center (OUHSC) Child Study Center on strategies for improving School Age LRE.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	D. Provide data collection and reporting workshops in each of the five regions in Oklahoma to assist LEAs in the requirements of reporting School Age LRE.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	E. Training to encourage LEAs to include disabled peers in the general curriculum.	FFY 2009-2012
Continuing	F. Provide training to special education professionals to identify the LRE (continuum of placement) for each student.	FFY 2009-2012
Continuing	G. Collaborate with representatives of higher education regarding instruction to teachers in the regular classroom about services to students with special needs	FFY 2005-2012
Continuing	H. Provide breakout sessions at the Language Arts, Reading First, Math/Science, and Title II/III Conferences regarding instruction to students with disabilities in the regular classroom	FFY 2005-2012
Continuing	I. Publicize school age LRE data on the OSDE-SES Web site by LEA as part of the district data profiles, where sample sizes allow.	FFY 2005-2012
Continuing	J. Provide training and technical assistance on collaboration, consultation, and co-teaching as it applies to LRE on an individual basis.	FFY 2010-2012

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 6: 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))

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010	

Actual Target Data for FFY 2010:

Reporting on this indicator was not required in the FFY 2010 APR.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

NA

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010:

NA

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See Indicator 1

<p>Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE</p>
--

Indicator 7: 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))

<p>Measurement:</p>

<p>Outcomes:</p>

- | |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. |
|--|

<p>Progress categories for A, B and C:</p>
--

- | |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100. b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100. c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100. d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100. e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100. |
|---|

<p>Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:</p>
--

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

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

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

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

Discussion of Baseline Data FFY 2010:

Beginning May 2011, Oklahoma determined to use Early Childhood Outcomes as the result component for the OSEP verification to occur in August 2011. During the course of review of data for the results visit, Oklahoma determined that data collected in the previous baseline data was not reliable due to educators using the COSF not being fully knowledgeable of the ratings. Since the review of data, Oklahoma has provided numerous trainings on the COSF to increase the knowledge of the educators completing the ratings. Oklahoma has determined the projected targets in the previous SPP are not valid and has determined to identify new baseline data and targets. Oklahoma established an ECO stakeholder group and based on their recommendations new targets have been set for Indicator 7. Oklahoma is continuing to work with districts through technical assistance and training to ensure accuracy of data. Oklahoma analyzed all valid data for each summary statement. Based on broad stakeholder input from the Early Childhood Outcomes stakeholder group and the IDEA-B stakeholder group, Oklahoma determined to use all valid data for each summary of a student. The number of children in each summary statement may vary.

Baseline Data for Preschool Children Exiting 2010-2011

Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	32	0.9%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	269	8.0%
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	1152	34.1%
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1291	38.2%
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	633	18.7%
Total	3377	100%
Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy):		
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	40	1.2%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	278	8.2%

c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	1169	34.7%
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1279	37.9%
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	606	18%
Total	3372	100%
Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:		
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	31	0.9%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	213	6.3%
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	753	22.3%
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1464	43.4%
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	913	27.1%
Total	3374	100%
Summary Statements	FFY 2010 (% of children)	
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)		
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program	89.0%	
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they exited the program	57.0%	
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)		
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program	88.5%	
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they exited the program	55.9%	
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program	90.1%	
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they exited the program	70.5%	

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010:

Oklahoma, with broad stakeholder input, has set the targets for early childhood outcomes based on the analysis of baseline data. Oklahoma utilized a two year moving average to determine the targets. Attached also is the ECO plan developed as a result of the OSEP verification visit and ECO as the results component.

Status	Activity	Timeline
Continuing	A. Collaborate with the OSDE Office of Early Childhood/Family Education identifying services and strategies for teaching preschool students with disabilities and developmental delays.	FFY 2008–2012
Continuing	B. Provide training through Statewide Training on early childhood outcomes for Part C staff, Part B staff, and parents.	FFY 2008–2012
Continuing	C. Provide technical assistance to LEAs regarding the identification, placement, and services available to preschool students with disabilities.	FFY 2008–2012
Continuing	D. Request information and technical assistance from resource and specialty centers on strategies for improving preschool outcomes or policies from other states.	FFY 2008–2012
Continuing	E. Publicize preschool outcome data on the OSDE-SES Web site by LEA as part of the district data profiles, where sample sizes allow	FFY 2008–2012
Continuing	F. Provided data collection and reporting workshops in each of the five regions in Oklahoma to assist LEAs in the requirements of the reports for ECO.	FFY 2008–2012
Continuing	G. Provide a Frequently Asked Questions document to LEAs at the beginning of each school year regarding ECO and how to collect the data.	FFY 2009–2012
Continuing	H. Include an edit check for the data collection that is reported in the school district reporting site to add reminders to enter ECO entry and exit data.	FFY 2009–2012
Continuing	I. Develop a plan (e.g., public service announcements) to expand the knowledge base and range of audiences (pediatricians) regarding Child Find.	FFY 2009–2012

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 8: 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))

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010	84.00% of parents with a child receiving special education services will report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2010:

In FFY 2010, 93.34% of parents with a child receiving special education services reported that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

In FFY 2010, 93.34% of parents with a child receiving special education services (10,744 of 11,510 surveys returned) reported that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. This data represents progress from OSDE’s FFY 2009 data of 92.53%. The OSDE met its FFY 2010 target of 84.00%.

The OSDE-SES’ response rate for FFY 2010 was 11.83% of surveys distributed to parents returned and included in the analysis (11,510 of 97,264). This is an increase from the FFY 2009 response rate of 11.80%. Also, surveys were received from 92.60% of the LEAs (489 of 528) this is an increase from the FFY 2009 of 90.60% (487 of 537).

For FFY 2010, the OSDE-SES required each LEA to provide parents with a copy of the parent survey and a business reply envelope at each annual IEP team meeting. To address response rates from FFY 2006, the OSDE-SES reduced the length of the survey to only include the critical items, and the OSDE-SES required that parents document on the IEP their receipt of the survey and envelope. Additionally, the

OSDE-SES has provided the LEA with shipments of surveys bi-annually to ensure that each LEA has enough surveys that have the LEA information clearly identified to decrease the amount of surveys that are returned the SEA that cannot be reported back to the LEA.

The OSDE-SES analyzed its response group for representativeness of the population of parents with children with disabilities being served by the OSDE-SES. The following tables show the representativeness by disability category and race/ethnicity. As shown, several parents did not choose to mark the bubbles for these demographic details and some parents failed to “only bubble one” primary disability category or created their own categories in the margins of the survey.

The OSDE-SES will continue to work with LEAs to ensure that parents are encouraged to complete the survey following their annual IEP meeting and to provide any accommodations that are required by parents in completing the survey. Oklahoma is looking at making the survey also available through SurveyMonkey and continuing to encourage districts to provide incentives for the return of the survey.

Disability Category	Population	Response Group
Autism	3.14%	6.01%
Deaf-Blindness	0.02%	0.26%
Developmental Delays	16.84%	13.87%
Serious Emotional Disturbance	4.61%	3.17%
Hearing Impairment, including Deafness	1.12%	1.09%
Intellectually Disabled	5.70%	3.76%
Multiple Disabilities	1.67%	5.27%
Orthopedic Impairments	0.48%	0.67%
Other Health Impairments	11.78%	8.16%
Specific Learning Disability	41.73%	28.99%
Speech or Language Impairment	12.11%	19.45%
Traumatic Brain Injury	0.28%	0.58%
Visual Impairment	0.52%	0.91%
Did Not Report Disability Category	NA	7.80%

Racial/Ethnic Group	Population	Response Group
African American	11.68%	9.24%
Native American	17.54%	18.31%
Hispanic	8.99%	6.22%
White or Other	57.96%	61.89%
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.97%	1.06%
Multiracial	2.86%	0.00%
Did Not Report	NA	3.28%

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010:

Status	Activity	Timeline
Continuing	A. Provide technical assistance and resources (through mail, e-mail, telephone technical assistance, and continual postings on the OSDE-SES Web site) to LEAs on methods of increasing response rates.	FFY 2008–2012
Continuing	B. Include parents on IDEA B Panel and teams to conduct parent meetings as a part of Focused Monitoring on-site visits.	FFY 2008–2012
Continuing	C. Recognize LEAs with above-average return rates and reports of	FFY

Status	Activity	Timeline
	facilitating parent involvement through a special article in the SEA newsletter (<i>Special EDition</i>).	2008–2012
Continuing	D. Request information and technical assistance from resource and specialty centers.	FFY 2008–2012
Continuing	E. Publicize parent involvement data on the OSDE-SES Web site by LEA as part of the district data profiles, where sample sizes allow.	FFY 2008–2012
Continuing	F. Mail parent surveys to the LEAs in two shipments both spring and fall.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	G. Add slide to compliance training presentation to stress the importance of the survey.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	H. Write articles for the Oklahoma Family Network (OFN) and the Oklahoma Parent Center Newsletters on the importance of completing the survey.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	I. IEP institutes for parents.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	J. Participate in community outreach for parents. For example, cooperative activities with the Joining Forces Group and participation in their annual conference.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	K. Examine and add information concerning identifiable information about the parent or student, wording of questions, and the addition of T.A. telephone number.	FFY 2008-2012
New	L. Examine alternative ways of providing access to the survey for parents.	FFY 2010-2012

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 9: 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))

Measurement:
 Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

The OSDE has defined “disproportionate representation” as a risk ratio of identification of less than or equal to 0.5 (underrepresentation) or 2.5 or greater (overrepresentation). When disproportionate representation is determined for a district, the OSDE will conduct a multi-layer analysis to determine if the disproportionate identification is the result of inappropriate identification.

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2008, describe how the State made its annual determination that the disproportionate representation it identified (consider both over and underrepresentation) of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum 'n' size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2008 reporting period, i.e., after June 30, 2009. If inappropriate identification is identified, report on corrective actions taken.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010	0% of LEAs will have disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2009: For FFY 2010, 0% of LEAs will have disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

*Oklahoma has identified a minimum n size of 10 for child count at each LEA. The “total number of LEAs” represents the number of districts that met the minimum n size. Six districts did not meet the minimum n size.

Year	Total Number of Districts	Number of Districts with Disproportionate Representation	Number of Districts with Disproportionate Representation of Racial and Ethnic Groups that was the Result of Inappropriate Identification	Percent of Districts
FFY 2010 (2010-2011)	522	155	0	0%

In FFY 2010, risk ratios indicated that 155 of 522 (29.60%) districts evidenced disproportionate representation for both over and under representation of race/ethnicity. It is important to note that this is the first year that Oklahoma has used the seven categories for race.

The multi-layer analysis to determine whether disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification found that 0 of 528 (0%) of the LEAs had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.

The review process for determining inappropriate procedures is multi-layer. First each district is required to submit an assurance statement and those statements are reviewed prior to the release of funding. Second, a review of policies and procedures occurs during all general supervision activities. Lastly, if a district is identified as being disproportionate, they are required to review their policies, submit those policies to the OSDE, and those policies are review for inappropriate identification.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

The OSDE-SES’s FFY 2010 data of 0% represent maintenance of disproportionate representation from its FFY 2009 data of 0%. The OSDE met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010:

Status	Activity	Timeline
Continuing	A. Require LEAs with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification to correct the noncompliance within one calendar year. In addition, the OSDE-SES provides technical assistance to LEAs throughout this process.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	B. Provide technical assistance to LEAs to revise their policies, practices, and/or procedures of identifying children with disabilities.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	C. Provide technical assistance to LEAs regarding Response to Intervention (RtI) and its use in the identification of students with specific learning disabilities.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	D. Request information and technical assistance from resource and specialty centers, such as national centers and the National Center for Culturally Responsible Educational Systems (NCCRESt)	FFY 2008-2012

Status	Activity	Timeline
	regarding the identification of children as children with disabilities.	
Continuing	E. Provide LEAs with feedback of their enrollment, child count, and weighted risk ratios by race/ethnicity as part of the annual disproportionality summaries.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	F. Publicize the status of disproportionality that is the result of inappropriate identification data on the OSDE-SES Web site by LEA as part of the district data profiles.	FFY 2008-2012

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 10: 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))

Measurement:
 Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

The OSDE has defined “disproportionate representation” as a risk ratio of identification of less than or equal to 0.5 (underrepresentation) or 2.5 or greater (overrepresentation). When disproportionate representation is determined for a district, the OSDE will conduct a multi-layer analysis to determine if the disproportionate identification is the result of inappropriate identification.

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2008, describe how the State made its annual determination that the disproportionate representation it identified (consider both over and under representation) of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum 'n' size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2008, i.e., after June 30, 2009. If inappropriate identification is identified, report on corrective actions taken.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010	0% of LEAs will have disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2010:

In FFY 2010, 353 of 522 (67.60%) LEAs evidenced disproportionate representation (either underidentification, overidentification or both) by race/ethnicity in specific disability categories.

*Oklahoma has identified a minimum n size of 10 for child count at each LEA. The “total number of LEAs” represents the number of districts that met the minimum n size. Oklahoma had six districts that did not meet the minimum n size.

Year	Total Number of Districts	Number of Districts with Disproportionate Representation	Number of Districts with Disproportionate Representation of Racial and Ethnic Groups that was the Result of Inappropriate Identification	Percent of Districts
FFY 2010 (2010-2011)	522	353	0	0%

OSDE’s multi-layer analysis to determine whether the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification found that 0 (0%) of the LEAs had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.

The review process for determining inappropriate procedures is multi-layer. First each district is required to submit an assurance statement and those statements are reviewed prior to the release of funding. Second, a review of policies and procedures occurs during all general supervision activities. Lastly, if a district is identified as being disproportionate, they are required to review their policies, submit those policies to the OSDE, and those policies are review for inappropriate identification.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

The OSDE-SES’s FFY 2010 data of 0% represent maintenance of disproportionate representation from its FFY 2009 data of 0%. The OSDE met its FFY 2010 target of 0%. It is important to note that this is the first year that Oklahoma has used the seven categories for race.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010:

Status	Activity	Timeline
Continuing	G. Require LEAs with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification to correct the noncompliance within one calendar year. In addition, the OSDE-SES provides technical assistance to LEAs throughout this process.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	H. Provide technical assistance to LEAs to revise their policies, practices, and/or procedures of identifying children with disabilities.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	I. Provide technical assistance to LEAs regarding Response to Intervention (RtI) and its use in the identification of students with specific learning disabilities.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	J. Request information and technical assistance from resource and specialty centers, such as national centers and the National Center for Culturally Responsible Educational Systems (NCCRESt)	FFY 2008-2012

Status	Activity	Timeline
	regarding the identification of children as children with disabilities.	
Continuing	K. Provide LEAs with feedback of their enrollment, child count, and weighted risk ratios by race/ethnicity as part of the annual disproportionality summaries.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	L. Publicize the status of disproportionality that is the result of inappropriate identification data on the OSDE-SES Web site by LEA as part of the district data profiles.	FFY 2008-2012

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010
Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Indicator 11: 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))

Measurement:

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

Account for children included in a but not included in b. Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.
Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010	100% of children with parental consent to evaluate will be evaluated and eligibility will be determined within 60 days.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2010:

In FFY 2010, 96.10% of initial evaluations (18,172 of 18,900) were completed and eligibility determined within 60 days or the State established timeline. This excludes initial evaluations that were not completed within the timelines due to the allowable exceptions in 34 CFR §300.301(d) and students who were determined eligible and not eligible. The timeline included 237 students who enrolled in another public agency prior to eligibility determination and 131 students whose parents repeatedly failed or refused to produce the child for the evaluation.

The range of days beyond the timeline when evaluations and determination of eligibility were completed was from one to 203 days. Failure to complete evaluations on time were attributed to the following reasons: LEAs’ failure to follow appropriate procedures; Multidisciplinary Evaluation and Eligibility Group Summary (MEEGS) team decided additional data was necessary; lack of appropriate resources; and breaks in school calendars and/or staff not on contract.

Timely Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State identified in FFY 2009 (the period from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010) (Sum of Column a on the Indicator B15 Worksheet)	115
---	------------

2. Number of findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding) (Sum of Column b on the Indicator B15 Worksheet)	115
3. Number of findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0
4. Number of FFY 2009 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
5. Number of FFY 2009 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”)	0
6. Number of FFY 2009 findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Verification of Correction for findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 (either timely or subsequent):

In FFY 2011 Oklahoma received a verification visit from OSEP. During the visit it was determined that Oklahoma may not be fully implementing correction of noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Oklahoma has four types of monitoring in which only one type, Focus Monitoring, met the requirements of both child level correction and updated data review. In the three other types of monitoring the Desk Audits did not ensure timely correction of child level data, and the Comprehensive Monitoring and the Concern Specific Monitoring did not review updated data for correction. Oklahoma has reviewed the monitoring procedures to ensure compliance with the OSEP Memo 09-02. However, based on the requirements of the FY2010 all areas of noncompliance were corrected within the one year time lined based on the policies and procedures in Oklahoma for the FY2010. Oklahoma has implemented the new procedures and all areas of noncompliance for the FFY 2011 will meet the requirements of the OSEP Memo 09-02. Oklahoma is reviewing all past findings of noncompliance and reviewing updated data to determine continuous compliance.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 (including any revisions to general supervision procedures, technical assistance provided and/or any enforcement actions that were taken):

In any LEA monitored that had less than 100%, for this indicator, the OSDE made a finding of noncompliance and required LEAs exceeding the 60 days (or State-established timeline) to review (and establish, if necessary) appropriate referral, evaluation, and eligibility procedures as well as to correct the noncompliance within one calendar year.

Based on the identification of untimely evaluations in each of the LEAs identified, based on FFY 2009 data, the OSDE-SES reviewed, consistent with CFR § 300.301(c)(1), and if appropriate, revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise) policies, practices, and procedures relating to the completion of an initial evaluation within 60 days of receiving parental consent or a state established timeline to comply with the requirements of IDEA. For FFY 2009, OSDE required a mandatory review of all files that did not meet the required timelines, each LEA was required to submit their written plan of improvements along with corrected documentation to support the fact that evaluations were completed within the 45 school day time line or in a timely manner but no later than one year from the identification of noncompliance. LEAs identified as in noncompliance had further review of data to determine compliance in this indicator. All noncompliance identified for FFY 2009 were identified as corrected within the one year timeline.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

The OSDE-SES’s FFY 2010 data of 96.10% represent slippage from its FFY 2009 data of 97.23%. The OSDE-SES did not meet the FFY 2010 target of 100%.

Oklahoma discussed the improvement activities that are outlined below with broad stakeholder input. Oklahoma has updated the procedures regarding correction of noncompliance.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010:

Status	Activity	Timeline
Continuing	A. Collaborate with the Response to Intervention (RtI) Stakeholder Group to develop statewide procedures for the evaluation and identification of students with specific learning disabilities.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	B. Provide technical assistance to LEAs regarding effective pre-referral strategies and the evaluation process.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	C. Provide tuition reimbursement for students enrolled in master’s level school psychology programs in Oklahoma to increase the number of qualified examiners in the state. In addition, the OSDE provided annual bonuses to Nationally Board Certified school psychologists.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	D. Request information and technical assistance from resource and specialty centers such as national centers.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	E. Provide data collection and reporting workshops in each of the five regions in Oklahoma to assist LEAs in the requirements of reporting and collecting accurate data.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	F. Publicize evaluation/eligibility timeline data on the OSDE-SES Web site by LEA as part of the district data profiles	FFY 2008-2012

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 12: 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))

Measurement:

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

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.

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2010	100.00% of children referred by Part C and who are found eligible for Part B will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2010:

In FFY 2010, 97.10% (960 of 988) of children referred by Part C had determined eligibility for Part B and an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday. The time line included 127 determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays, 988 found eligible who had an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays, 65 children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services, and 5 children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.

Of those not completed by the third birthday, the range of days beyond the third birthday to determine eligibility and implement an IEP was one to 66 days. Other delays were due to: personnel shortages; LEAs’ failure to follow appropriate procedures; MEEGS team decided additional data was necessary; lack of appropriate resources; breaks in school calendars and/or staff not on contract; and lack of communication between Part C and Part B personnel.

Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance in its FFY 2009 APR):

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2009 for this indicator: 97.10%

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2009 (the period from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010)	28
2. Number of FFY 2009 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	28
3. Number of FFY 2009 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

4. Number of FFY 2009 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
5. Number of FFY 2009 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”)	0
6. Number of FFY 2009 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Verification of Correction (either timely or subsequent):

In FFY 2011 Oklahoma received a verification visit from OSEP. During the visit it was determined that Oklahoma may not be fully implementing correction of noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Oklahoma has four types of monitoring in which only one type, Focus Monitoring, met the requirements of both child level correction and updated data review. In the three other types of monitoring the Desk Audits did not ensure timely correction of child level data, and the Comprehensive Monitoring and the Concern Specific Monitoring did not review updated data for correction. Oklahoma has reviewed the monitoring procedures to ensure compliance with the OSEP Memo 09-02. However, based on the requirements of the FY2010 all areas of noncompliance were corrected within the one year time lined based on the policies and procedures in Oklahoma for the FY2010. Oklahoma has implemented the new procedures and all areas of noncompliance for the FFY 2011 will meet the requirements of the OSEP Memo 09-02. Oklahoma is reviewing all past findings of noncompliance and reviewing updated data to determine continuous compliance.

28 of 28 LEAs that were found to be out of compliance with this indicator in FFY 2009 were verified to have corrected the noncompliance within one year. In addition, the OSDE-SES ensures that all children who were referred to Part B were evaluated and that all eligible children had IEPs in place even if not by the third birthday.

Based on the identification of untimely evaluations in each of the LEAs identified, based on FFY 2008 data, the OSDE-SES reviewed, consistent with CFR § 300.301(c)(1), and if appropriate, revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise) policies, practices, and procedures relating to the completion of an initial evaluation within 60 days of receiving parental consent or a state established timeline to comply with the requirements of IDEA. For FFY 2009, OSDE required a mandatory review of all files that did not meet the required timelines, each LEA was required to submit their written plan of improvements along with corrected documentation to support the fact that evaluations were completed by the child’s third birthday or in a timely manner but no later than one year from the identification of noncompliance. LEAs identified as in noncompliance had further review of data to determine compliance in this indicator. All noncompliance identified for FFY 2009 were identified as corrected within the one year timeline.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

The OSDE-SES’ FFY 2010 data of 97.10% represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 98.17%. The OSDE-SES did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.

Oklahoma discussed the improvement activities that are outlined below with broad stakeholder input.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010:

Status	Activity	Timeline
Continuing	A. Require LEAs noncompliant with early childhood transition timelines to review (and establish, if necessary) appropriate early childhood transition procedures as well as to correct the noncompliance within one calendar year. In addition, the OSDE-SES provides technical assistance to LEAs throughout this process.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	B. Provides training on early childhood transition for Part C staff, Part B staff, and parents of preschool students with disabilities.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	C. Provide breakout sessions on early childhood transition (overviews of federal and state laws regarding early childhood transition, as well as strategies on best practices to ensure timely and effective transitions) at the Speech/Language Pathology and Early Childhood Conference, and the State Superintendent's Conference for Special Education Directors and Teachers, and the Counselors Only Conference.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	D. Request information and technical assistance from resource and specialty centers such as national centers, the ECO Center, NECTAC, and the Oklahoma Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) on early childhood transition or policies from other states. This included analyzing Part C information regarding delays in referrals to Part B to target areas in need of additional technical assistance.	FFY 2009-2012
Continuing	E. Provide data collection and reporting workshops in each of the five regions in Oklahoma to assist LEAs in the requirements of reporting early childhood transition and to offer strategies for the timeliness and accuracy of data submissions.	FFY 2008-2012
Completed	F. Revise Part C data collection and reporting system on transition procedures and possible monitoring Part B and Part C together.	FFY 2009-2012
Completed	G. Provide Batelle Developmental Inventory (BDI) Kits to Part B staff at conferences and special events.	FFY 2009-2012
Completed	H. Provide BDI training to Part B examiners.	FFY 2009-2012
Completed	I. Participate in a focused monitoring with Part C to look at timelines and documentation related to Part B activities during transition.	FFY 2009-2012

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 13: 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 need. 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))

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010	100% of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above have 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 need.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2010:

In FFY 2010, 98.70% (20,779 of 21,035) of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above had an IEP that included 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 need.

Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance:

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2009 for this indicator: 98.70%

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2009 (the period from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010)	256
2. Number of FFY 2009 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	256
3. Number of FFY 2009 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

4. Number of FFY 2009 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
5. Number of FFY 2009 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”)	0
6. Number of FFY 2009 findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Verification of Correction (either timely or subsequent):

In FFY 2011 Oklahoma received a verification visit from OSEP. During the visit it was determined that Oklahoma may not be fully implementing correction of noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Oklahoma has four types of monitoring in which only one type, Focus Monitoring, met the requirements of both child level correction and updated data review. In the three other types of monitoring the Desk Audits did not ensure timely correction of child level data, and the Comprehensive Monitoring and the Concern Specific Monitoring did not review updated data for correction. Oklahoma has reviewed the monitoring procedures to ensure compliance with the OSEP Memo 09-02. However, based on the requirements of the FY2010 all areas of noncompliance were corrected within the one year time lined based on the policies and procedures in Oklahoma for the FY2010. Oklahoma has implemented the new procedures and all areas of noncompliance for the FFY 2011 will meet the requirements of the OSEP Memo 09-02. Oklahoma is reviewing all past findings of noncompliance and reviewing updated data to determine continuous compliance.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

The OSDE-SES’ FFY 2010 data of 98.70% represent progress from the FFY 2009 baseline data of 95.21%. The OSDE-SES did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.

Oklahoma discussed the improvement activities that are outlined below with broad stakeholder input.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010:

Status	Activity	Timeline
Continuing	A. Require LEAs (with youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that should have coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet	FFY 2008-2012

Status	Activity	Timeline
	the post-secondary goals) to correct the noncompliance within one calendar year. Provide technical assistance to LEAs throughout this process.	
Continuing	B. Collaborate with Institutions of Higher Education (IHE) regarding the training of special education majors (such as in classroom demonstrations, work adjustments, and job shadowing opportunities) and the provision of other resources that may be available to higher education students.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	C. Provide technical assistance to LEAs regarding writing IEP goals and providing transition services (such as the dissemination of the Indicator 13 checklist developed by NSTTAC, and personnel development opportunities through the Oklahoma Transition Institute, the First Year Special Education Teacher Academy, and local trainings upon request by LEAs).	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	D. Provide technical assistance through 2 breakout sessions at the State Superintendent’s Special Education Conference regarding secondary transition.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	E. Request information and technical assistance from resource and specialty centers, such as the national centers, NSTTAC, NDPC, and NPSO on secondary transition from other states, including a revision and utilization of the Summary of Performance (SOP) as part of the IEP.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	F. Provide data collection and reporting workshops in each of the five regions in Oklahoma to assist LEAs in the requirements of reporting early childhood transition and to offer strategies for the timeliness and accuracy of data submissions.	FFY 2008-2012
Completed	G. Train LEAs how to use transition assessments.	FFY 2009-2012
Continuing	H. Publicize secondary transition data on the OSDE-SES Web site by LEA as part of the district data profiles, where sample sizes allow.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	I. Collaborate with IHEs, professional organizations (e.g., Oklahoma Association on Higher Education and Disability), and other state agencies (e.g., Department of Rehabilitation Services and Career and Technology Education) to improve secondary transition planning for students with disabilities preparing for post-secondary education.	FFY 2008-2012

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 14: 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))

Measurement:

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. 31.9% enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school. B. 46.9% Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school. C. 73.5% 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.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2010:

In FFY 2010

A = 132 of 299 (44.10%) were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.

B = 87 of 299 (29.00%) were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

C = 80 of 299 (26.70%) were 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.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

The OSDE-SES' FFY 2010 data identifies that OSDE-SES did meet its FFY 2010 target for students enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school. However, FFY 2010 data identifies that OSDE-SES did not meet its FFY 2010 targets for students enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school or students 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.

Oklahoma discussed the improvement activities that are outlined below with broad stakeholder input.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010:

Status	Activity	Timeline
Continuing	A. Review the data collection process/instrument to ensure the highest return rate of contact information possible, including information from potential dropouts from ages 14 and above, by requiring contact information submissions from freshman and sophomores on IEPs as well as juniors and seniors.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	B. Contact each LEA underrepresented in the telephone interview process, and provide clarification on requirements and technical assistance on dissemination strategies.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	C. Collaborate with IHEs, professional organizations (e.g., Oklahoma Association on Higher Education and Disability), and other state agencies (e.g., Department of Rehabilitation Services and Career and Technology Education) to improve secondary transition planning for students with disabilities preparing for post-secondary education.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	D. Collaborate with a mentor state (e.g., Washington) to improve the data collection system, tools, and technical assistance provided to LEAs.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	E. Provide technical assistance to LEAs regarding writing IEP goals and providing transition services (such as the dissemination of the Indicator 13 checklist developed by the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center, and/or personnel development opportunities through the Oklahoma Transition Institute or the First Year Special Education Teacher Academy) to facilitate more effective transition planning.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	F. Develop a secondary transition handbook in both English and Spanish to include revisions in statute based on the reauthorization of the IDEA to assist LEAs, students, and parents in creating a	FFY 2008-2012

Status	Activity	Timeline
	smooth transition, as a part of the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) awarded to the OSDE-SES.	
Continuing	G. Provide technical assistance through a breakout session at the State Superintendent's Special Education Conference regarding secondary transition.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	H. Publicize post-school outcome data on the OSDE-SES Web site by LEA as part of the district data profiles, where sample sizes allow.	FFY 2008-2012

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 15: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

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

Measurement:
 Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

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

States are required to use the “Indicator 15 Worksheet” to report data for this indicator (see Attachment A).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010	100% of noncompliance identified will be corrected within one year of identification.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2010:

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)
1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. 2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	16	19
14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school or training program, or both, within one year of leaving high school.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit,	55	65

7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrated improved outcomes.	On-Site Visits, or Other		
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0
4A. Percent of districts identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	2	2
4B. 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.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0
5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 -educational placements.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	71	255
6. Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 – early childhood placement.			
8. 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.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	61	158
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	9	10
9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education that is the result of inappropriate identification.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0
	10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0
11. 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.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	49	115
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	2	3
12. 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.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	6	28
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0

13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with 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 service needs.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	38	241
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0
Other areas of noncompliance: Extended School Year (ESY Services)	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	24	39
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0
Other areas of noncompliance: Administrative records	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	15	22
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0
Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b		963	963
Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification =			963/963=100%

Verification of Correction (either timely or subsequent):

In FFY 2011 Oklahoma received a verification visit from OSEP. During the visit it was determined that Oklahoma may not be fully implementing correction of noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Oklahoma has four types of monitoring in which only one type, Focus Monitoring, met the requirements of both child level correction and updated data review. In the three other types of monitoring the Desk Audits did not ensure timely correction of child level data, and the Comprehensive Monitoring and the Concern Specific Monitoring did not review updated data for correction. Oklahoma has reviewed the monitoring procedures to ensure compliance with the OSEP Memo 09-02. However, based on the requirements of the FY2010 all areas of noncompliance were corrected within the one year time lined based on the policies and procedures in Oklahoma for the FY2010. Oklahoma has implemented the new procedures and all areas of noncompliance for the FFY 2011 will meet the requirements of the OSEP Memo 09-02. Oklahoma is reviewing all past findings of noncompliance and reviewing updated data to determine continuous of compliance.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

In FFY 2010, the OSDE-SES completed on-site monitoring visits, reviewed self-assessments and desk audits, and made findings through formal written complaint investigations and due process hearing decisions as reflected in the table above.

The OSDE-SES continued to ensure that all findings were corrected as soon as possible but no later than one year following the date of the notification to the district of the finding of noncompliance. The OSDE-SES makes findings based on the related requirements as well as the indicators as shown above in the

results indicators. The OSDE-SES groups individual instances of noncompliance by citation to make findings in each LEA. However, it also requires the correction of all individual instances of noncompliance and ensures that for instances that cannot be corrected (i.e. noncompliance with timelines), the student received the appropriate notice, services, or evaluations when not provided within required timelines, and that new placements are monitored and verified as being within timelines. Additionally, OSDE-SES continued to ensure that LEAs identified in noncompliance are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) as outlined in our Policies and Procedure Manual for Special Education in Oklahoma to comply with the requirements of IDEA. For FFY 2009, OSDE required a mandatory review of all files that did not meet the required timelines each LEA was required to submit their written plan of improvements along with corrected documentation to support noncompliance was corrected in a timely manner but no later than one year from the identification of noncompliance. LEAs identified as in noncompliance had further review of data to determine compliance. All noncompliance identified for FFY 2009 were identified as corrected within the one year timeline.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010:

Status	Activity	Timeline
Completed	A. The Focused Monitoring Stakeholder Committee will identify the two priority areas that will be the focus during the focused monitoring visits.	FFY-2008-2012
Completed	B. Request additional assistance from the Education Oversight Committee, NICHCY, ODSS, OFCEC, the National Center of Student Progress Monitoring, and other agencies, stakeholder groups, taskforces, and technical assistance providers listed in the SPP overview	FFY-2008-2012
Continuing	C. Continue with desk audits compliance reviews.	FFY-2008-2010
Continuing	D. Analyze the LEA data profiles based on data related to priority areas to identify the LEAs, which will receive the focused monitoring visits	FFY-2008-2012

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 16: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.

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

Measurement: Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued will be resolved within a 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2010:

For FFY 2010, 100% (34 of 34) signed written complaints with reports issued were resolved within 60 days.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

The OSDE-SES' FFY 2010 data of 100% remain unchanged from its FFY 2009 data of 100%. The OSDE-SES met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.

The OSDE-SES utilizes a formal written complaint management system for complaints regarding alleged violations of the requirements under the IDEA. This system allows the OSDE-SES staff to track the timeliness of reports issued. The OSDE-SES tracks areas of compliance and corrections of all findings of noncompliance identified through state complaints by citation. The correction of findings made based on FFY 2010 complaints will be reported in the FFY 2011 APR. Findings made based on FFY 2009 complaints are included in Indicator 15 of this APR.

Oklahoma discussed the improvement activities that are outlined below with broad stakeholder input.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010:

Status	Activity	Timeline
Completed	A. Maintain a log of complaint activities and develop a complaint tracking procedure and provide training for complaint investigators.	FFY-2008-2012
Continuing	B. Provide formal written complaint procedures to all LEAs and parents upon request, and maintains provision of this information on the OSDE-SES Web site regularly.	FFY-2008-2012
Continuing	C. Provide professional development regarding complaint procedures to include both internal guidance as well as training conducted by a leading national expert on special education law, and focused on procedures for investigating a formal written complaint, tracking the timeliness of the complaint investigation, and information regarding IDEA requirements that often lead to formal written complaints.	FFY-2008-2012
Continuing	D. Send complaint procedures out with the informational packet sent to the LEA upon the filing of the complaint.	FFY-2009-2012

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 17: Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.

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

Measurement: Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010	100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests will be fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that was properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2010:

For FFY 2010, 100% (1 of 1) fully adjudicated due process hearing requests were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that was properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

The OSDE-SES' FFY 2010 data of 100% cannot be compared for progress or slippage since the OSDE-SES did not have any fully adjudicated due process hearing requests data to report from FFY 2009. The OSDE-SES met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.

In FFY 2010, the OSDE-SES continued to contract with the Oklahoma State University (OSU) ABLE Tech to utilize the Special Education Resolution Center (SERC). The OSU-SERC is responsible for managing, directing, and operating the special education due process hearing system as required under the IDEA. Through the contract, the OSU-SERC also oversees the due process and resolution session systems and provides information to the OSDE-SES regarding the number of due process requests filed, resolution sessions (i.e., due process requests not dropped by the complainant), settlement agreements reached through resolution sessions, and findings of noncompliance of due process complaints that are not resolved through resolution sessions.

Oklahoma discussed the improvement activities that are outlined below with broad stakeholder input.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010:

Status	Activity	Timeline
Continuing	A. Collaborate with the OSU-SERC to establish an advisory panel regarding the due process complaint system, to review and update the due process guidelines that were distributed to hearing and appeal officers, parents, LEA personnel, and any other interested parties.	FFY-2008-2012
Continuing	B. Provide training to hearing and appeal officers that emphasize the timeline requirements and acceptable reasons for granting extensions for due process complaints and information regarding IDEA requirements that often lead to due process hearing requests.	FFY-2008-2012
Continuing	C. Provide technical assistance (on due process guidelines, resolution sessions, mediations, IDEA requirements regarding the provision of procedural safeguards to parents, as well as the obligations of LEAs after a due process hearing request has been filed) through breakout sessions at the State Superintendent’s Special Education Conference.	FFY-2008-2012
Continuing	D. Request information and technical assistance from resource and specialty centers and the Oklahoma ICC regarding due process timelines.	FFY-2008-2012

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 18: 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))

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010	85.00% of hearing requests that go to resolution sessions will be resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2010:

In FFY 2010, 38.89% (7 of 18) hearing requests that went to resolution sessions were resolved through resolution settlement agreements.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2009:

The OSDE-SES’ FFY 2010 data of 38.89% is slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 73.33%. The OSDE did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 85%.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010:

Status	Activity	Timeline
Continuing	A. Provide trainings to hearing and appeal officers that emphasize the timeline requirements, acceptable reasons for granting extensions for due process complaints, and utilization of the resolution session system, to include the enforceability of agreements.	FFY-2008-2012
Continuing	B. Provide technical assistance on due process guidelines and resolution sessions at the State Superintendent’s Special Education Conference.	FFY-2008-2012
Continuing	C. Request information and technical assistance from resource and specialty centers, such as the national centers, and NASDSE on due process timelines and resolution sessions or policies from other states.	FFY-2008-2012

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 19: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Measurement:
Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010	85.00% of mediations held will result in mediation agreements.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2010:

For FFY 2010, 94.40% (17 of 18) mediations held resulted in mediation agreements.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2009:

The OSDE-SES’s FFY 2010 data of 94.40% represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 66.67%. The OSDE-SES did meet its FFY 2010 target of 85.00%.

Oklahoma discussed the improvement activities that are outlined below with broad stakeholder input.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2009:

Status	Activity	Timeline
Continuing	A. Require the Alternative Dispute Resolution System of the Administrative Office of the Court to maintain a list of current mediators and provide updates to the OSDE-SES.	FFY-2008-2012
Continuing	B. Developed, printed, and distributed mediation guidelines in parent-friendly language to mediators, parents, school district personnel, advocates, and any other interested party.	FFY-2008-2012
Continuing	C. Distribute the mediation technical assistance brochure to parents and LEA personnel in the mediation process. The brochure is provided to any parent who has requested information on filing a formal written complaint, and provides direction on how to request mediation as a means to encourage use of the mediation system.	FFY-2008-2012

Status	Activity	Timeline
Continuing	D. Provide technical assistance (on due process guidelines, resolution sessions, mediations, IDEA requirements regarding the provision of procedural safeguards to parents, as well as the obligations of LEAs after a due process hearing request has been filed) through breakout sessions at the State Superintendent’s Special Education Conference.	FFY-2008-2012
Completed	E. Distribute updated Mediation Brochure.	FFY 2009-2010
Continuing	F. Provide technical assistance on the two types of mediation systems.	FFY-2009-2012
Continuing	G. Introduce mediation process to other child serving agencies (through Case Management Conference, DHS and other agency newsletters) to recommend mediation before complaints.	FFY-2009-2012

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 20: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

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

Measurement:
 State reported data, including 618 data, State Performance Plan, and Annual Performance Reports, are:
 a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity; placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel and dispute resolution; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports and assessment); and
 b. Accurate, including covering the correct year and following the correct measurement.

States are required to use the “Indicator 20 Scoring Rubric” for reporting data for this indicator (see Attachment B).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010	100.00% of state reported data will be submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for Child Count, including race, ethnicity, and placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, and personnel; and February 1 for APRs). 100.00% of state reported data will be accurate.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2009:

For FFY 2010, 100.00% of state-reported data were timely and accurate.

SPP/APR Data - Indicator 20			
APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Correct Calculation	Total
1	1		1
2	1		1
3A	1	1	2
3B	1	1	2
3C	1	1	2
4A	1	1	2

4B	1	1	2
5	1	1	2
7	1	1	2
8	1	1	2
9	1	1	2
10	1	1	2
11	1	1	2
12	1	1	2
13	1	1	2
14	1	1	2
15	1	1	2
16	1	1	2
17	1	1	2
18	1	1	2
19	1	1	2
		Subtotal	40
APR Score Calculation	Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2010 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.		5
	Grand Total - (Sum of subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =		45.00

618 Data - Indicator 20					
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Responded to Data Note Requests	Total
Table 1 - Child Count Due Date: 2/2/11	1	1	1	1	4
Table 2 - Personnel Due Date: 11/2/11	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 3 - Ed. Environments Due Date: 2/2/11	1	1	1	1	4

Table 4 - Exiting Due Date: 11/2/11	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 5 - Discipline Due Date: 11/2/11	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 6 - State Assessment Due Date: 12/15/11	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	1
Table 7 - Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/2/11	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 8 - MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/1/11	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	1
				Subtotal	22
618 Score Calculation			Grand Total (Subtotal X 2.045) =		45.00

Indicator #20 Calculation			
A. APR Grand Total			45.00
B. 618 Grand Total			45.00
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =			90.00
Total N/A in APR			0
Total N/A in 618			0
Base			90.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Base*) =			1.000
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =			100.00

* Note any cell marked as N/A will decrease the denominator by 1 for APR and 2.045 for 618

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

The OSDE-SES' FFY 2010 data of 100% remains the same from its FFY 2009 data of 100%. The OSDE-SES met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.

In FFY 2010, the OSDE-SES continued to implement strategies for ensuring the timeliness and accuracy of data submissions. The OSDE-SES continued to use edit checks in the Web-based system used by LEAs for reporting child count, exiting, discipline, and personnel information. In addition, the OSDE-SES continued to provide directions provided to LEAs to include more definitions, screen shots, and step-by-step directions to ensure the validity and reliability of the data submitted by LEAs to the OSDE-SES (and thus, from the OSDE-SES to the OSEP). In FFY 2011 OSDE-SES is implementing a new policy that will require LEAs to use the computerized IEP program. OSDE-SES has provided the

software and technical assistance for the program for five years but has not mandated the use of the program. This new mandate will ensure data validity and accuracy as the IEP will be the sole source of data collection.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010:

Status	Activity	Timeline
Continuing	A. Provide data collection and reporting workshops in each of the five regions in Oklahoma to assist LEAs in the requirements of reporting and to offer strategies for the timeliness and accuracy of data submissions.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	B. Publicize the timeliness of data submissions on the OSDE-SES Web site by LEA as part of the district data profiles. If needed to ensure compliance, the OSDE-SES may withhold federal allocations for LEAs that have not submitted required information. LEAs may also receive a deficiency in their accreditation reports for untimely reporting	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	C. Utilize a statewide SEMS to be used by all LEAs (or to be compatible with their existing information systems) for electronic access and monitoring of IEPs. This system will also allow the OSDE-SES to run reports of race, ethnicity, and placement on a continual basis throughout the year and allow the OSDE-SES to check for accuracy of data submission of the formal Child Count information requested in October by comparing the Child Count to the number of active IEPs for the LEA	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	D. OSDE-SES staff members attend meetings of the Education Information Management Advisory Consortium (EIMAC) as well as the OSEP/Westat Data Meeting and other national conferences related to reporting and data updates.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	E. Provides workshops and dissemination of district data profiles, information regarding withholding of federal funds, and revisions to statewide data reporting systems or information systems as needed.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	F. Request information and technical assistance from resource and specialty centers, such as the national centers, and Westat on data collection and policies from other states.	FFY 2008-2012
Continuing	G. Communicate with schools on timelines and deadlines in addition to data quality by sending notice to schools that have not submitted required documentation or sending reminder to school districts one week before data is due to be submitted.	FFY 2009-2012
Continuing	H. Identify schools not in attendance at annual data report workshops and send those schools training materials.	FFY 2009-2012
New	I. Implement mandatory computerized IEP program for data validity.	FFY 2010-2012
New	J. Provide target assistance for LEAs new to the computerized IEP program.	FFY 2010-2012

OKLAHOMA RESULTS PLAN

Vision: Collaboration between Part B and C staff, parents and service providers to ensure that there is consistency in program goals that lead to improved outcomes for children.

Hypotheses Statement: Enhance quality practices (inclusive of the ECO rating) will result in improved outcomes for children. Increased knowledge and consistency, competency of staff will improve the process of determining the rating for ECO

GOAL 1: Staff are knowledgeable and consistent in the process of determining the rating for ECO

Action Plan Template

Action	Timeline	Who	Benchmarks
(Name of major action here)	(timeline)	Lead and those involved	Benchmark (measure of success)
Step 1. Provide training on typical child development and how it relates to ECO	Late Spring/Summer 2012	Cynthia Valenzuela Jenny Giles Fran Ferrari	Training provided to SoonerStart sites and LEA's 6 Regional Training
Step 2. Provide consistent training on the ECO process. Trainer from ECO train all staff, resulting in web training available at all times for follow up	Summer/Fall 2012	Cynthia Valenzuela Jenny Giles Fran Ferrari	Staff have access to consistent training and processes used by staff for both Part B and Part C
Step 3. Provide guidelines related to scoring and consistent rating in increase inter-rater reliability	Fall 2012	Request information from ECO – Grace Kelley	Consistency in scoring

OKLAHOMA RESULTS PLAN

Step 4. Request TA guide on ECO process be developed by ECO.	Fall 2012	Request information from ECO – Grace Kelley	
Step 5. State staff will disseminate FAQ and other current relevant material on ECO process. State ECO team and PTI work to incorporate in staff meetings, trainings etc. Provide training to program managers on how to incorporate.	Ongoing	State Staff	Staff have ongoing support for ECO process
Step 6. PTI's provide training to parents on the ECO process and how they can be involved. Develop training and disseminate through 6 regional PTI workshops and statewide conference	Ongoing 2012	State Staff	Material is developed, trainer identified and trained, training provided to parents.
Step 7. Access the REACH network to ensure that dissemination of ECO material and training is accessible to all.	Ongoing 2012	State Staff	Use existing technology to share what is working'

GOAL 2: Parents have meaningful participation and understanding of achieving outcomes for their child

Action Plan

Action	Timeline	Who	Benchmarks
(Name of major action here)	(timeline)	Lead and those involved	Benchmark (measure of success)
Step 1. Provide information and training in collaboration with the PTI on the ECO process for families in a way that affords increased participation	Upcoming 5 regional workshops	PTI's	Training provided at 6 regional workshops, reported increased participation by parents
Step 2. Parents will be a part of the scoring process and will sign the ECO to indicate their presence and involvement – make a part of the IFSP/IEP process	Late 2012	Parents	Signature line added to forms –IFSP and IEP Parents will serve as the constant/consistent team members for rating at entry and exit ECO
Step 3 Provide information on ECO as part of the initial family contact	Ongoing	State Staff, Local Program staff	

GOAL 3: Services and practices with young children and family members must be based on explicit principles, validated practices, best available research and relevant laws and regulations.

Action Plan

Action	Timeline	Who	Benchmarks
(Name of major action here)	(timeline)	Lead and those involved	Benchmark (measure of success)
<i>Step 1.</i> . Gain input from stakeholders on current status of ECO targets. Use trend data and performance data to guide discussion.	2012	State Staff	
Step 2. Provide training on crucial conversations developed by Joan Blades, with the Special Education Resolution Center (SERC)	Spring 2012	SERC	
Step 3. Each program/district conduct self-assessment using the <i>Relationship of Quality Practices to Child and Family Outcome Measurement Results</i> or <i>Self Assessment tool for ECO</i>	Fall 2012	State Staff, Program and District Staff	
Step 4. Request review of current plan by ECO staff. Add activities as recommended by ECO staff.		Grace Kelley -SERRC	

GOAL:

Action Plan Template

Action	Timeline	Who	Benchmarks	Outcome
(Name of major action here)	(timeline)	Lead and those involved	Benchmark (measure of success)	(Ultimate outcome statement)
Step 1.				
Step 2.				
Step 3.				
Step 4.				

OKLAHOMA RESULTS PLAN